



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 19, 2004

No. 100

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUNES).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 19, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DEVIN NUNES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

IRAQI HANDOVER: GIFT OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, while we were in our districts late June and early July, celebrating the anniversary of our independence day, we handed over to the citizens of Iraq the gift of their independence, 2 days early no less.

Barely on anyone's radar screen, sovereignty passed from the Coalition Provisional Authority to the new Iraqi provisional government. By most barometers, except for the naysayers of

this administration, this was a big success. In the United States, we kept our word of giving the Iraqi people back their country. On Wall Street, in Asia and in Europe, the stock markets rallied. Gas prices continued their slide down: Average gasoline prices tumbled 7 cents a gallon from mid June to mid July, according to the new report from AAA. But to whom was this triumph most important? The free Iraqi people.

As I say, there are naysayers who likely did not celebrate this good news: The radical Islamist world, terrorists, al Qaeda, and a few political partisans. To them, it is not about Iraq, the people, it is about the President they want to see fail.

On what grounds do I say this? Well, on Monday, June 28, CNN heard Wendy Sherman, a former State Department counselor in the Clinton administration, say "I hope we have turned a corner, but obviously I think we need a change in presidents to really change the corner."

The President overthrew a brutal dictatorship, he arrested Saddam Hussein, he has since handed him over to Iraqi courts, restored or built new infrastructure, and set up a provisional government within 1 year following the attacks, and we need a change in the Presidency? Mr. Speaker, if you had to pick a team, would you rather play with those who see victory or those who see defeat?

Now, back to the Iraqi people. A recent poll of 2,200 Iraqi households by an Iraqi firm shows that half of Iraqis interviewed believe Iraq is headed in the right direction; 65 percent think they will be better off; 73 percent believe the handover of authority to the interim government will improve the current situation.

The Iraqi people now enjoy an administrative law system with sovereignty, justice, and rights of free expression, justice, thought, and conscience. That such optimism abounds following dec-

ades of tyranny, war, and terror reminds me of a speech by a citizen of a former colony of the British empire at its waning days, spoken at their handover, a citizen who made an impassioned plea for his countrymen to march into the destiny before them and create a land of democracy and freedom. That was August 14, 1947, by the eventual prime minister, Mr. Nehru, when he gave his speech on the granting of Indian independence.

Of course, there are spectacular differences, Mr. Speaker, between the two countries and the situation. India was a colony of another nation, not a sovereign country; whereas, Iraq has been hostage to an internal tyrant of their own blood and nationality. However, the mood of a nation and a people on the cusp of a new day, standing in the sun on their own, with the blessings of the free world, is somewhat transferable.

Mr. Nehru's entire speech is inspiring and lyrical, but there are two particular passages I find applicable to the handover the world is watching now. Nehru begins, "A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when an age ends, and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance. It is fitting that at this solemn moment we take the pledge of dedication to the service of India and her people and to the still larger cause of humanity."

Mr. Speaker, the Iraqis too are the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finding utterance, and I wish them the joys and the blessings of liberty. And I close with this uplifting benediction of Mr. Nehru's. "To the nations and peoples of the world we send greetings and pledge ourselves to cooperate with them in furthering peace, freedom, and democracy."

Nehru admonished his fellow Indians that it would not be enough to work for peace within India's border, or the border with Pakistan, but that to be truly

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5911

peaceful citizens of the world, Indians must cooperate with their international neighbors in "furthering peace, freedom, and democracy."

I wish and I hope that citizens of Iraq will think this, and think not only of civil rest within their great nation, but the opportunity for the dawning of a new day across the troubled swath of their neighborhood of the world.

LACK OF RULE OF LAW IN RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of my 5-minute speech, and that I may include extraneous material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to my serious concern with the lack of the rule of law in Russia.

Fifteen years ago, all of us watched with great excitement and great optimism as the Communist system came to a resounding close while the Russian people and the government went through an historic transformation. We saw President Boris Yeltsin stand up against tanks in the streets of Moscow, and we watched as Russia moved to embrace Democratic change.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in the last few years, we have watched as the government of Mr. Putin has slowly but surely pulled back from Democratic change. Freedom of the press has increasingly declined, particularly in the realm of television. Elections have been less open and less Democratic. The rule of law has been proscribed by government regulation. Increasingly, government control has restricted the freedoms that had just begun to blossom in post-Soviet Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the most recent, and in many ways the most dramatic, example of this decline of the rule of law in Russia has been the Russian government's political prosecution and persecution of Mikhail Khodorkovsky, the former chairman of Yuko Oil, one of Russia's largest companies, and the one that had gone the farthest in moving towards transparent western market-oriented business practices. It was the Russian company which had made the greatest progress in corporate transparency. The company was on the verge of an unprecedented business deal with Western oil companies.

The Russian prosecutors, clearly at the demand of the political leadership, initiated a political prosecution of Mr. Khodorkovsky. He was arrested last

summer by a mob of armed security forces as his plane landed at a Siberian airfield. Since that time, he has been held in a Russian jail. He has been limited in his contact with his own attorneys, he is not permitted to communicate with the outside world, and he appears in court in a steel cage.

This treatment of an individual who at this point has a tax dispute with the Putin regime violates all principles of due process and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling attention today of our colleagues in the Congress to this decline of civil and human rights in Russia. Together with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), we have established the Russia Democracy Caucus to work for the development of the rule of law and the consolidation of civil and human rights in Russia.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues will be submitting their statements joining me in deploring the rollback of freedom and civil rights in Russia during recent years.

Mr. Speaker, last month, on a visit to Moscow, I met with Ambassador Alexander Vershbow and other embassy officials to get an update on the political situation in that country. I also met with legal experts and human rights groups who provided a grim account of the recurring threats to individual and political freedoms that regrettably harkens back to the old Soviet days.

Respect for human rights is the cornerstone of a civilized society. Even the Russian constitution recognizes this fact, as provided in Article 2:

The individual and the individual's rights and freedoms represent the highest value. It is the duty of the state to recognize, respect, and protect the rights and freedoms of the individual and the citizen.

Our own commitment to human rights as it relates to Russia and other former Communist countries is manifest in the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, in which we effectively utilized the so-called "Basket Three" of that document to publicly hold the Soviet Union accountable for its violations of human rights and civil liberties.

For a brief moment, during President Yeltsin's presidency, we thought indeed there would be freedom and liberty in Russia. It was during this time, the G-8 member nations allowed Russia to participate as an ad-hoc member, so long as it adhered to the principles of Constitutional democracy, rule of law and human rights. My colleague CHRIS COX and Senator JOE BIDEN have spoken out recently about whether Russia, under President Vladimir Putin, deserves a place at the G-8 table and indeed if that country should host the next session in 2006.

I would also remind my colleagues that Resolution H. Con. Res. 336, which enumerates these shortfalls and recommends that Russia be denied participation in G-8 sessions until it demonstrates its worthiness as a Democratic state, recently passed the House International Relations Committee. A similar measure is co-sponsored by Senators MCCAIN and LIEBERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, our own State Department has documented what we have learned from a variety of sources concerning the deteriorating situation as it relates to rule of law, freedom

of expression, and human rights in Russia. Over the past year, reports from human rights groups, NGOs, the European Union, legal scholars, and wide spread media reporting of conditions in Russia bear out what our own government has reported. On Secretary of State's last trip to Russia, he made it a point to voice his concerns directly to President Putin and publicly expressed them through the limited media outlets that exist in Moscow.

There is much that concerns me about Russia today. In view of the time limitation I cannot address all of them, but I would like to mention a few that I believe deserve urgent attention.

First is the case against Mr. Mikhail Khodorkovsky, chairman of YUKOS Oil Company. This week Mr. Khodorkovsky goes to trail in a court that is hardly known for its integrity or independence. Virtually all of the legal entities and courts outside Russia have ruled against the Russian government, generally finding the cases lack in legal merit and being political in nature. Little wonder Mr. Khodorkovsky is already a condemned man. Hardly anyone inside or outside Russia seriously believes he will receive a fair and just trial.

Since his arbitrary arrest last fall by masked gunmen and detention, Mr. Khodorkovsky has been subjected to numerous violations of his due process rights. The Kremlin has directed the case against him for purposes that are widely seen as political, not criminal. Indeed the case is being held in the notoriously corrupt Basmany Court, which is controlled by Kremlin and Russia security forces. His corporate and lawyers' offices, foundations, daughter's school have been repeatedly searched without warrant or warning.

The relentless attacks on the YUKOS Company and efforts to cripple the once prominent and Western-oriented company raises questions about the true motives by the authorities involved. It is one thing to bring a case against Mr. Khodorkovsky and other officers in the company, depending on the charges brought against them. But clearly the Kremlin has other motives as well, not the least of which is to bring about a stake takeover or ownership of the once thriving private company.

Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of my colleagues to Senate Res. 258, which expresses concern about the circumstances surrounding Mr. Khodorkovsky's case, and which has passed the full Senate.

My second concern has to do with state ownership and control of the media in Russia. Under President Boris Yeltsin, privately owned and independently operated media began to take root and for the first time citizens of that country could read and view objectively reported news and even criticism of government officials, even the president himself.

The vanguard of this new era was Mr. Vladimir Gusinsky, an entrepreneur who had the genius of a William Randolph Hearst and the resources to build a media empire worthy of any in the West. However, Boris Yeltsin's successor had no tolerance and certainly not the temperament to allow any criticism of him or his politics.

The result, as we have seen in subsequent events, was predictable. An angry Vladimir Putin, utilizing extralegal means, forced a shutdown of Mr. Gusinsky's media outlets, save one—the prominent and popular NTV television station, which was taken over by the

state-owned Gazprom and has been under Kremlin influence ever since. Just a few weeks ago, the one newscaster on NTV who dared to lightly criticize government officials was sacked on orders from intelligence agencies inside the Kremlin. Mr. Leonid Parfyonov, a popular host of a Sunday-night political news program and one of the most independent voices in Russia, apparently crossed over the line on the Kremlin-directed censorship.

I was personally well acquainted with Mr. Gusinsky, who today operates a media conglomerate in Israel. Not only did he lose his media businesses in Russia, but he suffered personal hardship and humiliation. President Putin ordered raids by masked gunmen on his business headquarters and the arrest and detention in Moscow's infamous Butyrskaya prison, and eventually forced him into exile. Since then Russian authorities have sought his extradition by way of requests to Interpol, and the courts of Spain and Greece. In every single case, the requests were denied for lacking in legal merit and being political in nature.

Finally, I would like to address the issue of expropriation of property. There is little secret that many of Russia's crown jewels, its natural resources, were acquired by individuals during the privatization that occurred in the early 1990s. Whatever the circumstances and the controversial amounts that were paid for these acquisitions, they were conducted within the laws that existed at the time. Yet there are recurring threats, some outright as in the case of YUKOS and others implied, that the government may renationalize these assets.

This poses several disturbing questions. One, of course, is the overall affect on direct foreign investment in the country. At the moment, Russia's economy is performing well only because of the sizable revenue that is pouring in from the exportation of energy, primarily oil and gas. Foreign investment and Western business cooperation, which is necessary if Russia is to truly develop its industrial and exporting sectors, will be jeopardized if the Kremlin-directed assaults on these enterprises is allowed to continue.

Other questions concern the Russian government's official position with regard to these privatized businesses, most of which are in the resource-based sectors. At the moment, the government policy is, if anything, arbitrary and unpredictable, if not outright threatening to the privatized companies involved. At best, President Putin has sent conflicting messages by making reassuring statements, on the one hand, while authorizing contrary actions on the other.

A case in point is the SPI Group, which acquired production and distribution rights to Russia's most famous vodka trademarks (including Stolichnaya). In 1997, a group of investors, headed by Mr. Yuri Sheffer, bought the rights to 43 Russian vodka brands from the original investors who acquired the production and trademark rights during the privatization of this and other resource-based sectors. They assumed a \$50 million debt and promptly invested another \$20 million, and today it is a well managed and successful business.

SPI Group has registered the trademarks for its vodka brands in more than 150 countries. It has a 10 year distribution deal with Allied Domecq in the United States and equally well established distributors throughout Europe.

Yet the Russian authorities, principally Rospatent and the Ministry of Agriculture, have aggressively challenged the SPI Groups rights inside Russia and elsewhere, and while court rulings have been mixed in Russia they have been uniformly in favor, of the SPI Group outside the country. Among the more prominent cases, ruling in favor of the SPI Group, occurred in Germany, a Rotterdam decision affecting the Benelux countries, France, and more recently in Kazakhstan.

Mr. speaker, what I have recounted here is limited simply because there is no time to go on further. But it underscores the disturbing trends in Russia today.

I have always counted myself as a friend of Russia and have expressed on many occasions my gratitude for the huge sacrifices made by the people of the country to halt the march of Nazism in Europe. It greatly saddens me, therefore, to witness the unraveling of democratic freedoms in that country today. The Russia democracy Caucus, cochaired by CHRISTOPHER COX and myself, is fully committed to helping guide Russia through this period so that it can be counted among the truly great democracies of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion to this discussion of concerns about the rule of law and related problems, there is an urgent humanitarian issue that I want to bring to your attention. That is the grave medical condition of Mr. Platon Lebedev, a prominent businessman who, along with his partner, Mr. Mikhail Khodorovosky, is in detention under rather inhuman conditions in Moscow. The gravity of Mr. Lebedev's deteriorating health and the absolute neglect of his condition by the Russian authorities demands international outrage and it underscores why I, along with many of our colleagues, have asked for this time on the floor today.

Last week, a dozen of the leading human rights activists in Russia representing major human rights groups issued a statement critical of the treatment by Russian authorities of Platon Lebedev, the head of Group Menatep, the parent company of YUKOS Oil.

Mr. Lebedev has been detained and jailed for nearly a year and has not been allowed to have an independent medical examination or treatment, despite the fact that credible Russian and foreign experts have confirmed that he has severe and life-threatening ailments. In fact Mr. Lebedev was originally taken into custody from a hospital bed and in December 2003 had to have an ambulance take him from a court hearing.

Russian human rights activists point out that the denial of appropriate medical attention violates several articles of Russian law that indicate that detainees may receive medical treatment at medical establishments should this be required by the detainees condition. It is clear that Russia is not only violating universal human rights and the rule of law but their own laws.

Let me read a quote from the recent statement:

It is out conviction that in order to protect the sacred human rights—the right to live and the right to a fair trial—the court must change the custodial restraint for Platon Lebedev to a format that does not involve prison detention so that an independent medical examination and full-fledged treatment can be provided immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the treatment of Platon Lebedev is clear evidence that the Russian legal system is broken.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD a series of articles and extraneous material on the lack of the rule of law in Russia. These articles are from the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, and the International Herald Tribune.

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 2004]

SAME OLD RUTHLESS RUSSIA

(By Michael R. Caputo)

American journalist Paul Klebnikov was shot to death outside my office building on Friday. At least it used to be my office. I worked with Klebnikov, Forbes magazine's maverick correspondent, several times in the past 10 years, sometimes in Moscow, sometimes in New York. Out paths crossed often through one of Russia's wildest decades.

Eight years after we first met as he covered Boris Yeltsin's 1996 presidential election, his murder brings clarity: Nothing has changed. Brutal criminals still run amok in Russia, operating with impunity and no fear of prosecution.

Klebnikov had high hopes for Russia and was determined to urge democracy along. He grew up in the United States, cradled in the close-knit Russian American community; his Russian skills were perfect and his devotion to the culture ran deep. He blossomed in journalism just as the communist bloc crumbled, and his unique understanding of "the story" in the region propelled his career.

As we toured the Russian countryside eight years ago, he talked to peasants waiting in line to vote and grilled me with questions, too. Had I run across billionaire Boris Berezovsky in my work with the Yeltsin administration? I hadn't. Klebnikov had recently been scratching the surface of Berezovsky's brazen get-rich-quick schemes. He was convinced there was much more to the oligarch. He was in town to investigate him as well as to cover the elections.

Berezovsky was one of several super-wealthy men who had back doors to Yeltsin's Kremlin. His popularity waxed and waned, but as he amassed wealth he gained unparalleled power. Experienced expatriates in Russia shared an essential rule: Don't cross these brutal billionaires, ever, or you're likely to go home in a box.

Klebnikov knew this well. In Russia the mafia kills every day. He knew Paul Tatum, the Oklahoma entrepreneur who ran afoul of Moscow's mafia and was shot dead just a few hundred yards from a hotel he had founded and had fought against Mayor Yuri Luzhkov to control. After Tatum's murder, Hizzoner promised swift justice. We're still waiting.

Tatum had led a loud life in Moscow. Klebnikov told me he knew Tatum's battle with city "authorities" was never a sound strategy for survival. The Tatum murder shook him, but he was determined to go forward with what grew into a series of articles exposing Russian corruption. After all, he was a reporter, not a businessman.

As a journalist, Klebnikov was the real deal. He was based in New York through the 1990s but had more contacts in Moscow than most reporters on the ground full time.

During his frequent trips to the region he accomplished more meetings before lunch than many of us could pull off in a week.

Klebnikov listened as intently to the griping of a pensioner as he did to the drone of politicians. He was quick to the point, wasted no time, and drove to the center of his story like a tank. Some thought he was bold, others thought him brash, but everyone was reading.

"Godfather of the Kremlin," his December 1996 Forbes cover story on Berezovsky, threw new light on the doings of Russia's oligarchs. The story grew into Klebnikov's first book,

with the same title, published in 2001. The exiled industrialist took the magazine to court in London, and eventually Forbes recanted accusations of violence. Those of us who lived in Moscow during Berezovsky's heyday still believe.

His follow-up stories on Russian industrialists were always fair and thorough, but he didn't make many friends in the country. Soon after Vladimir Putin stepped into the presidency, Klebnikov and I met in New York. I told him he needed to watch his back with so much change afoot. He shrugged and said he was uniquely positioned to get to the heart of corruption in Russia. "Who else is going to do it?" he asked. I had no answer.

When Forbes announced Klebnikov would lead its new Russian publications and relocate to Moscow, I immediately feared for his safety. A few months later he was dead. I think about him, sprawled bleeding on the sidewalk, coughing his final words to a reporter colleague who found him dying.

Russia hasn't changed in the past decade and at this trajectory it won't be truly civilized for generations. Those who killed Klebnikov are killing today, plan to kill tomorrow, and know they'll roam free to kill for years to come. Hellbent on getting rich, they have no boundaries. Raised in a communist world devoid of morals, they have no soul.

There is no valid reason why a nation so tolerant—even complicit—in organized crime should stand on par with world leaders in groups such as the World Trade Organization. Putin must stand as the guarantor of media freedom. And the Bush administration must demand results in this murder investigation and require the assassins and their bosses be detected, arrested, tried and punished to the fullest extent of the law.

Or will it let Paul Klebnikov, like Paul Tatum, be just another footnote in Russia's disingenuous flirtation with world-class rule of law? We're waiting.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 12, 2004]

LAWLESS RUSSIA

The murder of Forbes Russia Editor-in-Chief Paul Klebnikov on a Moscow street Friday night was the most dramatic display yet of the lawlessness that has Russia in its grip. Prosecutor General Vladimir Ustinov says he has taken "personal control" of the case, a suggestion that the Russian state is finally conscious of its bad image in the world. But under its present leadership, the state is itself an important part of the problem.

The 41-year-old Mr. Klebnikov was a brilliant journalist and student of Russian history. He had written for our pages several times, most recently last November when he argued that the arrest of Russia's richest businessman, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, was a blow against the "kleptocracy" that had enriched itself with state assets under Boris Yeltsin's privatization program.

He knew a lot about the subject, having written a controversial 2000 book, "Godfather of the Kremlin," about one of the leading Russian oligarchs, Boris Berezovsky. In the May issue of Forbes Russia, Mr. Klebnikov broke the news that Moscow has more dollar billionaires than New York City.

The magazine, licensed by Forbes of the U.S. and published by the German Axel Springer organization, published the names of Russia's 100 richest business leaders, giving them the sort of attention many don't welcome. Mr. Klebnikov was not afraid to make powerful enemies in the interest of honest journalism.

In a recent book, "Darkness at Dawn," David Satter, a former Journal Moscow correspondent, wrote that Russia has been

taken over by a criminal elite in which gangsters, business and corrupt officials work together. The result is a climate of fear and public cynicism. The collapse of communism, with its history of state-sponsored violence, left a moral vacuum that persists in a different form. Some of the modern thugs got their training with the Soviet secret police.

The Committee to Protect Journalists, which records attacks on journalists throughout the world, cites Russia as a special problem. Attempts to shut up the press have been made by the Federal Security Bureau, formerly the KGB. Russian President Vladimir Putin, who has systematically seized control of Russian TV, retains some of the habits he developed when he himself was a KGB functionary.

Yet Mr. Putin is welcomed to international parleys, such as G-8 meetings, as if he were the leader of a normal country. The murder of Paul Klebnikov demonstrates that Russia is not a normal country. Perhaps it's time for the leaders of free democracies to ask Mr. Putin whether the rule of law exists in Russia.

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 2004]

RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT BEGINS SEIZING YUKOS ASSETS

(By Peter Baker and Susan B. Glasser)

Moscow, July 7.—The Russian government moved Wednesday to begin seizing assets of Yukos Oil Co. in the culmination of a politically charged tax battle that could either bankrupt or break up the country's largest oil producer.

Court marshals accompanied by special police forces raided the company's registry office in Moscow at the end of the business day to search for ownership documents for various Yukos properties. The marshals were enforcing last week's court judgment giving Yukos a Wednesday deadline to pay a \$3.4 billion back tax bill.

Yukos said this week that it had no more than \$1.4 billion in cash and could not pay the full charge in time without an installment plan. Yukos reportedly offered to turn over some or all of the controlling stake owned by the company's imprisoned chief shareholder, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, and his partners, but all attempts at negotiations appeared to have failed so far.

"The debtor was given a five-day deadline for voluntary execution, after which the court bailiffs service of the city of Moscow began to enforce the court decision," the Russian Justice Ministry said in a statement carried by the Interfax news service after the raid began.

The ministry statement immediately threatened a new criminal investigation and obstruction charges against officials at Yukos' registry for allegedly trying to avoid cooperating with the marshals who arrived at their building.

Authorities can seize the company's assets and either keep them to satisfy the tax debt or sell them off. But it is possible they were not able to find the right documents at the office of the registry, a firm called Revester-M. Yukos said registry documents of its subsidiaries in Siberia and along the Volga River were transferred last week after the court ruling, apparently to those regions.

The confrontation stems from a year-long power struggle between Khodorkovsky and President Vladimir Putin. Khodorkovsky is a brash former communist youth league leader who bought Yukos at bargain-basement price during the privatization auctions of state property during the 1990s. He built the company into a major international player and himself into Russia's richest man.

But he angered some in the Kremlin with his outspoken political activities and soon

found himself and his company under legal threat. Khodorkovsky was arrested at gunpoint last October and remains in prison awaiting trial on fraud and tax evasion charges, while the federal tax service has hit Yukos with two tax bills from 2000 and 2001 adding up to nearly \$7 billion. The country's chief prosecutor said Tuesday that more bills from 2002 and 2003 were still to come.

The situation endangers a company that pumps more oil than Libya and accounts for one-fifth of foreign petroleum sales by Russia, the world's second-largest oil exporter. The latest figures published by brokerage houses Monday showed that Yukos produces 1.7 million barrels a day, surpassing its own records and every other Russian oil company.

Bruce Misamore, the company's chief financial officer, said Tuesday that production had not been disrupted yet and that the company has prepaid transport and other fees to keep shipping oil until at least the third week in July. The bank accounts frozen so far have just \$20 million in them, he said. Misamore met Tuesday with representatives of Western banks that declared Yukos in default on a \$1 billion loan and they have not demanded payment yet.

Misamore said the government abruptly halted secret settlement discussions last week and has not been willing to compromise. "We're just trying to make our best efforts to reach a resolution to the situation," Misamore told a conference call with investors. "But first they've got to talk to us."

The Financial Times reported that Yukos sent a fresh proposal to the government Tuesday, offering some or all of Khodorkovsky's shares in exchange for a three-year payment plan. Prime Minister Mikhail Fradkov's office denied receiving any written proposal, and a Yukos spokesman said it sent no letter, however, he would not say whether the idea was floated in some other form.

Prosecutor General Vladimir Ustinov, who imprisoned Khodorkovsky, expressed little sympathy for what he sarcastically called "poor Yukos" and doused hopes for a deal. "This is like a snowball," he said on Echo Moskvy radio Tuesday. "This case has a beginning, but it's very difficult to see its end."

He asserted that the company should have no trouble paying the tax bills even though the government obtained a court order freezing its assets. "The profits that Yukos made could easily pay the company's debts," he said.

The case drew international criticism this week for the politicization of Russian business and courts. "The so-called 'Yukos case' reflects these problems," the Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, said in its annual report on Russia, released Wednesday. "Whether the charges against the company and its core shareholders are true or not, it is clearly a case of highly selective law enforcement."

A senior U.S. diplomat said Tuesday that the case is "raising fundamental questions in the minds of many investors." There are "increasing signs that destruction of the company is the intended endpoint," he said. "At a minimum," he added, it's "an extraordinary game of brinkmanship" akin to a game of chicken with two cars racing toward a cliff and "they're getting very close."

In his analysis, the diplomat said, it appears likely that a "sizable percentage of the company's assets [will] move into the hands of the state."

[From the Herald Tribune, June 15, 2004]

RUSSIA ON TRIAL

The Russian government's fraud and tax evasion case against two billionaires, Mikhail Khodorkovsky and Platon Lebedev, opens Wednesday in a Moscow court. The trial has already attracted enormous attention; the extraordinary fortunes of the two defendants, and the parallel struggle for survival of the oil company that made them rich, Yukos, has turned this case into a microcosm of the struggles that are shaping the new Russia. Much depends on the outcome, not least how investors will look at Russia in the future. In effect, it is Russia and the rule of law that go on trial.

Khodorkovsky, to be sure, is not the model, philanthropic businessman his supporters make of him. Like all the other so-called oligarchs, he made his billions in the dirty plunder of Russia's riches in the chaotic aftermath of the Soviet Union's disintegration. But neither is President Vladimir Putin the champion of civic virtue he would have us see. If tax evasion were the real issue, every oligarch, and most every Russian, would be in the dock. And even if Putin needed to pillory a couple of oligarchs to set an example, there are far more unsavory examples to go after. Khodorkovsky at least turned Yukos into a globally admired, relatively transparent business.

To all appearances, Putin is leaning on the judiciary to settle scores with tycoons who dared show an interest in politics. In this regard, Khodorkovsky, who has contributed generously to reform-minded parties, is only Putin's latest target, following in the footsteps of Boris Berezovsky and Vladimir Gusinsky, two Russian tycoons now residing in exile.

Equally ominous, in pushing Yukos to the brink in a parallel tax-avoidance case, Moscow has raised fears that it is trying to bring Russia's natural resources back under direct state control. Last Friday, the government was able to remove a judge from the case who seemed open-minded in considering an appeal by Yukos.

We do not argue that all oligarchs should go scot-free. No state can tolerate enterprises operating above the law. But at play here is a different danger, of a state capriciously and selectively applying laws to suit its political interests.

Russia's judiciary faces an unenviable challenge in tempering excess prosecutorial zeal, without endorsing blanket immunity for past misdeeds. In the end, the critical question is not whether the court finds the two men guilty or not, but whether it succeeds in demonstrating that it has delivered justice. Russia's courts have shown themselves sadly subservient to the government so far. Most Russians expect that they will continue down this familiar road, rubber-stamping the government's charges until Khodorkovsky and Lebedev are found guilty.

For the sake of Russian democracy, the judiciary needs to declare its independence. Courts in such high-profile cases can do so in the way they handle the objections and arguments of the defense, in the way they rule on the crude methods of the investigators and in the way they separate the political demands of the Kremlin from the legal facts of the case. Given Russia's past, few things could be more corrosive to democracy than a show trial.

The Russian government's fraud and tax evasion case against two billionaires, Mikhail Khodorkovsky and Platon Lebedev, opens Wednesday in a Moscow court. The trial has already attracted enormous attention; the extraordinary fortunes of the two defendants, and the parallel struggle for survival of the oil company that made them

rich, Yukos, has turned this case into a microcosm of the struggles that are shaping the new Russia. Much depends on the outcome, not least how investors will look at Russia in the future. In effect, it is Russia and the rule of law that go on trial.

Khodorkovsky, to be sure, is not the model, philanthropic businessman his supporters make of him. Like all the other so-called oligarchs, he made his billions in the dirty plunder of Russia's riches in the chaotic aftermath of the Soviet Union's disintegration. But neither is President Vladimir Putin the champion of civic virtue he would have us see. If tax evasion were the real issue, every oligarch, and most every Russian, would be in the dock. An even if Putin needed to pillory a couple of oligarchs to set an example, there are far more unsavory examples to go after. Khodorkovsky at least turned Yukos into a globally admired, relatively transparent business.

To all appearances, Putin is leaning on the judiciary to settle scores with tycoons who dared show an interest in politics. In this regard, Khodorkovsky, who has contributed generously to reform-minded parties, is only Putin's latest target, following in the footsteps of Boris Berezovsky and Vladimir Gusinsky, two Russian tycoons now residing in exile.

Equally ominous, in pushing Yukos to the brink in a parallel tax-avoidance case, Moscow has raised fears that it is trying to bring Russia's natural resources back under direct state control. Last Friday, the government was able to remove a judge from the case who seemed open-minded in considering an appeal by Yukos.

We do not argue that all oligarchs should go scot-free. No state can tolerate enterprises operating above the law. But at play here is a different danger, of a state capriciously and selectively applying laws to suit its political interests.

Russia's judiciary faces an unenviable challenge in tempering excess prosecutorial zeal, without endorsing blanket immunity for past misdeeds. In the end, the critical question is not whether the court finds the two men guilty or not, but whether it succeeds in demonstrating that it has delivered justice. Russia's courts have shown themselves sadly subservient to the government so far. Most Russians expect that they will continue down this familiar road, rubber-stamping the government's charges until Khodorkovsky and Lebedev are found guilty.

For the sake of Russian democracy, the judiciary needs to declare its independence. Courts in such high-profile cases can do so in the way they handle the objections and arguments of the defense, in the way they rule on the crude methods of the investigators and in the way they separate the political demands of the Kremlin from the legal facts of the case. Given Russia's past, few things could be more corrosive to democracy than a show trial. The Russian government's fraud and tax evasion case against two billionaires, Mikhail Khodorkovsky and Platon Lebedev, opens Wednesday in a Moscow court. The trial has already attracted enormous attention; the extraordinary fortunes of the two defendants, and the parallel struggle for survival of the oil company that made them rich, Yukos, has turned this case into a microcosm of the struggles that are shaping the new Russia. Much depends on the outcome, not least how investors will look at Russia in the future. In effect, it is Russia and the rule of law that go on trial.

Khodorkovsky, to be sure, is not the model, philanthropic businessman his supporters make of him. Like all the other so-called oligarchs, he made his billions in the dirty plunder of Russia's riches in the chaotic aftermath of the Soviet Union's disinte-

gration. But neither is President Vladimir Putin the champion of civic virtue he would have us see. If tax evasion were the real issue, every oligarch, and most every Russian, would be in the dock. And even if Putin needed to pillory a couple of oligarchs to set an example, there are far more unsavory examples to go after. Khodorkovsky at least turned Yukos into a globally admired, relatively transparent business.

To all appearances, Putin is leaning on the judiciary to settle scores with tycoons who dared show an interest in politics. In this regard, Khodorkovsky, who has contributed generously to reform-minded parties, is only Putin's latest target, following in the footsteps of Boris Berezovsky and Vladimir Gusinsky, two Russian tycoons now residing in exile.

Equally ominous, in pushing Yukos to the brink in a parallel tax-avoidance case, Moscow has raised fears that it is trying to bring Russia's natural resources back under direct state control. Last Friday, the government was able to remove a judge from the case who seemed open-minded in considering an appeal by Yukos.

We do not argue that all oligarchs should go scot-free. No state can tolerate enterprises operating above the law. But at play here is a different danger, of a state capriciously and selectively applying laws to suit its political interests.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, last March, I had the opportunity to meet with human rights groups, legal experts, media representatives, and others concerning the situation on the ground in Russia. I learned firsthand that Russia is enduring a difficult transition to what hopefully will become a modern, fully democratic nation. While there have been many positive developments in Russian society over the past decade, particularly with regard to the freedoms that average Russian citizens now enjoy, there are disturbing signs that Russia under President Vladimir Putin may be slipping back to its old authoritarian ways.

My primary concern is with the rule of law. Prior to coming to Congress, I served for eight years as the Attorney General of Kentucky. I understand that there are inherent principles in any constitutional democracy, chief among them the rule of law. Recent events have called into question Russia's unequivocal commitment to a transparent judicial system, defendants' rights, and the presumption of innocence within the Russian legal system.

As we speak, there is a major trial taking place in Moscow. It concerns the controversial arrest and detention of prominent Russian businessman Mikhail Khodorkovsky. The case of Mr. Khodorkovsky has raised concerns from legal experts, human rights groups, and the media that his trial may have more to do with his opposition to President Putin's policies rather than the crimes for which he is accused.

The most disturbing element of Mr. Khodorkovsky's trial is that it may signify a reassertion of state influence over Russia's private sector economy. Such a move by the Russian government, I fear, would raise questions about the state of property rights in Russia, discourage foreign investment, and slow progress towards Russia's full integration into the global economy.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. must continue to deliver the message that adherence to the rule of law and support for political and economic freedom is essential to developing successful free-market economies and prosperity. As I mentioned earlier, Russia is truly at a crossroads in its history. I urge my colleagues to

work with me to convince Russia to choose the path of transparency, adherence to the rule of law, and a commitment to the security of private investment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for requesting this time to discuss rule of law in Russia. Not only is this an issue of great importance to the citizens of Russia but U.S.-Russia relations are affected by the regard given to this critical component of democratic and civil society.

I have the privilege of serving as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, commonly known as the "Helsinki Commission," an independent agency of the United States Government charged with monitoring and encouraging compliance with the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 and subsequent documents of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The fate of rule of law in Russia, an OSCE member, will determine to a great degree the future of the Russian state and its role in the world community.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russia moved from an authoritarian police state under communist rule to a sovereign nation with democratically elected leadership and many of the civil liberties that we in this country take for granted. We were encouraged by those positive and historic steps. On paper at least, there have been significant reforms designed to bring the Russian political and legal system into conformity with the accepted norms and practices of the United Nations, the OSCE, the Council of Europe, etc.

In recent years, though, the Putin government has undermined these reforms. In its Nations in Transit 2004 report, Freedom House sums it up: "Russia is backsliding in key areas of democratic governance and rule of law."

Two months ago, on May 20th, the Helsinki Commission held hearings on the issue of human rights in President Putin's Russia. One of our distinguished witnesses, Mr. Gary Kasparov, chairman of the Free Choice 2008 Committee in Russia and world-famous chess champion, spoke with passion about restrictions on freedom of speech in the electronic media, a process that we see continuing today.

In the area of rule of law per se, we are also seeing some disturbing moves against individuals who have apparently offended the powers-that-be in the Kremlin or the intelligence apparatus.

The first case is that of industrialist Mikhail Khodorkovsky, former head of the Yukos Oil Company. Mr. Khodorkovsky's arrest on charges of fraud and tax evasion has received a lot of publicity. I don't claim to know whether Khodorkovsky is guilty or innocent, but this appears to be very much a case of selective justice. His real crime seems to have been, as David Satter wrote in the Wall Street Journal last week, that he "had demonstrated independence, and, by financing opposition political parties, had contributed to political pluralism."

Will Khodorkovsky get a fair trial? Let me quote from a report by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: "The courts are often subservient to the executive, while the security services, the prosecutors and the police remain highly politicized . . . the so-called 'Yukos case' reflects these problems." As if to confirm the OECD assessment, officials at the Matrosskaya Tishina pris-

on confiscated documents from one of his lawyers after she met with her client.

Another case is that of Dr. Igor Sutyagin, a Russian scientist who was sentenced to 15 years of labor camp for espionage, i.e., passing military secrets to British intelligence agents. Sutyagin never denied that he had worked with foreign scholars or that he shared previously published material with them. Indeed, Federal Security Service (FSB) agents never found evidence of any classified documents in his possession, and he had neither security clearance nor access to classified material. However, the FSB and the court came to the conclusion that Sutyagin's research was so accurate that he must have used classified documents to draw his conclusions. Think of it: one may be imprisoned for espionage for being too competent an analyst in military-security issues.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Steven Pifer of the State Department has testified before the Commission that "most observers agree that [Sutyagin] had no access to classified information and consider the severe sentence an effort to discourage information-sharing by Russians with professional colleagues from other countries."

The final case I would mention in this brief presentation is that of Mikhail Trepashkin, an attorney and former FSB officer who was arrested on October 24, 2003, a week before he was scheduled to represent relatives of a victim who perished in an apartment explosion at a trial in Moscow. At the trial, Trepashkin was expected to present the findings of his investigation which implicated the FSB in the 1999 apartment bombing in Moscow and the aborted attempted bombing of Ryazan.

A week before the trial opened, the police just happened to pull Trepashkin over on the highway, and just happened to find a revolver in his car. Trepashkin claims the gun was planted, a venerable KGB tactic. Three weeks later, he was put on trial and sentenced to four years labor camp for allegedly divulging state secrets to a foreign journalist.

I don't know all the details of this case, but it has the whiff of the proverbial mackerel by moonlight. It is very possible that Trepashkin was arrested in order to prevent him from releasing potentially damaging information regarding the activities of the FSB.

These are just few examples of the challenges to rule of law and human rights that Russia is now experiencing under President Putin. Let us hope that he will soon realize that the way to a genuinely stable and prosperous society is paved with rule of law and civil society, not the high price of crude oil.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Khodorkovsky/Lebedev trial resumed on Monday last week before a three judge panel in Moscow. Since the last hearing three weeks ago, the physical appearance of the court was much improved: the courtroom had been air conditioned and the halls outside had been refurbished and painted.

Appearances are important, but substance is critical.

Respect for the rule of law in Russia is essential for the same reason it is essential in every democratic society—citizens, the press, and the business community must have confidence that the legal system affords them protection of their rights and that everyone is treated equally under that law.

In Russia there is a pattern of troubling signs that the rule of law and a free press are

threatened. I know a number of my House colleagues share these concerns. Members of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, the Helsinki Commission, and the Russia Democracy Caucus are just some of those who have expressed their misgivings.

One high profile example of concern is the seizure of the assets of Russia's largest oil company, YUKOS, and the trial of two of YUKOS's largest stockholders, Mikhail Khodorkovsky and Platon Lebedev.

Many Russian and Western observers view the Russian Government seizure of the assets of YUKOS as a result of political motivations.

Here are just a few recent statements on these events:

On July 7, the Washington Post quoted a senior level U.S. diplomat as saying "there are increasing signs that destruction of the company is the intended endpoint," and that it appears likely that a "sizeable percentage of the company's assets will move into the hands of the state."

On July 7, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) called the YUKOS affair "a case of highly selective law enforcement" and a case that reveals how "the courts are often subservient to the executive, while the security services, prosecutors and police remain highly politicized."

What is now occurring in Russia has significant human, political, and economic consequences. Justice, freedom, and human rights are all directly tied to the rule of law, open and accountable government, and a free press, which are increasingly absent in Russia.

There are several disturbing trends that demonstrate problems with the rule of law in Russia.

The general prosecutor and courts cannot be merely an extension of the political will and agenda of the Kremlin. In his visit to Moscow earlier this year, Secretary of State Colin Powell was unambiguous in his concern over the rule of law in Russia, saying "Russia's democratic system seems not yet to have found the essential balance among the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government. Political power is not yet fully tethered to the law."

Furthermore, the selective and arbitrary use of judiciary power by the Kremlin undermines the rule of law.

Mikhail Khodorkovsky, as many observers have noted, shows how a businessman has been singled out for prosecution because his political activities are not appreciated.

Journalist German Galkin was thrown into jail and prosecuted for revealing the corrupt behavior of local government officials. His appeal was denied and he was only freed under the weight of international pressure.

Aleksandr Nikitin is a former submarine officer and nuclear safety inspector who was pursued relentlessly through the courts by the Russian security service in retaliation for his outspokenness about radioactive contamination by the Russian military. These rulings bear out what prominent legal experts have been saying about the flawed legal system in Russia.

More recent events in Russia threaten a free press, an essential element of any strong democracy.

We do not know who murdered Paul Klebnikov, the editor in chief of Forbes Russia, who was writing the truth about Russia's dark

underside, but the government must insist on a thorough, open, and full investigation of his killers. As one observer noted in the *New York Times*, "Twenty journalists have now been assassinated in Russia for their work; 14 since Mr. Putin became president. Not one of the murders has been solved."

A crackdown of media freedom has resulted in all major TV networks under state control. The last independent TV station disappeared last summer. TV is the number one way Russians get their news.

If Russia continues down this path, she will never fully become the peaceful and democratic nation that the Russian people and the international community desire. It is essential that Russia undertake a sincere effort to reform its judicial system and establish the highest degree of credibility for the rule of law and free press, which are essential for a prosperous and peaceful Russia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus I continue to be concerned that Russia has significant problems in honoring the universal human rights standards that are widely accepted in many parts of the world. Russia aspires to be a leading force on the world economic and political scene, but it is failing to respect some of the fundamental and universal principles of the rule of law, human rights and freedom of speech and expression.

I am concerned about freedom of expression in Russia, given the fact that the Russian government's commitment to independent and free media, freedom of assembly, and religious freedom appear to be wavering. In fact, Russia's last major non-state television station was eliminated in 2003 as a result of government pressure. This is a disturbing trend which is in stark contrast to the value placed on freedom of speech by other democracies around the world.

Earlier this year the State Department released its annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, which included documentation of many abuses. Serious violations of basic human rights in Chechnya were highlighted including unlawful killings, abuse of civilians and Chechen fighters and politically motivated disappearances. The report also mentioned that the December 7, 2003, Duma elections failed to meet international standards. Factors undermining party competition included criminal charges and threats of arrest or actual arrest against major financial supporters of opposition parties and the seizure of party materials from opposition parties.

I remain concerned that Russia is named in the State Department's annual report on trafficking in persons as a tier two country and this year was placed on the tier two "special watch list." Trafficking in persons is an evil that must be directly confronted and ended. Countries that fall under the special watch list have high numbers of trafficking victims and fail to provide evidence of increasing efforts to combat severe forms of trafficking from the previous year. Russia is named as the largest source country in Europe for trafficking and is a significantly large transit country. It is my hope that the Russian government will acknowledge the extent of its trafficking problem and play a more active role in ending trafficking in the region.

I also am concerned that Russia still does not fully accept or encourage religious freedom. The 2004 annual report on religious free-

dom by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom states about Russia:

"A federal law on religious organizations enacted in 1997 contains provisions that have prevented some religious groups from registering and thus practicing freely. Regional governments have often passed ordinances that result in discrimination against minority religious groups, and acts of violence against members of religious minorities are widespread.

"In the past few years, however, trends have emerged that have raised serious questions about Russia's commitment to democratic reform and protection of religious freedom. Russian authorities have denied registration efforts of certain religious communities, based on the allegedly insufficient time they have existed, despite a February 2002 Russian Constitutional Court decision that found that an active religious organization registered before the 1997 law could not be deprived of its legal status for failing to re-register. The government has meddled in the internal affairs of religious communities, including the Jewish and orthodox Old Believer communities."

The U.S. Congress must speak out about human rights abuses around the world. It is my hope that Russia will begin to encourage religious freedom, crack down on trafficking in persons and comply with international standards on human rights.

I would like to submit for the RECORD an article from *The Wall Street Journal*, highlighting the concern for the lack of rule of law in Russia.

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, July 12, 2004]

LAWLESS RUSSIA

The murder of *Forbes* Russian Editor-in-Chief Paul Klebnikov on a Moscow street Friday night was the most dramatic display yet of the lawlessness that has Russia in its grip. Prosecutor General Vladimir Ustinov says he has taken "personal control" of the case, a suggestion that the Russian state is finally conscious of its bad image in the world. But under its present leadership, the state is itself an important part of the problem.

The 41-year-old Mr. Klebnikov was a brilliant journalist and student of Russian history. He had written for our pages several times, most recently last November when he argued that the arrest of Russia's richest businessman, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, was a blow against the "kleptocracy" that had enriched itself with state assets under Boris Yeltsin's privatization program.

He knew a lot about the subject, having written a controversial 2000 book, "Godfather of the Kremlin," about one of the leading Russian oligarchs, Boris Berezovsky. In the May issue of *Forbes* Russia, Mr. Klebnikov broke the news that Moscow has more dollar billionaires than New York City.

The magazine, licensed by *Forbes* of the U.S. and published by the German Axel Springer organization, published the names of Russia's 100 richest business leaders, giving them the sort of attention many don't welcome. Mr. Klebnikov was not afraid to make powerful enemies in the interest of honest journalism.

In a recent book, "Darkness at Dawn," David Satter, a former *Journal* Moscow correspondent, wrote that Russia has been taken over by a criminal elite in which gangsters, businesses and corrupt officials work together. The result is a climate of fear and public cynicism. The collapse of communism, with its history of state-sponsored

violence, left a moral vacuum that persists in a different form. Some of the modern thugs got their training with the Soviet secret police.

The Committee to Protect Journalists, which records attacks on journalists throughout the world, cites Russia as a special problem. Attempts to shut up the press have been made by the Federal Security Bureau, formerly the KGB. Russian President Vladimir Putin, who has systematically seized control of Russian TV, retains some of the habits he developed when he himself was a KGB functionary.

Yet Mr. Putin is welcomed to international parleys, such as G-8 meetings, as if he were the leader of a normal country. The murder of Paul Klebnikov demonstrates that Russia is not a normal country. Perhaps it's time for the leaders of free democracies to ask Mr. Putin whether the rule of law exists in Russia.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues information that raises serious concerns about the development of a free-market system in Russia. Many of my constituents who develop products such as software and biological drugs rely on the enforcement of strong intellectual property rights laws and copyright protection, and therefore have an interest in ensuring that countries such as Russia maintain fair and enforceable laws in this regard. For this reason, there is cause for concern regarding the Russian government placing significant pressure on SPI, the company that produces the Stolichnaya beverage, in an effort to reclaim the intellectual property rights of its brands. Stolichnaya, nicknamed Stoli to many Americans, is one of many brands of production the Russian government is attempting to reclaim from SPI in the wake of the privatization of other beverage companies in the 1990's.

I am concerned about the implications of such actions on international global property rights, Russia's potential WTO and G-8 membership, and the direction of Russian Democracy and rule of law. This case is emblematic of a general situation and is part of a pattern of disrespect for the rule of law that has unnerved foreign investors who are concerned about long-term economic, legal and political stability of Russia. If we are to hope to crack down on the copyright infringements on software produced in the Puget Sound, I believe that proper enforcement of this issue is an important step.

I would like to offer my colleagues some background on SPI and its issues.

SPI is a Dutch-based company that owns the trademark rights to a large number of beverage brands including Russia's most famous brands, Stolichnaya and Moscovskaya as well as Russkaya and Limonnaya. It is my understanding that the SPI Group acquired the rights for these trademarks by means of buying out the minority shareholders of a Russian company, which owned the above-mentioned trademarks worldwide and was privatized between 1990-1992. It also assumed a \$50 million debt that was inherited by the previous owner from its state-owned predecessor. SPI has since invested another \$100 million to develop into a successful international competitor.

The SPI Group has registered the trademarks for the 43 brands in more than 150 countries. It has a 10-year distribution deal with Allied Domecq in the U.S. as well as a distribution deal with First Drinks in the UK

and Bacardi in Greece. Last year, SPI recorded sales of \$680 million. This success, however, has merely brought the company to the forefront of the debate over who owns these trademarks.

It is also my understanding that from 2000 onwards, certain entities within the Russian State have started various actions against SPI to obtain its trademark registrations.

In late 2001, in a case brought by the Russian State Trademark Organization, the Russian courts ruled that the original privatization of the company that owned the brand before SPI was invalid (on a technicality) and returned the rights for 17 brands controlled (now) by the SPI Group to the Russian Ministry of Agriculture.

Since then, SPI, while producing the product in Russia, has been forced to move its bottling plant to Riga in Latvia, after the Russian authorities seized and blocked its exports from the Russian port of Kaliningrad. Various heated legal battles have been fought in a number of Russian and foreign courts as SPI continues to sell Stolichnaya internationally. In Russia, a company resurrected by the Government markets its own Stolichnaya brand after confiscating back the trademark there.

On 4 March 2002, the Leninsk-Kuznetskiy City Court seemingly resolved the dispute by ruling that the Ministry of Agriculture had illegally registered 17 trademarks belonging to SPI, including the Stolichnaya trademark, and ordered that SPI be reinstated as the registered trademark owner.

However, Russian authorities ignored the Leninsk-Kuznetskiy City Court's ruling and employed intimidation and police-state tactics to grab the company's assets and trademark rights for its own purposes. Some examples of these tactics include:

The Government's Federal Security Service, in a letter dated March 5, 2002, ordering Kaliningrad Customs to prohibit bulk export of Stolichnaya produced by SPI in Kaliningrad.

The confiscation of more than 150,000 cases of SPI products seized in Kaliningrad along with related packaging material.

The filing of criminal charges levied against Audrey Skurikhin, president of SPI Spirits-Russia, and its Kaliningrad facility.

As a result of these events, it is my understanding that the Ministry of Agriculture currently produces these products in Russia with virtually identical labeling and uses libel and intimidation to force distributors and customers to stop doing business with SPI. In addition, the Russian Patent Agency gave the rights for the re-nationalized trademarks to the newly incorporated company of the Russian Ministry for Agriculture.

International courts have ruled in favor of SPI. Court rulings in October 2002 in Hamburg, Germany and May 2003 in Rotterdam, Netherlands, rejected the lawsuits brought against SPI, substantiating SPI's claims.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the SPI case is about something larger and more fundamental for Russia and its relationship with the United States and other nations of the world—adherence to the rule of law and political, social and economic freedom. SPI is an example of the need to uphold the rule of law and ensure a better business environment for Russian business. A stable and democratic Russia, based on a rule of law, is critical to U.S. interests; not only for U.S. firms interested in doing business there, but also for the overall, long-term

U.S.-Russia relationship. Many of my constituents depend on adherence to the rule of law and copyright protections to ensure that their products, particularly software and biotechnology, are not stolen. We should not let this SPI case set precedence or be a harbinger for software and other U.S. industries.

THE WORLD MUST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, after visiting Darfur, Sudan, and seeing firsthand the horrific conditions and oppression, and I have here a picture of a camp that was burned down by the Janjaweed, but having seen the horrific conditions and oppression, and having talked to eyewitnesses, I believe genocide is taking place in Darfur.

The United States and others around the world said never again after the genocide in Rwanda. So now I call on the United States, the United Nations, and world leaders to call it what it is, genocide, and to take action before more die. We have the ability to prevent further deaths and to stop genocide in its tracks. Our actions should follow our words.

Amnesty International just released a new report. It documents hundreds of cases of women who have been raped in Darfur. To highlight one story, I quote:

"I was sleeping when the attack on Disa started. I was taken away by the attackers, they were all in uniform. They took dozens of other girls and made us walk for 3 hours. During the day, we were beaten. And they kept telling us, 'You, the black women, we will exterminate you, you have no God.' At night, we were raped several times. We were not given food for 3 days."

This story echoes the stories of rape that I heard when I was in Darfur. We were given a letter by 44 women who were raped. The translation is heart-breaking.

It said, and this was to Senator BROWNBACK and myself, "We are 44 raped women. As a result of that savagery, some of us became pregnant, some have aborted, some took out their wombs and some are still receiving medical treatment. Hereunder, we list the names of the raped women and state that we have high hopes in you and the international community to stand by us and not forsake us to this tyrannical, brutal, and racist regime, which wants to eliminate us racially, bearing in mind that 90 percent of our sisters at this village are widows."

Women are systematically raped on a massive scale. These are crimes against humanity. The overall situation constitutes genocide.

Despite promises to rein in the militia, the violence continues to escalate. Over the weekend, U.N. humanitarian agencies reported that local authorities and militia continued to loot convoys and gang rape women.

The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment on the Crime of Genocide describes genocide as acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, national, ethnic, racial or religious groups. Specifically cited is:

Number one. Killing members of the group.

Thousands of black Africans have been killed. There are reports of mass graves.

Number two. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

One woman told us that the Janjaweed told her that she was being raped to create "lighter-skinned babies."

Number three. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction in whole or in part.

It is clear that the eradication of the Darfurian African population will occur if people do not return to their homes.

Number four. Forcefully transferring children of the group to another group.

There are constant stories of the abduction of children.

No matter what we call it, Mr. Speaker, genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, people are dying on a massive scale, and that is not acceptable. What matters now is action.

The international community has a moral and a legal obligation to stop what is occurring, and those responsible must be brought to justice. The United Nations Security Council needs to take immediate action to end this crisis.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, a large peacekeeping force made up of troops in the African union is now needed to allow the Darfurians to return to their homes and to verify that the government of Sudan is disarming the rebels. We must remember that the government of Sudan armed the rebels. We need independent monitors to ensure that they are disarmed. We need monitors and forensic experts on the ground to preserve the evidence for a future war crimes trial.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, two points: Every day that we delay and hesitate, more people die. The United States must speak out loudly. We must not shy from calling it what it is: Genocide.

THE G-8 NATIONS MUST END HUNGER AND SUPPORT EDUCATION FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, I had the pleasure of participating in a press conference in Savannah, Georgia, to call upon the leaders

of the G-8 nations to get serious and to work to end child hunger and support education for all.

The press conference was organized by NetAid and supported by the Basic Education Coalition. David Morrison, the President of NetAid, and Eveline Herfkens, the executive coordinator of the U.N. Secretary general's Millennium Project, joined me at the podium. I was especially impressed by the efforts of the children of Savannah, who, with the support of NetAid, have launched a campaign to raise awareness and funds so that children around the world can have a chance to go to school.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that central to the American Dream has been the desire by parents to make sure that their children receive a better education and get a chance at having a better life than they did. This was true when our country was founded, and it is still true today. So it is fitting that the United States should lead the world in achieving universal basic education for the world's children.

Around the time of World War II, the United States discovered another important key to good education: Food. Many of the soldiers volunteering for the military, who we now refer to as the greatest generation, had problems associated with poor nutrition or hunger. Ultimately, this discovery led to the U.S. establishing a full-fledged universal school lunch program, and today many of our schools also offer breakfast to those in need.

The combination of global basic education and school feeding programs contributes not only to achieving the Millennium Development Goal of universal primary education by the year 2015, but also to the Goal to cut hunger in half. But it is not going to happen unless donor nations make a significantly greater commitment of funds and resources.

Right now, wealthy nations commit an estimated \$1.4 billion to basic education. For fiscal year 2004, Congress appropriated \$326.5 million in foreign aid for basic education and another \$37 million provided through the Department of Labor to combat child labor. Sadly, only \$125 million was made available for global school feeding programs through all USAID and Department of Agriculture programs combined.

At this rate, the world will not be able to achieve universal primary education for another 150 years, or end child hunger for another century. So what should we do?

The G-8 leaders need to do much more than issue glowing statements in support of universal education. Photos and juggling the books will not build schools or put more teachers and materials in the classroom or provide meals to students too hungry to learn. Only new money, new resources, and, most important, the political will to turn promises into reality can do that.

Developing countries need an additional \$5.6 billion to ensure that every child can go to primary school. For the U.S. to exercise genuine leadership, President Bush should make a firm commitment that the United States will provide at least \$1 billion by fiscal year 2006 for basic education, and a minimum of \$300 million for U.S. funded international school feeding programs. The other G-8 nations should make similar commitments and fulfill them.

I am pleased to note that the fiscal year 2005 foreign aid bill that we passed last week includes \$400 million for basic education programs, and today we will vote on a resolution in support of global school feeding programs.

Our world will not achieve economic prosperity or social and political stability as long as children cannot go to school and continue to die from hunger. And we can only win the war against intolerance and terrorism when the children of the world are no longer hungry and illiterate, and their parents, families, and communities have hope for a better future.

On Sea Island, Georgia, the leaders of the world issued another set of glowing proclamations about how to create the better future. We now must wait and see if they have the political will to put their money on the table and make it happen.

A GREAT NATIONAL DEBATE AND OPEN GLOBAL DIALOGUE WILL WIN WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we know the President landed on the deck of an aircraft carrier and declared "mission accomplished" in Iraq. We know there have been more casualties in Iraq after the President's declaration than before. We know that Iraq was a wrong war at the wrong time in the wrong place. We know the justifications offered by the administration for war were either outright wrong or grossly misrepresented. We know that the work of the United Nations' weapons inspectors was finding the truth. We know Iraq did not pose a clear and present danger or an imminent threat to the United States. We know the President has led us into a blind, box canyon. We know we have diverted U.S. resources and international attention away from the hunt for the real terrorist. We need to remember that the war goes on. The U.S. casualties mount.

When the administration pulled out of Iraq, it left 160,000 U.S. soldiers in Iraq in harm's way. Not a day goes by without more U.S. soldiers being killed or injured in combat. Is the world safer or more dangerous? Did we succeed in Iraq because the administration pulled

out on time, or did we fail in Iraq by going there in the first place?

A new book, published by a 20-year national security veteran, bluntly concludes that Iraq was "a bloody and unsuccessful tool." Worse yet, the book is another voice saying that the war in Iraq will nurture more terrorism around the world. The book, entitled *Imperial Hubris*, ought to be required reading by every American, regardless of political party. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the author, you reach one inescapable conclusion: It is time for America to seriously debate and define a national terrorism policy.

Today, America has the so-called PATRIOT Act, passed in the middle of the night, that endangers the very freedoms the President claims to be defending. Today, we have a useless, so-called terror alert system fixed in permanent threat mode, as if scaring Americans on a daily basis somehow comforts them. Today, resolutions are rushed through the Congress, as if a rush to judgment will somehow make us safer. Today, we have a constant stream of terror rhetoric from the administration that speaks in broad generalities.

Some way, someday, somehow, someplace, something bad is going to happen. We will not be surprised. What we need to know as a Nation is, what are we going to do about it? Osama bin Laden may be the face of the terror, but the arms, the legs, and the rest of the body is much more than one person, and the issues involved are much deeper than the daily dose of rhetoric out of the White House.

America must face the choice before us; that we can confront the roots of terrorism by listening to everyone involved, by looking at all sides of the story, and acting from one of America's founding principles: Equal justice for all.

The Middle East is a place that wobbles on the brink of madness. A war without borders is a war carried on by people from place to place. A war without borders is a war against an invisible enemy standing in plain sight. We can confront the roots of terrorism by debating their cause, our role, and the world's future.

The alternative is to accept a world where we imagine that bullets and bombs can win a war without soldiers, where guns will prevail on a battlefield no one can walk on because we are standing on it, and where U.S. casualties risk going unnoticed by the Nation because the media has moved on, even as the blood of our beloved ones continue to flow.

Today, 160,000 soldiers are fighting and dying in Iraq. There is no end in sight, there is no homecoming anywhere soon. The bombs and the bullets and the madness are limitless, unless we choose to stop them. We best honor those who have fallen by resolving to face the consequences of war and by confronting the origins of terror. Words alone will not end the war on

terrorism, but words are the only way to stop.

The war on terrorism can be won: First, with a great national debate, followed by an honest and global dialogue with all the parties involved. Every day we delay is another day of bloodshed, another soldier dies, another caser comes home, another family buries their loved one, and it is another day further away from real peace and real judgment for all.

Mr. Speaker, the President has 106 days to begin this debate. If he fails, we will have a new president.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, You are the Daystar of a new day.

From the darkness of night and phantom dreams, You awaken us to the brightness of reality.

As from a mother's womb, You bring us forth to smile and delight or frown and cry over another passing day.

By the tasks You set before us, You strengthen our whole being and bring us to accomplishment. You lighten our burden and brighten our face by knowing love and friendship.

Help Congress and all in this Nation to awaken and respond as Your people now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HAYWORTH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1303. An act to amend the E-Government Act of 2002 with respect to rulemaking authority of the Judicial Conference.

H.R. 4759. An act to implement the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4520. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove impediments in such Code and make our manufacturing, service, and high-technology businesses and workers more competitive and productive both at home and abroad.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4520) "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to comply with the World Trade Organization rulings on the FSC/ETI benefit in a manner that preserves jobs and production activities in the United States, to reform and simplify the international taxation rules of the United States, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. LOTT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KYL, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARKIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2261. An act to expand certain preferential trade treatment for Haiti.

S. 2479. An act to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Federal employees to make elections to make, modify, and terminate contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund at any time, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, vice the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

REPORT ON H.R. 4850, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. WOLF, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-610) on the bill (H.R. 4850) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

KEEP AMERICANS INFORMED ON HOMELAND SECURITY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we enter this week and begin a very legislatively-intense week, members of the Select Committee on Homeland Security will be meeting this afternoon to begin to legislate and implement the reauthorization of the homeland security efforts.

I call today for a unified effort. I call today for telling the American people the truth and being able to explain to them the substance of chatter and the importance of unifying around a single theme of securing the homeland.

It is important to note as we leave this body at the end of the week, going to our respective home sites but also to our respective conventions, selecting nominees for the Presidency of the United States, it is important for local communities to be informed aptly. We must explain more extensively the color system, use what is right, pronounce when it is important to pronounce, and not utilize any of this for political purposes.

The debate this afternoon in our Select Committee on Homeland Security should be vigorous, special interest should have no place. The only place that should be in this mark-up should be the place of the American people, to ensure their safety. For many do believe that we are not as safe as we were 4 years ago, and we need to work in a unified policy to ensure that happens.

Internationally and domestically, securing the homeland is balanced between our freedom and our rights, as well as our ability to secure our local communities. I constantly believe that we should engage the American people in the security of our homeland.

WHATEVER IT TAKES TO DEFEND THE NATION

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I welcome many of the comments from my colleague from Texas. Homeland security and our national security, indeed, the survival and the continued success of the American people is what is at stake as we find ourselves engaged in this new type of warfare, this war on terror.

I believe it is important, despite this time of year and the pending political season, to understand that it is important not to politicize but at the same time to point out genuine differences of opinion that may exist because, after all, that is the purpose of the House of Representatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, to those who might misinterpret abroad, to those who perhaps fail to understand our tradition of vigorous debate and honest disagreement, Mr. Speaker, at this time in this place in the well of the people's House, let us reaffirm as a Nation our resolve to do, in the words of my constituents from the Fifth Congressional District of Arizona, "whatever it takes" to protect our homeland and to ensure that the American Nation not only survives but thrives.

Good people can disagree; but on this point there should be no disagreement. There are those who are tempted to strike the homeland; severe consequences will follow those actions.

THE RIGHT PRESCRIPTION

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am a doctor and I have seen some prescriptions in my time that were the wrong medicine for the right illness. I am here to tell you that is exactly what the Republicans did with their prescription drug bill. The big drug companies got the overwhelming benefit, and the seniors get the underwhelming Republican rhetoric.

Well, there is a doctor in the House and Democrats are doing something about a Republican drug bill that needs steroids to help seniors and the disabled. Democrats are circulating what is called a "discharge petition."

I urge every citizen, Mr. Speaker, to write, call, cajole, pester, or otherwise demand that your elected representatives go on it.

This petition would require, require, the Federal Government to use its substantial clout and purchasing power to negotiate real discounts for seniors and disabled on prescription drugs. This is the right medicine for the right illness.

I am a doctor, and I do not play one on TV. Sign the petition. Give the seniors something they deserve: real benefits.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

ALLOWING BINDING ARBITRATION CLAUSES TO BE INCLUDED IN CONTRACTS AFFECTING LAND WITHIN SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 4115) to amend the Act of November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1112), to allow binding arbitration clauses to be included in all contracts affecting the land within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4115

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BINDING ARBITRATION FOR SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN RESERVATION CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(c) of the Act of November 2, 1966 (25 U.S.C. 416a(c)), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking "Any lease" and all that follows through "affecting land" and inserting "Any contract, including a lease, affecting land"; and

(B) by striking "such lease or contract" and inserting "such contract"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking "Such leases or contracts entered into pursuant to such Acts" and inserting "Such contracts".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-179).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4115.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4115 is a bill I have sponsored along with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from the State of Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), to resolve a problem affecting an Indian tribe in my district.

It is basically a technical correction to a provision in existing law pertaining to leases and contracts on the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservation which is located in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

The Committee on Resources ordered the bill reported by unanimous consent on May 19, 2004.

The need for this bill originates in the Act of November 2, 1966, and in subsequent amendments to related leasing laws affecting Indian lands. The Act of November 2, 1966, authorizes the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community to put binding arbitration clauses into leases and contracts for business development on its reservation.

Without such binding arbitration clauses, many investors would not be

interested in doing business with the tribe because there would be no means of enforcing contracts. Unfortunately, an amendment to a related provision of law has made it unclear whether the tribe may put the binding arbitration clauses into all of its contracts and leases. This bill clarifies that the tribe may include binding arbitration clauses in all contracts for business developments on its reservation.

There are sometimes concerns expressed over passing bills that affect tribal land rights without securing the consent of the affected tribe. In this case, H.R. 4115 was specifically requested by the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community which has informed me and my colleagues who join me on the Committee on Resources that it stands to lose major economic development opportunities on its reservation unless this bill is enacted. According to the tribe's attorneys, the language of the bill will solve the tribe's problem.

The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community should be applauded for its aggressive pursuits of economic development and diversification. It is taking advantage of its location in a major metropolitan area to attract investors and create jobs and prosperity for the tribe, its members, and also for the surrounding communities.

Enacting H.R. 4115 enables the tribe to execute leasing contracts that will benefit the tribe and its members far into the future.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation may seem like just a minor fix to a technical leasing issue, but in fact there is much at stake for the tribe's economic future in the passage of the bill. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4115 would allow binding arbitration clauses to be included in all contracts that affect the lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation.

The idea behind this legislation is to provide a comfort level to those wanting to enter into business agreements with this particular tribe. Should a conflict arise in any business contract, this legislation would allow both the tribe and the business partner to avoid the normal channel of the tribal court system.

Mr. Speaker, I support adoption of H.R. 4115 by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr.

HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4115.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4492) to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4492

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—EXTENSIONS

SECTION 101. AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION EXTENSIONS.

Division II of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended—

(1) in each of sections 107, 208, 408, 507, 811, and 910, by striking “September 30, 2012” and inserting “September 30, 2027”;

(2) in each of sections 108(a), 209(a), 409(a), 508(a), 812(a), and 909(c), by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”; and

(3) in title VIII, by striking “Canal National Heritage Corridor” each place it appears in the section headings and text and inserting “National Heritage Canalway”.

TITLE II—NATIONAL AVIATION HERITAGE AREA

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Aviation Heritage Area Act”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Few technological advances have transformed the world or our Nation’s economy, society, culture, and national character as the development of powered flight.

(2) The industrial, cultural, and natural heritage legacies of the aviation and aerospace industry in the State of Ohio are nationally significant.

(3) Dayton, Ohio, and other defined areas where the development of the airplane and aerospace technology established our Nation’s leadership in both civil and military aeronautics and astronautics set the foundation for the 20th Century to be an American Century.

(4) Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, is the birthplace, the home, and an integral part of the future of aerospace.

(5) The economic strength of our Nation is connected integrally to the vitality of the aviation and aerospace industry, which is responsible for an estimated 11,200,000 American jobs.

(6) The industrial and cultural heritage of the aviation and aerospace industry in the State of Ohio includes the social history and living cultural traditions of several generations.

(7) The Department of the Interior is responsible for protecting and interpreting the Nation’s cultural and historic resources, and

there are significant examples of these resources within Ohio to merit the involvement of the Federal Government to develop programs and projects in cooperation with the Aviation Heritage Foundation, Incorporated, the State of Ohio, and other local and governmental entities to adequately conserve, protect, and interpret this heritage for the educational and recreational benefit of this and future generations of Americans, while providing opportunities for education and revitalization.

(8) Since the enactment of the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-419), partnerships among the Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector have greatly assisted the development and preservation of the historic aviation resources in the Miami Valley.

(9) An aviation heritage area centered in Southwest Ohio is a suitable and feasible management option to increase collaboration, promote heritage tourism, and build on the established partnerships among Ohio’s historic aviation resources and related sites.

(10) A critical level of collaboration among the historic aviation resources in Southwest Ohio cannot be achieved without a congressionally established national heritage area and the support of the National Park Service and other Federal agencies which own significant historic aviation-related sites in Ohio.

(11) The Aviation Heritage Foundation, Incorporated, would be an appropriate management entity to oversee the development of the National Aviation Heritage Area.

(12) Five National Park Service and Dayton Aviation Heritage Commission studies and planning documents: “Study of Alternatives: Dayton’s Aviation Heritage”, “Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park Suitability/Feasibility Study”, “Dayton Aviation Heritage General Management Plan”, “Dayton Historic Resources Preservation and Development Plan”, and Heritage Area Concept Study, demonstrated that sufficient historical resources exist to establish the National Aviation Heritage Area.

(13) With the advent of the 100th anniversary of the first powered flight in 2003, it is recognized that the preservation of properties nationally significant in the history of aviation is an important goal for the future education of Americans.

(14) Local governments, the State of Ohio, and private sector interests have embraced the heritage area concept and desire to enter into a partnership with the Federal government to preserve, protect, and develop the Heritage Area for public benefit.

(15) The National Aviation Heritage Area would complement and enhance the aviation-related resources within the National Park Service, especially the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to establish the Heritage Area to—

(1) encourage and facilitate collaboration among the facilities, sites, organizations, governmental entities, and educational institutions within the Heritage Area to promote heritage tourism and to develop educational and cultural programs for the public;

(2) preserve and interpret for the educational and inspirational benefit of present and future generations the unique and significant contributions to our national heritage of certain historic and cultural lands, structures, facilities, and sites within the National Aviation Heritage Area;

(3) encourage within the National Aviation Heritage Area a broad range of economic opportunities enhancing the quality of life for present and future generations;

(4) provide a management framework to assist the State of Ohio, its political subdivisions, other areas, and private organizations, or combinations thereof, in preparing and implementing an integrated Management Plan to conserve their aviation heritage and in developing policies and programs that will preserve, enhance, and interpret the cultural, historical, natural, recreation, and scenic resources of the Heritage Area; and

(5) authorize the Secretary to provide financial and technical assistance to the State of Ohio, its political subdivisions, and private organizations, or combinations thereof, in preparing and implementing the private Management Plan.

SEC. 203. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the Board of Directors of the Foundation.

(2) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The term “financial assistance” means funds appropriated by Congress and made available to the management entity for the purpose of preparing and implementing the Management Plan.

(3) HERITAGE AREA.—The term “Heritage Area” means the National Aviation Heritage Area established by section 104 to receive, distribute, and account for Federal funds appropriated for the purpose of this title.

(4) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “Management Plan” means the management plan for the Heritage Area developed under section 106.

(5) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The term “management entity” means the Aviation Heritage Foundation, Incorporated (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of Ohio).

(6) PARTNER.—The term “partner” means a Federal, State, or local governmental entity, organization, private industry, educational institution, or individual involved in promoting the conservation and preservation of the cultural and natural resources of the Heritage Area.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(8) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The term “technical assistance” means any guidance, advice, help, or aid, other than financial assistance, provided by the Secretary.

SEC. 204. NATIONAL AVIATION HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the States of Ohio and Indiana, the National Aviation Heritage Area.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The Heritage Area shall include the following:

(1) A core area consisting of resources in Montgomery, Greene, Warren, Miami, Clark, Champaign, Shelby, and Auglaize Counties in Ohio.

(2) Space Museum, Wapakoneta, Ohio.

(3) Sites, buildings, and districts within the core area recommended by the Management Plan.

(c) MAP.—A map of the Heritage Area shall be included in the Management Plan. The map shall be on file in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(d) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Aviation Heritage Foundation.

SEC. 205. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

(a) AUTHORITIES.—For purposes of implementing the Management Plan, the management entity may use Federal funds made available through this title to—

(1) make grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with, the State of Ohio and political subdivisions of that State, private organizations, or any person;

(2) hire and compensate staff; and

(3) enter into contracts for goods and services.

(b) DUTIES.—The management entity shall—

(1) develop and submit to the Secretary for approval the proposed Management Plan in accordance with section 106;

(2) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the Management Plan, including taking steps to assist units of government and nonprofit organizations in preserving resources within the Heritage Area;

(3) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area in developing and implementing the Management Plan;

(4) maintain a collaboration among the partners to promote heritage tourism and to assist partners to develop educational and cultural programs for the public;

(5) encourage economic viability in the Heritage Area consistent with the goals of the Management Plan;

(6) assist units of government and nonprofit organizations in—

(A) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the Heritage Area;

(B) developing recreational resources in the Heritage Area;

(C) increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the historical, natural, and architectural resources and sites in the Heritage Area; and

(D) restoring historic buildings that relate to the purposes of the Heritage Area;

(7) conduct public meetings at least quarterly regarding the implementation of the Management Plan;

(8) submit substantial amendments to the Management Plan to the Secretary for the approval of the Secretary; and

(9) for any year in which Federal funds have been received under this title—

(A) submit an annual report to the Secretary that sets forth the accomplishments of the management entity and its expenses and income;

(B) make available to the Secretary for audit all records relating to the expenditure of such funds and any matching funds; and

(C) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the receiving organizations make available to the Secretary for audit all records concerning the expenditure of such funds.

(c) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The management entity shall not use Federal funds received under this title to acquire real property or an interest in real property.

(2) OTHER SOURCES.—Nothing in this title precludes the management entity from using Federal funds from other sources for authorized purposes.

SEC. 206. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) PREPARATION OF PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this title, the management entity shall submit to the Secretary for approval a proposed Management Plan that shall take into consideration State and local plans and involve residents, public agencies, and private organizations in the Heritage Area.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Management Plan shall incorporate an integrated and cooperative approach for the protection, enhancement, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, historic, scenic, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area and shall include the following:

(1) An inventory of the resources contained in the core area of the Heritage Area, including the Dayton Aviation Heritage Historical Park, the sites, buildings, and districts listed in section 202 of the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-419), and any other property in the Heritage Area that is related to the themes of the

Heritage Area and that should be preserved, restored, managed, or maintained because of its significance.

(2) An assessment of cultural landscapes within the Heritage Area.

(3) Provisions for the protection, interpretation, and enjoyment of the resources of the Heritage Area consistent with the purposes of this title.

(4) An interpretation plan for the Heritage Area.

(5) A program for implementation of the Management Plan by the management entity, including the following:

(A) Facilitating ongoing collaboration among the partners to promote heritage tourism and to develop educational and cultural programs for the public.

(B) Assisting partners planning for restoration and construction.

(C) Specific commitments of the partners for the first 5 years of operation.

(6) The identification of sources of funding for implementing the plan.

(7) A description and evaluation of the management entity, including its membership and organizational structure.

(c) DISQUALIFICATION FROM FUNDING.—If a proposed Management Plan is not submitted to the Secretary within 3 years of the date of the enactment of this title, the management entity shall be ineligible to receive additional funding under this title until the date on which the Secretary receives the proposed Management Plan.

(d) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State of Ohio, shall approve or disapprove the proposed Management Plan submitted under this title not later than 90 days after receiving such proposed Management Plan.

(e) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a proposed Management Plan, the Secretary shall advise the management entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval and shall make recommendations for revisions to the proposed Management Plan. The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 90 days after the date it is submitted.

(f) APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS.—The Secretary shall review and approve substantial amendments to the Management Plan. Funds appropriated under this title may not be expended to implement any changes made by such amendment until the Secretary approves the amendment.

SEC. 207. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE; OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon the request of the management entity, the Secretary may provide technical assistance, on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis, and financial assistance to the Heritage Area to develop and implement the management plan. The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the management entity and other public or private entities for this purpose. In assisting the Heritage Area, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that in general assist in—

(1) conserving the significant natural, historic, cultural, and scenic resources of the Heritage Area; and

(2) providing educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with the purposes of the Heritage Area.

(b) DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Any Federal agency conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Heritage Area shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the management entity with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the management entity in carrying out their duties under this title;

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and

(4) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner which the management entity determines will not have an adverse effect on the Heritage Area.

SEC. 208. COORDINATION BETWEEN THE SECRETARY AND THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND THE ADMINISTRATOR OF NASA.

The decisions concerning the execution of this title as it applies to properties under the control of the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be made by such Secretary or such Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 209. REQUIREMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS REQUIRED.—No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the Heritage Area until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the management entity and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the management entity.

(b) LANDOWNER WITHDRAW.—Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the Heritage Area shall have their property immediately removed from the boundary by submitting a written request to the management entity.

SEC. 210. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

(1) require any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to such private property; or

(2) modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with regard to public access to or use of private property.

(b) LIABILITY.—Designation of the Heritage Area shall not be considered to create any liability, or to have any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any persons injured on such private property.

(c) RECOGNITION OF AUTHORITY TO CONTROL LAND USE.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to modify the authority of Federal, State, or local governments to regulate land use.

(d) PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS IN HERITAGE AREA.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to require the owner of any private property located within the boundaries of the Heritage Area to participate in or be associated with the Heritage Area.

(e) EFFECT OF ESTABLISHMENT.—The boundaries designated for the Heritage Area represent the area within which Federal funds appropriated for the purpose of this title may be expended. The establishment of the Heritage Area and its boundaries shall not be construed to provide any nonexisting regulatory authority on land use within the Heritage Area or its viewshed by the Secretary, the National Park Service, or the management entity.

SEC. 211. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this title there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000, except that not more than \$1,000,000 may be appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year.

(b) FIFTY PERCENT MATCH.—The Federal share of the cost of activities carried out using any assistance or grant under this title shall not exceed 50 percent.

SEC. 212. SUNSET PROVISION.

The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this title terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date that funds are first made available for this title.

SEC. 213. STUDY REGARDING INCORPORATION OF WRIGHT COMPANY FACTORY AS A UNIT OF DAYTON AVIATION HERITAGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study updating the study required under section 104 of the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-419) and detailing alternatives for incorporating the Wright Company factory as a unit of Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, including detailing management and development options and costs for each alternative.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult with the Delphi Corporation, the Aviation Heritage Foundation, State and local agencies, and other interested parties in the area.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than three years after funds are first made available for this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the results of the study conducted under this section.

TITLE III—NATIONAL COAL HERITAGE AREA**SEC. 301. NATIONAL COAL HERITAGE AREA.**

(a) **NATIONAL COAL HERITAGE AREA AUTHORITY; BOUNDARY REVISION.**—Title I of division II of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 103(b), by inserting “(1)” before “the counties” and by inserting the following before the period: “; (2) Lincoln County, West Virginia; and (3) Paint Creek and Cabin Creek in Kanawha County, West Virginia”.

(2) In section 104, by striking “Governor” and all that follows through “organizations” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting “National Coal Heritage Area Authority, a public corporation and government instrumentality established by the State of West Virginia, pursuant to which the Secretary shall assist the National Coal Heritage Area Authority”.

(3) In section 105—

(A) by striking “paragraph (2) of”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Resources within Lincoln County, West Virginia, and Paint Creek and Cabin Creek within Kanawha County, West Virginia, shall also be eligible for assistance as determined by the National Coal Heritage Area Authority.”.

(4) In section 106(a)—

(A) by striking “Governor” and all that follows through “and Parks” and inserting “National Coal Heritage Area Authority”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “State of West Virginia” and all that follows through “entities” and inserting “National Coal Heritage Area Authority”.

(b) **AGREEMENT CONTINUING IN EFFECT.**—The contractual agreement entered into by the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of West Virginia prior to the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to section 104 of title I of division II of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) shall be deemed as continuing in effect, except that such agreement shall be between the Secretary and the National Coal Heritage Area Authority.

TITLE IV—COASTAL HERITAGE TRAIL ROUTE IN NEW JERSEY**SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COASTAL HERITAGE TRAIL ROUTE IN NEW JERSEY.**

(a) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 6 of Public Law 100-515 (16 U.S.C. 1244 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “\$4,000,000” and all that follows and inserting “such sums as may be necessary.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “10” and inserting “12”.

(b) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall, by not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, prepare a strategic plan for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The strategic plan shall describe—

(A) opportunities to increase participation by national and local private and public interests in planning, development, and administration of the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route; and

(B) organizational options for sustaining the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route.

TITLE V—ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR**SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act Amendments of 2004”.

SEC. 502. TRANSITION AND PROVISIONS FOR NEW MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

The Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-398; 16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 103—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “and”;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) the term ‘Association’ means the Canal Corridor Association (an organization described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code).”.

(2) By adding at the end of section 112 the following new paragraph:

“(7) The Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Association to help ensure appropriate transition of the management entity to the Association and coordination with the Association regarding that role.”.

(3) By adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 119. ASSOCIATION AS MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

“Upon the termination of the Commission, the management entity for the corridor shall be the Association.

“SEC. 120. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF ASSOCIATION.

“For purposes of preparing and implementing the management plan developed under section 121, the Association may use Federal funds made available under this title—

“(1) to make loans and grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with, States and their political subdivisions, private organizations, or any person;

“(2) to hire, train, and compensate staff; and

“(3) to enter into contracts for goods and services.

“SEC. 121. DUTIES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

“The Association shall—

“(1) develop and submit to the Secretary for approval under section 123 a proposed management plan for the corridor not later than 2 years after Federal funds are made available for this purpose;

“(2) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the management plan, including taking steps to assist units of local government, regional planning organizations, and other organizations—

“(A) in preserving the corridor;

“(B) in establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the corridor;

“(C) in developing recreational resources in the corridor;

“(D) in increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the natural, historical, and architectural resources and sites in the corridor; and

“(E) in facilitating the restoration of any historic building relating to the themes of the corridor;

“(3) encourage by appropriate means economic viability in the corridor consistent with the goals of the management plan;

“(4) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and other groups within the corridor;

“(5) conduct public meetings at least quarterly regarding the implementation of the management plan;

“(6) submit substantial changes (including any increase of more than 20 percent in the cost estimates for implementation) to the management plan to the Secretary;

“(7) for any year in which Federal funds have been received under this title—

“(A) submit an annual report to the Secretary setting forth the Association’s accomplishments, expenses and income, and the identity of each entity to which any loans and grants were made during the year for which the report is made;

“(B) make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds and any matching funds; and

“(C) require, for all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the receiving organizations make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds.

“SEC. 122. USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall not use Federal funds received under this title to acquire real property or an interest in real property.

“(2) **OTHER SOURCES.**—Nothing in this title precludes the Association from using Federal funds from other sources for authorized purposes.

“SEC. 123. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

“(a) **PREPARATION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date that Federal funds are made available for this purpose, the Association shall submit to the Secretary for approval a proposed management plan that shall—

“(1) take into consideration State and local plans and involve residents, local governments and public agencies, and private organizations in the corridor;

“(2) present comprehensive recommendations for the corridor’s conservation, funding, management, and development;

“(3) include actions proposed to be undertaken by units of government and non-governmental and private organizations to protect the resources of the corridor;

“(4) specify the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the corridor; and

“(5) include the following:

“(A) Identification of the geographic boundaries of the corridor.

“(B) A brief description and map of the corridor’s overall concept or vision that show key sites, visitor facilities and attractions, and physical linkages.

“(C) Identification of overall goals and the strategies and tasks intended to reach them, and a realistic schedule for completing the tasks.

“(D) A listing of the key resources and themes of the corridor.

“(E) Identification of parties proposed to be responsible for carrying out the tasks.

“(F) A financial plan and other information on costs and sources of funds.

“(G) A description of the public participation process used in developing the plan and a proposal for public participation in the implementation of the management plan.

“(H) A mechanism and schedule for updating the plan based on actual progress.

“(I) A bibliography of documents used to develop the management plan.

“(J) A discussion of any other relevant issues relating to the management plan.

“(b) **DISQUALIFICATION FROM FUNDING.**—If a proposed management plan is not submitted to the Secretary within 2 years after the date that Federal funds are made available for this purpose, the Association shall be ineligible to receive additional funds under this title until the Secretary receives a proposed management plan from the Association.

“(c) **APPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed management plan submitted under this title not later than 180 days after receiving such proposed management plan. If action is not taken by the Secretary within the time period specified in the preceding sentence, the management plan shall be deemed approved. The Secretary shall consult with the local entities representing the diverse interests of the corridor including governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners prior to approving the management plan. The Association shall conduct semi-annual public meetings, workshops, and hearings to provide adequate opportunity for the public and local and governmental entities to review and to aid in the preparation and implementation of the management plan.

“(d) **EFFECT OF APPROVAL.**—Upon the approval of the management plan as provided in subsection (c), the management plan shall supersede the conceptual plan contained in the National Park Service report.

“(e) **ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.**—If the Secretary disapproves a proposed management plan within the time period specified in subsection (c), the Secretary shall advise the Association in writing of the reasons for the disapproval and shall make recommendations for revisions to the proposed management plan.

“(f) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS.**—The Secretary shall review and approve all substantial amendments (including any increase of more than 20 percent in the cost estimates for implementation) to the management plan. Funds made available under this title may not be expended to implement any changes made by a substantial amendment until the Secretary approves that substantial amendment.

“SEC. 124. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE; OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

“(a) **TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—Upon the request of the Association, the Secretary may provide technical assistance, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, and financial assistance to the Association to develop and implement the management plan. The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the Association and other public or private entities for this purpose. In assisting the Association, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that in general assist in—

“(1) conserving the significant natural, historic, cultural, and scenic resources of the corridor; and

“(2) providing educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with the purposes of the corridor.

“(b) **DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Any Federal agency conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the corridor shall—

“(1) consult with the Secretary and the Association with respect to such activities;

“(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the Association in carrying out their duties under this title;

“(3) to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and

“(4) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner which the Association determines is not likely to have an adverse effect on the corridor.

“SEC. 125. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To carry out this title there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000, except that not more than \$1,000,000 may be appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year.

“(b) **50 PERCENT MATCH.**—The Federal share of the cost of activities carried out using any assistance or grant under this title shall not exceed 50 percent of that cost.

“SEC. 126. SUNSET.

“The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this title terminates on September 30, 2027.”

“SEC. 503. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

The Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 is further amended by adding after section 126 (as added by section 502 of this title) the following new sections:

“SEC. 127. REQUIREMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

“(a) **NOTIFICATION AND CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS REQUIRED.**—No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the corridor until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the Association and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the Association.

“(b) **LANDOWNER WITHDRAW.**—Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the corridor, and not notified under subsection (a), shall have their property immediately removed from the boundary of the corridor by submitting a written request to the Association.

“SEC. 128. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

“(a) **ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

“(1) require any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to such private property; or

“(2) modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with regard to public access to or use of private property.

“(b) **LIABILITY.**—Designation of the corridor shall not be considered to create any liability, or to have any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any persons injured on such private property.

“(c) **RECOGNITION OF AUTHORITY TO CONTROL LAND USE.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to modify the authority of Federal, State, or local governments to regulate land use.

“(d) **PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS IN CORRIDOR.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to require the owner of any private property located within the boundaries of the corridor to participate in or be associated with the corridor.

“(e) **EFFECT OF ESTABLISHMENT.**—The boundaries designated for the corridor rep-

resent the area within which Federal funds appropriated for the purpose of this title may be expended. The establishment of the corridor and its boundaries shall not be construed to provide any nonexisting regulatory authority on land use within the corridor or its viewed by the Secretary, the National Park Service, or the Association.”

SEC. 504. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 116 of Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “(a)” and all that follows through “For each” and inserting “(a) For each”;

(B) by striking “Commission” and inserting “Association”;

(C) by striking “Commission’s” and inserting “Association’s”;

(D) by redesignating paragraph (2) as subsection (b); and

(E) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

TITLE VI—OIL REGION NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITIONS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the “Oil Region National Heritage Area Act”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this title, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) **HERITAGE AREA.**—The term “Heritage Area” means the Oil Region National Heritage Area established in section 603(a).

(2) **MANAGEMENT ENTITY.**—The term “management entity” means the Oil Heritage Region, Inc., or its successor entity.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 602. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Oil Region of Northwestern Pennsylvania, with numerous sites and districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and designated by the Governor of Pennsylvania as one of the State Heritage Park Areas, is a region with tremendous physical and natural resources and possesses a story of State, national, and international significance.

(2) The single event of Colonel Edwin Drake’s drilling of the world’s first successful oil well in 1859 has affected the industrial, natural, social, and political structures of the modern world.

(3) Six national historic districts are located within the State Heritage Park boundary, in Emlenton, Franklin, Oil City, and Titusville, as well as 17 separate National Register sites.

(4) The Allegheny River, which was designated as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system in 1992 by Public Law 102-271, traverses the Oil Region and connects several of its major sites, as do some of the river’s tributaries such as Oil Creek, French Creek, and Sandy Creek.

(5) The unspoiled rural character of the Oil Region provides many natural and recreational resources, scenic vistas, and excellent water quality for people throughout the United States to enjoy.

(6) Remnants of the oil industry, visible on the landscape to this day, provide a direct link to the past for visitors, as do the historic valley settlements, riverbed settlements, plateau developments, farmlands, and industrial landscapes.

(7) The Oil Region also represents a cross section of American history associated with Native Americans, frontier settlements, the French and Indian War, African Americans and the Underground Railroad, and immigration of Swedish and Polish individuals, among others.

(8) Involvement by the Federal Government shall serve to enhance the efforts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, local subdivisions of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, volunteer organizations, and private businesses, to promote the cultural, national, and recreational resources of the region in order to fulfill their full potential.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this title is to enhance a cooperative management framework to assist the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, its units of local government, and area citizens in conserving, enhancing, and interpreting the significant features of the lands, water, and structures of the Oil Region, in a manner consistent with compatible economic development for the benefit and inspiration of present and future generations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United States.

SEC. 603. OIL REGION NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established the Oil Region National Heritage Area.

(b) **BOUNDARIES.**—The boundaries of the Heritage Area shall include all of those lands depicted on a map entitled “Oil Region National Heritage Area”, numbered OIRE/20,000 and dated October, 2000. The map shall be on file in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register, as soon as practical after the date of the enactment of this Act, a detailed description and map of the boundaries established under this subsection.

(c) **MANAGEMENT ENTITY.**—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Oil Heritage Region, Inc., the locally based private, nonprofit management corporation which shall oversee the development of a management plan in accordance with section 605(b).

SEC. 604. COMPACT.

To carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the area, including a discussion of the goals and objectives of the Heritage Area, including an explanation of the proposed approach to conservation and interpretation and a general outline of the protection measures committed to by the Secretary and management entity.

SEC. 605. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

(a) **AUTHORITIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.**—The management entity may use funds made available under this title for purposes of preparing, updating, and implementing the management plan developed under subsection (b). Such purposes may include—

(1) making grants to, and entering into cooperative agreements with, States and their political subdivisions, private organizations, or any other person;

(2) hiring and compensating staff; and

(3) undertaking initiatives that advance the purposes of the Heritage Area.

(b) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The management entity shall develop a management plan for the Heritage Area that—

(1) presents comprehensive strategies and recommendations for conservation, funding, management, and development of the Heritage Area;

(2) takes into consideration existing State, county, and local plans and involves residents, public agencies, and private organizations working in the Heritage Area;

(3) includes a description of actions that units of government and private organizations have agreed to take to protect the resources of the Heritage Area;

(4) specifies the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area;

(5) includes an inventory of the resources contained in the Heritage Area, including a list of any property in the Heritage Area that is related to the themes of the Heritage Area and that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained because of its natural, cultural, historic, recreational, or scenic significance;

(6) describes a program for implementation of the management plan by the management entity, including plans for restoration and construction, and specific commitments for that implementation that have been made by the management entity and any other persons for the first 5 years of implementation;

(7) lists any revisions to the boundaries of the Heritage Area proposed by the management entity and requested by the affected local government; and

(8) includes an interpretation plan for the Heritage Area.

(c) **DEADLINE; TERMINATION OF FUNDING.**—

(1) **DEADLINE.**—The management entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary within 2 years after the funds are made available for this title.

(2) **TERMINATION OF FUNDING.**—If a management plan is not submitted to the Secretary in accordance with this subsection, the management entity shall not qualify for Federal assistance under this title.

(d) **DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.**—The management entity shall—

(1) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the compact and management plan;

(2) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in—

(A) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the Heritage Area;

(B) developing recreational resources in the Heritage Area;

(C) increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the natural, historical, and architectural resources and sites in the Heritage Area;

(D) the restoration of any historic building relating to the themes of the Heritage Area;

(E) ensuring that clear signs identifying access points and sites of interest are put in place throughout the Heritage Area; and

(F) carrying out other actions that the management entity determines to be advisable to fulfill the purposes of this title;

(3) encourage by appropriate means economic viability in the Heritage Area consistent with the goals of the management plan;

(4) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area; and

(5) for any year in which Federal funds have been provided to implement the management plan under subsection (b)—

(A) conduct public meetings at least annually regarding the implementation of the management plan;

(B) submit an annual report to the Secretary setting forth accomplishments, expenses and income, and each person to which any grant was made by the management entity in the year for which the report is made; and

(C) require, for all agreements entered into by the management entity authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by any other person, that the person making the expenditure make available to the management entity for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds.

(e) **PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this title to acquire real property or an interest in real property.

SEC. 606. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY.

(a) **TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **OVERALL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary may, upon the request of the management entity, and subject to the availability of appropriations, provide technical and financial assistance to the management entity to carry out its duties under this title, including updating and implementing a management plan that is submitted under section 605(b) and approved by the Secretary and, prior to such approval, providing assistance for initiatives.

(B) **OTHER ASSISTANCE.**—If the Secretary has the resources available to provide technical assistance to the management entity to carry out its duties under this title (including updating and implementing a management plan that is submitted under section 605(b) and approved by the Secretary and, prior to such approval, providing assistance for initiatives), upon the request of the management entity the Secretary shall provide such assistance on a reimbursable basis. This subparagraph does not preclude the Secretary from providing nonreimbursable assistance under subparagraph (A).

(2) **PRIORITY.**—In assisting the management entity, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that assist in the—

(A) implementation of the management plan;

(B) provision of educational assistance and advice regarding land and water management techniques to conserve the significant natural resources of the region;

(C) development and application of techniques promoting the preservation of cultural and historic properties;

(D) preservation, restoration, and reuse of publicly and privately owned historic buildings;

(E) design and fabrication of a wide range of interpretive materials based on the management plan, including guide brochures, visitor displays, audio-visual and interactive exhibits, and educational curriculum materials for public education; and

(F) implementation of initiatives prior to approval of the management plan.

(3) **DOCUMENTATION OF STRUCTURES.**—The Secretary, acting through the Historic American Building Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record, shall conduct studies necessary to document the industrial, engineering, building, and architectural history of the Heritage Area.

(b) **APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Pennsylvania, shall approve or disapprove a management plan submitted under this title not later than 90 days after receiving such plan. In approving the plan, the Secretary shall take into consideration the following criteria:

(1) The extent to which the management plan adequately preserves and protects the natural, cultural, and historical resources of the Heritage Area.

(2) The level of public participation in the development of the management plan.

(3) The extent to which the board of directors of the management entity is representative of the local government and a wide range of interested organizations and citizens.

(c) **ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.**—If the Secretary disapproves a management plan, the Secretary shall advise the management entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval and shall make recommendations for revisions in the management plan. The

Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 90 days after the date it is submitted.

(d) **APPROVING CHANGES.**—The Secretary shall review and approve amendments to the management plan under section 605(b) that make substantial changes. Funds appropriated under this title may not be expended to implement such changes until the Secretary approves the amendments.

(e) **EFFECT OF INACTION.**—If the Secretary does not approve or disapprove a management plan, revision, or change within 90 days after it is submitted to the Secretary, then such management plan, revision, or change shall be deemed to have been approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 607. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.

Any Federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Heritage Area shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the management entity with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the management entity in carrying out their duties under this title and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner that the management entity determines shall not have an adverse effect on the Heritage Area.

SEC. 608. SUNSET.

The Secretary may not make any grant or provide any assistance under this title after the expiration of the 15-year period beginning on the date that funds are first made available for this title.

SEC. 609. REQUIREMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

(a) **NOTIFICATION AND CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS REQUIRED.**—No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the Heritage Area until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the management entity and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the management entity.

(b) **LANDOWNER WITHDRAW.**—Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the Heritage Area shall have their property immediately removed from the boundary by submitting a written request to the management entity.

SEC. 610. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) **ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

(1) require any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to such private property; or

(2) modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with regard to public access to or use of private property.

(b) **LIABILITY.**—Designation of the Heritage Area shall not be considered to create any liability, or to have any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any persons injured on such private property.

(c) **RECOGNITION OF AUTHORITY TO CONTROL LAND USE.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to modify the authority of Federal, State, or local governments to regulate land use.

(d) **PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS IN HERITAGE AREA.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to require the owner of any private property located within the boundaries of the Heritage Area to participate in or be associated with the Heritage Area.

(e) **EFFECT OF ESTABLISHMENT.**—The boundaries designated for the Heritage Area rep-

resent the area within which Federal funds appropriated for the purpose of this title may be expended. The establishment of the Heritage Area and its boundaries shall not be construed to provide any nonexistent regulatory authority on land use within the Heritage Area or its viewshed by the Secretary, the National Park Service, or the management entity.

SEC. 611. USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

Nothing in this title shall preclude the management entity from using Federal funds available under Acts other than this title for the purposes for which those funds were authorized.

SEC. 612. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

(1) not more than \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year; and

(2) not more than a total of \$10,000,000.

(b) **50 PERCENT MATCH.**—Financial assistance provided under this title may not be used to pay more than 50 percent of the total cost of any activity carried out with that assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4492, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4492, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), would amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

The bill was subsequently amended by the Committee on Resources where five additional titles were added. As amended, Title I would extend the existing authorities of six established National Heritage Areas. Titles II and VI would establish the National Aviation Heritage Area in Ohio and the Oil Region National Heritage Area in northwestern Pennsylvania, respectively. Titles III, IV, and V would make technical changes to two existing National Heritage Areas and one Heritage Trail Route.

The existing Heritage Areas seek to transition their management authority to a nonprofit organization, which is in line with more recent Heritage Area management, and the Trail Route seeks to produce an economic feasibility plan in an effort to move away from Federal appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4492 is supported by the majority and minority of the committee.

I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, National Heritage Areas protect and interpret some of the best stories and places in American history. Heritage Areas have been enormously popular and successful partnerships between the local communities and the National Park Service.

This legislation makes important technical changes to several existing Heritage Areas and establishes several new ones.

We urge our colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4492. Among its provisions, H.R. 4492 reauthorizes the Illinois and Michigan (I&M) Canal National Heritage Corridor to receive appropriations and transfers management entity status from the federal, I&M Commission to the non-profit Canal Corridor Association. I would like to commend Chairman POMBO and the House Committee on Resources for their hard work on this important piece of legislation.

The I&M Canal changed the nation in 1848 when it opened the first shipping route between New York and New Orleans, designating Chicago as the nation's greatest inland port. While the canal eventually fell into disuse due to new transportation methods and routes, in 1982, business and industry leaders founded the Canal Corridor Association to help revitalize the I&M Canal region, and in doing so, created a national model for regional partnership, conservation and renewal. I am proud to say that the I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor was America's charter National Heritage area, being created by an act of Congress in 1984. For 20 years, the federal I&M Commission has worked to carry out the mission of the I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor. Its efforts have been particularly successful during the past five years that Phyllis Ellin has provided strong leadership as the Executive Director of the Commission.

Since 1984, the I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor has increasingly become an engine of economic growth in communities up and down the length of the Corridor; primarily through an increase in tourism but also in the use of the Corridor for recreational purposes. After consulting with local officials and those most interested and involved in the I&M Canal, it seems that the private sector approach offers more advantages to handle the increased work load brought on by the recent success of the canal and interest in heritage tourism.

As a result, H.R. 4492 designated the Canal Corridor Association (CCA) as the new management entity of the I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor. The CCA seeks to enhance economic vitality by raising awareness of and expanding the parks, trails, landscapes, and historic sites that make the I&M Canal region a special place. They have also successfully implemented education programs and improved the cultural, environmental, historic and tourism resources that the canal offers.

Under the leadership of Ana Koval I am firmly convinced that the CCA, through their governance of the I&M Canal, will continue to successfully educate citizens of the nationally historical importance of the I&M Canal and to play a pivotal role in the continued economic redevelopment of the region.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4492, which includes legislation to reauthorize the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route. I would first like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues in the New Jersey delegation for their support of this reauthorization, especially Representative JIM SAXTON whose assistance helped to bring this legislation to the floor today. I would also like to thank Chairman POMBO and his staff for their support and guidance.

I firmly believe the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail incorporates the very best of what the great state of New Jersey has to offer the rest of the Nation. Established by Congress in 1988, the Trail unifies New Jersey's many scenic points of interest. These points of interest include a wealth of environmental, historic, maritime and recreational sights found along New Jersey's coastline, stretching 300 miles from Perth Amboy to the north, Cape May in the extreme southern tip of the State and Deepwater to the west.

The Trail's area includes three National Wildlife Refuges, four tributaries of a Wild and Scenic River system, a Civil War fort and National cemetery, several lighthouses, historic homes, and other sites tied to southern New Jersey's maritime history. Through a network of themes and destinations, the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail connects people with places of historic, recreational, environmental and maritime interest.

H.R. 4492 would extend the authorization of the Trail to provide additional funding over 2 years to continue the work began in 1988. It would also require that during this period, a Strategic Plan be created in order to explore opportunities to increase participation by national and local private and public interests, as well as organizational options for sustaining the Trail.

The New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail has helped New Jersey residents develop pride, awareness, experience with, and understanding of our coastal resources and its history. This reauthorization will allow the Trail to continue and flourish.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4492, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3874) to convey for public purposes certain Federal lands in Riverside County, California, that have been identified for disposal, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3874

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.—*The Secretary of the Interior shall convey, without consideration and subject to valid existing rights, to S.V.D.P. Management Inc-DBA Father Joe's Villages (referred to in this section as the "Villages"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel described in paragraph (2) for use by the Villages for the purposes described in subsection (b).*

(2) PARCEL.—*The parcel referred to in paragraph (1) is the parcel of land identified for disposal and consisting of approximately 44 acres under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the map entitled "H.R. 3874 Coachella Valley Land Transfer" and dated March 5, 2004.*

(b) PURPOSES OF CONVEYANCE.—*The purposes of the conveyance under section (a) are to provide a homeless shelter, a training center, and affordable housing.*

(c) REVERTER.—*If the Villages or any subsequent owner of the land transferred under this section uses that land for purposes other than those described in subsection (b), all right, title, and interest to the land (and any improvements thereon) shall revert to the United States to be administered by the Bureau of Land Management if the Secretary of the Interior determines that such a reversion is in the best interests of the United States.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3874, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3874, introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), as amended by the Committee on Resources, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey 44 acres of Federal land identified for disposal in Riverside County, California, to Father Joe's Villages, a successful nonprofit organization that assists the homeless in California. Father Joe's plans to develop a comprehensive operation that will address both housing

and training needs for the homeless in the greater Coachella Valley.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3874 is supported by the majority and minority of the Committee on Resources and by the administration.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California's (Mrs. BONO) bill, H.R. 3874, would transfer a parcel of BLM land in North Palm Springs, California, to a charitable organization.

As the administration testified before our committee, the Federal Government would normally require some amount of compensation for a land conveyance such as this one, a requirement this legislation waives. However, it appears that, in this instance, making this conveyance free of charge may be in the best interests of the entire community.

Father Joe's Village has a long history of working in the community to address the problems of unemployment, substance abuse and homelessness. It is our hope that this conveyance will enable this organization to continue its fine work and expand whatever projects that are currently ongoing.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, it is truly rewarding when we, as Members of Congress, can move a bill that will make such a positive impact in our own communities. This bill, H.R. 3874, does just that.

As we all know, no matter how well our economy does, there will always be a segment of our population in need of a safety net. H.R. 3874 takes a step in the right direction as it relates to helping those less fortunate in our society.

This legislation conveys 44 acres of BLM land, which is already on the disposal list, to Father Joe's Villages. Together, with a local charity called Martha's Village and Kitchen, the plan is to build a residential center for the homeless, a job training center and 100 units of affordable housing.

Many would be surprised to learn that even Palm Springs and its surrounding community have numerous people in dire need of a helping hand. But my community, much like everyone else's, unfortunately has a need for shelters, worker training and other forms of assistance.

Father Joe's, located in San Diego and part of Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS's district, and Martha's Village and Kitchen, which is headquartered in my district, are two very reputable and successful organizations. That is why Congressman DAVIS and I want to help them make this village a reality.

Thanks to the most generous individuals I know, Mr. Tom Martin and his wife Rita, much of the money to build this project is secured. Mr. and Mrs. Martin have helped Martha's Village and Kitchen and have again put themselves on the front line of fighting for compassion by getting involved in this effort. Furthermore, we have the energy and enthusiasm of

Father Joe Carroll to run this project. We are ready to go.

Our contribution of this land will enable new workers to enter the workforce, provide shelter and assume other functions that will take the burden off the local, State and Federal governments. The relative cost of this land will come back to us tenfold. In short, this is a perfect example of how a private-public partnership can work for the betterment of so many.

So while I fully realize H.R. 3874 does not create new broad sweeping national policy, it helps people I really care about the people I really care about and that is reward enough.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a very special thank you to Chairman RICHARD POMBO who is responsible for this bill being on the floor of the House today. My heartfelt thanks go out also to Chairman RADANOVICH and Ranking Member RAHALL for shepherding this legislation through committee. These three gentlemen showed great care and dedication in moving this bill through the process. And thanks also to their very able staff, especially Rob Howarth, as well as my staff, Linda Valter, for their help on this important piece of legislation.

I look forward to your support of this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3874, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING CEILING ON FEDERAL SHARE OF ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1156) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN CEILING ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT.

Section 1631(d) of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h-13(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The Federal share of the costs of the project authorized by section 1624 shall not exceed \$80,000,000.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1156, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1156, introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), increases the authorized Federal cost ceiling of the phase I Regional Water Reclamation Project in Orange County, California, by \$60 million.

Local project sponsors have expressed a desire to expand the groundwater replenishment system, which injects highly treated wastewater blended with other sources of water into the local groundwater aquifer. This project will provide an additional water supply for future use and create a freshwater barrier to prevent seawater intrusion.

The project reduces the region's dependency on imported water supplies and provides drought-proofing safeguards.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, the Colorado River Basin is now experiencing the worst drought in 500 years. H.R. 1156 authorizes a modest increase in Federal financial support to expand water recycling in southern California's Orange County water district.

There is a strong Federal interest in completing this project, as it will help reduce the amount of water that now must be imported from the Colorado River. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for introducing this important legislation.

I urge support for H.R. 1156.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1156, a bill that I authored. I am

pleased to see that the bill is on the Suspension Calendar today, and I thank the leadership for putting it on today's calendar.

H.R. 1156 would increase the authorized Federal share for the Orange County, California, groundwater replenishment system from \$20 million to \$80 million. This will allow Orange County to complete its innovative groundwater replenishment system. The groundwater replenishment system will serve about 2.3 million residents of north and central Orange County, and it will create a new water supply of 72,000 acre-feet per year. It is basically a recycling program, a very innovative one; and many States and nations around the world have come to Orange County to look at our tertiary cleaning system that we have.

What this bill does is to increase the Federal share of the project, bringing it closer to the 25 percent level, the level at which almost every other reclamation project is funded in the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act of 1992 and the Reclamation Cycling and Water Conservation Act.

The project is not just important to Orange County, California, but is important to the entire western United States because by recycling our own water, we would not rely so heavily on the Colorado River Aqueduct or the San Francisco Bay Delta water.

Members from both sides of the aisle recognize the need for this project, and I would like to particularly recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) for his cosponsorship and his continued support. The gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) is also offering H.R. 142 today, authorizing the Interior Secretary to participate in Inland Empire water projects; and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of that, and I urge my colleagues to support that as well.

At the same time, I would like to thank the Committee on Resources chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO); the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL); as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT); and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for their overwhelming support of H.R. 1156.

I would also like to say in a very bipartisan manner, the rest of the Orange County delegation, including the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), have been strong supporters of H.R. 1156; and I thank them as well.

Lastly, let me thank Denis Bilodeau, Virginia Grebbien, Craig Miller, and everyone affiliated with the Orange County Water District and Orange County Sanitation District for their hard work and leadership in groundwater recycling. Their innovation has

put Orange County in the forefront of water recycling and groundwater replenishment technology. I thank them for their continued support.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers; I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1156.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEWLANDS PROJECT HEAD- QUARTERS AND MAINTENANCE YARD FACILITY TRANSFER ACT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2831) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2831

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF NEWLANDS PROJECT HEADQUARTERS AND MAINTENANCE YARD FACILITY.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—*The Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, Nevada, as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act and in accordance with all applicable law and the terms of the memorandum of agreement between the District and the Secretary dated June 9, 2003 (Contract No. 3-LC-20-8052), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real property within the Newlands Projects, Nevada, known as 2666 Harrigan Road, Fallon, Nevada, and identified for disposition on the map entitled "Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility".*

(b) TREATMENT OF PROCEEDS FROM FALLON FREIGHT YARD AS CONSIDERATION.—*Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, amounts received by the United States for the lease and sale of Newlands Project lands comprising the Fallon Freight Yard shall, for purposes of this section, be treated as payment in full of consideration for the property conveyed under subsection (a).*

(c) REPORT.—*If the Secretary has not completed such conveyance within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress explaining the reasons the conveyance has not been completed and stating the date by which the conveyance will be completed.*

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW, REMEDIATION, AND REMOVAL.—*The Secretary may not make any conveyance under this section until the completion with respect to the conveyance, in accordance with the memorandum of agreement referred to in subsection (a), of—*

(1) *compliance with requirements relating to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. et seq. 4321 et seq.) and cultural resources; and*

(2) *environmental site assessments, remediation, or removal.*

(e) LIABILITY.—*The United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act or omission by, or occurrence relating to, the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District or its employees, agents, or contractors relating to the property conveyed under this section and occurring prior to, on, or after the date of such conveyance.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2831, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2831, authored by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), our distinguished Committee on Resources vice chairman, directs the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 35 acres to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District as soon as practicable. This transfer, which includes the Newlands Projects headquarters and maintenance yard facility, would occur after adjustments for the lease and sale of other project lands have been included in the valuation process.

The bill also stipulates that environmental analyses, including those under the National Environmental Policy Act, must be completed prior to the transfer.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2831 would provide for the transfer of the Bureau of Reclamation land in Nevada to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District. My Republican colleagues have already explained the legislation, and we have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), for yielding me the time on which to speak on this bill. I also would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the chairman, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the subcommittee chairman, for working with me to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor today.

H.R. 2831, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have already heard, will require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, or TCID, as we say in Nevada, all rights, title and interest of the Newlands Reclamation Project located in Fallon, Nevada.

On June 9, 2003, a little over a year ago, the Bureau of Reclamation and the TCID reached an agreement and signed a Memorandum of Agreement specifying the details of this transfer. This transfer of approximately 35 acres will allow the irrigation district to make permanent improvements on the property for the continued operation and maintenance of the Newlands Reclamation Project. This transfer is necessary so that financing can be obtained for these improvements.

It is important to note that in 1996, the Bureau of Reclamation certified that the TCID had repaid to the United States all of the original construction charges that were designated for repayment to the U.S. Government on this project.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is of utmost importance to the people of the State of Nevada and especially those in the Second District of Nevada. Consequently, I have received letters of support from the governor of the State of Nevada, Mr. Kenny Guinn; Churchill County Commissioners; the mayor of Fallon; State representatives Grady and Goicoechea; as well as State senator Mike McGinness.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of support and common-sense agreement on this bill, and so I would urge all Members of this body to vote in favor of H.R. 2831.

□ 1430

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2831, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GATEWAY COMMUNITIES
COOPERATION ACT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1014) to require Federal land managers to support, and to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with, designated gateway communities, to improve the ability of gateway communities to participate in Federal land management planning conducted by the Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior, and to respond to the impacts of the public use of the Federal lands administered by these agencies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1014

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Gateway Communities Cooperation Act".

SEC. 2. IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL LAND MANAGERS AND GATEWAY COMMUNITIES TO SUPPORT COMPATIBLE LAND MANAGEMENT OF BOTH FEDERAL AND ADJACENT LANDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Many communities that abut or are near Federal lands, including units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, units of the National Forest System, and lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, are vitally impacted by the management and public use of these Federal lands.

(2) Some of these communities, commonly known as gateway communities, fulfill an integral part in the mission of the Federal lands by providing necessary services, such as schools, roads, search and rescue, emergency service, medical support, logistical support, living quarters, and drinking water and sanitary systems for visitors to the Federal lands and employees of Federal land management agencies.

(3) Provision of these vital services by gateway communities is an essential ingredient for a meaningful and enjoyable experience by visitors to the Federal lands because Federal land management agencies are unable to provide, or are prevented from providing, these services.

(4) Many gateway communities serve as an entry point for persons who visit the Federal lands and are ideal for establishment of visitor services, including lodging, food service, fuel, auto repairs, emergency services, and visitor information.

(5) Development in some gateway communities may impact the management and protection of these Federal lands.

(6) The planning and management decisions of Federal land managers can have unintended consequences for gateway communities and the Federal lands when the decisions are not adequately communicated to, or coordinated with, the elected officials and residents of gateway communities.

(7) Experts in land management planning are available to Federal land managers, but persons with technical planning skills are often not readily available to gateway communities, particularly small gateway communities.

(8) Gateway communities are often affected by the policies and actions of several Federal land management agencies and the communities and the agencies would benefit from greater inter-agency coordination of those policies and actions.

(9) Persuading gateway communities to make decisions and undertake actions in their communities that would also be in the best interest of the Federal lands is most likely to occur when

such decisionmaking and actions are built upon a foundation of cooperation and coordination.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to require Federal land managers to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with gateway communities in order to—

(1) improve the relationships among Federal land managers, elected officials, and residents of gateway communities;

(2) enhance the facilities and services in gateway communities available to visitors to Federal lands when compatible with the management of these lands, including the availability of historical and cultural resources; and

(3) result in better local land use planning in gateway communities and decisions by the relevant Secretary.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) GATEWAY COMMUNITY.—The term "gateway community" means a county, city, town, village, or other subdivision of a State, a federally recognized Indian tribe, or Alaska Native village, that—

(A) is incorporated or recognized in a county or regional land use plan or within tribal jurisdictional boundaries; and

(B) the relevant Secretary (or the head of the tourism office for the State) determines is significantly affected economically, socially, or environmentally by planning and management decisions regarding Federal lands administered by the relevant Secretary.

(2) RELEVANT SECRETARY.—The term "relevant Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate.

(d) PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL PLANNING AND LAND USE.—

(1) PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING.—At the earliest possible time, the relevant Secretary shall solicit the involvement of elected and appointed officials of governments of gateway communities in the development of land use plans, programs, land use regulations, land use decisions, transportation plans, general management plans, and any other plans, decisions, projects, or policies for Federal lands under the jurisdiction of these Federal agencies that are likely to have a significant impact on these gateway communities.

(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED.—To facilitate such involvement, the relevant Secretary shall provide the appropriate officials, at the earliest possible time but not later than the scoping process, with the following:

(A) A summary, in nontechnical language, of the assumptions, purposes, goals, and objectives of the plan, decision, project, or policy.

(B) A description of any anticipated significant impact of the plan, decision, project, or policy on gateway communities.

(C) Information regarding the technical assistance and training available to the gateway community.

(3) TRAINING SESSIONS.—At the request of a gateway community, the relevant Secretary shall offer training sessions for elected and appointed officials of gateway communities at which such officials can obtain a better understanding of—

(A) the agency planning processes; and

(B) the methods by which they can participate most meaningfully in the development of the agency plans, decisions, and policies referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—At the request of a gateway community, the relevant Secretary shall make available personnel, on a temporary basis, to assist gateway communities in development of mutually compatible land use or management plans.

(5) COORDINATION OF LAND USE.—The relevant Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with gateway communities to coordinate the management of—

(A) the land use inventory, planning, and management activities for the Federal lands administered by the relevant Secretary; and

(B) the land use planning and management activities of other Federal agencies, agencies of

the State in which the Federal lands are located, and local and tribal governments in the vicinity of the Federal lands.

(6) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AND COORDINATION.—To the extent practicable, when the plans and activities of 2 or more Federal agencies are anticipated to have a significant impact on a gateway community, the Federal agencies involved shall consolidate and coordinate their plans and planning processes to facilitate the participation of affected gateway communities in the planning processes.

(7) TREATMENT AS COOPERATING AGENCIES.—To the earliest extent practicable, but not later than the scoping process, when a proposed action is determined to require an environmental impact statement, the relevant Secretary shall allow any affected gateway communities the opportunity to be recognized as cooperating agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(e) GRANTS TO SMALL GATEWAY COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The relevant Secretary may make grants to any gateway community with a population of 10,000 or less to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTMAKING.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each fiscal year for grants under this subsection.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (other than for grants under subsection (e)), \$10,000,000 for each fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1014, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), would facilitate better communication between the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior and those designated communities located adjacent to our Federal lands which have come to be known as gateway communities. These gateway communities have and continue to be impacted by decisions made by managers of our public lands and oftentimes fulfill an integral part in the mission of these Federal lands by providing necessary services such as schools, roads, search and rescue, emergency and medical support, drinking water and sanitary systems, to name just a few. It would improve the relationship among Federal land managers, elected officials, and residents of gateway communities, enhance facilities and services available to visitors to our Federal lands, and improve the coordination of land use planning and decisions made by Federal land managers.

In addition, this legislation would make grants available to eligible gateway communities to participate in the Federal land planning process, further giving these communities a place at the table when decisions are being made.

H.R. 1014 is supported by the majority and the minority of the committee. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, as introduced, the gateway community legislation sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) was controversial. However, over the last 2 years, committee staff, outside groups, and the agencies themselves have worked cooperatively to resolve many of the issues presented by this legislation. Recently, enough progress was made that the bill is before us today.

We agree with the National Parks Conservation Association, however, H.R. 1014 is not perfect. It is our hope as this legislation is considered by the other body, all of the interested parties might continue working cooperatively to resolve some of the remaining issues. Furthermore, Members should realize that H.R. 1014 represents yet another piece of legislation placing new duties upon our Federal land managers.

As we continue to work on the Interior appropriations legislation, I would call on all Members to work together to ensure that our Federal land management agencies receive funding sufficient to meet not only their current operations and maintenance needs, but also to cover any new responsibilities we are placing on them through legislation such as H.R. 1014. In many ways, an increase in funding will do as much to improve the communication and cooperation between Federal land management agencies and their neighbors as new authorizing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Land.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I like to call this bill "the good neighbor act" even though its real name is the Gateway Communities Cooperation Act. The purpose of the bill is to make certain that small communities located just outside the Federal properties have input in the Federal land planning processes. This measure is critical to many of my constituents and important for numerous small communities throughout the country that are impacted by the Federal land management decisions. Many times they are the ones that provide solutions to Federal management problems.

As someone who represents several small towns located just outside Yosemite National Park and near the Stanislaus and Sierra National forests, I know that too often these communities are left out of the process.

This bill ensures that communities serving as gateways to our Nation's Federal lands, including Park Service and Forest Service properties, have a voice in that process. Gateway communities can greatly benefit or be severely harmed by the decisions of Federal land managers, so it is critical that their views are heard before land managers make final decisions. That is why H.R. 1014 encourages a more open discussion between Federal agencies and local communities.

Additionally, this bill makes grants available to qualified gateway communities to provide technical assistance to local communities, allowing them to more readily participate in the Federal land planning process. For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1014.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1014, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KILAUEA POINT NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE EXPANSION ACT OF 2004

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2619) to provide for the expansion of Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2619

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge Expansion Act of 2004".

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF KILAUEA POINT NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, all or a portion of the land or interests in land described in subsection (b), as depicted on a map on file with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Kilauea Point Wildlife Refuge Expansion Area" and dated April 22, 2004.

(b) *DESCRIPTION OF LAND.*—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the following:

- (1) Parcel 1, consisting of approximately 12 acres known as the Kilauea Bay property.
- (2) Parcel 2, consisting of approximately 40 acres known as the Kilauea Vistas property.
- (3) Parcel 3, consisting of approximately 162 acres known as the Kilauea Falls Ranch.

(4) Parcel 4, consisting of approximately 5 acres known as the Kauai Public Land Trust Kahili Beach property.

(5) Parcel 5, comprised of lot 10c of the parcel known as Kilauea Garden Farms, and consisting of approximately 15 acres.

(c) *BOUNDARY REVISIONS.*—The Secretary may make such minor revisions in the boundaries of any of the parcels described in subsection (b) as may be appropriate to facilitate the acquisition of land or interests under subsection (a).

(d) *INCLUSION IN REFUGE.*—Land and interests acquired under this section shall become part of the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge.

(e) *MANNER OF ACQUISITION.*—All acquisitions of land or waters under this Act shall be made in a voluntary manner and shall not be the result of forced takings.

(f) *ADDITIONAL PURPOSES.*—In addition to the purposes of the Refuge under other laws, regulations, Executive orders, and comprehensive conservation plans, the Refuge shall be managed for—

(1) the protection and recovery of endangered Hawaiian water birds and other endangered birds, including the Nene (Hawaiian goose); and

(2) the conservation and management of native coastal strand, riparian, and aquatic biological diversity.

(g) *PRIORITY GENERAL PUBLIC USES.*—Nothing in this Act shall be considered to affect any policy or requirement, under paragraph (3) or (4), respectively, of section 4(a) of the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(a)), to treat compatible wildlife-dependent recreational uses as priority general public uses of the Refuge.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall administer all federally owned land, water, and interests in land and water that are located within the boundaries of the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge in accordance with—

(1) the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.); and

(2) this Act.

(b) *ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.*—The Secretary may, in the administration of the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge, use such additional statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and the provision of opportunities for fish- and wildlife-dependent recreation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to carry out this Act.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary—

(1) to acquire land and water within the Refuge under section 2(a); and

(2) to develop, operate, and maintain the Refuge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE),

would allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to acquire up to 234 acres of land from private landowners who have expressed an interest in selling or donating their property for inclusion in the refuge.

The Kilauea Point Refuge was established in 1984. The centerpiece of this unit is a 90-year-old lighthouse which served as a navigational aid for thousands of commercial vessels and boats that sailed between Hawaii and Asia. The Coast Guard has now deactivated the lighthouse, but it has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

This refuge provides essential habitat to a number of listed plant, avian and wildlife species, including the Hawaiian monk seal and the official State bird, which is called the nene. It is estimated that more than 400,000 people annually visit this beautiful refuge on the island of Kauai; and this expansion will assist in the recovery of these listed species, conserve native coastal strand and riparian habitat, and help ensure aquatic biological diversity in the future.

During the committee process, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was successfully offered that clarified that the owners of this property may donate their land if they so desire, all acquisitions shall be made in a voluntary manner, and wildlife-dependent recreation will be a priority use when compatible with the purposes of the refuge. This is a good piece of legislation, and I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 2619.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the adequate description of the legislation provided by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

To briefly reiterate, H.R. 2619 would virtually double the size of the existing Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge on the Hawaiian island of Kauai.

The purpose of this 219-acre expansion would be to protect the scarce and threatened habitats for several endangered species of Hawaiian wildlife. This noncontroversial legislation is strongly supported by the State of Hawaii, the mayor of Kauai, the Kauai County Council, and the citizens of the Kilauea.

That this expansion will be executed entirely through willing seller purchases is testament to the tireless consensus-building which has been accomplished by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE). Both the Committee on Resources ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and I commend the gentleman from Hawaii for his efforts to protect special areas of the Hawaiian environment. I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. CASE, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2619, my Kilauea Point National Wildlife Expansion Act. This bill authorizes the addition of 234 invaluable acres to the Refuge, a national treasure, currently home to a variety of endangered and threatened seabirds as well as Hawaii's endangered state bird, the nēnē (Hawaiian Goose).

This bill is a vital component of one of my principal goals in Congress: to ensure that federal and/or state or private protection is extended to as many of Hawaii's threatened and irreplaceable areas as possible, both to ensure the survival and recovery of Hawaii's unique endangered and threatened species and to preserve the dwindling unspoiled resources of our beautiful islands for future generations.

The Kilauea National Wildlife Refuge, located at the northernmost tip of Kauai, was established in 1985. The initial acreage of 31 acres was increased to 203 acres through additional acquisitions in 1993 and 1994. The refuge provides invaluable habitat for many native seabirds, including the Laysan Albatross, the Red-footed Booby, and the Wedge-tailed Shearwater, as well as for the endangered nēnē. Endangered native plants have also been reintroduced to the area. The Refuge and its historic lighthouse have become one of Hawaii's world-class tourist destinations, visited by some 300,000 visitors each year. It is one of the most heavily visited refuges in the United States.

The proposed expansion area comprises five parcels of some 234 acres adjoining the boundary of the Refuge on both the east and west sides. The Kilauea River runs through a portion of the land, which also includes an extensive lo'i (irrigated terrace for traditional cultivation of taro, the staple crop of Native Hawaiians) which could be restored to support endangered Hawaiian water birds, including the Hawaiian duck (Kōloa), Hawaiian coot ('Alae 'ke'oke'o), Hawaiian stilt (Ae'o), and Hawaiian moorhen ('Alae 'ula). There is also a high quality estuarine ecosystem at the lower reaches of the river, which includes habitat for endangered birds as well as native stream life, such as the hihiwai (an endemic snail), o'opu (native goby), the native sleeper fish, flagtail, mullet, prawn, shrimp, invertebrates and juveniles of several important recreational and commercial marine fish species. The proposed addition also provides excellent additional habitat for the nēnē, which was only recently saved from extinction. The beach is also sometimes used by endangered Hawaiian monk seals, and threatened and endangered sea turtles nest in the area.

The upper end of the proposed expansion area contains one of the largest waterfalls (Kilauea Falls) in the state of Hawaii.

One of the parcels, 5 acres of valuable beachfront property, was donated after introduction of the bill by a private owner to the Kauai Public Land Trust for eventual transfer to the Fish & Wildlife Service. The owner of another 15-acre parcel has expressed his desire to donate it to the Refuge. The other parcels are on the market, although their owners are amenable to acquisition by the Refuge.

The Kilauea community strongly supports the Refuge. In fact, the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge is a model for management of other federal refuges nationwide. The operations of the Refuge are supported by community volunteers, who give daily tours of the

Refuge and help in the preservation and propagation of native plant species. The principal volunteer group, Kilauea Point Natural History Association, even has a small store in the Visitor Center, the proceeds of which support environmental education programs throughout Kauai.

H.R. 2619 is supported by Kauai's Mayor Bryan Baptiste, State Senator Gary L. Hooser, State Representatives Hermina M. Morita and Ezra Kanoho, the Kauai County Council, the State Department of Land and Natural Resources, the Kilauea Neighborhood Association, the Kauai Public Land Trust, the Kilauea Point Natural History Association, and the Hawaii Chapter of the Sierra Club. I want to take a moment to thank some of the individuals in Kauai whose dedication and commitment to the Refuge and the endangered species it protects inspired development of this bill: Gary Smith, Gary and Beryl Blaich, Susan Boynton, Janis Lyon, and Katie Pickett.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Oceans and Wildlife Chair WAYNE GILCHREST and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE for moving this bill through their subcommittee, as well as Committee Chair RICHARD POMBO and Ranking NICK RAHALL for helping to bring the bill to the floor today. I would also like to recognize the work of Committee and Subcommittee staff, in particular Dave Jansen and Jim Zoia on the minority staff and Harry Burroughs, Dave Whaley, Mike Correia, and Steve Ding on the majority staff.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2619 and invite you to come to the Island of Kauai to visit our Refuge. I know that if you did so, you would be as convinced as I am of the importance of protecting these previous lands.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2619, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN CERTAIN RECYCLING PROJECTS

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2991) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional recycling project and in the Cucamonga County Water District recycling program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2991

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INLAND EMPIRE AND CUCAMONGA COUNTY RECYCLING PROJECTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative”.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Reclamation Waste-water and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102-575, Title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1636. INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Inland Empire regional water recycling project described in the report submitted under section 1606(c).

“(b) **COST SHARING.**—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000.

“SEC. 1637. CUCAMONGA COUNTY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Cucamonga County Water District, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Cucamonga County Water District pilot satellite recycling plant in Rancho Cucamonga, California, to reclaim and recycle approximately 2 million gallons per day of domestic wastewater.

“(b) **COST SHARING.**—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the capital cost of the project.

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$10,000,000.”

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102-575 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1635 the following:

“Sec. 1636. Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Program.

“Sec. 1637. Cucamonga County Water Recycling Project.”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2991, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), provides Federal resources for

two water recycling projects in southern California. The projects authorized in the bill would add an estimated 75,000 acre-feet of water annually to one of the largest recycled water distribution systems in the Santa Ana River Watershed. The projects will treat contaminated surface and ground waters and deliver the recycled water to nearby localities, including underground storage. The bill limits the Federal cost share to 25 percent of the total cost of the projects.

This bill is yet another step toward utilizing currently untapped sources of water and providing clean and dependable water supplies for future generations. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the drought in the Colorado River Basin is a serious crisis. H.R. 2991 would help support the construction of regional water recycling projects in southern California. These projects can help stabilize water supplies and reduce the need to use water from the Colorado River. Local communities have made substantial investments in the projects, and they deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation authored by my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and the author of this legislation.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise obviously in strong support of this legislation. I thank my friend from Guam for her very nice remarks, and I would especially like to express my appreciation to my friend from Arizona. This initiative deals with water, and both of our States right now are dealing with very serious fire problems. Obviously, I would like to say that our thoughts and prayers go out to the victims in both of our States, Arizona and California, of those who are suffering and have been over the last several weeks. I would also like to express appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources, as well as my friend from California (Mr. CALVERT), chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power. We appreciate their hard work and that of all the members of the committee, and I see a lot of staff members here on the floor. I know they have played a big role in helping us move H.R. 2991 to the floor here.

This measure was introduced as the Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative to authorize water recycling projects under the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's title XVI program. This initiative includes two projects which, combined, will produce 75,000 acre-feet of new water annually. With the passage of the CalFed authorization legislation, which we have been working for a decade and a half on, and I mentioned the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) last when we brought this measure up 2 weeks ago, it is very imperative that we continue to approve measures preventing water supply shortages in the western United States. This recycling initiative will help meet the water needs of the Inland Empire and begin a strategic Federal-local partnership to bring a significant amount of new water supply to our region.

I am very pleased that this bill has the support of all member agencies of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency as well as the water agencies downstream in Orange County. The IEUA encompasses approximately 242 square miles and serves the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Fontana, Ontario, Upland, Montclair, and Rancho Cucamonga.

The Inland Empire Utilities Agency produces recycled water for a variety of nonpotable purposes, such as landscape irrigation, agricultural irrigation, construction and industrial cooling. By replacing these water-intensive applications with high-quality recycled water, fresh water can be conserved or used for drinking, thereby reducing the dependence on expensive imported water.

In addition, by recycling water which would otherwise be wasted and unavailable, the Inland Empire Utilities Agency provides that the water available goes through at least one more cycle of beneficial use before it is ultimately returned to the environment.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my thanks to the Committee on Resources which under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the subcommittee led by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) has really accomplished landmark water legislation this year. This is just a small but, for me, a very important part of that.

I also want to express appreciation to the bipartisan delegation from southern California that joined as cosponsors of this legislation: the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), whom I share representing the San Gabriel Valley with, has long been very involved in water issues; the gentleman from Diamond Bar, California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), who has spent a lot of time representing actually three counties, Orange County, Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County, and has been very focused on these issues; and, of course, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) who represents a large part

of the Inland Empire. Those were the lead cosponsors we had on this legislation.

Last but not least I do want to express my appreciation for the hard work and dedication of Mr. Robert DeLoach, the general manager of the Cucamonga County Water District, and Mr. Rich Atwater, the CEO and general manager of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, who have worked tirelessly in behalf of the Inland Empire.

Again, I thank my friend from Arizona for generously yielding me this time. I will join with my friends from Guam and from Arizona in urging all of our colleagues to provide unanimous support for this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my colleagues who serve on the House Resources Committee, and extend my appreciation to Chairman POMBO and Subcommittee Chairman CALVERT, for their hard work in moving this bill to the House floor. I introduced the Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative, H.R. 2991, to authorize water recycling projects under the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI program.

This initiative includes two projects, the first of which will be constructed by the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) and will produce 70,000 acre-feet of new water annually. This project is expected to be fully constructed and on-line by 2008. The second of these projects, to be constructed by the Cucamonga County Water District (CCWD), will produce an additional 5,000 acre-feet of new water annually. This project is expected to be fully constructed and on-line by 2010. Between these two projects, 75,000 acre-feet of new water will be produced annually before the end of the decade.

With the recent passage of the CalFed authorization, it is imperative that we continue to approve measures preventing water supply shortages in the Western United States. This recycling initiative will help meet the water needs of the Inland Empire, and help alleviate California's dependence on the Colorado River. The passage of H.R. 2991 will begin a strategic Federal-local partnership to bring a significant amount of new water supply to the region.

IEUA produces recycled water for a variety of non-potable purposes, such as landscape irrigation, agricultural irrigation, construction, and industrial cooling. By replacing these water-intensive applications with high-quality recycled water, fresh water can be conserved or used for drinking, thereby reducing the dependence on expensive imported water. In addition, by recycling water which would otherwise be wasted and unavailable, IEUA provides that the water available goes through at least one more cycle of beneficial use before it is ultimately returned to the environment.

The Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative has the support of all member agencies of IEUA, as well as the water agencies downstream in Orange County. IEUA encompasses approximately 242 square miles and serves the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Fontana (through the Fontana Water Company), Ontario, Upland, Montclair, Rancho Cucamonga (through the Cucamonga County Water District), and the Monte Vista Water District.

I want to reiterate my thanks to the House Resources Committee, which under the lead-

ership of Chairman POMBO and Subcommittee Chairman KEN CALVERT, has really accomplished landmark water legislation this year. I also want to thank my colleagues GRACE NAPOLITANO, GARY MILLER, and JOE BACA for cosponsoring H.R. 2991. And last but certainly not least, I appreciate the hard work and dedication of Mr. Robert DeLoach, general manager of the Cucamonga County Water District, and Mr. Rich Atwater, CEO and general manager of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency who work tirelessly on behalf of the Inland Empire.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2991, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LAND IN EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3785) to authorize the exchange of certain land in Everglades National Park, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3785

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK.

Section 102 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 410r-6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “The park boundary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The park boundary”;

(B) by striking “The map” and inserting the following:

“(2) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map”; and (C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire from 1 or more willing sellers not more than 10 acres of land located outside the boundary of the park and adjacent to or near the East Everglades area of the park for the development of administrative, housing, maintenance, or other park purposes.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION; APPLICABLE LAW.—On acquisition of the land under subparagraph (A), the land shall be administered as part of the park in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the park.”; and (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) LAND EXCHANGES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of General Services.

“(B) COUNTY.—The term ‘County’ means Miami-Dade County, Florida.

“(C) COUNTY LAND.—The term ‘County land’ means the 2 parcels of land owned by the County totaling approximately 152.93 acres that are designated as ‘Tract 605-01’ and ‘Tract 605-03’.

“(D) DISTRICT.—The term ‘District’ means the South Florida Water Management District.

“(E) DISTRICT LAND.—The term ‘District land’ means the approximately 1,054 acres of District land located in the Southern Glades Wildlife and Environmental Area and identified on the map as ‘South Florida Water Management District Exchange Lands’.

“(F) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION LAND.—The term ‘General Services Administration land’ means the approximately 595.28 acres of land designated as ‘Site Alpha’ that is declared by the Department of the Navy to be excess land.

“(G) MAP.—The term ‘map’ means the map entitled ‘Boundary Modification for C-111 Project, Everglades National Park’, numbered 160/80,007A, and dated May 18, 2004.

“(H) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LAND.—The term ‘National Park Service land’ means the approximately 1,054 acres of land located in the Rocky Glades area of the park and identified on the map as ‘NPS Exchange Lands’.

“(2) EXCHANGE OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION LAND AND COUNTY LAND.—The Administrator shall convey to the County fee title to the General Services Administration land in exchange for the conveyance by the County to the Secretary of fee title to the County land.

“(3) EXCHANGE OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LAND AND DISTRICT LAND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the completion of the exchange under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey to the District fee title to the National Park Service land in exchange for fee title to the District land.

“(B) USE OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LAND.—The National Park Service land conveyed to the District shall be used by the District for the purposes of the C-111 project, including restoration of the Everglades natural system.

“(C) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On completion of the land exchange under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall modify the boundary of the park to reflect the exchange of the National Park Service land and the District land.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.”.

SEC. 2. BIG CYPRESS NATIONAL PRESERVE.

Subsection (d)(3) of the first section of Public Law 93-440 (16 U.S.C. 698f) is amended by striking “The amount described in paragraph (1)” and inserting “The amount described in paragraph (2)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3785, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO

DIAZ-BALART) and amended by the Committee on Resources, would authorize the exchange of approximately 1,054 acres of land between the South Florida Water Management District and the Everglades National Park. The Federal lands conveyed are to be used by the South Florida Water Management District for the C-111 project, including restoration of the Everglades natural system. The C-111 project, located on the eastern boundary of the Everglades, would restore habitat in the national park that has been adversely affected by projects to restore more natural flows of water to the park's eastern panhandle, Taylor Slough and Florida Bay.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3785 is supported by the majority and minority of the Committee on Resources and by the administration. I would urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3785, as amended, represents a cooperative effort among the bill's sponsor, the Committee on Resources, the National Park Service and other Federal and State agencies to help restore natural water flows that are very important to the health and well-being of the Everglades in Florida. This legislation presents a workable solution to the resource management needs in this area, and we support adoption of the bill by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), the sponsor of this important legislation, a newcomer to the Congress but one who is well schooled in public affairs and in legislation as a former member of the Florida legislature.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am actually glad that I am doing this now because the Speaker pro tempore is also from Florida, understands the Everglades very, very well, and has been a strong supporter of Everglades restoration.

Let me just briefly talk about what this is. First, the district that I am privileged to represent includes the Everglades National Park. I spent much of my State legislative career assisting with the implementation of the Everglades restoration plan. This plan is showing extreme success, and this legislation before us today will greatly contribute to that success, to continuing that success.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Florida have a strong commitment to the restoration of the Everglades. Not only is

it a national treasure, a global treasure, really an international treasure, tourists from around the country and around the world come to experience the wonders, the beauty that is the Everglades. But the people of Florida as well as the taxpayers of the country have also put a lot of resources to try to make sure that the Everglades is as pristine as possible and gets back to as much of its natural state as is possible.

This legislation will allow for the implementation of a component of the 1994 general reevaluation report that provided for the construction of a buffer and detention system along the eastern boundary of Everglades National Park. This system seeks to establish a hydraulic ridge to both prevent excess loss of seepage from the park and to reestablish the historical surface water flow from Northeast Shark River Slough to Taylor Slough.

Again, as I mentioned before, these are not inexpensive propositions. These are not only expensive, they are also very time-consuming projects.

Again, the people of the State of Florida, the State legislature in the State of Florida, the governor in the State of Florida and again previous governors as well but particularly this governor, Governor Jeb Bush, have shown that they are extremely committed to this effort; and again, the taxpayers, the State legislature and the governor have put in a lot of money to make sure that it is not just the Federal taxpayer, the Federal Government, that is contributing to this wonderful effort.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will authorize the exchange of approximately 1,054 acres between the South Florida Water Management District and the Everglades National Park to carry out the construction of the buffer and detention system. Currently, 2.5 miles of the detention and buffer system have been already constructed, and the Federal lands conveyed in this legislation are to be used by the South Florida Water Management District to construct the remaining 5.5 miles of the system.

This is a vital part of the Everglades restoration that again, I repeat, that both the Federal Government has put a lot of emphasis, a lot of time, a lot of effort and a lot of money, and the State as well; not only the State but also the local taxpayers again through the water management district have also put up a lot of money, a lot of effort, a lot of time to try to get this done. This is a vital part of that restoration.

I particularly need to thank the efforts of Chairman POMBO. Chairman POMBO has been just wonderful to work with on this. His staff has been great. My staff has been working with his staff. They have been extremely receptive, not only receptive but their in-depth knowledge of this national treasure has been wonderful to see. We have not had to educate them on something that those of us in Florida know and

love so much. Chairman POMBO and his staff are so familiar with this project and it has been just a wonderful experience.

Again, one of the things that I want to just reemphasize is that this is not a State of Florida project, that this is a national treasure. The Everglades is a national treasure that is also a threatened national treasure, an extremely delicate ecosystem, one that is vital for the entire State and I would then say for the entire Nation. When we think about the Everglades, we should not only think about that swampland that a lot of people just see in the airplanes when they are flying by, but we should also think about the impact that that has on, for example, Florida Bay, Biscayne Bay, the Florida Keys, the reef system. It is all interconnected. The heart of that is a vital, clean, vibrant, alive Florida Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank again Chairman POMBO and his staff for allowing me to bring this bill up here.

□ 1500

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3785, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3819) to redesignate Fort Clatsop National Memorial as the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park, to include in the park sites in the State of Washington as well as the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK DESIGNATION ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Lewis and Clark National Historical Park Designation Act".

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) PARK.—The term "park" means the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park designated in section 103.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 103. LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In order to preserve for the benefit of the people of the United States the historic, cultural, scenic, and natural resources associated with the arrival of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in the lower Columbia River area, and for the purpose of commemorating the culmination and the winter encampment of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in the winter of 1805-1806 following its successful crossing of the North American Continent, there is designated as a unit of the National Park System the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the park are those generally depicted on the map entitled "Lewis and Clark National Historical Park, Boundary Map", numbered 405/80027, and dated December 2003, and which includes—

(1) lands located in Clatsop County, Oregon, which are associated with the winter encampment of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, known as Fort Clatsop and designated as the Fort Clatsop National Memorial by Public Law 85-435, including the site of the salt cairn (specifically, lot number 18, block 1, Cartwright Park Addition of Seaside, Oregon) used by that expedition and adjacent portions of the old trail which led overland from the fort to the coast;

(2) lands identified as "Fort Clatsop 2002 Addition Lands" on the map referred to in this subsection; and

(3) lands located along the lower Columbia River in the State of Washington associated with the arrival of the Lewis and Clark Expedition at the Pacific Ocean in 1805, which are identified as "Station Camp", "Clark's Dismal Nitch", and "Cape Disappointment" on the map referred to in this subsection.

(c) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire land, interests in land, and improvements therein within the boundaries of the park, as identified on the map referred to in subsection (b), by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, transfer from any Federal agency, or by such other means as the Secretary deems to be in the public interest.

(2) CONSENT OF LANDOWNER REQUIRED.—The lands authorized to be acquired under paragraph (1) (other than corporately owned timberlands within the area identified as "Fort Clatsop 2002 Addition Lands" on the map referred to in subsection (b)) may be acquired only with the consent of the owner.

(3) ACQUISITION OF FORT CLATSOP 2002 ADDITION LANDS.—If the owner of corporately owned timberlands within the area identified as "Fort Clatsop 2002 Addition Lands" on the map referred to in subsection (b) agrees to enter into a sale of such lands as a result of actual condemnation proceedings or in lieu of condemnation proceedings, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the owner regarding the manner in which such lands shall be managed after acquisition by the United States.

(d) CAPE DISAPPOINTMENT.—

(1) TRANSFER.—Subject to valid rights (including withdrawals), the Secretary shall transfer to the Director of the National Park Service management of any Federal land at Cape Disappointment, Washington, that is within the boundary of the park.

(2) WITHDRAWN LAND.—

(A) NOTICE.—The head of any Federal agency that has administrative jurisdiction over withdrawn land at Cape Disappointment, Washington, within the boundary of the park shall notify the Secretary in writing if the head of the Federal agency does not need the withdrawn land.

(B) TRANSFER.—On receipt of a notice under subparagraph (A), the withdrawn land

shall be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary, to be administered as part of the park.

(3) MEMORIAL TO THOMAS JEFFERSON.—All withdrawals of the 20-acre parcel depicted as a "Memorial to Thomas Jefferson" on the map referred to in subsection (b) are revoked, and the Secretary shall establish a memorial to Thomas Jefferson on the parcel.

(4) MANAGEMENT OF CAPE DISAPPOINTMENT STATE PARK LAND.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State of Washington providing for the administration by the State of the land within the boundary of the park known as "Cape Disappointment State Park".

(e) MAP AVAILABILITY.—The map referred to in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

SEC. 104. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The park shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this title and with laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after funds are made available for this purpose, the Secretary shall prepare an amendment to the General Management Plan for Fort Clatsop National Memorial to guide the management of the park.

(c) COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT.—In order to facilitate the presentation of a comprehensive picture of the Lewis and Clark Expedition's experiences in the lower Columbia River area and to promote more efficient administration of the sites associated with those experiences, the Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements with appropriate officials in the States of Washington and Oregon in accordance with the authority provided under section 3(1) of Public Law 91-383 (112 Stat. 3522; 16 U.S.C. 1a-2).

SEC. 105. REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Public Law 85-435 (72 Stat. 153; 16 U.S.C. 450mm et seq.), regarding the establishment and administration of Fort Clatsop National Memorial, is repealed.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law (other than this title), regulation, document, record, map or other paper of the United States to "Fort Clatsop National Memorial" shall be considered a reference to the "Lewis and Clark National Historical Park".

SEC. 106. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

(1) require any private property owner to permit public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to such private property; or

(2) modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with regard to public access to or use of private lands.

(b) LIABILITY.—Designation of the park shall not be considered to create any liability, or to have any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any persons injured on such private property.

(c) RECOGNITION OF AUTHORITY TO CONTROL LAND USE.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to modify any authority of Federal, State, or local governments to regulate the use of private land within the boundary of the park.

SEC. 107. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

TITLE II—LEWIS AND CLARK EASTERN LEGACY STUDY**SEC. 201. DESIGNATION OF ADDITIONAL SITES FOR STUDY.****(a) STUDY.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall update, with an accompanying map, the 1958 Lewis and Clark National Historic Landmark theme study to determine the historical significance of the eastern sites of the Corps of Discovery expedition used by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whether independently or together, in the preparation phase starting at Monticello, Virginia, and traveling to Wood River, Illinois, and the return phase from Saint Louis, Missouri, to Washington, District of Columbia, including sites in Virginia, Washington, District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, and Illinois.

(2) FOCUS OF UPDATE; NOMINATION AND ADDITION OF PROPERTIES.—The focus of the study under paragraph (1) shall be on developing historic context information to assist in the evaluation and identification, including the use of plaques, of sites eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or designation as a National Historic Landmark.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after funds are made available for the study under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate a report describing any findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3819, introduced by the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD), would redesignate Fort Clatsop National Memorial as the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park, to include in the park sites in the State of Washington as well as the State of Oregon, and for other purposes. Additionally, this bill directs the transfer of existing Federal lands currently under the jurisdiction of the BLM and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to the National Park Service for inclusion in the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park.

Finally, H.R. 3819 calls for a study of additional sites associated with the eastern legacy of the Lewis and Clark expedition to be completed by the Secretary of the Interior and the results

transmitted to Congress within 1 year of this bill's passage. The study will serve to identify potential additions east of the Mississippi to the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, for which several pieces of legislation have recently been introduced. Mr. Speaker, without completing this important first step, determining which sites are truly worthy of recognition, designating further sites would stain the authenticity of the Lewis and Clark Historic Trail as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3819 is supported by the majority and the minority of the committee and by the administration. I would urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the significance of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in the history of the United States cannot be overstated. Once enacted, H.R. 3819 will ensure that the critical "turnaround" chapter of the Lewis and Clark story, which took place once they reached the west coast, can be fully explored and the relevant sites fully conserved and interpreted.

H.R. 3819, sponsored by the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD), would implement the preferred alternative identified in the recently completed Lower Columbia Lewis and Clark Sites Boundary Study. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is to be commended for his diligence in getting this measure to the floor and for his dedication as a steward of the Lewis and Clark story.

We urge our colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the author of this legislation.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Guam for yielding me this time, and I thank my friend and colleague from Arizona as well for his support.

This is a very exciting day. As we all know, 200 years ago today, as we speak, Lewis and Clark and their Corps of Discovery were in the middle of their epic journey, actually in the early stages; and what a journey it was: thousands of miles of territory unexplored by U.S. citizens prior to that point and terminating, I am very proud to say, actually in my district on the west coast. And as the Members know, the Pacific Northwest is rich in history pertaining directly to Lewis and Clark's Corps of Discovery and to the many tribes that greeted their arrival.

The Lewis and Clark National Historical Park Designation Act will redesignate 560 acres in Washington and Or-

gon states as the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park and will make this a unit of the National Park System. The acreage will include Fort Clatsop National Memorial; the Megler Safety Rest Area, which was then called Clark's Dismal Nitch; Station Camp; and Cape Disappointment State Park.

I want to take just a second to talk about Station Camp because it was a miraculous place. Lewis and Clark were facing horrific weather. If we read their journals from the time, the rain was pouring down, their clothes were rotting off their bodies, their canoes were capsizing frequently, and they were really at a critical point. They sent a group to the coast itself to look out over the ocean, and they had hoped perhaps they might see a ship there. There were none. Ships had been plying those waters for some decades, but they thought perhaps we will get lucky and can take a ship back. No such luck.

The question then arose: Where shall we winter over? Will we winter on the Washington side, what is now the Washington side, or on the southern side, what is now Oregon? How did they resolve this debate? In true democratic spirit, they had a vote. But what is so remarkable about this vote is the record in the journal indicates that Sacagawea voted, as did York, who was Clark's slave at the time. So here we were 60 years before emancipation, 100 years before suffrage. We took a vote, and the African American and the woman, a Native American, were included in the vote. And that happened at Station Camp.

So this commemoration and designation will allow visitors to the area to fully appreciate the richness of this courageous journey and the heroism that these early explorers showed.

I believe inclusion of these sites as part of the National Historical Park represents the best means for comprehensive interpretation of the history of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in the Pacific Northwest and will continue to relate the importance of the Corps of Discovery's journey long after the bicentennial commemoration has passed.

Fort Clatsop National Memorial, located near Astoria, Oregon, marks the spot where Lewis and Clark and the Corps of Discovery spent 106 days during the winter of 1805 through 1806. That memorial was established by an act of Congress in 1958 and is the only unit of the National Park System solely dedicated to the Lewis and Clark expedition.

During the bicentennial years, the National Park Service estimates that well over 1 million people will visit Fort Clatsop and the surrounding area. In fact, the memorial has already begun to notice a significant increase in visits; and to accommodate all of these visitors, to enhance visitor experience, it is vital that Fort Clatsop finish its expansion efforts immediately.

The inclusion of these sites is timely considering the bicentennial of the

Corps of Discovery is already under way and the preparations are being made in southwest Washington and northwest Oregon for the Destination Pacific Signature Event in 2005.

In addition to preserving and enhancing the historic value of these sites, inclusion with the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park will bring important economic benefits to local communities that, quite frankly, have struggled with the decline of major industries and with high unemployment of late.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and his staffers, Jim Zoia and David Watkins; the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and staffer Frank Vitello. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) has been instrumental in this, as have members of both delegations and both sides of the aisle. This is truly a bistate, bicameral regional effort. And I also express my appreciation to Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton in the administration. The Secretary herself visited the area not long ago and has been a stalwart advocate. And, finally, Chip Jenkins, the superintendent of the park; David Nicandria of the Washington State Historical Society; and my own staffer, Ms. Paula Burg, have done outstanding work.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration in support of this legislation.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3819, the Lewis and Clark National and Historical Park Designation Act.

The bicentennial of Lewis and Clark's epic journey is upon us. H.R. 3819 commemorates the Corps of Discovery by renaming several state parks and Ft. Clatsop National Memorial as the Lewis and Clark National and Historical Park.

Through 15 National Heritage Events, tens of thousands of participants from all over the world will be able to experience the 200-year-old story of Lewis and Clark, and take away lessons that are still relevant today.

The Pacific is one of 15 nationally sanctioned events taking place along the Lewis and Clark trail. This is a bi-state collaboration between Washington and Oregon scheduled for Friday, November 11th through Tuesday, November 15th, 2005 and ends with the dedication of a new state/national park at Station Camp. Local businesses, national and state park staff, and volunteers are working tirelessly to make our signature event a success. Congress must also do its part by passing H.R. 3819.

As America ventures further and is lifted by the spark of discovery, today and in years to come, it behooves our nation to look to those who have paved the way before us. Whether pushing the frontiers of freedom here on earth, the frontiers of exploration in the heavens, or the frontiers of knowledge everywhere there is ignorance, the story of the Lewis and Clark expedition is one that demonstrates the power of what is possible when a people, and a nation, have the curiosity to ask, "why?"; the sense of unbounded possibility to ask, "why not?"; and the resolve to remake the world.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3819.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3819, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLAMATION WASTEWATER AND GROUNDWATER STUDY AND FACILITIES ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 142) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional water recycling project, to authorize the Secretary to carry out a program to assist agencies in projects to construct regional brine lines in California, and to authorize the Secretary to participate in the Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRADO BASIN NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102-575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1636. PRADO BASIN NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM PROJECT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Orange County Water District, shall participate in the planning, design, and construction of natural treatment systems and wetlands for the flows of the Santa Ana River, California, and its tributaries into the Prado Basin.

“(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

“(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for the operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102-575 is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1634 the following:

“Sec. 1636. Prado Basin Natural Treatment System Project.”.

SEC. 2. REGIONAL BRINE LINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102-575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1637. REGIONAL BRINE LINES.

“(a) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary, in cooperation with units of local government, may carry out a program under the Federal reclamation laws to assist agencies in projects to construct regional brine lines to export the salinity imported from the Colorado River to the Pacific Ocean as identified in—

“(1) the Salinity Management Study prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; and

“(2) the Southern California Comprehensive Water Reclamation and Reuse Study prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation.

“(b) AGREEMENTS AND REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may enter into such agreements and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

“(c) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of a project to construct regional brine lines described in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

“(1) 25 percent of the total cost of the project; or

“(2) \$40,000,000.

“(d) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any project described in subsection (a).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102-575 is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1635 the following:

“Sec. 1637. Regional brine lines.”.

SEC. 3. LOWER CHINO DAIRY AREA DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION AND RECLAMATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102-575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1638. LOWER CHINO DAIRY AREA DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION AND RECLAMATION PROJECT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, and the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority and acting under the Federal reclamation laws, shall participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project.

“(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

“(1) 25 percent of the total cost of the project; or

“(2) \$50,000,000.

“(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102-575 is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1636 the following:

“Sec. 1638. Lower Chino dairy area desalination demonstration and reclamation project.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 142, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), provides Federal assistance for three water projects to produce dependable water supplies in Southern California. The bill provides for the strategic placement of wetlands to naturally clean surface water in the Santa Ana Watershed. The bill also authorizes Federal funding for the design and construction of a regional brine wastewater pipeline from local groundwater treatment plans. Thirdly, the bill provides for the design and construction of a desalter to treat brackish groundwater. At full build-out, these projects will produce an estimated 50,000 acre-feet of new water.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is another example of how communities are utilizing new water technologies to provide water from varied sources of supply that are dependable and drought-proof. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 142 would support the construction of desalting and water recycling projects in Southern California. These projects can help stabilize water supplies and reduce the need to use water from the Colorado River. Local communities have made substantial investments in the project, and they do deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 142, legislation I have sponsored to dramatically improve the water supply reliability of the Santa Ana watershed and the water basins in San Bernardino, Riverside and Orange counties. I thank Committee Chairman Pombo and Water Subcommittee Chairman Calvert for recognizing the importance of this bill to providing innovative solutions to the challenges posed by chronic water shortages in Southern California.

Many states today are faced with the formidable task of providing reliable and safe water resources for a rapidly increasing population. This is no exception to California and its growing population of more than 30 million people. Southern California's arid climate makes it difficult for this region to find variable and dependable sources of water. The Interior Department's ruling to reduce the availability of Colorado River water to Southern California has exacerbated the area's water supply problems by reducing approximately 700,000 acre

feet of water this year alone. Such water supply deficiencies discourage economic growth, imperil the environment and compromise the health and safety of Southern California residents.

As a result of dwindling supplies and increasing demands, communities continue to seek non-traditional methods to produce dependable water sources, including through water recycling and desalination. H.R. 142 would enhance Southern California's water supply by constructing a water recycling project, a desalination demonstration and reclamation project, and a regional brine lines project. Upon full implementation, these projects will create an estimated 50,000 new acre feet of water annually for the region.

PRADO BASIN NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM

H.R. 142 will provide Southern California with additional new water annually through the construction of a water recycling project. The Prado Basin Natural Treatment System will naturally treat the Santa Ana River flow through wetlands development. By assisting Mother Nature in the creation of these wetlands, we will improve the water quality of the Santa Ana River, thereby recharging the Orange County Water District's groundwater basin.

Currently-constructed wetlands have demonstrated an ability to reduce nitrate contaminants to level that permit water supply use. The expanded program will result in more than 1,200 acres to treat three tributaries to the Santa Ana River. This will mean additional treated water that can be made available to the citizens of the region. The new system will help drought-proof the region and protect against salt water intrusion. In addition, the restoration of natural wetlands allows for the amount of water to be stored behind the currently underutilized Prado Dam to be increased.

In a region that is prone to droughts, the expansion of this water supply will deliver non-potable (non-drinkable) water for irrigation and industrial purposes so that our limited supply of potable water can be reserved for drinking water purposes.

LOWER CHINO DAIRY AREA DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION AND RECLAMATION PROJECT

H.R. 142 expands groundwater desalination in the Chino Basin from the current 9,000 acre feet per year to 40,000 acre feet per year, which would provide a vital new drinking water supply for a rapidly increasing population in San Bernardino County, including Jurupa Community Services District, Santa Ana Mutual Water Company in Riverside County, and the cities of Norco, Chino, Chino Hills and Ontario in San Bernardino County.

As former President Dwight D. Eisenhower once said, "We need a farsighted program for meeting urgent water needs by converting saltwater to fresh water." Once deemed impractical and costly, desalination has evolved into one of America's most effective and reliable solutions to water supply shortages. Desalination provides drinking water directly into the delivery system and is blended with other sources of potable water in many cases. The construction of a desalination demonstration and reclamation project in the Lower Chino Dairy Area offers a viable method of meeting the region's water supply needs into the future.

BASIN NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM PROJECT

One of the main challenges to desalination is the transport of the salts, also known as

brine, to outfall stations. H.R. 152 seeks to address this obstacle by providing a means to safely and efficiently discard excess brine from desalination plants. Specifically, this legislation calls for the construction of a regional line to transport excess brine to the Pacific Ocean, where it can be safely filtered through an ocean-outfall pump station. This will prevent many of the environmental hazards that can occur from inadequate disposal of excess brine, thus protecting groundwater reserves for the over six million resident of Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

These projects will help ensure the water needs of Southern California's communities are met, and I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 142, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Prado Basin Natural Treatment System Project, to authorize the Secretary to carry out a program to assist agencies in projects to construct regional brine lines in California, and to authorize the Secretary to participate in the Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONTINUED USE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3932) to amend Public Law 99-338 to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3932

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION TO REISSUE PERMIT.

The first section of Public Law 99-338 is amended by striking "one renewal" and inserting "3 renewals".

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

Section 3 of Public Law 99-338 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. The permit shall contain the following provisions:

"(1) A prohibition on expansion of the Kaweah Project in Sequoia National Park.

"(2) A requirement that an independent safety assessment of the Kaweah Project be conducted,

and that any deficiencies identified as a result of the assessment would be corrected.

"(3) A requirement that the Secretary prepare and submit to Congress an update of the July 1983 report on the impact of the operations of the Kaweah No. 3 facility on Sequoia National Park.

"(4) Any other reasonable terms and conditions that the Secretary of the Interior deems necessary and proper for the management and care of Sequoia National Park and the purposes for which it was established."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3932, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and amended by the Committee on Resources, would amend Public Law 99-338 to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project.

□ 1515

The legislation would provide the authority necessary for Southern California Edison Company to continue operating the Kaweah hydroelectric project partly located in the park until the year 2016, with an option to extend until 2026. The bill also requires the company to pay the park compensation, which shall be determined in consultation with the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3932, as amended, is supported by the majority and the minority of the Committee on Resources and by the administration. I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained the purpose of H.R. 3932. While it is unusual to have a hydroelectric facility in a national park, this is a nearly 100-year-old use that has been and will continue to be held to a very high standard to ensure that there is no degradation of park resources.

The National Park Service supports this legislation, as amended, and we appreciate the willingness of the majority to work with us to see that high standards for the use of national parks

are maintained and that the park is adequately compensated for this use of park resources.

We support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), the author of this important legislation.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my thanks to the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) and their staff for their hard work on this legislation, H.R. 3932.

This bill is a simple maintenance of the law which has to be accomplished every 20 years to renew the Secretary of the Interior's authority to issue permits for the operation of a hydroelectric power facility in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park. This facility was built over 100 years ago and continues to generate power today. If this authority is not renewed, power generation would be halted. This bill is critical, and I urge quick passage.

Again, I offer thanks to the Committee on Resources for moving this bill quickly to the floor.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3932, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend Public Law 99-338 to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO OF DECOMMISSIONED NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION SHIP

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4158) to provide for the conveyance to the Government of Mexico of a decommissioned National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ship, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF NOAA VESSEL WHITING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall convey to the Government of

Mexico, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel WHITING—

(1) for use as a hydrographic survey platform in support of activities of the United States-Mexico Charting Advisors Committee; and

(2) to enhance coordination and cooperation between the United States and Mexico regarding hydrographic surveying and nautical charting activities in the border waters of both countries in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific Ocean.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The Government of the United States shall not be responsible or liable for any remediation, maintenance, or operation of a vessel conveyed under this section after the date of the delivery of the vessel to the Government of Mexico.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall seek to complete the conveyance by as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DELIVERY OF VESSEL.—The Secretary shall deliver the vessel WHITING pursuant to this section at the vessel's homeport location of Norfolk, Virginia, at no additional cost to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4158.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4158 will transfer a decommissioned NOAA vessel, the *Whiting*, to the Government of Mexico.

The United States is an active partner in the U.S.-Mexico Charting Advisors Committee which addresses regional issues on charting, research and data collection. As part of the cooperative activities of this committee, the Government of Mexico contacted NOAA indicating an interest in obtaining the vessel from the United States. The Government of Mexico does not have a vessel dedicated to hydrographic surveys, and the *Whiting* would be the first ship to fill that role.

The *Whiting* is 163 feet in length, draws 12 feet of water, has a cruising speed of 12 knots and a cruising range of 5,700 nautical miles. It was removed from service in 2002 after 40 years of conducting hydrographic surveys in the Great Lakes and along the East and Gulf Coasts of the United States.

Under the terms of H.R. 4158, all rights, title and interest in the *Whiting* are transferred to the Government of Mexico. The vessel must be used as a hydrographic platform in support of activities of the U.S.-Mexico Charting Advisors Committee.

The ship will be delivered at the vessel's current home port of Norfolk, Virginia, and the United States will not be responsible for any remediation, maintenance or operation of the *Whiting* after delivery. I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 4158, and compliment the author, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, as noted, H.R. 4158 is a noncontroversial piece of legislation to convey to the Government of Mexico at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer the decommissioned hydrographic survey vessel *Whiting* from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

I want to go on record to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) for recognizing the value of conveying the vessel to help strengthen the Mexican Government's civilian hydrographic survey capabilities in the Gulf of Mexico and to participate in joint hydrographic operations with the United States.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4158, sponsored by Mr. ORTIZ, which seeks to convey to the Government of Mexico, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel, *Whiting*.

The NOAA and U.S. Navy are the main U.S. representatives of the MesoAmerican-Caribbean Sea Hydrographic Commission that coordinates the hydrographic surveys and charting activities of member nations. Since 1963, the *Whiting* had been in service for the NOAA, conducting hydrographic surveys along the east and Gulf Coast of the United States and the Great Lakes. In March 2003, NOAA replaced the *Whiting* with a former U.S. Navy hydrographic survey vessel.

As of August 2003, Mexico did not have a vessel dedicated to hydrographic surveys. The *Whiting* could fill that role, as it was decommissioned by the NOAA in May 2003. By conveying the *Whiting* to the Government of Mexico, Mexican dependence on NOAA and U.S. Navy assets for hydrographic surveys would decrease. In addition to the lessened dependence, the regional capacity would be strengthened. Such a conveyance would foster the exchange of information in the Gulf Coast and improve navigational safety for all vessels sailing in the Gulf of Mexico.

NOAA possesses no authority to transfer ships to foreign governments, and thus, this legislation would authorize such a transfer. With the passage of this legislation, the United States would bear no responsibility for any remediation, maintenance, or operation of the *Whiting* after delivery.

This legislation is exemplary in its effort to contribute globally, without putting a burden on the shoulders of the U.S. By conveying the *Whiting*, a vessel decommissioned by NOAA, to Mexico, Mexico would gain valuable and necessary infrastructure, without cost to the United States, and it would allow it to contribute to the NOAA efforts, for which the

United States bears an enormous amount of energy. The United States would gain safer waters in the Gulf Coast, which is central to our national security. In addition, the transfer of the *Whiting* to the Government of Mexico would act to balance the level of responsibility of the countries who are bordered by the waters of the Gulf Coast.

I congratulate Mr. ORTIZ on his leadership in this matter.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4158.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR VOLUNTEER RECRUITMENT ACT OF 2004

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4170) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit volunteers to assist with, or facilitate, the activities of various agencies and offices of the Department of Interior, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior Volunteer Recruitment Act of 2004".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit and use volunteers to assist with, or facilitate, the programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. VOLUNTEER AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior may recruit, train, and accept, without regard to the civil service classification laws, rules, or regulations, the services of individuals, contributed without compensation as volunteers, for aiding in or facilitating the activities administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Office of the Secretary.

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON ACTIVITIES OF VOLUNTEERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accepting such services of individuals as volunteers, the Secretary shall not permit the use of volunteers in law enforcement work, in regulatory and enforcement work, in policymaking processes, or to displace any employee.

(2) PRIVATE PROPERTY.—No volunteer services authorized by this Act may be conducted on private property unless the officer or employee charged with supervising the volunteer obtains appropriate consent to enter the property from the property owner.

(3) HAZARDOUS DUTY.—The Secretary may accept the services of individuals in hazardous duty only upon a determination by the Secretary that such individuals are skilled in performing hazardous duty activities.

(4) SUPERVISION.—The Secretary shall ensure that an appropriate officer or employee of the United States provides adequate and appropriate supervision of each volunteer whose services the Secretary accepts.

(c) PROVISION OF SERVICES AND COSTS.—The Secretary may provide for services and costs incidental to the utilization of volunteers, including transportation, supplies, uniforms, lodging, subsistence (without regard to place of residence), recruiting, training, supervision, and awards and recognition (including nominal cash awards).

(d) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS.—

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, a volunteer shall not be deemed a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those provisions relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(2) Volunteers shall be deemed employees of the United States for the purposes of—

(A) the tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code;

(B) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code; and

(C) claims relating to damage to, or loss of, personal property of a volunteer incident to volunteer service, in which case the provisions of section 3721 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply.

(3) Volunteers under this Act shall be subject to chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, unless the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, determines in writing published in the Federal Register that the provisions of that chapter, except section 201, shall not apply to the actions of a class or classes of volunteers who carry out only those duties or functions specified in the determination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4170, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4170, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the chairman of the Committee on Resources, and subsequently amended by the Committee on Resources, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish volunteer programs in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of the Secretary. With this authority, these four bureaus would be able to

parallel the successful volunteer programs of the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to recruit volunteers to assist with or facilitate the activities within these agencies.

Mr. Speaker, over 200,000 volunteers annually serve as campground hosts, clear trail, help with seasonal bird surveys, collect new information for maps and assist with many other day-to-day activities.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, volunteers provide the Department of the Interior vital services to help it meet its mission responsibilities. Volunteer programs within the Department also provide outstanding opportunity for community service and public involvement in conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4170 is supported by the majority and the minority of the Committee on Resources and the administration. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained the purpose of H.R. 4170, which was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the chairman of the Committee on Resources, at the request of the administration. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank publicly the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), for attending the 60th anniversary of Guam's liberation this past weekend in Tracy, California.

On behalf of the Committee on Resources ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), we appreciate the willingness of the chairman and his staff to make changes to the bill to address concerns about the use of volunteers in regulatory and legal offices within the Department of Interior.

Mr. Speaker, with those changes, we have no objection to the passage of H.R. 4170, as amended, by the House today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4170, the Department of the Interior Volunteer Recruitment Act of 2004. The legislation before us would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit, train, and accept, without regard to the civil service classification laws, rules, or regulations, the services of individuals, contributed without compensation as volunteers, for aiding in or facilitating the activities administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, the Minerals Management Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of the Solicitor, and the Office of the Secretary. This legislation will make it easier for those who want to volunteer to take part in the activities under the Department of the Interior.

I applaud Representative POMBO and the crafters of this legislation for taking into consideration the concerns of the Minority in the

Resources Committee. Furthermore, this legislation is thorough in that it has protections for the volunteers who are eligible under this Act. This legislation authorizes the Secretary to accept the services of individuals in hazardous duty only upon a determination by the Secretary that such individuals are skilled in performing hazardous activities and it ensures that an appropriate U.S. officer or employee provides adequate and appropriate supervision of each volunteer. Perhaps most importantly this Act prohibits the Secretary from permitting the use of such volunteers in law enforcement work, in regulatory and enforcement work, in policy-making processes, or to displace any employee. It is vital that when we craft legislation such as this that we make sure it protects paid workers who could be compromised by the presence of unpaid volunteers. It is easy to be in favor of this legislation thanks to the protections instated in the language.

I am in full support of this legislation because it has an altruistic spirit. There are a great many Americans every year who give of their time to others without any compensation or material reward. We should be taking down the barriers that might needlessly keep them from these volunteer pursuits. This legislation allows those interested in volunteering for the Department of the Interior to take part in responsibilities that would have previously been blocked from them. The responsibilities under the management of the Department of the Interior are immense and require a great deal of good and willing manpower. This program will help alleviate that burden in a sensible manner. I hope this program will also be used to recruit and train volunteers from areas such as the inner-city where many people never been get to see our grand National Parks. Perhaps in the future this program can be supplemented to provide grants and scholarships to college-age inner-city youths to spend time working in our great outdoors. These experiences have been proven to expand the horizons of young people who often only get to see blighted urban landscapes. It is time that Americans from all parts of our great nation get to experience all the various landscapes and environments our vast country has to offer. This legislation is a good start and I hope that we will continue to take the initiative to expand this program.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of bipartisanship, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4170, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SODA ASH ROYALTY REDUCTION ACT OF 2004

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4625) to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2004".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The combination of global competitive pressures, flat domestic demand, and spiraling costs of production threaten the future of the United States soda ash industry.

(2) Despite booming world demand, growth in United States exports of soda ash since 1997 has been flat, with most of the world's largest markets for such growth, including Brazil, the People's Republic of China, India, the countries of eastern Europe, and the Republic of South Africa, have been closed by protectionist policies.

(3) The People's Republic of China is the prime competitor of the United States in soda ash production, and recently supplanted the United States as the largest producer of soda ash in the world.

(4) Over 700 jobs have been lost in the United States soda ash industry since the Department of the Interior increased the royalty rate on soda ash produced on Federal land, in 1996.

(5) Reduction of the royalty rate on soda ash produced on Federal land will provide needed relief to the United States soda ash industry and allow it to increase export growth and competitiveness in emerging world markets, and create new jobs in the United States.

SEC. 3. REDUCTION IN ROYALTY RATE ON SODA ASH.

Notwithstanding section 102(a)(9) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(9)), section 24 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 262), and the terms of any lease under that Act, the royalty rate on the quantity or gross value of the output of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market from Federal land in the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be 2 percent.

SEC. 4. STUDY.

After the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and before the end of the 5-year period beginning on that date, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress on the effects of the royalty reduction under this Act, including—

(1) the amount of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market from Federal land during that 4-year period;

(2) the number of jobs that have been created or maintained during the royalty reduction period;

(3) the total amount of royalty paid to the United States on the quantity or gross value of the output of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market produced during that 4-year period, and the portion of such royalty paid to States; and

(4) a recommendation of whether the reduced royalty rate should apply after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the gentle-

woman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4625.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for his kindness in waiving the rule that establishes the ratio of suspension bills and allowing me to bring this bill up today, rather than having to wait until a later day. I also want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and his staff for all the courteous friendship and work that we have done on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, plainly stated, H.R. 4625 would help balance the unfair playing field in the world market and allow the United States trona producers to face growing competition from countries like China.

The United States soda ash industry, which until recently was the largest in the world, has operations in Wyoming, Colorado and California, with the bulk of the total production through four plants in the great State of Wyoming. The total estimated value of the industry is around \$800 million.

If you read the papers or watch the news, you know that current economic indicators show that the Nation's economy on the whole is gaining momentum, but the hard-working men and women of Wyoming in the soda ash industry continue to lose their jobs to countries like China.

Seven hundred jobs have been lost in the Wyoming trona industry. The new, rosy economic numbers do not help these families put food on the table. They do not help them buy a new car or buy homes, and they do not help put their children through college. They do not help them sleep at night either. But this bill will provide reassurance for the 3,000 men and women who now work in the trona industry in Wyoming and the other States in the United States.

The future of the soda ash industry is being threatened by a number of factors, including China's announced plans to increase existing soda ash plant capacity by 600,000 tons this year and to construct another new plant that will produce 900,000 tons when completed. It is distressing indeed to consider this level of production, when we know how the Chinese exploit cheap labor and almost completely disregard environmental standards.

Furthermore, the domestic market for soda ash has been stagnant for

nearly 20 years, and little growth is expected in the foreseeable future to meet the demand for glass or glass packaging.

Add to all of this the rising energy costs, including a 150 percent increase in natural gas prices over the past 4 years, that have only made matters worse. The much-needed growth will have to be found in places like Asia and Australia, and that means we must take the Chinese head on and with every boost our government can give the soda ash industry.

In order to allow all U.S. soda ash producers to compete on a level playing field with the likes of China, India and synthetic producers around the world and, in turn, create jobs here in the United States, we need to promote a lower tax burden on the industry, a reduced royalty rate and more affordable energy costs that are such a crucial part of the economic mix.

□ 1530

The U.S. soda ash industry pays in the ballpark of \$100 million in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. Due to the growth of China's soda ash exports, it is essential that we provide temporary relief to the soda ash indus-

try in the form of royalty rate reduction. This reduction is intended not to increase the bottom line on soda ash companies; it is intended entirely to grow the market and increase the number of jobs.

H.R. 4625 reduces the royalty rate from 6 percent to 2 percent in order to help the industry achieve increased export growth and competitiveness in the emerging world market.

The hard-working men and women in the soda ash industry have my commitment to continue working to help open new markets and create the good-paying jobs that will help our communities grow and to push for a real energy policy for the Nation that will help smooth out some of the volatility in the natural gas markets by increasing domestic production.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4625 is supported by the majority and the minority of the committee, and I urge adoption of this bill.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2004.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Chairman, Committee on Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost

estimate for H.R. 4625, the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2004.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON
(For Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 4625—Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2004

Summary: H.R. 4625 would provide royalty relief to producers of sodium compounds and related products on federal land. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4625 would increase direct spending by \$3 million in 2005 and \$15 million over the next five years (with no effect after 2009). Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

H.R. 4625 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The royalty reduction required by the bill would temporarily reduce federal payments to three states—Wyoming, Colorado, and California—by about \$3 million a year over the 2005–2009 period.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 4625 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING										
Estimated budget authority	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0

Basis of estimate: H.R. 4625 would reduce the federal royalty rate for sodium compounds and related materials produced on federal land over the 2005–2009 period. Based on information from the Minerals Management Service about the amount of royalties expected to be generated by production of those materials under current law, CBO estimates that this bill would reduce federal receipts by \$6 million in 2005 and \$30 million over the next five years. Those forgone receipts would be partially offset by a corresponding decrease in direct spending for payments to the states in which they are generated. Hence, CBO estimates that the next increase in direct spending under H.R. 4625 would total \$3 million in 2005 and \$15 million over the 2005–2009 period.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 4625 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. The royalty reduction required by the bill would temporarily reduce federal payments to three states—Wyoming, Colorado, and California—by about \$3 million a year over the 2005–2009 period.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Megan Carroll, Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Theresa Gullo, Impact on the Private Sector: Crystal Taylor.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4625, the Soda Ash Roy-

alty Relief Act of 2004, authored by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Soda ash, a chemical produced from trona ore, means mining jobs in southwest Wyoming. These jobs, however, may disappear if we do not provide some measure of relief for our domestic trona producers who are fighting to stay competitive in today's global economy.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, unfair competition from China threatens to dismantle the American soda ash industry. The pending bill would, for a limited time, enhance the competitiveness of our domestic producers by providing a royalty reduction on trona produced on Federal lands.

At a time when too many American jobs are being lost, we must do what is necessary to keep our workforce here at home strong and competitive. We, on this side of the aisle, have no objection to passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers; and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for her work on this issue and for managing so many of the bills today. She certainly does a good job in the committee, and it is great working with her. Always having someone that we can have confidence in really helps move the process along.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4625.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING SANDRA FELDMAN ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE PRESIDENCY OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 714) honoring Sandra Feldman on the occasion of her retirement from the presidency of the American Federation of Teachers for her tireless efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 714

Whereas Sandra Feldman was born in New York City and attended its public schools;

Whereas Ms. Feldman is a former public elementary school teacher, having taught 2nd and 3rd graders at PS 34 in Manhattan;

Whereas Ms. Feldman began her advocacy efforts on behalf of children and other disadvantaged individuals during the 1960's civil rights movement;

Whereas Ms. Feldman rose through the ranks of the United Federation of Teachers to the position of executive director and to the Federation's presidency in 1986;

Whereas Ms. Feldman was elected in May 1997, as the President of the American Federation of Teachers, becoming the 15th president in the Federation's history and the first female president since 1930;

Whereas Ms. Feldman is widely recognized as an expert on urban education and a strong advocate for disadvantaged children;

Whereas Ms. Feldman was selected as one of the "100 Most Influential Women in America" by Ladies Home Journal; and

Whereas educational experts continue to seek the service of Ms. Feldman on numerous high-level commissions and task forces designed to tackle the most pressing problems in our education system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes Sandra Feldman on the occasion of her retirement from the presidency of the American Federation of Teachers for—

(1) her decades of work on behalf of disadvantaged children; and

(2) her outstanding contributions and leadership in improving the quality of teaching and learning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 714.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 714, which honors Sandra Feldman on the occasion of her retirement from the presidency of the American Federation of Teachers and for her efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Ms. Feldman was born in New York City and educated in its public schools, including James Madison High School and Brooklyn College. She holds a masters degree in English literature from New York University.

A former teacher and United Federation of Teachers chapter leader of PS-34 Manhattan, she joined the UFT staff as a field representative in 1966. She was promoted through the ranks to executive director, a post in which she supervised all aspects of the union's work. In 1983, she was elected secretary of the UFT, the union's second highest office, before becoming president in 1986.

From 1986 through 1997, Ms. Feldman was president of the 130,000-member United Federation of Teachers in New York City, the largest union local in the United States and an affiliate of the AFT. During that time, she also served as a vice president of the AFT.

In May of 1997, Sandra Feldman was elected as president of the 1.3 million-

member American Federation of Teachers. She served as the 15th president of the AFT and the union's first female President since 1930. According to AFT publications, membership increased by more than 350,000 in her 7 years as president.

Ms. Feldman is widely recognized as an authority on urban education and an advocate for children and has long been willing to examine innovative approaches in efforts to raise student achievement. Her long-standing commitment to social justice dates back to her involvement with the early civil rights movement, both locally and nationally, when she was arrested during the Freedom Rides and other protests in the 1960s. U.S. Presidents, Governors, and mayors have appointed her to numerous commissions and task forces, tackling educational, economics, child welfare, labor, and other social issues.

This resolution honors Sandra Feldman on the occasion of her retirement from the American Federation of Teachers and recognizes her contributions to teaching and learning in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 714. This resolution honors a great American committed to a great cause. Sandra Feldman's tenure at the AFT has solidified that organization's influential and positive role in education reform.

Sandra Feldman's career first focused on improving teaching and learning as part of the civil rights movement of the 1960s. Her work as a second and third grade teacher in New York City's public schools solidified her view that a high-quality teacher is one of the key elements of successful learning.

To the benefit of teachers everywhere, Ms. Feldman was elected to the presidency of the United Federation of Teachers New York affiliate of the AFT in 1986. She was subsequently elected to the AFT presidency in 1997.

While holding the presidency of the AFT, Ms. Feldman has helped to improve the conditions under which our teachers work, but she has also been a tireless advocate for improved teaching and learning. Successful teaching includes better pay and benefits. But Ms. Feldman also recognized that we have to ensure our teachers have the skills and the professional development to do their jobs well. Her focus on quality has allowed many school systems to redouble their efforts to improve academic achievement.

While Ms. Feldman has recently retired, her legacy will continue to improve education in this country for many, many years to come. I urge the Members to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to add that all of the words that were spoken on both sides I think are particularly applicable to Sandra Feldman and the work she did with the AFT, who, in my judgment, was open-minded about change and progression in education; and for that I think she deserves a tremendous amount of credit. We wish her well as she goes off into her retirement.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 714. This resolution honors a woman who has been one of the most influential and positive forces on public education for many years.

Last week, Sandra Feldman retired from the presidency of the American Federation of Teachers, which represents 1.3 million teachers—from pre-schools to universities—throughout this nation.

Through this resolution, the Congress joins her colleagues in the AFT, and throughout the education field, in recognizing and honoring her contributions to teaching and to the improved status and professionalism of educators.

Ms. Feldman's involvement in improving the quality of education began as an advocate for children during the civil rights movement in the 1960s.

She understood, as we should all, that the right to a sound public education is one of the most basic of our civil rights.

Without that education and training; opportunities are cut off from young people in higher education, employment and promotions.

Her work continued as a public elementary school teacher in 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms at PS 34 in Manhattan. She was elected to the presidency of the United Federation of Teachers in 1986, and then the AFT presidency in 1997.

Ms. Feldman's tenure as president of AFT has been marked by tireless efforts to improve teaching and learning in our country. Ms. Feldman's strong national leadership on standards based reform helped strengthen student performance and expand the skills of teachers.

Along with many Members of Congress, state and local legislators, and local board of education, I have long sought Ms. Feldman's advice and counsel in the development of education and child development policy.

She has never failed to respond to requests for her expert advice, serving on innumerable task forces and commissions, and as a regular witness before Congress.

Quite simply, her leadership at the AFT has enabled the nation to improve teacher quality and make academic achievement a reality.

The contributions of Ms. Feldman to our educational system has been immeasurable. This resolution only recognizes these contributions in a small way. The true measurement of Ms. Feldman's efforts are seen in our schools.

Her impact can be seen with an increased focus on teacher quality and better working conditions for teachers. But also her impact is evident in the strength and desire by our schools to improve teaching and learning.

Her leadership at the AFT has brought increased commitment to closing the achievement gap and ensuring all children can succeed.

This is the type of leadership that will continue to strengthen our educational system for

years to come, and that will open the door of opportunity to millions of children who otherwise may well have languished in underfunded, unsupported schools throughout this country. That is a legacy that any teacher can be very proud of.

I urge all Members to support this resolution, to recognize a great educator and advocate for teachers and schools, and to wish Sandy the very best for her years of contribution to her country.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the impressive career of Ms. Sandra Feldman, as she retires from her presidency of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). For many years, Ms. Feldman has tirelessly served our nation's teachers, paraprofessionals and school-related personnel, local, state and federal employees, higher education faculty and staff, nurses and healthcare professionals, and public schoolchildren. A New York City native, Ms. Feldman taught in New York City public elementary schools, served in the United Federation of Teachers as secretary from 1983 to 1986 and its president from 1986 to 1997. In 1997, Ms. Feldman was elected as the 15th president of the AFT and the union's first female president since 1930.

Ms. Feldman's unwavering support for teachers and her allegiance to America's children have contributed to many successes in our public schools. She engaged AFT in the fight to attract and retain a first-class workforce, to secure funds for critical services in the public schools and to provide access to professional development programs for teachers and faculty. In 2001, her leadership helped secure a number of positive measures in the No Child Left Behind Act. Since the passage of the law, she has continued to be a voice for children and teachers, striving to implement new guidelines in a way that will truly reach all children.

Ms. Feldman chose not to seek reelection as president of the AFT this year, as she focuses on her health. I sincerely thank Ms. Feldman for her decades of work on behalf of disadvantaged children, her outstanding contributions and leadership in improving the quality of teaching and learning. I wish her every success in her fight against cancer.

Ms. Feldman will be succeeded by a Rhode Island native—Mr. Edward J. McElroy, who I have had the pleasure of working with over the years. I am confident that Mr. McElroy will continue to champion the causes of the teachers, public schools, and most importantly our children.

Again, I thank Ms. Feldman for her dedication to our children and urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 714.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Sandra Feldman on the occasion of her retirement from the Presidency of the American Federation of Teachers. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H. Res. 714, honoring Sandra Feldman.

Ms. Feldman has served as President of the American Federation of Teachers since 1997. In that time, she has dedicated herself completely to advancement of education. H. Res. 714 shows all Americans that a life committed to our youth and to our future does not go unnoticed.

I am thankful to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have voiced support for this bill and for the scores of citizens and ac-

tivists around the country who have supported similar efforts.

I urge all members of this body to join me in my praising of Sandra Feldman and her exemplary leadership.

Sandra Feldman has been involved with public schools from her youth. As a child she attended a public school in New York City. Upon graduation, she attended Brooklyn College and received a Master's degree in English Literature from New York University.

Eventually Ms. Feldman moved to the other side of the classroom and became a teacher herself, teaching to 2nd and 3rd graders in Manhattan.

Still, Ms. Feldman's dedication to teaching and learning extended well beyond the classroom. In the 1960's, she became both teacher and an advocate.

As an advocate, Ms. Feldman rose through the ranks of both the United Federation of Teachers and the American Federation of Teachers, serving as executive director of the UFT and eventually as President of both organizations.

Her journey was not only unique, but inspiring. She was the first female President of the United Federation of Teachers in more than sixty years. She has earned recognition as an urban education expert and a persistent advocate for disadvantaged children. And she has served on numerous commissions, worked with UNICEF, and tackled issues ranging from child-welfare and labor to school vouchers. She has been recognized by the *Ladies Home Journal* as one of the "100 Most Influential Women in America." And today, she deserves the recognition of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, these brief words cannot adequately describe a lifetime of service and commitment to the betterment of this great nation. Words can never truly convey the gratitude that my colleges and I feel toward Sandra Feldman for her consistent unwavering support for disadvantaged children and our nation's education system. But the reality is, our country and its children and its schools are better off because of her years of service.

I ask my colleagues to support the passage of H. Res. 714 to recognize Sandra Feldman's contributions and leadership in improving the quality of teaching and learning.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 714. This resolution honors one of the most influential individuals in American education today. As a former public school teacher, I am pleased to honor Ms. Feldman on her retirement.

Ms. Feldman's leadership at the American Federation of Teachers has made teacher quality and improved working conditions for teachers one of the primary factors in ensuring academic success. Her advocacy on behalf of children and teachers alike have greatly improved education reform in this country. For this, we owe Ms. Feldman our thanks.

The value of a public education is immeasurable. Ms. Feldman's work at the AFT lifted the value of education in the minds of the public. Most importantly however, Ms. Feldman has defined the importance of teacher quality. This legacy will continue to help children for many years to come. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I rise to honor the distinguished career and re-

tirement of Sandra Feldman as outgoing President of the American Federation of Teachers. She is truly an extraordinary trailblazer of the American educational system.

Defying odds and raising standards is second nature to Sandra Feldman. The daughter of laborers and a product of New York City's educational system, Sandra Feldman has dedicated her life and her passion to her community and this nation in improving teaching and learning for all Americans.

Since taking the reins of the AFT in 1997 as the 15th president and its first woman president, the organization and its state affiliates have been an unprecedented rise in state and national standardized test scores. The AFT has also increased graduation and retention rates in schools determined to be "at risk."

This great advocate of education has been an invaluable tool in our nation's efforts to make our public schools accountable and equipped with quality teachers, textbooks and other materials needed to ensure that the truly free people are also an educated people.

Mr. Speaker, as we recognize Ms. Feldman, I would also like to extend this recognition and honor to the Texas Federation of Teachers, particularly those in my district of Dallas. Facing extreme budget cuts from the state and new standardized test scores, the teachers of the Dallas Independent School District have risen to the challenge to make sure that their students are able to compete on the equal footing.

Mr. Speaker, as I concluded, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing an unwavering pioneer in the realm of education—Ms. Sandra Feldman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sandra Feldman, who has retired as president of the American Federation of Teachers.

A union activist for nearly 40 years, Sandy started her career as a teacher, and was elected AFT president in 1997 after serving as president of the United Federation of Teachers in New York City for more than a decade.

Under her tenure, the AFT continued its strong advocacy for educational reforms, but also expanded its efforts into educational research. The AFT released major studies on the teaching of reading, and on how to improve teacher training.

She also personally advocated for more aggressive early childhood efforts, including "Kindergarten-Plus" which would allow disadvantaged children to start kindergarten in the summer, and keep them in school during the summer before first grade.

In addition to her work on strengthening and reforming public education, Sandy has been a tremendous advocate for the right to collectively bargain, and has worked to strengthen health care and retirement benefits for her members.

Her dedication to her members and their families is legendary. She has left an enduring imprint on the lives of generation of union workers. Her tireless efforts to secure a better quality of life for working people is a testament to her tremendous energy and commitment to others. Her experience, determination and vision will be greatly missed.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Sandra Feldman as she retires from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and thank her for her valuable contributions to education and dedication to the teaching profession. As a former New York City school

teacher and member of the United Federation of Teachers myself, I can personally attest to her strength of conviction and determination. Having known her for many years, it is also a great privilege to count her a personal friend.

Throughout her career, Sandra Feldman became known as an authority on urban education and an advocate for children. No stranger to activism, she began her advocacy work during the 1960s civil rights movement. A former public school student herself, she then taught in one of New York City's public elementary schools. I had the privilege of working with Sandra Feldman when she was President of the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, the largest union local in the United States. She later took over as President of the American Federation of Teachers in 1997, leading its more than 1 million members.

Throughout her career, U.S. presidents, governors and mayors have appointed her to numerous commissions and task forces tackling educational, economic and child-welfare, labor and social issues. However, Sandra Feldman's interests went beyond the field of education; she serves as a board member or activist in many community and civic organizations.

A dedicated activist, educator and leader, I thank Sandra Feldman for her work throughout her career and sincerely congratulate her on her retirement as president of the AFT.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring a wonderful leader and educator, Ms. Sandra Feldman, as she retires from her role as President of the American Federation of Teachers.

As the 15th president of the American Federation of Teachers and the union's 1st female president since 1930, Ms. Feldman has led the more than 1 million members of her union since 1997.

A native of New York, Sandra Feldman is a self-described "kid from Coney Island." She grew up in a city-owned slum in Brooklyn that was condemned for all the years she lived there and worked her way through the public education system. She attended Brooklyn College on a scholarship and later received a master's degree in English Literature from New York University.

Sandra Feldman is a lifelong civil rights and union activist. She rose from union ranks to serve as president of the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, a post she held from 1986 to 1997, when she was elected AFT president. She recognizes that children are America's most valuable resource and, as such, they must have guidance from able-bodied professionals to develop into productive members of society.

Recognized as an authority on urban education and an advocate for children, her longstanding commitment to social justice dates back to her involvement with the early Civil Rights movement. As such, she has been recognized by many United States Presidents, governors and mayors to tackle the social issues of education, the economy, child-welfare and labor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank her for her many efforts and sacrifices, as she continues to work to increase the rights of public school teachers and the quality of education for our young children and I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating this wonderful American.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with words of strong praise for Sandra Feldman, a

woman who has spent her life in service to others, as she retires from the presidency of the American Federation of Teachers.

Sandy Feldman's educational journey took her first to children as a teacher in the New York City Public Schools, continued with her service to teachers, children and working people, and culminated in her seven outstanding years as President of the AFT.

Equal rights has been an overarching theme of Sandy Feldman's life. I met Sandy when we both were kids in the civil rights movement. The movement was nascent, but Sandy already was deeply engaged. It was no surprise to me that Sandy Feldman would become the leader of a great union or that she would fight so effectively and productively for the rights of its members. However, for Sandy and the American Federation of Teachers, the value added has been the union's leadership on education itself.

In many circles, Sandra Feldman is equally well-known as an educational innovator. She has regarded her work for the advancement of teachers as part and parcel of the advancement of education for children. She has understood that it is impossible for children to get what they need and deserve if teachers are underpaid and without a say in the working conditions under which they teach.

One example of her forward thinking is her handling of charter schools. Recognizing how they were embraced by many families seeking public school alternatives, Sandy Feldman has been able to reconcile charter school popularity with the maintenance of strong public schools and the rights of teachers in districts willing to work in the same spirit of respect for all concerned.

Sandy's energy, ability to move people and fertile mind for unique educational innovation will be missed, but she has set such a high mark that unions and school districts alike will long be following the path she has so ably laid out.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF ASSISTANT OF HON. MARCY KAPTUR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Dan Foote, Staff Assistant of the Honorable MARCY KAPTUR, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil subpoena for testimony issued by the Court of Common Pleas for Lucas County, Ohio.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DAN FOOTE,
Staff Assistant.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1587, by the yeas and nays;
Senate Concurrent Resolution 114, by the yeas and nays; and

Senate 2264, by the yeas and nays.
The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote of this series will be a 5-minute vote.

VIET NAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1587, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1587, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 45, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—323

Ackerman	Bereuter	Boswell
Aderholt	Berkley	Boucher
Akin	Berman	Boyd
Alexander	Berry	Bradley (NH)
Allen	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Brady (TX)
Baca	Bishop (UT)	Brown (OH)
Bachus	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Baird	Blumenauer	Brown, Corrine
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Bartlett (MD)	Boehert	Ginny
Barton (TX)	Boehner	Burgess
Bass	Bonilla	Burns
Beauprez	Bono	Burr
Becerra	Boozman	Burton (IN)

Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Cole
Cox
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English
Etheridge
Farr
Feeney
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herseth
Hill
Hinchev
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hyde
Israel

Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourrette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pombo

Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chocola
Clay
Collins
Cramer
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—45

Baldwin
Biggert
Bishop (GA)

Cantor
Coble
Conyers

Cooper
Costello
Crane

Dooley (CA)
Dreier
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Flake
Goss
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (CT)

Jones (NC)
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
McDermott
McInnis
Miller, George
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose

Paul
Pryce (OH)
Ruppersberger
Sabo
Shays
Shimkus
Simmons
Smith (MI)
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Weller

NOT VOTING—65

Abercrombie
Baker
Ballenger
Bell
Bonner
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chocola
Clay
Collins
Cramer
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hayes
Hinojosa
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
John
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Klecza
Lee
Lipinski
Majette
McCreary
McIntyre
McKeon

Menendez
Miller (MI)
Neugebauer
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Quinn
Renzi
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sanders
Spratt
Sweeney
Toomey
Townes
Vitter
Watt
Wexler
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) (during the vote). Members are reminded that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1858

Messrs. CANTOR, TANNER, OSE, COSTELLO, DICKS, HERGER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. GOSS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FARR and Mr. DOOLITTLE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 391 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

CONCERNING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD IN SCHOOLS TO HUNGRY OR MALNOURISHED CHILDREN AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 114.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 114, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 4, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—367

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks

Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchev
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hyde
Israel

Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourrette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich

Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—4

Flake
Johnson, Sam

Miller (FL)
Paul

NOT VOTING—62

Abercrombie
Ballenger
Bell
Bonner
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chocola
Clay
Collins
Cramer
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
DeMint
Deutsch
Fattah
Ferguson
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gephardt
Granger

Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hayes
Hinojosa
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Insee
Isakson
John
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kleczka
Lee
Lipinski
Majette
McCreery
McIntyre
McKeon

Menendez
Miller (MI)
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Quinn
Renzi
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sanders
Spratt
Sweeney
Toomey
Townes
Vitter
Watt
Wexler
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1907

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHERN UGANDA CRISIS
RESPONSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2264.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2264,

on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

YEAS—371

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkeley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gatliff
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Herseth
Hill
Hinche
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hyde
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy

Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock

Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—61

Abercrombie
Ballenger
Bell
Bonner
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chocola
Clay
Collins
Cramer
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
DeMint
Deutsch
Fattah
Ferguson
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gephardt
Granger

Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hayes
Hinojosa
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Insee
Isakson
John
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kleczka
Lee
Lipinski
Majette
McCreery
McIntyre
McKeon

Menendez
Miller (MI)
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Quinn
Renzi
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Spratt
Sweeney
Toomey
Townes
Vitter
Watt
Wexler
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1923

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday July 19, 2004 I was addressing the Navajo Nation Tribal Council and missed the day's votes. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

(1) On the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1587—the Viet Nam Human Rights Act of 2003, I would have voted “yea.”

(2) On the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. Con. Res. 114—the Food Distribution in Schools to Hungry or Malnourished Children Around the World Act, I would have voted “yea.”

(3) On the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 2264—the Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, personal reasons prevent me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, July 19, 2004. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on H.R. 1587, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act of 2003 (rollcall No. 391); “yea” on S. Con. Res. 114, a resolution concerning the importance of the distribution of food in schools to hungry or malnourished people around the world (rollcall No. 392); and “yea” on S. 2264, the Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act (rollcall No. 393).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, Tax Relief, Simplification, and Equity Act of 2003.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Stenholm moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1308 be instructed to agree, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to a conference report that—

- (1) extends the tax relief provisions which expire at the end of 2004, and
- (2) does not increase the Federal budget deficit.

BUSH TAX CUTS ARE WORKING

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I brought a little article down here with me tonight because I think it is kind of instructive. Sunday morning I was watching some of the talk shows and doing a little reading, and I heard a spokesman for the Democratic candidate say, “Well, you know, this administration has wrecked the economy.”

At that point in time, I happened to be reading an article here. It says, “Sales Survey: Economy is Still Picking Up Speed.”

What this is talking about is the amount of growth in Tennessee’s economy. Over 370 sales professionals were surveyed for their second quarter sales; 69 percent of them saw sales up over first quarter numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I think this just reminds us and proves to us that tax relief works. Continued tax relief for the American people works. Jobs are being created, over 1 million jobs in the last few months. Over 91 million Americans saw a tax cut last year. The Bush tax cuts are working.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4850, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-615) on the resolution (H. Res. 724) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4850) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3574, STOCK OPTION ACCOUNTING REFORM ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-616) on the resolution (H. Res. 725) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3574) to require the mandatory expensing of stock options granted to executive officers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MISSION NOT ACCOMPLISHED ON ECONOMY

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Department of Labor reported that hourly earnings for workers fell 1.1 percent last month. That is the deepest drop since the depths of the recession in 1991, and it follows a 0.8 decrease in hourly wages in May.

With household income down nearly \$1,500 the last 2 years, working families will have to work more hours just to lift their incomes to get back to where they were 3 years ago.

All the while, health care costs for a family of four have gone up from \$6,500 to \$9,000, college costs have gone up 26 percent in the last 3 years, household bankruptcies have risen by 33 percent in the last 2 years, \$180 billion of net value has been erased from 401(k)s.

With a record like this, only this administration would hang the banner “mission accomplished” above the economy.

We can do better for the middle-class families who are facing a squeeze on college costs, health care, savings for their own personal retirement and hourly working income. It is time to turn this economy around to reflect the economic interests of middle-class families who have been faced with a squeeze on them, their family and their children as it relates to the costs.

It is time to put this administration’s banner “mission accomplished” back where it came from.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING NORBERT DREILING OF HAYS, KANSAS

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize a man from my hometown who is a legend in Kansas and a pillar in our community, a man who is sought out for his political expertise and advice as well as for his legal skills, and a man who is well known for his charitable efforts and his vision for our State and our country. I am here tonight to honor a leader, and my friend, Mr. Norbert Dreiling.

Mr. Dreiling may best be known as the father of Democratic politics in the State of Kansas. Through years of dedicated service, he breathed life into a struggling Democratic party and established a lasting two-party system in our State.

Early on, Norbert found ways to use his talents to further his beliefs in good government and in opportunity for all. After graduating from law school in 1949, he returned to his home of Hays, Kansas, where he volunteered as a precinct committeeman, a position he held for the following 25 years. Norbert’s enthusiasm and ability brought opportunities well beyond local politics. From 1966 to 1974, he served as State party chairman of the Democratic Party and as campaign chairman for Kansas Governor Robert Docking.

□ 1930

The party flourished under Chairman Dreiling’s leadership; and for the first time in Kansas’s history, an incumbent Republican Governor was defeated in a race for that office. Norbert went on to advise Governor Docking and helped elect him to a historic four terms as Kansas Governor, the most terms ever served by a Governor in our State. Norbert took an interest in national politics; and along with serving as a delegate to four national party conventions, he served as State co-chairman for the Johnson and Kennedy Presidential campaigns. Today, at the wise age of 79, Mr. Dreiling continues to advise and empower candidates and officeholders.

Norbert’s influence extends well beyond politics. Even before President Kennedy’s call for civic duty, Norbert was revered as a strong leader and a generous spirit in our community. His benevolent service in support of hospitals, rest homes, schools, and civic organizations is legendary. With an eye to bettering the future, Norbert also knows the importance of remembering

the past. He has been instrumental in promoting the Volga-German heritage of Ellis County, Kansas; and he has authored a history of the Volga-German people and their immigration to Kansas, as well as a pageant play marking the centennial anniversary of these events.

When he is not volunteering his time and talents, Norbert is a successful attorney and a partner in the law firm of Dreiling, Bieker and Hoffman. Despite his many activities, his family comes first. Norbert is a devoted husband to his wife Jeannie, and a proud father of four children: January, Mark, Curtis, and Kathy.

Like his Volga-German ancestors who crossed the Kansas prairie many years ago, Norbert's hard work and strong values have made his community and our State a better place. I want tonight to thank Norbert for his many accomplishments, for his civic-minded spirit, and for his sound leadership. Despite a difference in our party affiliation, he is a friend and adviser; and I commend him for his longtime service to our great democracy.

Norbert has spent his life advocating for those in need and enabling others to overcome life's challenges. Today, Norbert himself is facing a great challenge, a personal battle with Parkinson's disease. And tonight, our prayers go out to Norbert and his family during these difficult times. May the strength and courage demonstrated in his years of service throughout his life help him fight the effects of this terrible disease.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT ON RENEWING ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this week, we all take our 6-week break before we come back to the House. That means we only have 9 days left before September 13 when we are going to see the assault weapons ban in this country expire. We have already seen where the gun manufacturers are coming out and saying they cannot wait until this expires, mainly because on September 14 they will be able to supply assault weapons back into the stores so anyone that wants to can buy them.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been here in Washington trying to fight and reduce gun violence in this country, I have always been fair. I have never tried to take away the right of someone to own a gun. But assault weapons go way overboard. Do we want to see our citizens in this country be able to have assault weapons? Assault weapons are the guns that we are seeing every day, unfortunately, in Iraq. Assault weapons are guns that are made to take down as many people as possible in the shortest period of time.

A recent poll by the Educational Fund to Stop Gun Violence shows that

an overwhelming amount of Americans support renewal of the ban, including gun owners around the country and NRA supporters. Voters in key Midwestern States, including Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Missouri, average 72 percent in support of the renewal. In Florida, 81 percent of likely voters support renewing the ban. In rural States, including West Virginia and South Dakota, 68 percent of voters support the renewal. The majority of gun owners in this country support the renewal, mainly because the majority of gun owners in this country are fair, and they know what kinds of guns they need and what kinds of guns we do not need.

In the face of these dramatic numbers in favor of the ban, the issue, unfortunately, remains in a political deadlock. In 2000, the President, President Bush, said that he would sign the bill if it got on his desk. Well, we know that the President has been able to get everything that he has wanted through this House by making some phone calls. It is time the President stands up. It is time the President says, we should have the assault weapons ban certainly renewed, at the least.

Listen, I support our police officers across this country. The police officers across this country want this ban kept in place. Why? Because they have found over the last 10 years fewer and fewer assault weapons are being used in crimes. Fewer and fewer assault weapons are being used to hurt our police officers across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe very strongly that one person can make a difference. That is why I came to Congress. But I also know that it takes the American people to wake up, to be able to have their voices heard here; and this is one chance when the American people can come together.

Do not let this time run out. This is where the American people can get involved. Certainly e-mail the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States. Let us keep this promise that the President made back in 2000 a reality. Do we want assault weapons back on our streets? Do we want the possibility of terrorists that are supposedly in this country being able to buy these guns? Do we want the drug lords to be able to have these guns? Think of the shootings that we have had in this country over the last several years. Can we imagine if they had had an assault weapon and how many more people they could have taken down?

I spent my life as a nurse before I came to this great House. My job is to take care of people. My job is to prevent people from being ill, to give them the best quality of life possible. Having assault weapons is deadly for all of us. It is deadly for our children. It is deadly for our police officers. I here in Congress refuse to let this die. That is why I came to Congress, to save lives.

I am asking the American people to get behind this. When we come back in

September, over 2,000 people will have died during that time. Two thousand people. Two thousand families, not even counting how many have been wounded. I know this is personal for me, but the rhetoric that we are hearing from the NRA is false.

Ten years ago we heard constantly the only reason we wanted to get this assault weapons ban done is so we could go down that slippery road. Well, let me tell my colleagues something. Second amendment rights, the Constitution, each one of us swears that we will uphold that. I am not out here to take away anyone's right to own a gun.

Please, the American people must become involved in this.

DEFINITION OF MARRIAGE

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate lately about the definition of marriage. It seems that the position taken is determined largely by a person's world view. Some are primarily interested in what best serves adults. Issues such as health insurance benefits, Social Security benefits, survivor benefits, hospital visitation rights tend to dominate the debate. There is emphasis upon individual rights and personal freedoms.

There is resentment of those who would attempt to limit the definition of marriage. On the other hand, there are those who are primarily interested in children's welfare and long-term cultural implications as they seek to define marriage. For these people, marriage is viewed as the most basic, elemental social contract. It is the bedrock of the culture. Its primary purpose is the conception and rearing of children in a stable, long-term relationship between a man and a woman. The strength of the culture, possibly for its very survival, depends upon this process.

If one subscribes to the primacy of the importance of children, then certain facts appear to be incontrovertible. First, a man and a woman produce a child; no other arrangement seems to work very well. Second, research shows that children do better when they live with their biological father and mother in a long-term, stable relationship.

Twelve leading family scholars summarized thousands of studies on child rearing as follows: children raised by both biological parents within a marriage are less likely to become unmarried parents, live in poverty, drop out of school, have poor grades, experience health problems, die as infants, abuse drugs and alcohol, experience mental illness, commit suicide, experience sexual and verbal abuse, engage in criminal behavior. And they conclude their observations as follows: "Marriage is more than a private, emotional relationship. It is also a social good." In

other words, all of these behaviors certainly impact all of us as tax payers and certainly break down the culture.

I worked closely with young people for 40 years and personally witnessed the emotional pain and dysfunctional behavior brought about by the destruction of marriages. Most of this dysfunction was caused by the absence of fathers. Fathers contribute to a child's well-being in a unique way. Mothers also obviously make a unique contribution. It takes both.

Opponents of traditional marriage will refer to studies refuting this data. However, these studies almost always compare families where no father at all is present, are not longitudinal, and are poorly designed. Several countries, notably in Scandinavia, have changed the traditional definition of marriage. The result has been a decline in traditional marriage and a surge in out-of-wedlock births in these countries. Children born in such circumstances on average suffer significant dysfunction and distress.

The strength of a culture can be measured by how it treats its most vulnerable citizens: its children. So the question before us today is this: Do we allow a small number of members of the judiciary to alter an institution which has been the backbone of this Nation? Do we allow these same jurists to do so with the great majority of our citizens in our cities and our States firmly opposed to a change? Forty-four of 50 States have laws defining marriage in a traditional manner.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that speaks directly to the welfare of our children and our Nation. Same-sex marriage issues such as survivor benefits and health care benefits for adults can be addressed without doing violence to a time-honored institution which is vital to our national well-being and particularly to our children.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, an earlier speaker tonight said the economy is showing signs of some considerable improvement. Jobs are being created, GDP is increasing. Well, it should. We have borrowed \$2.5 trillion in the last 3½ years and spent it. We should get the kind of results with that amount of borrowing.

Last week, the administration failed to meet the deadline to release the mid-session review of the budget. If the administration had released the mid-session review, it would have shown that our budget is in a deep hole. As my colleagues have heard me say many times, when you find yourself in a hole, the first rule is to quit digging. Soon we will have an announcement of another record deficit, somewhere between \$425 billion and \$500 billion.

Under the simple concept of pay-as-you-go, if we want to pass a tax cut or

spending increase, we need to say how we would pay for it. We need to take two shovels away from Congress and the President to stop us from digging the hole deeper. The original PAYGO legislation was part of the bipartisan 1990 budget agreement between President George Herbert Walker Bush and the Democratic Congress. It was subsequently extended in 1993 and 1997, but was allowed to expire in 2002 by President Bush and the Republican Congress.

We should be spending our time trying to find a bipartisan solution to balance our budget, but that may be too much to expect from this do-nothing 108th Congress. Not only has this Congress failed to make any serious efforts to reduce the deficit, we have allowed the budget enforcement tools, which we have proven the track record of in controlling the deficit, to expire. Last month, the House spent 7 hours on this floor debating 19 amendments on budget process reform, but the House leadership would not even allow an up-and-down vote on the Blue Dog budget enforcement proposals because the leadership knew that it would have enough bipartisan support to pass.

□ 1945

Now, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska who just spoke regarding marriage. I strongly support middle-class tax relief. I support extending the marriage penalty relief, the \$1,000 per child tax credit and the 10 percent tax bracket. What I oppose is passing these tax cuts with borrowed money and leaving our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

Those who want to extend expiring tax cuts or make the tax cuts permanent, which they will try to do again this week, adding another \$120 to \$180 billion to our deficit, should be willing to put forward the spending cuts or the offsetting necessary to pay for them.

Applying pay-as-you-go rules to tax cuts does not prevent Congress from passing more tax cuts. All it says is that if we are going to reduce our revenues, we need to reduce our spending by the same amount so the deficit does not get deeper.

If Republicans actually meant what they say about controlling spending, they would have no problem with applying pay-as-you-go to tax cuts, because it would force Congress to actually control spending when we pass tax cuts instead of just promising to do so in the future.

The problem is the actions of Republicans have not matched their rhetoric. They cut taxes without cutting spending and charge the difference to our children and grandchildren.

Last year we increased the debt limit by \$984 billion. The current debt limit is \$7.384 trillion. At the close of business last Friday, our total national debt stood at \$7,273,792,456,490.62. It appears very likely the debt limit will be reached sometime in late September or

October, with the most likely date being early October.

It is time for Congress to deal seriously with our Nation's fiscal affairs. We cannot keep having 70 percent of our debt being bought by foreigners and not paying the bill sooner or later.

LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK DESIGNATION ACT OF 2004

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H.R. 3819, the Lewis and Clark National Historic Park Designation Act of 2004, passed the House earlier today.

From Jamestown to the Cumberland Gap, Virginia has been a land of pioneers. Virginians have explored the New World and established America, and two of her most adventurous sons are Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

While the western trail of the Lewis and Clark Expedition is well-recognized, less known is the route taken in the preparation phase and return phase of the expedition. I thank my colleagues for joining me in support of H.R. 3819 and in recognition of the Eastern Legacy of the Lewis and Clark Expedition during this bicentennial commemoration.

On January 18, 1803, President Thomas Jefferson sent a confidential letter to Congress requesting an appropriation of \$2,500 to fund an expedition of exploration to the Pacific Ocean by route of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers with the hope of discovering a continuous water passage to the Pacific for the purpose of commerce. It was from Monticello that Jefferson conceived this idea, and he chose Captain Meriwether Lewis to lead the exploration. Thus began what would become the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

On March 15, 1803, Meriwether Lewis left the President's House in Washington, D.C. and began preparations for his adventures toward the Pacific. He stopped at the arsenal in Harper's Ferry with an authorizing letter from the Secretary of War and purchased items. He proceeded to Philadelphia, where he studied a wide range of scientific topics. Lewis returned to Washington when he wrote to Captain William Clark to enlist his aid and to share command of the expedition.

In Pittsburgh, Lewis had a keelboat constructed and recruited boatmen to man the vessel that would enable him and Clark to make the long journey. Preparations for the expedition, beginning at Monticello and ending in Wood River, Illinois and the return phase beginning in St. Louis and ending in Washington, D.C., included visiting sites in ten States in the East. These States include Virginia, Maryland,

Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana and Illinois, as well as the District of Columbia.

Currently, no sites visited in these States are recognized as Lewis and Clark National Historic Landmarks nor are they locations along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail. I am pleased that Title II of H.R. 3819 implements a study that begins the process towards obtaining recognition for these sites east of the Mississippi.

On January 18, Jefferson's Monticello hosted the commencement of the National Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration that will continue through 2006. This was the first signature event of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial, and hopefully, once the study has been completed, the National Park Service will designate Monticello and other parts of the Eastern Legacy as official Lewis and Clark trail sites.

I believe that it is appropriate to include the route followed by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whether independently or together, in the preparation and return phases of the expedition. The Eastern Legacy should rightfully be included in the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail. H.R. 3819 is a positive step towards properly recognizing and honoring the Eastern Legacy of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

THE FAILINGS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, if Congress were to receive a fiscal responsibility report card, there would not be a single passing grade. Congress should receive an "F" for failing when it comes to taking care of our Nation's fiscal security. Congress should receive an "F" for failing to pass a budget resolution conference report.

Both the Senate and the House are controlled by the same party, and yet no agreement was reached on simply setting a budget that Congress should stick to. So much for taking fiscal responsibility seriously.

Congress should receive an "F" for so poorly managing the taxpayers' money that the debt ceiling will have to be raised by over \$8 trillion in just a few short months.

For the third time in 3 years, the majority party needs to increase the debt limit. Last year we saw the largest debt limit increase in history, \$984 billion, Mr. Speaker, and now we are looking at another \$690 billion increase just to keep the Federal Government running.

Congress should receive an "F" for failing to pass spending caps and pay-as-you-go legislation, or PAYGO. Pay-as-you-go is a common-sense piece of legislation that Congress ought to pass if we are going to be serious about putting this fiscal House back in order. Simply put, PAYGO provides the blue-

print for getting our Nation out of the red ink that we are swimming in.

The PAYGO rules Congress and the President enacted in 1990 were an important part in getting a handle on the deficits in the early 1990s and getting the budget back into balance. The pay-as-you-go rules enacted in 1990 have been tested, and they have passed. There is no question that significantly improved the responsibility and accountability of the budget process and were instrumental in getting from large deficits in the 1980s and early 1990s to budget surpluses in the late 1990s.

The one area that this Congress and administration has excelled in is its ability to run up massive amounts of debt. This year alone we are expected to run approximately a \$425 billion deficit, just this year alone, the worst deficit in the United States history, every dime of which must be paid back.

Had Congress and the administration worked in a bipartisan manner with the Blue Dog Coalition, they could have passed a budget and PAYGO. Instead, they forged a partisan path, and the American people are left with neither. The American people deserve a better grade than failure on fiscal responsibility from their elected officials. The President is fond of saying it is the people's money, and he is correct. It is the people's money. And I believe that the people deserve to have our Nation managed in a fiscally responsible manner.

Let us stop playing politics with our financial security. Instead, pass real, meaningful PAYGO legislation and get our Nation's fiscal health back in order.

WERE WE RIGHT TO REMOVE SADDAM?

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, recent reports have done much to identify the mistakes, shortcomings and gaps in U.S. intelligence about Iraq. There is no doubt that the information we had about the weapons programs of Saddam Hussein was incomplete and, to some degree, inaccurate. However, these reports also demonstrate that in a number of respects, U.S. intelligence got it right. Saddam Hussein did possess forbidden weapons, particularly missiles. Saddam and his cronies did indeed have contact and discussions at some level with al Qaeda and various terrorist groups. Terrorists did in fact use Iraq as a sanctuary for training and as a source of supply.

Finally, if British reports are to be believed, President Bush was correct when he warned that Saddam was seeking nuclear material in Africa.

The real question, Mr. Speaker, is not whether U.S. intelligence was perfect, but whether America was right to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

Not so long ago, few Americans professed doubts about removing Saddam. In 1998, President Clinton made regime change in Iraq the goal of U.S. policy. In doing so, he received bipartisan congressional support. When President Bush made the case for war against Saddam in 2002, he, too, received bipartisan support in Congress.

Lest we forget who and what Saddam Hussein was, we should remind ourselves of his actions over the course of his political career. Saddam is a man who launched two regional wars in the Middle East. One cost nearly a million lives. The other required an international military coalition led by the United States to free the victim. Saddam Hussein has actively pursued and employed weapons of mass destruction since the 1980s. He has trained, armed and patronized terrorists of various sorts. He attempted to assassinate a United States President, and his forces routinely tried to down U.S. and allied planes that were responsible for enforcing U.S. sanctioned no-fly zones.

Saddam's crimes and atrocities were not just directed against his neighbors in the international community. The 20-year-plus reign of terror he unleashed against his fellow Iraqis almost defies belief. The countless murders, torture sessions and rapes made him one of the 20th century's most feared and ferocious dictators. He gassed thousands of his own Kurdish citizens, poisoned the environment of those Arab marsh tribes that opposed his rule and looted the country of its wealth. When Saddam's own people rose up against him in 1991 at our urging, he butchered them by the tens of thousands.

When American and Coalition forces finally came to Iraq 12 years later, what did they find? Not, at least yet, stockpiles of WMD. They found something far worse. Dozens of mass graves containing an estimated 400,000 men, women and children murdered by the minions of Saddam Hussein.

I invite my colleagues who so quickly and correctly condemn every shortcoming in the Coalition occupation of Iraq to spend equal time cataloging and criticizing the atrocities of the Hussein regime. If they need any help finding the information, they should talk to the lucky survivors and visit with the thousands of grieving family members who can acquaint them with the full scope of Saddam's crimes.

Once they do, I suspect they will agree with one young American soldier I met while in Iraq. He said, "The real question is not why we came to Iraq but why the whole world was not here years ago."

Would it have been better to leave Saddam in power? In power to do what? To resume his unending efforts to acquire and develop WMDs, to expand, develop and formalize his evolving relationship with al Qaeda and other terrorist groups, to continue murdering his domestic opponents by the thousands?

When the history of Saddam Hussein and the liberation of Iraq is written, Mr. Speaker, there will be many lessons to learn. We will wonder why our intelligence was not better. We will question some of the decisions we made during the occupation. We will be ashamed of a few of our fellow Americans who lost their moral compass in the awful crucible of war and occupation. We will ask why so many Europeans were so slow to learn the lessons of their own sad history and so unwilling to extend to others the freedom they now enjoy. And we will be amazed at so many humane and decent people willing to allow Saddam to reign from a palace rather than rot in a prison.

But, Mr. Speaker, history will show we were right to remove Saddam Hussein. It will demonstrate that the demise of his regime made the world better, America safer and gave the Iraqi people a chance for a decent future. It will vindicate the leaders, especially our President, who saw the danger, rallied the forces of decency and stayed the course.

Finally, and most appropriately, history will honor those Americans in uniform who once again answered the call of their country and liberated an oppressed people.

Mr. Speaker, the recent Senate Intelligence Committee Report on the status of Weapons of Mass Destruction in pre-war Iraq and the early release of material from the 9/11 Commission's Report that will appear later this week have done much to identify the mistakes, shortcomings and gaps in U.S. intelligence about Iraq. There is no doubt that the information we had about the weapons programs of Saddam Hussein was incomplete and, to some degree, inaccurate. It's worth noting that almost every other intelligence estimate in the world was similarly flawed.

The Senate Report and the 9/11 Commission Report, however, also demonstrate that in a number of respects, U.S. intelligence did get it right. Saddam Hussein did possess weapons—particularly missiles—which were forbidden under U.N. resolutions. Saddam and his cronies did, indeed, have contact and discussions at some level with al Qaeda and various terrorist groups. Terrorists did, in fact, use Iraq as a sanctuary, for training, and as a source of supply. Finally, if British reports are to be believed, President Bush was correct when he warned that Saddam was seeking nuclear material in Africa.

The real question, Mr. Speaker, is not whether U.S. intelligence was right in every particular. By its very nature intelligence is incomplete, imprecise, and imperfect. What America must resolve for itself is whether or not we were right to remove Saddam from power in Iraq. Is the world better off, America safer, and the situation in Iraq more hopeful without Saddam?

Not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, before the amnesia induced by the current political season, few serious Americans professed doubts about these issues. It was, after all, President Clinton who made regime change in Iraq the goal of U.S. policy. He received bipartisan congressional support when he did so. And, again, when President Bush made the case for war against Saddam in 2002 he received

bipartisan support in Congress. That support included the votes and the vocal support of those from the minority party who now seek to unseat the President and the Vice President in the current electoral campaign.

Lest we forget who and what Saddam Hussein was we should remind ourselves of his actions over the course of his political career. Saddam is a man who launched two regional wars in the Middle East. One cost nearly a million lives. The other required an international military coalition led by the United States to free the victim. Saddam Hussein has actively pursued and employed weapons of mass destruction since the 1980's. He has trained, armed, and patronized terrorists of various sorts. He kidnapped and killed foreign nationals from Kuwait. He attempted to assassinate a former U.S. President. And his forces routinely tried to down aircraft from the U.S. and other countries which were responsible for enforcing the U.N. sanctioned no-fly zones in Iraq.

Saddam's crimes and atrocities were not just directed against his neighbors and the international community. He was at least a brutal toward his own people. The 20 year plus reign of terror he directed against his fellow Iraqis almost defies belief. The countless murders, torture sessions, and rapes made him one of the 20th century's most feared and ferocious dictators. He gassed thousands of his own Kurdish subjects, poisoned the environment of those Arab marsh tribes who opposed his rule, and looted his country of its wealth. When Saddam's own people rose up against him in 1991 at our urging, he butchered them by the tens of thousands. The failure of the United States and its allies to support an uprising which we helped to encourage is, in my view, a sad chapter in our own history.

When American and Coalition forces finally came to Iraq twelve years later, what did they find? Not (at least yet) stockpiles of WMD's, to be sure. They found something far worse—dozens of mass graves containing an estimated 400,000 men, women and children murdered by the minions of Saddam Hussein. I invite my colleagues who so quickly and correctly condemn every shortcoming in the Coalition occupation of Iraq to spend equal time cataloging and criticizing the atrocities of the Hussein regime. If they need any help finding the information—for it is seldom chronicled in the elite media of our country—they should read the voluminous documents and numerous eyewitness accounts, talk to the lucky survivors, and visit with the thousands of grieving family members who can acquaint them with the scope and scale of Saddam's crimes against humanity.

Once they do, I suspect they will echo the sentiments of one young American soldier I met while in Iraq. He said, "the real question is not why did we come to Iraq, but why the whole world wasn't here years ago."

Given Saddam's record of international villainy, brutality and mass murder how can anyone argue that it would have been better to leave him in power? In power to do what? To resume his unending efforts to acquire and develop WMD's? To expand, develop, and formalize his evolving relationship with al Qaeda and other terrorist groups? To continue murdering his domestic opponents by the thousands while the world turned a blind eye?

It is revealing, Mr. Speaker, that the current critics of the war in Iraq never question wheth-

er or not that tortured country is better off without Saddam in power. In fact, the critics usually ignore the Iraqi people altogether when they discuss the conflict. It is as if the critics believe that the suffering of the Iraqi people under Saddam does not matter and that their future does not count. How convenient! How self-serving! And how morally bankrupt.

When the history of Saddam Hussein and the liberation of Iraq is written, Mr. Speaker, there will be many lessons to learn. We will wonder why our intelligence was not better. We will question some of the decisions we made with respect to the occupation. We will be ashamed of a few of our fellow Americans who lost their moral compass in the awful crucible of war and occupation. We will ask why so many Europeans were so slow to learn the lessons of their own sad history and so unwilling to extend to others the freedom they now enjoy. We will be amazed that so many humane and decent people were willing to allow Saddam to reign from a palace rather than rot in a prison. We will even question, as we now do with respect to World War II, why the United States took so long to confront evil and act to end the atrocities of a dangerous and evil dictator.

But, Mr. Speaker, History will show we were right to remove Saddam Hussein. It will demonstrate that the demise of his regime made the world better, America more secure, and gave the Iraqi people a chance for a decent future. It will vindicate the leaders—especially our President—who saw the danger, rallied the forces of decency, and stayed the course. Finally, and most appropriately, History will honor those men and women in uniform who once again answered the call of their country, liberated an oppressed people, and left America and the world safer and freer than they found it.

□ 2000

FINANCIAL FREEDOM NEEDED

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to adopt as part of my remarks the comments that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) made before me.

The Blue Dogs have tried repeatedly to do something about this abuse of our country and what is going on here with regard to the Nation's balance sheet. I do not think that people of this country realize fully how bad it is and how quickly it is deteriorating. And I am talking about our Nation's financial picture.

We cannot be a strong and free country if we are in hock to every other country on Earth. We cannot be strong and free if we are broke. We cannot fix the problems our society faces as long as we are engaged in this financial madness that has been going on around here for the last 3½ years.

Let me just tell you something that is going to scare you. It is not fun to talk about and nobody talks about it because it is not much of a comfort to us as Americans when we beat on our chests and say how great we are. Let me tell you what we are doing. The privately held debt, that is the debt not

held by government agencies, the debt that we write checks on every year as interest, in January of 2001 was \$2.96 trillion. Of that amount, foreign interest, foreign governments owned \$1.01 trillion; 34 percent, in other words, of our debt in 2001 was held by foreigners.

Today, that privately held debt is \$4.22 trillion. Foreign interests own \$1.75 trillion. It is now 42 percent of our Nation's debt, outstanding debt held by foreign interests. That is a 73 percent increase since we had a one-party government here the last 3 years. Can you imagine what we are doing in the name of cutting taxes for American citizens and without the PAYGO rules to discipline ourselves on spending, which the majority party will not allow the Blue Dogs to bring up? They have increased what we are in debt to the rest of the world by 73 percent in the last 3 years. Last year alone the deficit was \$374 billion.

Do you know how much foreigners lent us so that we could keep on spending? \$260 billion. Seventy percent of the deficit last year that we spent right here on this floor was lent to us by foreigners who we are now writing interest checks to.

This is the most irresponsible financial game plan for this country in my lifetime, maybe in the country's lifetime.

What is happening here ought to enrage the American people. They will not let us bring up PAYGO so we can stop the spending. They keep on spending, keep on reducing revenue, and borrowing it from foreign interests.

You talk about patriotism. We are in hock. Let me read you a few, if you would like. Do you know how much Japan owns of our paper? \$668 billion. China and Hong Kong together, \$216 billion. Almost a trillion dollars by two countries. Caribbean banking centers, we owe them \$72 billion. Korea, \$58 billion. Germany, \$49 billion. Switzerland, \$49 billion. OPEC, \$48 billion. Mexico, \$41 billion. Canada, 33. It goes on. We owe Brazil almost \$13 billion. The Netherlands, \$13 billion. Belgium, \$13 billion. Turkey, 15. India, 15. And just the other day we had a foreign aid bill.

What is happening for the last 3½ years here financially is an outrage. It is not only what we are doing to ourselves now. I contend that this Congress has raised taxes more than any other Congress in history. Why? Because they borrowed so much money that we have got to pay interest on, not just once, but every year, every year.

So far this year we have spent \$130 billion just to write interest checks to people. I tell you what, unless the American people get on to this scheme that is going on around here about borrowing and spending so that we can hold down taxes or so we say in which we are doing the reverse, we are raising taxes because we will have interest payments on all of this borrowing every year, not to mention the sad fact that we are in hock to every nation that lends us money.

I will tell one thing to the American people that was said in the Wall Street Journal, "Whose bread I eat, whose song I sing."

We are in hock all over the world, and we had better stop right now.

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

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

WHERE IS THE VISION

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I come here night after night, and I see these Howdy Doody neo-cons come to the well and present this ridiculous idea that everything is all right, everything is wonderful. All we need to do is just keep cutting taxes and borrowing money and acting like we have not got good sense, and everything is just going to be wonderful.

I heard a speech this evening about how great the economy is in Tennessee, and I just ask you one question, Mr. Speaker, if things are so doggone good, how come we are broke?

I met with the manufacturer of Army boots last week. He was not complaining. I just happened to run into him, and we had a conversation. He was not asking me to do anything. He said, We do not have money to warehouse Army boots for our troops. We have to ship them directly to the field because we do not have the money to buy any more Army boots for the troops until the year comes in, until October. He said, We are making boots and warehousing them at our own expense so that they will be ready when the time comes because we do not want our men and women in the battlefields to not have boots.

I was just astounded because I hear these folks come down here and talk about how wonderful it is. This is insane what is going on here. We cut taxes and brag about what happens that is good about it. We borrow money that our children, our grandchildren will not even be able to pay back, and act like we do not know what the consequences of all this is going to be. And it is the Republicans that are doing it.

All we get to do is come down here and have a 5-minute discussion about why it is the wrong idea. You have heard tonight, 70 percent of our debt is being bought by foreigners; we have borrowed \$2.5 trillion, and we owe another \$2 trillion in current account deficits. You cannot be broke and free. Everybody knows that.

Health care costs are in runaway conditions because the Republicans and

the Republican administration are so determined to pass public law and public policy that gives the pharmaceutical companies the exclusive right to rob the American people.

You cannot fund veterans, you vote to send men and women on the battlefields and then you do not have enough money to pay for the veterans benefits that they are entitled to, and you keep coming back with budgets that cut that and then come back here and talk about how wonderful things are.

I do not know what in the world they are thinking about. Where I come from it is just as bad to be lying as it is to be stealing.

I just wonder, where is the vision?

There was an article in The Washington Post yesterday about where are the patriotic businessmen; where are the people in this country, the leaders in the business community that used to stand up and say, This is a bad idea, do not do this. It will hurt everybody. It will hurt our children and grandchildren. We want this country to continue to be good and strong and wonderful like we have had it. And yet these people come down here and try to blow smoke at everybody and tell them everything is going to be all right and it is going to be wonderful; and then they put everybody's children and grandchildren at risk.

I just wonder where is the vision. What were you people thinking about?

We met with Mr. CHENEY, the Blue Dogs, we met with Vice President CHENEY back in the Spring of 2001. He said, we think you are nice people, but we can cram this down your throat and that is what we are going to do. And they did. We voted against it.

Then they send that little fellow over there from OMB, I cannot remember his name. He is running for Governor of Indiana today. And he said, Do not worry. We are going to have so much money, we will not even have any bonds to sell. Now look at this mess we have got.

It is time for us to do something about it. And the good news is it is up to the American people, and we still get to vote in November, and we are going to make the decision.

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

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

SEARCHING FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here today to join my Blue Dog colleagues who have preceded me, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Indiana

(Mr. HILL), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), and also the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) who will follow.

We have worked together on this fiscal responsibility and budget issues. Mr. Speaker, I listened to what the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) said, and I just have the thought that most American families when they sit down to look at their finances and they consider that they have got a food bill and rent or a house payment, utilities, car payments, they have got to send their kids to school, they know that at the end of the day, at the end of the month, at the end of the year, they have to have had enough revenue come in to meet those expenses. This is a very simple principle. You have to have enough revenue coming in to meet your expenses.

I like to look at the history of this whole deficit situation, and let us just go back about 12 years. Mr. Speaker, in 1992 this Congress, this government was spending \$290 billion more than it took in. In other words, there was an annual deficit of \$290 billion. That was the largest at that time in the history of the Nation. It was stagnating the economy. The interest rates were higher than they should have been. The American people understood this because it was affecting them on a daily basis, and they spoke through the ballot box in 1992.

Starting in 1993 and for the next 5 years, the deficit went down every year. In 1998, for the first time since 1969, the Federal Government had a surplus. In 1998, for the first time in almost 30 years, the Federal Government had a surplus. Two years later, our Federal Government, for the first time since the 1950s, did not have to borrow from the Social Security fund to cover its yearly operating expenses. That was only 4 short years ago in fiscal year 2000. Since then, Mr. Speaker, this government has borrowed \$1.7 trillion to pay its bills. We have put that into the economy.

We hear rhetoric every day about how the economy is improving. Mr. Speaker, if you cannot improve this economy by borrowing, the government borrowing \$1.7 trillion and pumping it into the economy, I feel for you; \$670 billion was borrowed during that same 3-year period from the trust funds, like Social Security. And as we heard the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) say, we borrowed over a trillion dollars from the public, mostly, about 70 percent of it coming from foreign countries like China and Japan.

Mr. Speaker, our government with respect to our budget and fiscal responsibility is headed in the wrong direction under the current leadership.

□ 2015

Let me say that again. The government and the budget, with regard to fiscal responsibility, is heading in the wrong direction under the current leadership.

This Congress and this administration have no discipline when it comes to fiscal responsibility. We are spending at record levels. It is absolutely running out of control, while there is no thought given to how we responsibly pay for that spending, and we are simply sending the bill to the children and the grandchildren. We will pay for it in our lifetime, and we will pay for it soon as we see those bills come due.

Mr. Speaker, the group that I work with, the Blue Dogs, have worked hard to return some sanity to the budgeting process. Just like any responsible American family that has to balance their own family budget or business budget, we believe that it is time for the Federal Government, the Congress, to dust off the deficit reduction tools that we used in the 1990s to get the budget under control.

We have heard them talk about this here tonight. We heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) talk about them. Strong PAYGO rules, that means pay-as-you-go. When you find yourself in a hole, that is what you do.

Enforceable spending caps, that was an important component of the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. We put caps in place for spending and we lived by it.

Most important of all and a simple step that this Congress and administration ought to be able to do is to enact a budget resolution that the House and Senate can use as a blueprint to establish its priorities and identify the resources to pay for those priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I think that pretty soon the American people will realize that annual deficit spending to the tune of a half a trillion dollars a year will come back to haunt us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, as the newest member of the Blue Dog Coalition, I rise today to speak on an issue of vital importance to the hardworking people of South Dakota, fiscal responsibility.

South Dakota families know how important it is to live within their means. They do this because they know that is what it means to live responsibly, even if it requires difficult decisions for them and their families.

In its most recent pronouncement, the Congressional Budget Office now estimates that the Federal budget deficit for fiscal year 2004 will be approxi-

mately \$477 billion. This means that in a 12-month period ending this September 30, the Federal Government will spend almost half a trillion dollars more than it will take in. If a South Dakota family behaved in this way, they would ultimately be headed to bankruptcy court under the burden and pressure of crushing debt.

This projected deficit would be the highest in our Nation's history, and the picture does not get much better as we look down the road. CBO's updated 10-year deficit estimate is \$2.4 trillion, almost \$1 trillion more than its earlier predictions. To make matters worse, the 10-year deficit estimate would virtually explode to \$4.1 trillion if all of the current administration's tax cuts are extended for 10 years.

What is often lost in the debate about the budget deficit is its impact on the overall Federal debt. We cannot allow this fact to be obscured. The national debt currently stands at well over \$7 trillion. That is an estimated Federal debt of more than \$24,000 for every man, woman and child in the United States. During this past year, the national debt has continued to increase an average of \$1.69 billion per day.

In fiscal year 2003, the U.S. Government spent \$318 billion of taxpayers' money on interest payments on the national debt. This is over \$1,000 per person and over \$4,000 for a family of four in this country, and that was for last year alone.

The problem can be brought into sharp focus by taking a snapshot of the programs under the jurisdiction of the committees on which I serve: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Resources, and Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Because Congress and the administration have failed to exercise the same fiscal responsibility that South Dakotans use to balance their household budgets every day, our government is now seeking to balance the budgets on the backs of family farmers, veterans and vulnerable members of our society, such as many Native Americans.

Under pressure from our massive deficit, the Agriculture appropriations bill that just passed the House shortchanges conservation programs that are needed to restore the land and build wildlife habitat.

The same fiscal policy has led to cuts in vital service for Native Americans, including in education and human services. These cuts come despite the fact that Native Americans in my State live in some of the poorest counties in the entire Nation in sometimes desperate conditions. They know better than anyone else that education is the only path toward a better life.

Finally, just as we are creating a whole new generation of veterans on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan, pressure from the deficit has led to a budget that shortchanges America's veterans. It is a sad fact that this

administration's budget is \$1.2 billion short of the amount that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs said is necessary simply to maintain current services.

In the years ahead, we must meet the obligations that we are making to these tens of thousands of selfless Americans. They will need assistance to recover from injuries sustained on the battlefield. They deserve assistance with education, housing and building a better life. Especially in light of the sacrifices they have already made, they do not deserve having to bear the additional burden of financing this outrageous financial debt.

We must put our financial house back in order. The \$318 billion we are paying in interest on the debt alone would fund all of these needs many times over. It would help sustain family farms and rural economies, build new schools for all who need them, and keep our Nation's promise to our veterans.

I hope that we can bring common sense back to our Nation's budgeting process. We must reinstate meaningful budget enforcement tools such as the pay-as-you-go rule proposed by the Blue Dogs and by which this House previously abided. We must focus on middle class tax relief, paying down our Nation's debt and balancing our Nation's budget in a way that protects our key priorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND HALLIBURTON

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 3 months, the Bush administration has flatly refused to cooperate with the United Nations-sanctioned auditors examining the contracts provided to companies like Halliburton for services in Iraq.

President Bush's government has withheld pertinent information from the U.N.'s International Advisory and Monitoring Board which was specifically tasked to ensure that Iraq's oil revenues would be managed responsibly during the United States occupation and for as long as American and other companies work on reconstruction jobs in Iraq.

Halliburton, my colleagues may remember, is the Texas-based oil company that has received over \$1 billion in lucrative contracts from the United States for the reconstruction of Iraq, and they have never had to place a single bid for these contracts.

Years ago, the Pentagon established the practice of allowing private companies to bid on various projects, rewarding the most qualified company willing to complete a given project for the lowest price with a highly sought after government contract.

Mr. Speaker, this practice was good for American companies, while, through competition, also kept prices down, ensuring that American taxpayers did not get fleeced in the process.

The Pentagon, under the shoddy supervision of the Bush White House, has all but disregarded this process in 4 short years. Not only has the Bush administration given rise to the shameful new policy of the no-bid contract, it has also rebuffed any and all attempts by international organizations to provide oversight to those companies that are the recipients of these no-bid contracts.

My colleagues may also recall that Vice President CHENEY is the former CEO of Halliburton. In the months since the beginning of the Iraq War, Vice President CHENEY's former company, from which he still receives nearly \$200,000 a year in deferred income, has been nothing if not greedy.

CHENEY's company, Halliburton, overcharged the U.S. Government for the price of gasoline imported into Iraq from Kuwait. CHENEY's company, Halliburton, charged the United States Government for thousands of meals for soldiers that were never provided. Yet the Bush administration has done everything in its power to ensure that CHENEY's company, Halliburton, gets whatever it wants or whatever it does not want.

In this case, Halliburton does not want international auditors to get their hands on documents that stipulate how Iraq's oil revenues have been spent or even how much oil has been processed. Halliburton does not want international auditors to learn that meters have never been installed on Iraq's Persian Gulf loading platforms, allowing for the exportation of an unlimited and unaccounted amount of crude oil.

As a result, in addition to the billions of dollars in no-bid contracts, Halliburton may be making millions of dollars more off of the oil that rightfully belongs to the Iraqi people, but

then this is the same company that provided fake meals to American troops and overcharged our government for Kuwaiti oil.

There has to be a better way, because the Bush doctrine of rewarding cronies at the expense of the American taxpayer has proven to be an utter failure. We need to be smart about how we choose companies to rebuild countries like war-torn Iraq.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, which is legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism.

The wonderful organizations Physicians for Social Responsibility, Friends Committee on National Legislation and Women's Action for New Directions helped me in crafting this legislation.

In this day and age, terrorism is an international problem, and so it makes sense that the fight against terrorism should involve the international community. That is why SMART security calls for working closely with the U.N. and NATO to achieve its goals. Only by actively involving other nations in this fight can we hope to prevent future acts of terrorism.

The Bush administration likes to talk the talk when it comes to national security, but if they want to walk the walk, they will stop rewarding their buddies with no-bid contracts, while protecting these same buddies from international auditors. If they want to be truly smart about defending our country, they will be smart enough to realize that national security depends on international cooperation.

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

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

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

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

IN MEMORIAM OF JUANITA RABOUIN PHILLIPS

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and memorialize a great American, Juanita R. Phillips, a retired educator in the St. Louis public schools. She died of natural causes on Thursday, July 1, 2004, 3 months shy of celebrating her 100th birthday.

She was born in Chicago, Illinois, on September 26, 1904, 3 months, as I said,

before her centennial. She attended the Clinton Iowa public schools and graduated in 1927 from the University of California at Los Angeles and earned a master's degree in English from Ohio State University.

After graduation, she taught English at various historically black institutions such as Florida A&M College in Tallahassee, Florida, and Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia, before moving to St. Louis.

□ 2030

In 1943 she moved with her husband, Dr. A.C. Phillips, an educator who served as principal of Washington Technical, Vashon, and Central High Schools, and after retirement as a former president of New Age Federal Savings and Loan in North St. Louis.

Mrs. Phillips continued her love for teaching English at Soldan High School, from which she retired in 1972, and subsequently served as a tutorial volunteer.

During her lifetime, Mrs. Phillips remained engaged in various local and national organizations until she became well advanced in age. As a founding member and first president of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority's Alpha Gamma Chapter, my chapter, at UCLA in the 1920s, she also dated Ralph Bunche, a classmate while in college. She continued an active social life in St. Louis where she maintained membership in the Booklovers Club, the Garden Club, a local women's bridge club, as well as shared activities with her husband as an archoness in the Beta Eta Boule, The Anniversary Club, The Couples Club, and numerous civic and philanthropic projects. She was a voracious reader, avid gardener, a consummate traveler, and a generous hostess who enjoyed sharing her time and energy to make life more pleasant for her friends and family, and especially her grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I just returned from the Alpha Kappa Alpha Convention, over 10,000 women, and announced to them her passing. But the remarkable thing is that she almost saw a full century of life and we, her family, she was my aunt, need to emulate her spirit because she believed in peace. She loved poetry, and she wrote to us poetically. The last conversation I had with her she said to me, I think I have just lived too long. And I responded, you will live forever in our hearts and our minds.

EXPENSING STOCK OPTIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to reference briefly, legislation that we are going to be dealing with tomorrow that I think is very important. I have been spending time, as I know a number of my col-

leagues have, questioning the recent proposal from the Financial Accounting Standards Board, FASB, about whether or not we are going to be expensing stock options.

This is particularly important for somebody from the State of Oregon where technology has become a critical part of our local economy. It is the largest export of our State by far, a State originally founded on agriculture and timber. Now, technology exports are twice what we have in those traditional areas. The wages that are paid are twice the State average. They are high-paying, important jobs for a growing part of our economy that is increasingly a critical part of a global economy.

When these proposals came forward, I looked at them closely because, sadly, Congress in the past has not always been the most constructive partner. When it comes to financial regulations, often our participation has hindered rather than helped. I think any objective analysis would suggest that congressional interference with what happened with the savings and loan scandal probably added billions of dollars to the long-term cost to the taxpayer.

More recently, congressional interference dealing with accounting standards probably increased the problems there when we had some of the most difficult fallout. We had an opportunity to play a more constructive role; I am not certain that we did.

That is why I look at this carefully. I started by talking to business people I know back home who were involved with this process to find what impact expensing options would have on their businesses. It was clear that were we to be dealing with the expensing of broad-based stock option plans, the impact would be negative.

Now, it is clear that we are not talking about the vast majority of stock options that are granted to only a small number of high-level employees. Here we have seen expensing take place with little or no impact on shareholder value. That is because they are very limited. In the area that we are talking about with broad-based stock options where the majority of the employees have these options vested, not just the top few, it would have a dramatic impact on the balance sheet.

What it would mean in the long term is that a number of these firms, because of the lower values, they would simply stop offering broad-based stock option programs. That would be a tragedy on several levels. One has to do with the fact that broad-based stock option programs probably are a counterweight, a check and a balance against abuse. If you have a large number of employees who have a stock option program, there is less incentive and it is harder to manipulate. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge, there has not been a single case of a broad-based stock option program that has been one of the problems we have been reading about in the papers. The

Worldcoms or the Enrons have been those stock options that were more limited in nature. So we would lose that check and that balance.

Additionally, we lose an important part of start-up capital. What we are finding in the volatile world of technology finance is that there are a number of people who are willing to grab the brass ring, they are willing to take a chance to forgo salary for stock options, putting, in effect, sweat equity into the business on the prospect that it will prosper and that they will reap handsome rewards in the future. This does not happen all of the time, but it happens frequently enough that people are willing to make that type of investment. It has been a critical part of the success in getting the talent and getting these start-ups off the ground.

It is particularly important in a small State like Oregon which does not have access to capital that we see in other parts of the country like Silicon Valley; and as a result, Oregon would be particularly hard hit if we were to lose the opportunity for broad-based stock options.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues carefully examine this legislation coming before us tomorrow and look at the impact that broad-based stock options have in terms of the entrepreneurial spirit, in terms of what it means for the benefit of large numbers of employees, and the integrity of stock options themselves. Members should look carefully at the problems of valuation for something that is in effect equity in the future that is unknown and avoid a problem of adopting a new policy that could have a very negative effect on our technology industry and small business.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting time sitting here and listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the issue revolving around the budget, the budget deficit and spending problems we are experiencing. It is undeniably true that we are spending far too much money. It is fascinating to hear the discussion of this particular phenomenon, spending too much money, and having Members on the other side of the aisle decry that particular activity.

It is fascinating because I sit on the Budget Committee, and on that committee we have for a number of years now looked at budgets that are offered by not just the administration, by the Republican Party, but by Members of the other party. To the best of my recollection, we have yet to see any budget proposed by the other side of the aisle that would address the issue

of spending. Not one. In fact, every single budget proposed by Members from the other side of the aisle spends more.

At no time to the best of my recollection have we said on this floor, while we debated any particular appropriations bill, any one of the 13 appropriations bills the House has the responsibility to address and pass to keep the government moving, I do not recall, and I certainly could be wrong, but I just do not recall any time during the discussion of any one of those appropriations bills where the issue was we are spending too much from the other side. That is to say that they were complaining that the bill was too rich.

They were oftentimes complaining about where the money was spent, but not that we were not spending enough. Nobody was complaining about the fact that it was overspending; complaints were almost always that we were not spending enough on particular programs.

On every single appropriations bill, or at least a majority of the appropriations bills that come to the floor, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), who has been around for approximately 20 years and has certainly seen a lot of budgets come and go in this process, but every year he stands up and to almost every single appropriation bill he attempts to add an amendment. He offers an amendment that is a limiting amendment.

It does something really very scary. The ramifications would be incredible if we were to ever pass it. We fail to pass it every single time; but what this amazing, incredible thing that he offers to the Members of this body who are supposedly concerned about spending, he suggests that we should cut spending on each one of the appropriations bills by an enormous amount, or enormous around here, and that amount is 1 percent. Every single year he gets up and offers this amendment to every appropriations bill, let us just cut 1 percent off of this appropriation, and he fails. Almost all of the Members on the other side of the aisle vote against it, as do many Members on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise here to defend the spending activities of this Congress, but I do suggest that when one does propose that we should not spend so much, when one stands up at this microphone and condemns the body for spending a lot of money, they should be willing then to vote to stop that, not just criticize it, but stop it.

What, is the devil making us do this? That is what it sounds like: please, somebody stop me; I cannot control myself. Please, somebody out there deal with it. Institute some rule, institute some program because I have to continually vote to spend all of the money that I can possibly vote to spend, and then some. And then it is somebody else's fault. And the one continuing theme that ran through almost every one of the discussions that preceded mine here tonight discussing the appropriations process and the budget

process, the continuing theme was this: the real problem, the real dastardly thing that we, the Republicans, have done over the course of the last 4 years is to reduce taxes. That is the most heinous crime with which we have been charged during the last hour.

There was a lot of discussion about the economic condition that most Americans find themselves in and many families are wondering about how to pay the bills and especially their health care costs. All these things are undeniably true.

□ 2045

Here is the solution, then, as I heard them explain it. The best thing we can do to those people who are trying to figure out how to pay the bills in America is to increase their taxes. This will help us all. This will make everybody happy. It will solve all of our problems because you and I both know, Mr. Speaker, that there are just too many Americans out there, middle-class Americans who are not paying enough to keep this thing afloat.

Again I want to stress, I absolutely do not wish to defend the spending practices of this body, both Republicans and certainly the Democrats. We spend too much money. That is undeniably true. It is also undeniably true that something happened called 9/11 and as a result of that we did have extraordinary things occur. One, a dramatic drop in the economic activity of the country and, two, an inordinate increase in the amount of money we spent on homeland security and on national defense. Those things, I think, are understandable. Our expenses went up, our revenues went down as a result of an event. But I do not excuse the fact that we still spent money beyond what we took in to an ever greater extent every year. I believe that we should have made many more decisions about how to cut in other areas. Whenever the Labor, Health and Human Services bill comes up, which is a huge, huge, huge spending bill, all for social services, we shall see how many amendments will be offered by the other side to that bill to cut spending. We shall see whether or not anybody would vote for that 1 percent cut in that \$400 billion or \$500 billion bill in order to reduce the size of the deficit that we all decry. I will vote for it. I guarantee you I will vote as I did every single time for every single 1 percent and I would have voted for a much higher percentage cut had it been offered, but I voted for every single one of those 1 percent cuts. What a scary thing that we proposed, 1 percent. We failed to get it.

As I say, the issue evidently is spending. Nobody really tries to stop it around here. But the real scary thing to our friends on the other side of the aisle is that we may in fact be allowing people to keep too much of their own wages, too many of their own dollars. This absolutely astounds the other side. It is frightening to them. Every-

body would be happier, as I say. We could go to every one of those families that are sitting around the table, that they talked about earlier tonight, wondering how to pay their bills and say, "We'll help you figure out how to pay the bills. We'll take more money away from you in taxes. That will be better. Believe us. Trust us. That's going to help you out."

Does this sound weird to anybody else out there? It is a very strange philosophy but it is decorated with a lot of rhetoric so that all of a sudden it sounds logical. "Of course, we just need to do that. We have to raise taxes, naturally. We have to spend all this money, take money away from everybody, it is only right. Everybody would be happier if we did, right?"

I do not think so. I do not think so. I think most Americans do not think so, either. They are not delusionary. Most Americans want us to spend less. That is undeniably true. I am with them. I am with them in that regard. I do wish that we could spend less and I do wish that we could prioritize better than we have been able to prioritize and I believe that it is incumbent upon us to continue the effort. But the last thing I think we should do is to turn over that process to the folks whose only history in dealing with budgets, by the way, around here for 40 something years prior to the time that Republicans took control was to develop dramatic spending increases ad infinitum. I just really do not feel safe in thinking that the other way to handle this is to provide the other party with the keys to the treasury.

Of course that is not the issue that I wanted to bring forward tonight. I just had to comment on that as I listened to the discussion. I wanted to talk tonight about an issue that does compel me to come to this floor often and that is an issue dealing with the policy of this government with regard to immigration and to hopefully address the broader concept that immigration, immigration policy, has a tendency to affect. There are many aspects, many facets to the immigration debate. That is why I find it so fascinating, quite frankly. I cannot think of another domestic policy issue that should command as much of our attention as should the immigration debate, what little debate I should say, that goes on. There is not an awful lot. People suggest that we should really pay close attention to this in the presidential race. I hope we do. But the reality is there is not all that much difference, I am afraid and ashamed to say, between the two positions taken by the presidential candidates. One is strictly pandering for votes and one is pandering light, I guess I would call it, but they are both in the process of trying to figure out a way to gain votes among those folks who are here as immigrants and/or people who have come to this country even illegally and who sometimes, in fact oftentimes, do vote.

Let me talk a little about this whole concept of voting. This is really what

has propelled me to come to the floor this evening. About, I guess it was a year or so ago, maybe 2 years now, a year and a half, I read something that was a statement by the then candidate for mayor of Washington, D.C. I found it disconcerting, to say the least, and I have quoted it often because a lot of people when I talk about the issue of immigration and citizenship which, of course, go hand in hand, people are surprised by the fact that there are places around this country, cities in particular, that have called themselves and/or we have called sanctuary cities. Sanctuary cities are cities that develop policies with regard to immigration. Of course, this is bizarre to say the least because the Federal Government is supposed to have the primary and unique role of determining our immigration policies. But what we are seeing happen all over the country, well, I should not say all over the country, primarily on the left coast and on the east coast, we see these peculiar things going on in local communities where they will say things like, in our community, in our city, we will not allow our police departments to communicate with the Department of Homeland Security. If they arrest someone and find out that that person is here illegally, we will not allow our police department to tell the government about that, tell the Department of Homeland Security. Some have gone farther than that, farther than saying that if you are in their community illegally, you will not be hassled essentially, that that little city will not participate in the process of trying to identify your status and/or have anything to do with the punishment of the crime. If, in fact, you have come into this country illegally, they will not help enforce the law of the land. I find this to be quite peculiar.

I have spoken about this. We have attempted to amend other bills, appropriations bills, to stop this from happening but something occurred here just the other night that goes along with what the then candidate, or, no, I am sorry, he was mayor at the time, Mayor Anthony Williams. I see this article was back on October 1, 2002, when he was running again but he was the mayor. Mayor Anthony Williams said on October 1, 2002, that noncitizens in the District of Columbia should be allowed to vote in local elections. He had said this in response to a complaint from a Latino coalition where they issued a report in which they identified a lack of services and access to local government. Mayor Williams said, "I am committed to expanding the franchise. The city needs to develop a new standard for voting."

This is the mayor of Washington, D.C., the Nation's capital. Again, only here on the east coast or maybe in some scattered pockets of the left coast would a statement like this not be incredible and would go without a great deal of attention being paid to it, but he says, "The city needs to develop

a new standard for voting, but it isn't citizenship." When the council's executive director, I think there they are talking about the city council of D.C., the executive director, Eugenio Arene, suggested that all local taxpayers be allowed to cast ballots, the mayor added, "Sounds like a good standard to me." Asked about extending the vote to noncitizens, Williams pledged to work with local government officials and experts on the idea and he said he hoped it would be possible in elections for mayor on down.

By the way, in this proposal, there was nothing at the time that would even indicate that they were entertaining the idea that people who are noncitizens should vote but excluding it from people who are here illegally. There is nothing in here to suggest that that was the case. In fact, it is just the opposite. Anyone who they say is a resident should vote. Anyone who is a resident should vote. This, of course, is an attack on the whole concept of citizenship. It is becoming less and less meaningful to many people, it is true. We are trying our best to eliminate anything that distinguishes a person here as a citizen from someone who is not and to accommodate, therefore, the massive numbers of people who are here illegally. If this is not pandering for votes, you tell me what is, Mr. Speaker. How can we possibly define such a thing, that a statement of this nature could be made and that people could possibly think that it was for any other purpose but to go after a voting group that perhaps is not solidly behind you or you want to sort of encourage, you want to make sure that you pay them back for whatever kind of political support they may give you, that you would even go to the extent of saying that citizenship in this country is not important, it is essentially meaningless. Because, you see, if it is not meaningful to the mayor for voting purposes, what in the world could it be meaningful for? What purpose does it have? What does citizenship mean? Is it of any value whatsoever?

There is an oath that is taken when someone wants to become a citizen of the United States. It has been around for a couple of hundred years. In it we talk about the need to disavow any allegiance to any other government or potentate, I think the words are, in the vow itself. We are talking about somebody who is separating themselves from whatever they were in terms of their political affiliation to something new. We do that for a purpose, because it is important to have that distinguishment. It is important to have people who come here as immigrants. It is important to have people who are born here understand the importance of citizenship. It does distinguish someone here and it distinguishes us from other nations and other people groups. I think that that distinguishment is a good thing.

I am constantly amazed at how much time and attention is spent on trying

to minimize the importance of the whole concept of citizenship, that we are all just residents, that is the theory, that we are just here on the planet in this particular location. Nothing really holds us together as a nation except for the economic benefits that can be obtained by living in this particular geographic area. That is all. As bizarre as that sounded back on October 1, 2002, and to a certain extent I did not really worry about it because you can write that off to a political campaign and the rhetoric of someone looking to pander to voters. Certainly that is the only way I could read what he said there.

Come to find out last week, this particular little seed, bad seed, has begun to sprout.

□ 2100

The other day several Councilmembers here in the District of Columbia introduced the "Equitable Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2004," a bill that will extend full local voting rights to documented permanent residents of the District of Columbia. The bill was co-introduced by Councilmember Jim Graham, and it goes on to describe them. The Voting Rights for All D.C. Coalition is actively seeking other co-sponsors. So in the City Council of Washington, D.C., they are proposing now to implement the Mayor's idea of having people who are noncitizens be eligible to vote.

We know we will have the Washington, D.C. appropriations bill up here soon, and we will certainly look at that for an opportunity to address this particular issue, as the Federal Government does have a responsibility for oversight, and I will have an amendment prepared. But whether or not we offer it, whether or not it passes, I mean the idea that this is happening in cities across the country and here in the Nation's capital has got to be a sobering thought even for those people who press for more and more of the elimination, if the Members will, of anything that distinguishes individuals here as citizens of the United States.

Massive immigration into the country, both legally and illegally, has consequences. And it is absolutely true that we have been successful as a Nation in assimilating hundreds of millions of people into this country and into this culture over the past 200 years. And it is true that sometimes that is assimilation happened easily and sometimes not so easily. It is true that many people faced hardships and discrimination and that it was not an easy thing to do, and that groups came into the country, and every time there was a wave of immigration from any particular area, there would be people here saying we have got to stop that. There is something bad about that particular group coming into the country.

The country not only survived it but grew and prospered, and I think, for the most part, we can look back at the experience and say it was positive for the Nation.

But there is a different phenomenon today. It is a different immigration, not just in terms of numbers. There are far more people coming into this country today legally and illegally than ever before in the Nation's history. But there is also this growing problem, this sort of cult of multiculturalism, as I call it, that has taken over much of certainly the media. Certainly our colleges and high schools and textbooks are influenced by this peculiar philosophy. I say peculiar because it is this: It is not just a recognition of our differences, which I think all of us can appreciate. It is not just extolling the virtues of diversity, of which there are many. It is not that at all. The cult of multiculturalism to which I refer is the kind of thing that pushes this idea that we should no longer identify ourselves as Americans because that is, of course, some unique distinction that is in some way troublesome; and that we should in no way extol the virtues of American society or the American creed. We should not tell our children in schools that there is anything of value in what we have established here, that there is nothing in Western Civilization in our history of which we can be proud, that everything is negative, that the only way that we can portray a sympathy and express a sympathy and an appreciation for another culture is to degrade and debase our own. That is the cult of multiculturalism, and it is rampant throughout the country.

There was an interesting little spot on National Public Radio not too long ago about a school in Los Angeles, a public high school, 5,000 students, most of them, as they said, had "recently arrived," almost all from Mexico, almost all speaking Spanish. And in this NPR spot, they were interviewing the teacher, and they were talking about the fact that they did not have enough textbooks in the school, especially civics or history textbooks. And the teacher said, I do not care that we do not have any textbooks in the school because the textbooks that we have prepared for us and are given to us by the school district do not teach our kids about who they are. She said, They only teach about this other culture.

Now, what was she talking about? Who were their kids and who they are, and who was the other culture that she was deriding and in saying that we should not be teaching children today? That other culture was, of course, ours, America's. Who were these children? She said "our children." Not American children? No. No. So, therefore, she said, I have devised a different curriculum for these kids, and I do not want them using textbooks provided by the Anglo community. She said, Instead of using textbooks, we are going to go out and study murals.

Mural, that is a euphemism, most of the time, for graffiti.

So they went out, and the reporter went out with them, and they walked along the streets of Los Angeles. The

school kids, instead of being in class studying American history, this was her alternative, a "mural walk." That is what she called it. And when the students got there and they talked to the "artist" who had created this thing, this mural, this historical monument, this psychological jewel, they asked him to teach the class. This was on radio. They were interviewing these guys, and this was all recorded. And the guy said, I want the students to know you do not belong here. That flag is not your flag, pointing to American flag. He said, You are just all a colony. This is a colony of the United States. You really do not belong here. You have no allegiance here.

This is the cult of multiculturalism to which I refer. And it is there, and it permeates our society, and it is problematic when it meshes with massive immigration, when there is no longer a press for assimilation or pressure for assimilation, but all the pressure is just the opposite. It is all to divide us into subgroups, into hyphenated Americans in every way.

I had a meeting, I remember, with a bishop in Denver, Bishop Gomez. And we were arguing this issue, and he said to me, I do not know why you are so concerned about people who are coming here from Mexico. He said, They do not want to be Americans.

I said, Bishop, there are two things about that statement that really get me. First of all, that you assume my problem with immigration is that I do not want the people who immigrate here to become American; and, secondly, the fact is you are right. That is the problem, and it is exactly why I am worried. It is not that I should not be worried about that. It is that every American should be worried about it. There are many people doing exactly what my grandparents did and your grandparents and everybody else's grandparents or great grandparents or great great grandparents did. They all come here because they all make a very difficult choice to come to a brand new land. And it is true that that is the one thing we have in common, people coming today and people coming when my grandparents came: They want to come to America. But let me ask you if there is now a difference. Let me ask you if you can just get a feeling that, in fact, something else is different. They want to come to America. The question is do they want to be American?

The answer, according to Bishop Gomez, is no. This is different.

I see the gentleman from Virginia has joined me, and I will ask him to express his observations here in just a second.

But I just want to point out that this cult of multiculturalism is truly having an impact on our society because historically public schools, we could at least rely on them. When I went to school, when my grandparents went to school here, we could rely on a public school as a place to help assimilate

children into the American culture. There was a pressure to do so, first of all, of course, to learn English. That was an absolute must. Secondly, to learn about the history of this country and attach ourselves to it, which I did. That is gone. That is gone from most schools in this Nation.

According to a study of San Diego high school students in the early 1990s, after 3 years of high school, the proportion of students identifying themselves as "American" dropped by 50 percent from the time they came into the school. The proportion identifying themselves as hyphenated Americans had gone down by 30 percent, and the proportion of identifying themselves with a foreign nationality, overwhelmingly in this case Mexican, had gone up 52 percent.

What did we teach them? To what did we say that they should attach themselves? As immigrants or as citizens who have been here for years, whatever that citizenship concept is in anybody's mind anymore? What we taught them is there is nothing unique, nothing that they should, in fact, attach themselves to; that they should stay separate, keep their own language, keep their on special identity, separate identity.

I tell my colleagues this is the problem that the immigration policy has got to address. And I am pilloried many times certainly by the press, my opponents, because I talk about this issue. And there are always attempts to characterize my debate or my desire to debate this issue in the most nasty of terms. And the epithets that are thrown around here and at me oftentimes, we just have to accept that people wish to change the debate away from these kinds of issues that I am trying to address tonight on to the stuff of racism and xenophobia and that sort of thing.

I have watched over the years, and there are people who have been here longer than I and have done far better work than I, far more productive work in many cases, I am sure, in this particular area than I have ever been able to do, and one is the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), who is here tonight and I am proud to say is a friend.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for yielding to me.

I want to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on bringing immigration reform to this Congress and before the American people. He has traveled across this Nation. He has gone to the border between Mexico and the United States. He has also been to the Canadian border. He brought back the tax returns and have weighed them of those who I believe were here illegally, trying to get money from the American Treasury and who, no doubt in my mind, many of which have been successful.

□ 2115

The gentleman saw how they were going to utilize the Earned Income Tax Credit on papers that the gentleman gathered in alleged trash near the Mexican border. The gentleman has done the research on items like the papers by the mayor of the District of Columbia. The gentleman has talked to the Border Patrol agents. The gentleman has done countless other things on behalf of bringing true immigration reform to this country, and I want to thank the gentleman.

We heard speakers before the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) talk about the deficit, and I want to see the deficit reduced. I would like to see it eliminated. It is great to identify a problem, but you also need to address the problem.

Reduce illegal immigration and reduce the deficit. Illegals come into this country and soak up not thousands, not millions, but billions of healthcare dollars that taxpayers of this country are paying for. If we stopped illegal immigration, we would have those billions of dollars to apply to the deficit.

We can look at social services and social programs. Again, we are not talking about hundreds, thousands or millions; we are talking about billions of dollars.

If we want to reduce the deficit, reduce illegal immigration. Stop it, and stop that money going to them from these social programs.

Another area of concern are illegals getting Social Security. I have heard some say, "Oh, we passed a law to stop that."

Yes, we passed a law saying if you are illegally in this country, you cannot draw Social Security benefits. But if you go back to Mexico, or you go back to whatever other country you came from to this country illegally, you can start dipping into the Social Security System and getting money out of it.

If we were to get that totalization agreement with Mexico, which I surely hope we do not, the totalization agreement would override the statute that says illegals cannot get Social Security benefits. If that were followed by an amnesty of any type, form, shape or regularization or whatever euphemistic phrase you want to call amnesty, you are going to hear a sucking sound out of the Social Security fund that would turn all seniors whose heads are not gray gray, I would predict, because the drain on the Social Security fund would be significant and heavy. Again, it is not hundreds, it is not thousands, it is not millions; it is billions of dollars.

So, if you want to reduce the deficit, let us stop illegal immigration and put a big dent in the deficit.

Pretty soon we are going to get the September 11 Commission report. It is going to talk an intelligence czar, and I am anxious to see what they have to say about that. But I bet it will not mention too much about the fact that

19 of those terrorists who flew the airplanes into the buildings of this country and killed thousands of citizens in New York, Pennsylvania and across the river in Arlington, were in this country illegally. They had overstayed their visas, for the most part, illegal aliens.

They committed suicide by flying those planes into the World Trade Center and into the Pentagon. They were in this country illegally, and if they were not here illegally, they could not have done the acts. If we stopped illegal immigration, then there would have been 19 fewer persons in this country to do those acts that they did. I hope, but I do not expect, the 9/11 Commission to address this facet of making America more secure.

I remember the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) bringing to a meeting of the Immigration Reform Caucus, and I recollect it was held in the courtyard outside of the Longworth Building, the father of one of the September 11 victims. As I recall, the statements made by that individual, he said, "If I had to pick out a key factor in what caused September 11, it was a huge sea of illegal immigration, whereby 19 illegals could float around in that sea undetected."

What he wanted was to see a reduction in illegal immigration. I hope the 9/11 Commission will address this fact. I want to see America be made more secure, and one way to make America more secure is to reduce illegal immigration, just as one way to reduce the deficit is to reduce illegal immigration.

So I would like to close by doing as I started and to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for taking the time to come to the floor of this House on a repeated basis and point out the many problems and the many pitfalls of illegal immigration. I hope that the voting standard in this country will always be that you have to be a United States citizen to participate in our electoral process.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue when we talk about spending and deficits that I think is intriguing. We just passed last week the foreign operations bill. This is most often referred to as the foreign aid bill. There is an interesting aspect of this particular spending plan that really deserves our attention here, and I think we seldom ever address it.

It is this: That beyond the money that we appropriate in that bill for governments all over the world, most of them, unfortunately, corrupt, and much of the money, of course, as we know, does not get to the intended individuals that most desperately need it, but we, nonetheless, distribute monies to countries all over the world in the form of foreign aid.

But most people I think do not understand or know that a great deal of wealth is also transferred in another way from the United States to other

countries, and this is by the process of what is called remittances.

Now, "remittances," that is just a term that refers to the dollars that flow from people who are working here in the United States to people who are in other countries, mostly to family members who are in other countries.

I was in Mexico not too long ago speaking to a gentleman who was the head of a newly created ministry down there called the Ministry for Mexicans living in the United States. I think it has changed its name, but that is what it was originally. But Mr. Hernandez, the minister, was telling me that part of the responsibilities he had as a minister of this particular agency was to make sure that the movement, the flow of Mexican nationals into the United States, was maintained, and, in fact, increased.

That was such an odd thing, in a way. When I asked why in the world would a government agency be set up to increase the flow of their nationals to another country, he said, "Well, it is actually kind of simple." He said, "There are actually several reasons, but they are all beneficial to Mexico, and you can see why we would be doing this."

He said that the number of people between the ages of 18 and 25, Mexican citizens, that particular demographic profile, the number of people in that profile had doubled in 10 years, and he said the unemployment rate for that same group is about 40 percent.

So on the remittance issue, he said the people coming into the country were in desperate need of a job, and what would happen when they get here, they get employed, and then they send money back home, in this case to Mexico. That was 2 years ago, and that amounted to \$13 billion. \$13 billion.

Now, you say, well, so what? That is a significant portion of the GDP of Mexico, as a matter of fact. Mr. Hernandez referenced it. He said this was an important thing, to have the money be sent back. It actually now approximates the greatest amount of foreign investment in the country of Mexico.

Remittances. Far in excess of any sort of investment by any other corporation in the world; far in excess of the money that goes into Mexico from tourism. It is the highest source of foreign investment they have, except for PEMEX, the government-owned oil company.

"Therefore," he said, "it is important for us to have this continual flow." He went on to explain there were other important things. He said, "You know, the more Mexican nationals we have living in the United States, the more your government will be influenced in a positive way to treat Mexico."

Finally, he said, when I told him I thought these things were incredible in a way, that any government would be set up for the purpose of trying to actually influence our policy vis-a-vis their government by exporting people

into our country, he said, "Congressman," he said this in a relatively condescending way, he said, "Congressman, it is not two countries. It is just a region. It is not two countries."

Interestingly, Vicente Fox was here just a couple of weeks ago in the United States campaigning. The President of Mexico was in the United States of America, in Illinois, in Michigan and in Wisconsin, campaigning, talking to Mexican nationals living here, trying to get them to vote, and also promising them, by the way, that he would defend their rights in the United States, asking them to vote in the election in Mexico, saying that they will pass legislation to allow them to do so, because they wanted them to remain connected to Mexico.

That gets us back to this issue we talked about earlier, about whether or not people come to the United States because they want to be in the United States, or because they want to be Americans. Two different things. In this case he is saying, "I want you to come to America; I just do not want you to become Americans. I want you to stay connected to Mexico."

He is not the only person, and that is not the only country. The countries in the world, there are now seven or eight countries that have actually over 10 percent of their gross domestic product as a result of the remittances coming from the United States.

Now, I suggest that we ought to reduce our foreign aid to every single one of those countries by the amount of remittances that are going there. Actually, the remittances are a better way of getting foreign aid to them, because it actually is going to people and not the corrupt governments.

I have written the committee. I have written the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and asked him to consider this in the creation of the bill. He chose not to. But I suggest to you there is no reason we should not at least count this into the amount of money that we do in fact provide for foreign aid.

The reason I think we should do this is because we have to, I think, begin to eliminate the allure of the remittances to other countries, because as they begin to depend more and more on the United States and their nationals working here to send money back home, then they press us more and more for open borders and for reduction in any sort of obstacles that might be placed in the path of immigration into the country, legally or illegally.

Then we see the Mexican consulates and the Guatemalan consulates, 15 countries that are now handing out these matricula consular cards, these cards to their nationals living in the United States, for the purposes of, again, making it easier and simpler for them to live here, and make money and, of course, send it home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

First and foremost I would like to honor my colleague from Colorado. All of us in Congress who take this issue seriously know that without the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), this issue would not be getting the attention it is, and it is not getting the attention it deserves as it is.

□ 2130

So the fact is that he has taken many hard knocks; he has been attacked personally and politically for the leadership that he has provided on this issue. I salute him. And, let me just say that I am proud that on most of these fights that I have been able to rush down here and be at his side and fight the good fight, because this issue is determining the well-being of the people of the United States of America.

That is what we are supposed to be doing here, is it not? We are here elected to watch out for the well-being of the people of the United States; more than anything else that we do, that is supposedly our responsibility. Yet, we have seen almost no action on the part of the political establishment of the United States to deal with the issue of illegal immigration, and our people are paying for it. They are paying for it in a big way. There is no doubt what effect this massive flow of illegal immigration that continues into our country is having. And if I would just have any difference with my colleague, it would only be to stress that it is not just illegal immigration from Mexico. And, by the way, we would not care if it was illegal immigration from Ireland or from Germany or Italy or anywhere else. We have an out-of-control flow of illegal immigration into this country. Today, I believe the biggest source of illegal immigration into our country actually is not Mexico, but is China and countries in Asia.

Again, people who come, for them we have, I would say, the most generous legal immigration policy of any country in the world. We admit more legal immigrants into our country than all other countries in the world combined. But to permit millions more on top of that to pour into our country is having a dramatic impact on us, and it is heroes like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) who are stepping up to the plate and trying to do something about it.

The average person out there knows that his children and the working people themselves are suffering from the fact that their wages are being kept down. Yes, we had a huge growth in our GNP, but the wages of our middle class and our working class people have been kept down by a massive flow of illegals into our country. There is nothing wrong to think that people who work in hotels changing beds and cleaning should earn a good living, but their pay has been kept way down. People who pick fruit and vegetables, yes, okay, so it is going to cost us 10 cents more for a hamburger. The bottom line is, the

people of this country who make hamburgers and are involved with that industry should be paid more money, but they will not be paid more money and the people who clean the buildings and take jobs like this, they are being paid less. The working people are being hurt by this. Of course, we are not going to provide them health care, because we have plenty of illegals who work and are not getting health care. The taxpayers pick up their health care.

In California we know wages are being kept down for normal people. The health care system in our State is collapsing, and around the country there is strain, especially in the southwest. The education system in California, because of the illegal flow of illegals into our system, our children are not getting the education they deserve. It can be traced right back to a massive, uncontrolled flow of illegals into our country, bringing their children, so that they can get benefits that they could never afford in their own country. We should not blame the illegals. Blame us. Blame the government. Because this government is supposed to watch out for the welfare of our people. We are not doing it. The criminal justice system in California is breaking down. Over 40 percent of the people in our prisons and our jails are illegal immigrants.

This is a huge burden on the taxpayers but, also, on our own people. Do my colleagues know what happens when those people get out of jail? They do not send them back to the countries they came from; they let them out among our population and they commit more crimes. Not only the terrorists who came into our country legally and just overstayed their visas, not only have they murdered our people, but every day someone is killed in this country by someone who is not supposed to be in this country because they are not here legally. We are talking about our citizens being murdered, their wages being kept down, their children's education system and health care system going to hell. This is a major issue and it is not being addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), by continuing to bring it up over and over again, he is doing a tremendous service to our people, and I am proud to stand with him tonight again to try to motivate the people in this city, in Washington, D.C. They say that Washington, D.C. is 64 square miles surrounded by reality. We have to bring some reality here to Washington, D.C. Our people are suffering because of this issue. Let us deal with it. Let us deal with it, yes, in a fair way. And again, this has nothing to do with where illegals are coming from, but it has everything to do with getting control of an out of control situation that is hurting our people.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I am proud to work with him on the issue.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I am certainly proud that he is a friend and has become, and has been for a long time, not become, but has been a major and important voice for reason on this particular issue.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, just a note that I will be giving a Special Order in about an hour on 9-11, so if people are looking in to see about this, this is not the Special Order that I will be giving.

Mr. TANCREDO. Stay tuned. Stay tuned.

Mr. Speaker, I will end this Special Order with just this last reference. It is to one thing that was written in a book called "Who Are We?" By Samuel Huntington. This has become I think one of the most important books written, and it just came out actually in May, but it is a fascinating analysis of this whole issue we are talking about in terms of trying to understand the merging of multiculturalism, this sort of cult of multiculturalism and the issue of massive immigration and the erosion of the concept of citizenship.

Samuel Huntington puts it this way: "The erosion of the difference between citizens and aliens, the overall declining rates of naturalization, and the naturalization spike of the mid 1990s, all suggest the central importance of material government benefits for immigrant decisions. Immigrants become citizens not because they are attracted to America's culture and creed, but because they are attracted by government social welfare and affirmative action programs. If these are available to noncitizens, the incentive for citizenship fades. Citizenship is becoming, in Peter Spiro's phrase, one more generally available 'Federal social benefit.' If, however, citizenship is not necessary to get the benefits, it is superfluous. As Peter Schuck and Rogers Smith argue, it 'is welfare state' membership, not citizenship, that increasingly counts. Membership in the welfare state, in contrast to membership in the political community, is of crucial and growing significance; for some, who are wholly dependent upon public benefits, it may be literally a matter of life and death."

It is citizenship, it is the concept of a nation State that we are today debating. Whether or not its existence can be assured, certainly we do not know, but I can guarantee my colleagues this, that the threats to its existence are great and are exacerbated by the cult of multiculturalism and unrestrained immigration.

REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITIES AND THE REAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by a number of colleagues interested in the safety of America and Americans, and concerned about the future of our military forces. We are speaking this evening because we have great reservations about the way America's national security policy is being conducted.

Sixty years ago next month, the American Army was welcomed into Paris with cheers and flowers and cries of "Vive les Americains!" We had fought a dogged and grueling war against the forces of a cruel dictator. And from every window and rooftop, a liberated populace honored the foreigners who restored their freedom.

Move forward 60 years to another war, another dictator, another country freed. To be sure, many Iraqis welcomed the American invasion and, for all the talk of coalition, this was an overwhelmingly American force. But those who welcomed our forces found they had to keep their voices low lest they become targets of those who rewarded their liberators with bombs and bullets.

We should not accept the appearance of an ungrateful Nation at face value. But neither should we idealize the occupation of Iraq.

It is increasingly clear that at a time when America should have focused its might on punishing those who, callously and in defiance of any known theology, attacked our country, and eliminating the threat they continued to pose, we allowed ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to be diverted.

What we see on TV every night is not the war on terror. The war in Iraq; really, now, the peacekeeping mission in Iraq, is costly and bloody and largely irrelevant. Was Saddam Hussein unpleasant? Yes. Did he bode U.S. ill? Without a doubt. But going to war against Saddam Hussein, taking people and resources away from the search for Osama bin Laden and the destruction of al Qaeda, is like the football defense that goes after the runner while the quarterback sneaks the ball across the goal line. We fell for the fake.

The real war on terror is the war to find and punish those who attacked this country and who would do so again. After nearly 3 years, their networks have been shattered, their organization has been bruised. But destroying such a strong and such a decentralized threat is very difficult. Any one man with a weapon of mass destruction is a superpower. The best we can do, militarily anyway, is to contain and keep the leadership incommunicado or on the run. That is the real war.

Is America safer with Saddam Hussein out of power? Probably. But is America safer because of the Iraq war? No, it is not. Because of the way we entered that war and the way in which we have handled the aftermath, I believe that we have increased the chances of another attack and, sadly, another war. We have incited the anger of millions who previously did not much like

the United States, but probably would have been willing to live and let live. We have become the villain of millions of glittering eyes, and we did it to ourselves.

At the same time, we drove away stalwart friends whose company provided us with such strength. By forcing a political showdown on Iraq rather than focusing on the real war, the proven threat to all western civilization, we made our allies choose between the will of their people on the one hand and the relationship with the United States on the other, and it was unnecessary.

After September 11, the leaders of countless nations expressed their support to our President. Not one, not one called to gloat or said that we deserved what we got. NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time ever to come to the collective defense of the United States. They were all on our side, in the real war.

We chose to defy the will of the international community and take it upon ourselves to unilaterally enforce sanctions that were not solely America's to begin with. The Canadian Mounties cannot come to Lexington, Missouri to enforce Missouri law; that is the duty of the State of Missouri. Similarly, I do not believe it was right for the United States to act to enforce edicts that were not of our creation. That is why the United Nations was created. By taking it upon ourselves to literally become the world's policeman, we changed the view that many of our allies had of us. We became, in their view, not just a victim of a vicious attack, but a potential attacker ourselves.

Let me be candid, Mr. Speaker. I and some of those who will speak later voted to give the President the authority to move Saddam Hussein out. We did that based on the information at the time, much of which has since fallen into question. The former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Jack Keane, told the Committee on Armed Services last week, "We were seduced by the Iraqi exiles."

□ 2145

But regardless of underlying data, nowhere in our votes did we say to go it alone. Never did we say that Iraq should take focus away from the real war. At the same time, I twice wrote to the President and pointed out that ejecting Saddam is one thing, but we have to plan to manage the aftermath. That clearly did not happen.

The peace has been managed far worse than the war, and it has been argued that the United States invasion was justified as an act of self-defense. Indeed, this administration changed the national security policy of our country to assert the right of the United States to preemptively attack anywhere we believe there might be a threat to our Nation.

We have debated, and I am sure we will continue to debate, whether the

policy of preemption is wise or in keeping with American values. But this much is clear. In order to preempt, in order to become an aggressor, in order to throw the first punch, we had better have clear, convincing and accurate intelligence that a real threat exists.

As we are seeing in the case of Iraq, our intelligence system is not yet ready to meet that standard. Until it is, a doctrine of preemption puts America in the black hat before the world. Whatever happened to the Weinberger doctrine? Whatever happened to the Powell doctrine?

Mr. Speaker, if a global black eye were the only consequence of our Iraqi adventure, it might be manageable. We could live with it. But to do that and to take energy and focus from finding the true villains of September the 11 and to enter into a war that was not clearly necessary and to strain local economies by calling up reserves, National Guard and even retired military to serve in that war and to drive a wedge in the alliance that kept peace for 60 years and to engage in a bloody and costly occupation and to stretch the American military forces to the breaking point and ultimately to inflame new generations to hate America, with all of that, I cannot see how America is in the end safer or better off because of this war.

The Soviet Union tried to put America in this strategic situation for half a century. We did it to ourselves in just a year. On top of that, we have created a huge new burden for America's military. I recently wrote that we could have forces in Iraq for 50 years. When I asked the Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz whether we would be in Iraq for a good many years, he said this is entirely possible, and he added, "I cannot tell you how long that's going to take."

I and many who stand with me have tried to be supportive of our President and our policies. We stand foreshore with the troops under fire and grieve for the families of those who have been lost, who, Mr. Speaker, come disproportionately from rural America. We stand with them. We cannot stand with the failure to prosecute the real war against those who attacked and continue to threaten our country. We do not oppose having a strong military, and we do not oppose using it, but we do oppose squandering it.

That is a question of priorities. Over \$10 billion just this year on missile defense. Is the threat of foreign missiles the most serious one facing our country? Remember, this is not a defense against weapons of mass destruction. Those can be delivered in many ways. Missile defense addresses the delivery system with the highest cost and the lowest probability of being used against us. So why is it there that we spend the most?

The administration is devoting hundreds of millions a year to develop fighter planes that push the envelope of technology and knowledge, bold in-

novation, the edge, but the true threats to our country from people who have no fighter airplanes, have no aircraft carriers and have no satellites.

The war against terror is door to door and manpower-intensive, so spending all this money on other items should make us ask, where are our priorities?

Soldiers make the war on terrorism work, more than any doctrine or any system. Yet, the most personnel-intensive services, the army and the Marine Corps, are last in line for funding from the Defense Department. Where are our priorities? Why, Mr. Speaker, are we not throwing America's might into the real war?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I associate myself with his comments. As a member of Congress, a veteran who has been to Iraq five times and have sat many, many times across from our men and women in uniform, as they look into our eyes and they show not just their commitment and their professionalism but their trust in us to do the right thing, and sometimes I wonder if we are not betraying our obligations of doing the right thing for them.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about an issue that is vitally important to our country and to the men and women that are fighting and defending our freedoms in Iraq, Afghanistan and other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, time and again attempts by this House to acquire documents related to the Abu Ghraib prison abuse scandal have been defeated, largely on party line votes. During consideration of the intelligence authorization bill, I offered an amendment, both in committee markup and on the floor of this House, to require the Department of Defense to turn over documents related to the handling and the treatment of detainees in Iraq, Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere, including those documents that would come from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and documents that had been already asked for, not just by our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence but by other committees in this House.

Both of these attempts, attempts to find answers to the questions that all Americans are asking and that all Americans are expecting us to answer, have failed, again, largely on party line votes.

Last Thursday the House Committee on Armed Services met to mark up H. Res. 689 and H. Con. Res. 472, two resolutions that are a direct result of the prisoner abuse scandal. H. Res. 689 would require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the State and the Attorney General to transmit to the House information produced in connection with the investigations into allegations of abuse against prisoners and detainees in Iraq, Afghanistan and at

the U.S. base in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Unfortunately and disappointingly, the committee ordered that this resolution be reported to the House with an adverse recommendation. This is the second time in less than two months that the House Committee on Armed Services has failed to order the production of documents that could assist this committee in understanding and working towards a resolution of the prisoner abuse scandal.

In June the committee adversely reported H. Res. 640, a bill that sought documents associated with the investigation by Army Major General Antonio Taguba into the prisoner abuses at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq. I am deeply disappointed in this committee and at the partisan politics that are keeping America from learning the truth about what happened at Abu Ghraib.

Instead of supporting this fact-seeking resolution last week, Republicans on the House Committee on Armed Services preferred H. Con. Res. 472, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the apprehension, detention and interrogation of terrorists are fundamental elements in the successful prosecution of the global war on terrorism, and that the protection of the lives of the United States citizens at home and abroad.

Fundamentally, this resolution is mired in a lot of partisanship and may ultimately hurt our men and women in uniform. I am deeply concerned about the unintended consequences that could result from the adoption of such a resolution.

By effectively absolving ourselves from adhering to the Geneva Conventions and instead following our own standards of "humane treatment for those in our custody," we open the doors for the rest of the world to do the same to our own troops.

In the words of former prisoner of war, the Nation's first ambassador to Vietnam and past Congressman Pete Peterson, "I know what life in a foreign prison is like. To a large degree, I credit the Geneva Conventions for my survival. While the Vietnamese rarely abided by the rules, the international pressure on them to do so forced them to walk a fine line that ensured that they not perpetrate the sort of shocking abuses at Abu Ghraib."

It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we live to the same standard that we expect other nations to abide by in the horrific event that they capture our soldiers. I am disappointed that the Republicans on the House Committee on Armed Services would prefer to have this resolution passed through our committee in the House rather than a resolution seeking the truth about what occurred at Abu Ghraib.

While we eventually voted to postpone marking up this resolution, the committee, however, is scheduled to take it up again this week. I hope that before then our colleagues will see the grave dangers that lie in insisting on

dismissing such behavior and not blaming it just on a handful of soldiers but instead recognizing it for what it is, a failure of our system and our failure on this committee and in this House to do our oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight as a concerned American, a concerned Member of Congress, and I join my colleague from Missouri in asking our colleagues to do everything that we can to exercise our oversight responsibilities. It is the right thing to do. It is what our men and women in uniform expect us to do as they sit across the table from us in places such as Tikrit, Mosul and other parts of faraway lands. They trust us. We cannot fail them.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the entire House of Representatives knows that our ranking member (Mr. SKELTON), who there is not a more patriotic individual, there is nobody in this body who is for a stronger defense, and I think our ranking member has two of his sons serving in the United States military right now. It is just an example of the great military tradition in his family. And the ranking member as a student of history has very insightful questions that he asks at hearings, and his questioning of General Jack Keane the other day was just an example of that.

And I was struck by General Keane's testimony, when he said that if we had to put it in graphic terms, the prewar planning in Iraq was about like this, more or less a bucket full, a large bucket full, but the postwar planning in Iraq was more like this, more like a thimble full. And our ranking member has quoted General Keane when he said that he felt almost that he had been seduced by the Iraqi expatriates into believing that the postwar situation would be easy, friendly, we would be greeted as liberators, not as occupiers.

The two issues that I would like to bring up tonight have to do with the troop commitment that Tennessee is making, yet again. We are the Volunteer State and the most recent group of reservists and guardsmen to be called up. The 278th Armored Cavalry Regiment, these men and women in uniform are leaving family and friends back home for their tour of duty. They are proud to serve, but almost 4,000 Tennesseans will be involved in this mobilization, and that just reminds me that in this next rotation, 43 percent of our troops in Iraq, 43 percent of the 130,000 men and women in uniform, will not be active duty personnel. They will be guardsmen and reservists who are called up to serve their country in a faraway land.

I worry that our Nation is not aware of this terrific OP TEMPO, the fact that we have the heaviest OP TEMPO since World War II. A lot of folks do

not know how to put that into perspective, because they think Vietnam was a big war or Korea was a big war; but, yet, due to the rotational demands on our troops, they are facing some of the greatest strains and stresses on family life and professional life than any other men and women who have served in uniform have faced since World War II. And the 278th Armored Cavalry Regiment from Tennessee is just the latest example of that in our State.

Another issue I wanted to focus on, Mr. Speaker, was the cost of the war and honesty in accounting. People have said for a long time that truth is the first casualty in war, and I am worried that when it comes to honestly and fully disclosing the cost of this war, the administration has not been forthcoming. As the gentleman from Missouri knows, the administration included no money in this year's budget for the war in Iraq or Afghanistan. That is almost too incredible to be believed by folks back home. To have a war of this magnitude go on and to have the administration put zero dollars in their budget for Iraq or Afghanistan is incredible.

Finally, after Congressional pressure, they have inserted, as the gentleman knows, \$25 billion in the budget, and I think this week the defense appropriations bill will go through and it will become effective immediately. It won't wait until the beginning of the next fiscal year in October. Because why? Our troops need the money now. They are running out of money, and it is the least we can do as members of the Committee on Armed Services to fully fund our troops, our men and women in uniform, while they are serving our Nation abroad.

That \$25 billion will not last for very long. As the gentleman knows, the estimates we have got on the committee indicate it might last through October, November, December, and then come January of next year, the next Congress. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) estimates we could be facing \$50 billion then, and none of this is being disclosed to the American people as it should be. I think we should be honest with them and forthright, let them know the nature of our commitment overseas and let them know the burden that they bear as taxpayers to pay for this, because this is a very serious financial issue. These are large dollars involved.

□ 2200

If you add it all up, the total expenditure of the war so far is in the neighborhood of 150 and \$200 billion, 150 to \$200 billion. This is to wage war on a country whose annual defense budget was about \$1 billion. So it is an incredible situation that we are in. And I think by being honest and straightforward with our constituents back home, being straightforward with the American taxpayer, we will come a lot closer to getting through this conflict successfully, to winning and bringing our troops back home safely.

I commend the leadership of our ranking member. He has done a great job and has done so for many years on the committee, a true patriot, a true leader, a true lover of the American military, and a true supporter of our troops. It is an honor to serve with the gentleman, and I am proud to be part of this special order.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his leadership of the House Committee on Armed Services, as ranking member, where he commands respect on both sides of the aisle and across our military.

Mr. Speaker, I have 3 unique privileges in this institution. One is to represent the people of Long Island's Second Congressional District. The second is to serve under the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). And the third is to serve under the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) on the House Committee on Armed Services, a committee which has no more profound and fundamental mission than to protect our troops and keep them strong so that they can keep our Nation strong.

How do we do that, Mr. Speaker? How do we keep them strong in order to keep our Nation strong? We do it by having right priorities and by giving them the best resources. Having the right priorities means that we be focussed. We have to have focussed priorities and disciplined priorities. And having focus and said disciplined priorities enables us to provide the best resources to our troops so that they can combat the global war on terror.

Sadly, Washington has fallen woefully short on those priorities. Let me share some examples that come from some of the people that I represent. These are real people with real stories.

I have a policy, Mr. Speaker, that if you have been deployed into any dangerous place in the world, if you are a member of our military or related to a member of the military, my door is open at all times. You can come to my office on Long Island. You can come to my office in Washington and I will sit with you and listen to what you have to say.

I sat with the mother of a young soldier who said to me at a table in HopHog, New York. She said, I had to send my son money in Iraq so he could afford the best armored vest because he did not have the best armored vest. And then I had to send him money so he could afford night vision goggles because I believe that my boy deserves the best night vision goggles. And my boy had to spend 2 or \$300 out of his own pocket every month to give the men in his command socks and underwear because they could not afford to do that. She said, Do you not think that should be your obligation and not my obligation?

I want to share with you the story of Raheen Tyson Heighter, a 19-year-old from Bay Shore, enlisted in the Army. He was asked what kind of life insurance he wants. That 19-year-old did not believe he needed life insurance. Most 19-year-olds do not believe they need life insurance. He said, Give me the cheapest that you have. Because all he could afford from his net monthly paycheck of about \$1,200 was a \$10,000 life insurance policy. And his pay check was docked about 80 cents a month for that policy. Well, he did not make it back. He was killed in Baghdad.

His casualty officer called his mother and said, We regret to inform you that your son was killed in action and his life insurance policy was \$10,000, which does not go very far.

I believe if we are going to send young men into battle, we can handle their life insurance premiums, Mr. Speaker. It should not have been to come out of Raheen Tyson Heighter's pay check.

I want to close by sharing a story that I heard from a young woman whose husband is in the Reserves and has just been deployed. He has been accumulating hundreds of dollars of cell phone calls on his personal cell phone which he loans to the men in his command so that they can call home because they cannot afford it without any reimbursement.

These families do not complain. They do not come to my office to complain. They do come to my office because they are patriots, and they believe that we owe them something back. They are seeking fairness. They say, if you are going to honor us, honor us not simply with your words but in your budgets. Do not simply put lapel pins on your lapels, but put us in your budgets and do not balance those budgets on the backs of people who are fighting on our fronts.

Those are our sacred obligations to the men and women that are fighting for our freedoms in dangerous parts of the world. There should be no Democratic or Republican way to protect our troops. We ought to do it because it is the right thing to do. And we ought to quit talking about our troops as priorities and spending as if they were our priorities.

It is my privilege to serve under the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) so we can reach that vital goal. It is my privilege to continue to advocate for those in my words who advocate for us with their sacrifices.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL). Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity. There has been a broad discussion here tonight on a variety of issues that we have been dealing with on the Committee on Armed Services. I would like to thank the ranking member for the opportunity to share some of these views because we do not al-

ways get the opportunity in committee. We only usually have 5 minutes or so to question some witnesses that we may have before us or to talk about a particular issue.

Among some of the issues that were raised here tonight, I would like to shift the debate just a little bit over to Afghanistan. There were some of us when the war in Iraq began, where we were wondering, why are we going over there when we have obligations already in Afghanistan? And we had major obligations in Afghanistan. We had an international coalition that we had put together to go into Afghanistan on October 7, almost 3 years ago, to make this happen.

Reason we went into Afghanistan is that the Taliban, the ruling government in Afghanistan, was harboring terrorists from al Qaeda. Al Qaeda hit us on 9-11. We had every right to go into Afghanistan and try to rectify the situation and try to get the terrorists and try to destroy the al Qaeda network.

One of the problems in Afghanistan has been drug production, opium, heroine, poppy, is the main culprit there. And those of us who thought it was a bad idea to go into Iraq were saying, well, all the arguments that we do not believe they had weapons of mass destruction and we do not believe Saddam Hussein had any tie to 9-11 and all these other arguments that some of us were making aside, if we are going to be in Afghanistan let us be in Afghanistan.

If we want to try to set a democracy up in the Middle East, let us set one up in Afghanistan. We were already there. We invaded the state. We had taken control to a certain extent what was going on there.

We now, today, have 130,000 troops in Iraq. We have 17,000 troops in Afghanistan.

I want to share with the people at home here a picture of Afghanistan opium poppy cultivation in 2001. The areas that are producing or growing poppy in 2001 are in red. You can see a majority of the country is in white. Now I would like to share Afghanistan opium poppy cultivation in 2003. Nearly the entire country is producing poppies which is now, today, half of the gross domestic product in Afghanistan is poppy, \$2.3 billion.

We have a narco-state on our hands in Afghanistan. And what happens is that in these outer regions outside of Kabul, which is the capital, the drug lords are running the show and they are making \$2.3 billion worth of money that will eventually make its way back into the hands of al Qaeda, which their sole purpose in life is to destroy the United States of America, destroy the infidels.

So the question is, why do we have 130,000 troops in Iraq and only 17,000 in Afghanistan? We have \$2.3 billion worth of poppies being grown and sold outside of Afghanistan. When General Myers was before our committee sev-

eral months ago, maybe a month and a half ago, I asked General Myers, What are we doing about the poppy? What are we doing about the money that is making its way back to al Qaeda?

General Myers said, Well, we have a little problem this year. The harvest came in early. The harvest came in early.

So we have another year's supply of heroine on the market being sold that will eventually make its way back to al Qaeda to fund terrorists acts against the United States and the reason is the harvest came in early. We only have 17,000 troops there, and the question that I would like to ask the people at home across the United States of America, what would Afghanistan look like today if we had 130,000 troops there, if we spent \$200 billion there, and we had the international community supporting the effort?

We would be much closer to having a democracy in the Middle East. I believe that we would not have \$2.3 billion of drug money going back to al Qaeda to help fund acts against the United States. We would probably have elections very soon. And we would have the entire national community supporting the effort. And we would not be bogged down in the situation we are in now in Iraq.

So, when we look at the production and we look and see this next chart, how it has grown from 2001 when the Taliban ruled, they were obviously anti-narcotic, and the growth in 2000 and 2003 of opium production in Afghanistan. And when we look and see all the reasons that we have had for going to Iraq, and now the latest is create a democracy in the Middle East, we have spent \$200 billion there. I think we had an opportunity, we had the commitment, we had the international community, we had the resolve to go into Afghanistan and set up this Arab democracy that would hopefully lead to the domino effect of leading the democracy throughout the Middle East.

So I want the people at home to know that this is a lack of leadership in my mind as to why we are in the position we are in. While we are over in Iraq struggling right now, we cannot forget that we also broke Afghanistan as we broke Iraq. And if we break Iraq, we have got to buy it, and it has cost us \$200 billion. We cannot forget we broke Afghanistan. And I believe the major threat to this country is the money that is being taken out of this country through the drug sales and back to al Qaeda to lead the terrorist acts in this country.

So my point is that I think we have dropped the ball in Afghanistan. And I appreciate the letter the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) sent to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) last week saying that we need to have a full hearing on what is going on in Afghanistan and that the American people will not stand for the excuse that the harvest came in early as to why we have another \$2.3 billion in the hands of al Qaeda.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity and all his support with all the hearings that we have trying to get done in the Committee on Armed Services. I thank the other members of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) who was phenomenal in a classified hearing last week. I would like to thank him as well.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 2215

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing us together this evening. I thank him for training his insight on a situation that, as I say, this as somebody who did not vote for the resolution in the first place because of my apprehension, but I could not have foreseen it being mishandled in a way that has produced the situation we face today.

I salute the gentleman for his leadership, his voice of reason throughout my tenure in Congress during some very difficult times. Whether it is in the Balkans or it is the Middle East, he has focused our attention. He has asked the right questions, and he has done so in a way that permits people to get past some of their biases and concerns and I think really approach it in an open, honest and forthright fashion. I salute the gentleman for that. I appreciate the leadership he is providing this evening.

I listened to the gentleman's appraisal and I could not agree more, that, sadly, this administration was not prepared to win the peace, and this, as my colleague has pointed out time and again, is not the fault of our men and women in uniform, who have performed heroically. They have done the task that is assigned to them and more.

I think it is clear that what we have seen here has been a failure of the people at the top, who refused to listen to the men and women in uniform in the command structure. They have indeed, as the gentleman mentioned, been diverted from the real war in Afghanistan, something that the vast majority of people in this chamber were united behind. They understood that was the origin of the attack on the United States. That is where al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden were headquartered. That is where we needed to act. Sadly, we did not finish the job. We were diverted.

We have seen stress unprecedented on our National Guard and ready Reserve, and I appreciate the gentleman focusing on that. It is something that I encounter every week as I go home, hearing from the families, from the employers, the news accounts, the meetings we have had at home where sometimes there are people that just want to have a confidential moment.

A couple of weeks ago, I had a young man call the office. I was very tightly

scheduled. He said, "I'll tell you what. I know you're going back to Washington, DC. Can I come and ride to the airport with you? I just want to tell you what's in my heart before I go back."

It was for me extraordinarily frustrating to hear this young man unburden himself. He was back stateside because he had won a special commendation. He was back, but he wanted me to know the deep concern that the men and women he served with had about what was going on.

As the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) said, we did it to ourselves. Three years ago, the world was united behind us. We had specific objectives. There was a sense of unity here that could have been mobilized and was not, but I think the question that the gentleman is raising for us is not just focusing on what went tragically wrong, understanding what is there, but he is focusing our attention on where we go from here, how do we do right by these young men and women in the field, how do we do right by the people in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

Well, I think, first and foremost, I would like to see us do a better job at oversight, and I know the gentleman has done his best as the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, but there is no excuse for our not being able to do a better job of pulling this information out, sharing it with our colleagues and the American public, and holding people accountable, doing a better job of focusing on what is happening to the 5,600, what are we calling them, post-active duty people who are being brought back to service yet again. The strains that have been put on the ready Reserve, more people called up than in every previous mobilization from the Cuban missile crisis through every decade, every year right up till today, we have had this amazing stress.

What can we do? We can have an honest accounting of the costs and consequences, not the budgeting that puts it off till the future. We can chase down what happened with that prison abuse scandal and not scapegoat a few young men and women who were in a situation, candidly I think, over their heads. I would have liked to have thought that they would have known better, but by no stretch of the imagination can the evidence coming forth lead us to believe that we can resolve this by simply coming down on a half dozen, a dozen of these young men and women. It goes much further up the chain of command, all the way to the top. When we look at what orders have been issued, side-stepping the Geneva Convention, detention, it is a failure of responsibility at the top. We ought to hold them accountable.

There is also the focus on the people who are, to a greater extent than ever before in wartime in the United States, dealing with unaccountable, unelected, no-bid contracts and contractors who are doing things that should be the

purview of the United States military, and had they been done, they would have been done far, far better.

We can shift much of this activity overseas to the locals, but it is insanity when we are paying \$10-, \$12,000 a month for contractors to drive a truck when we have Iraqis, for instance, unemployed, who would take that job for a couple hundred dollars a month and put that right back into their families.

Last, but by no means least, it is important that we not forget about Afghanistan, and I appreciate my colleague focusing our attention on that this evening. Here is a country from which the attack on the United States on 9/11 was launched. Here is a country that has been abused and damaged for over a quarter century. It is larger than Iraq. It is poorer than Iraq. It has a larger population than Iraq. Our friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) just pointed out how narco-terrorism is building and some of those resources are being used against us in the war on terror, and yet we are investing less than one-tenth of the amount of money in Afghanistan as we are in Iraq, and we have a much tinier military footprint, about one-ninth.

I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri's (Mr. SKELTON) leadership, his attention and the calm and quiet, thoughtful way he has analyzed this issue in a way that I think ought to touch the mind and heart of every Member of this chamber. I look forward to working with him in the weeks and months ahead to try and recover our momentum, our balance, and place our priorities where they belong and do right by the American people, the Iraqis, Afghanistan, and win this struggle against terror.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from the State of Oregon.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this issue before the House tonight. This is an issue that I spoke about this morning, and it seemed strange to me, as I was coming in here about to ask him for some time, to realize that his thinking and the thinking of the people who have been speaking are very much where my mind was.

I think it is probably where the American people actually are because, in my view, it is past time for America to have a national terrorism policy. The line between countries we call friend and foe is blurred. The distinction between peril and safety is just as vague here at home. America has too much at stake not to consider a national terrorism policy as a work in progress.

Civil liberties hang in the balance at home. Credibility is questioned in countries around the world. Military personnel are fighting and dying in one country today, but what about tomorrow? America is spending in excess of

\$150 billion in a country that has more to do with errors in judgment than threats of terrorism against the United States.

The patchwork of actions and reactions about terrorism are long on rhetoric but stop well short of defining potential threats and responses or a philosophy to guide America. Questions need to be asked and answered, and that is why what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is doing tonight is so important.

The acting director of the CIA admits that a good case can be made for a new Cabinet-level Secretary to oversee all of the Nation's intelligence agencies, but the director thinks some changes in the CIA could accomplish just as much.

Now, in Washington, D.C., turf issues are big issues. Are the remarks by the acting director turf or analysis? When it comes to terrorism, the old ways of Washington, turf among them, must change.

The President took America to war in Iraq over alleged ties to terrorism, now proven incorrect. We learned just today that eight of the 9/11 hijackers passed back and forth through Iran before the attacks. We learned the Iranian government instructed border guards to let all al Qaeda pass. The CIA says there is no evidence of an official connection, but there is tacit approval, at a minimum. The same could have been said before Iraq, but that did not stop the President from going to war.

What does this new information mean about Iran? The President says he launched a preemptive war in Iraq. Well, will the President launch a post-emptive war against Iran? Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction. Iran is openly developing a nuclear capacity, claimed peaceful at this point, but outside the scope of objective knowledge and data. Is Iran next for U.S. military action? Why? Why not?

Given Iraq, would Congress write this President another blank check for anywhere else in the world? What about North Korea? There is a regime that is as oppressive as Saddam's. There is a country that bought weapons technology from our old friend or our new friend and our old nemesis Libya. There is a country where weapons are almost certainly not theoretical. Are we going into North Korea anytime soon? We are pulling our troops back in South Korea from the border. We are thinking about moving some of them to Iraq. What does that mean?

Today, Libya must be in line for, and I am not kidding about it, a football game. Mr. Qaddafi may have isolated himself economically for years, but he could still watch television. So, today, Qaddafi is trying to buy a British sports club, hoping that the English version of football will thaw the icy relations.

Then there is Pakistan. They were not at the top of our list until we needed a friendly Nation in the Middle East after the September 11 attacks. Now,

Pakistan is a key ally. We have made them a non-European NATO ally. Is that good for Pakistan and the United States? If so, why? Is it a good thing for relationships between India and Pakistan and the United States? If it is, does this mean that the world is so interconnected that the notion of friend or enemy no longer applies?

After all, we remember the television networks have shown pictures of Defense Secretary Rumsfeld bringing greetings to Saddam Hussein, not that many years ago, in the administration of Bush I. He was a bad guy then, but Mr. Bush liked him, and I guess that was good enough for those days.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago he became a bad guy. We did not like him any more, and we all know what happened then. What is the distinction between Saddam Hussein in Bush I and in Bush II? He just gassed people in his own country in Bush I. America needs a better definition of policy than just expediency. American policy today is grounded in reaction, not philosophy.

There has been enough time since the tragedy of 9/11 for the President to articulate a terrorism policy for the Nation to debate, adopt and defend. All of us gave him some slack right after 9/11. Who would not want our President to have the power to deal with what he needed to deal with at the moment, but that is a long time ago.

We see nothing. We do not have a policy, and the headlines can prove it. We have a military stretched so thin that the President launched an undeclared draft to compel soldiers to return to active military duty. If officers did not resign their commission, the service can reach back 20 years to bring them in.

The New England Journal of Medicine just carried a study that 1 out of 5 people coming home is subject to psychological problems, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and other problems. We are suffering casualties. If we think out of 160,000 people, 1 out of 5 coming home, that is 30,000 people, never mind all of the people who have lost an arm or leg. Now we have psychological problems coming home as well.

Does America need a draft? The administration says no, or not until at least after the election. They say this "no" just after they have issued stop-loss orders to prevent soldiers from leaving active duty in Iraq. We have an indefinite military commitment in Iraq. But why, if we supposedly handed the country over to the Iraqis?

America lives in perpetual terrorism-alert status. Is there nothing to be gained other than a CYA for this policy? Who decided that we should be told to be very worried just after America was told not to worry any more that we were already worried? They are moving the fear back and forth and keeping the American people on edge, and that summarizes the ad-

ministration's recent public statements on terror. It also symbolizes the lack of a coherent terrorism policy.

Today the administration basically says just trust us. Just trust us. America's response should be mine from the Reagan administration, "Just Say No." We did trust, and that is how we got into Iraq. The safety and security of America is everyone's business. It should be debated in this House before the People's Body. Every district, every person in this country is represented on this floor. It should not be decided by one man. I think the average American knows that and knows what the administration has given us so far is not a policy but wishful thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the President has 105 days to articulate the terror policy, what he is really trying to do. If he does not do that, we are going to have a new President.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me close by saying at the end of the day we all need to pay tribute to those wonderful, wonderful young men and young women in uniform, whether they come from Missouri, Washington, Ohio, New York, Florida, or all across our country. They are professionals. They know what their duty is, and we certainly wish to salute them this evening as well as the families that support them and wish well for them and of course pray for them.

9/11 WAS NOT PREDESTINED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for half the time before midnight, approximately 43 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) who has always had the respect of his colleagues. I know that the gentleman is very serious and sincere about the national security of the United States. I appreciate him trying to put forth some creative and positive alternatives to the current policies he may or may not agree with in terms of the war on terrorism.

There are positive opponents to the President and there are negative opponents to the President. There are people who offer alternatives, and there are people who do nothing but undermine the President's policy; but there are also those who have legitimate complaints and alternatives to offer, and I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for always trying to provide the alternative.

Let me note, after hearing our last colleague who spoke, Saddam Hussein had a blood grudge against the people of the United States of America. He

wanted to hurt us and would have hurt us had he been given a chance. It is a good thing that Saddam Hussein was removed from power. Those who nitpick our President and backbite him as we try to make this situation, turn the situation around in Iraq, would not return Saddam Hussein to power. That is not the question.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, let me note that we need to look at the terrorism angle which is what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) was suggesting for tonight. I have a speech to talk about what happened on 9/11, the terrorist attack, and I give this speech leading up to some time this week when the terrorism task force will report to the American people on what happened on 9/11.

The most important thing that the American people need to know when looking at 9/11, the 9/11 terrorist attack, was that it was not predestined. It was not unavoidable. Unfortunately, the commission investigating 9/11, and we will find this out when they issue their report, they seem to be uncomfortable with fixing responsibility, branding such attempts of fixing responsibility to individuals or to policy as the blame game or pointing fingers. So instead of looking for policies that were dead wrong or people who were incompetent, we have heard about glitches in the system or a lack of communication or a lack of a shared database. Expect the recommendations of the task force to be consistent with this thinking. We will hear about changes in flow charts, organizational restructuring and the creation of a new central authority, an intelligence czar. If there has ever been a cliché, let us create a czar and give him all of the power, and that will solve the problems.

No, I am sorry, 9/11 represents a dramatic failure of policy and people. A number of insane policies led to the creation of a hostile, radical Islamic movement, the one that we face today, and we had policies in place that enabled this weird, feudalistic religion, religious zealots of radical Islam to become a major threat to the western world, and especially to the people of the United States.

Yes, the origins of this frightening reality go back aways. In the 1980s, high-level officials in the Reagan administration, and this is probably where it started, agreed to the demand of Pakistani President Zia Al-Haq that his government oversee, read that control, America's support for those Afghans who were fighting against the Soviet troops occupying their country. Much of the lethal inventory that we sent to the Afghan freedom fighters ended up in the hands of Pakistan's favorite Muslim fanatics, like Rasool Sayyaf or Gulbuddin Hekmatyar. Hekmatyar was a fiend, for example, who in his college days threw acid in the face of young women who refused to cover themselves with a burqa. That is who ended up with the lion's share of our aid to the Afghan freedom fighters.

During the war with the Soviet occupation, I hiked into Afghanistan with a small mujahadin infantry unit. On our way to the siege of Jalalabad, which was the last major battle in that war with Soviet troops, we came across an encampment of Saudi volunteers. In stark contrast to the spartan living conditions of the Afghan fighters who I was with, this camp site was complete with large safari-style tents, cots, and even SUVs. I was told not to speak English because the Saudi crazy man who led this bunch would rather kill Americans than Soviet troops. His name was Osama bin Laden.

So by the end of the 1980s, the presence of dangerous wackoes in Afghanistan was well known. I can assure Members that complaints were made at the highest levels about American support ending up in the hands of these fanatics. I personally made such protests while working in the Reagan White House, yet the policy continued, probably because those representing us on the scene, meaning in Pakistan and Afghanistan, did not complain. In fact, everything indicates that the American so-called professionals on the scene supported the let-Pakistan-decide policy.

Milton Bearden, senior CIA officer overseeing America's support for the Afghanistan insurgency, has suggested that his job was beating the Soviet Army and he should not have been expected to keep our weapons out of the hands of those who might pose a long-term threat to us, to the United States. Nonsense.

Had he raised the issue, coupled with the complaints like the ones I was making to the National Security Council, as well as other people who I know who were making these complaints, this policy would have been reviewed and it would have been reversed. But Milt did not want to rock the boat. He did not want to upset the Pakistanis, so our weapons continued to be delivered into the hands of people who hated us. So put this man, Milton Bearden, CIA station chief, on the list of people who helped bring about 9/11.

Also put unnamed high-level Reagan officials, perhaps even CIA Director Bill Casey, who I have a great deal of respect for, this might have been one of the mistakes he made. We all make mistakes. But in the end, we made a deal to give Pakistan the dominant role in this operation. To be fair, there was no indication at that time that these medieval mullahs would ever pose a threat to the United States, but we should have supported people who were more pro-western and more enlightened. They were available, but we would have had to make Pakistan mad at us for us to we have delivered weapons to them directly. Nevertheless, we could have helped these others and it would have been a better world and better path for us to be on in the long and short run had we done that, and had the CIA and Milton Bearden insisted this was the best way to go and the moral way to go.

Contrary to leftist cliché, and this is what is important, contrary to leftist cliché, the roots of the current terrorist crisis lie not in our support for the Afghan people in their gallant fight against the Soviet occupation, but instead on America's willingness to let Pakistan distribute war supplies and our unconscionable decision after the retreat of the Soviet Army to walk away ourselves and leave the poor and wounded Afghans to live in the rubble and suffer their misery.

To fix responsibility on that decision, look at the list of senior foreign service officers at our embassy in Islamabad, Pakistan, in the 1980s and 1990s. Up to this day, there are high-level State Department officials and career foreign service officers who still toe the Pakistani line, who still seem unable to call Pakistan to task for its transgressions, its sins of omission and commission. These State Department pros, always trying to prevent a crisis on their watch, always trying to avoid a decision that will mandate a confrontation, these people gave us 9/11. Put them on the list.

Furthermore, it was a policy decision to walk away and abandon our devoted Afghan allies even after psychopathic killers like Gulbadeen rose up as the Soviets departed. President George Bush, father of our current President, has to accept the lion's share of the blame for this cowardly, arrogant and selfish policy. There would be no Marshall Plan for Afghanistan or anything else like that because like during the war itself, we left postwar construction and assistance basically up to the Saudis and up to the Pakistanis which was another indefensible policy decision.

□ 2245

As we went into an era in the 1990s of prosperity, the Afghans were stuck in misery and they could not even take care of their wounded, the people who had lost limbs during the war. They could not even clear away the land mines.

So what happened when we left it up to the Saudis and Pakistanis to take care of the situation? Predictably, they had their own agenda, which included the creation of a radical Islamic state in Afghanistan. They were not upset about violent extremists like Hekmatyar and Sayyaf being so well armed. The Saudis and the Pakistanis supported these violent extremists. They were the ones who armed the violent extremists and did so in many cases with our own weapons. Predictably, what followed when the Soviets left and we walked away was a period of havoc and bloodshed. Hekmatyar Gulbadeen peppered Kabul with American rockets that were stockpiled during the Soviet occupation. Thank you, Mr. Bearden.

There was a way out of this bloody mess. Afghanistan's benevolent old king, King Zahir Shah, was exiled in Rome and he was ready and willing to

return to Afghanistan to offer a moderate leadership to that country. He is now and was at that time the most beloved man in Afghanistan. He is a pro-western force for stability and decency in that country. But instead of supporting King Zahir Shah, our State Department opted for the creation of a third force. This new force was to be made up of religious fanatics educated in the Madrassas, the so-called schools in Pakistan that were financed and built by the Saudis. I pleaded with my own government and I pleaded with the Saudi intelligence chief, Prince Turki, to at least give the old king, Zahir Shah, a chance to lead an interim government and bring some stability there. "No way" was the answer. Again our State Department sided with the Saudis and Pakistanis, going with the radical Muslim fanatics rather than going with a pro-western alternative. We ended up, yes, with the Taliban. That is what we are talking about being created.

Make no mistake about it, the Taliban's ascent to power as well as their ability to stay in power was a Clinton administration policy decision promoted by the know-it-alls at the State Department. Again, put on the list of those whom to blame for 9/11 those people in the State Department that supported and advocated this policy. The policy of the State Department again and the Clinton administration in collusion with the Saudis and the Pakistanis was to create and support the Taliban control of Afghanistan. They obviously did not learn a thing from the horror that they created by backing Islamic fanatics like Hekmatyar.

Two specific diplomats to put on the 9/11 blame or shame list are Ambassador Robert Oakley who was on the scene as U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan when following Pakistani lead became U.S. policy. Another diplomat, John Holtzman, was the deputy chief of mission at our embassy in Pakistan during the 1990s. He discouraged and undercut efforts to those who were offering an alternative to the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Of course our government's support for the Taliban was never publicly acknowledged. It is too diplomatic for that. We do not mention that but that was the policy and it was never publicly acknowledged but for those of us who were engaged in that region. Let me say there were darn few of us who were engaged in that region after the Soviets had left. We knew it was clear that the United States was supporting the Taliban, but what is even more poignant, most Afghans believed that the Taliban were created by the United States of America and that they had our support. Why should they not believe that that was our policy? America's aid, for the most part, was channeled, and I say this, channeled disproportionately through the Taliban-controlled areas. I remember trying to clear the way for the shipping of pri-

vate humanitarian relief to a non-Taliban area in the northern part of Afghanistan only to be blocked by Assistant Secretary of State for Southern Asian Affairs Rick Inderfurth. If there was any doubt about my suspicions about U.S. policy, it was confirmed in 1997 when high-level executives from the Clinton administration saved the Taliban from total defeat and extinction. Here is what happened. In April of 1997, the Taliban launched a major offensive aimed at taking control over the northern third of Afghanistan which up until that point had remained a free zone under the control of regional leaders. Those regional leaders are commonly referred to as warlords. One of those regional leaders, General Malik, tricked the Taliban and managed to capture almost all of their front line troops along with most of their heavy weaponry. It was an utter disaster for the Taliban. The road to the capital, Kabul, was wide open. The Taliban were totally vulnerable and could easily have been wiped out. I sent a message to Commander Masoud and others that Kabul should be liberated and the king of Afghanistan, Zhir Shah, this moderate force I have been talking about, should be brought back to oversee a transition government which hopefully would evolve into a democratically elected government perhaps like we saw in Spain where the monarchy was brought back and they evolved into a democracy. But before the anti-Taliban forces could strike, before the anti-Taliban forces could take advantage of this incredible opportunity to get rid of the Taliban, Assistant Secretary of State Rick Inderfurth and American and United States Ambassador Bill Richardson flew to northern Afghanistan and convinced these anti-Taliban leaders that this was not the time for an offensive. Instead, they insisted, this was the time for a cease-fire and an arms embargo. This was clearly a statement of U.S. policy that two top foreign policy leaders in the Clinton administration for that region flew to northern Afghanistan to convince the anti-Taliban forces not to take advantage of their one opportunity to soundly defeat and thus eliminate this enemy.

Let us remember, by this time it was clear that the Taliban were Islamic Nazis. I had fought the Taliban for years trying to present the king as an alternative. When they took over Kabul, I remember even my comment was, "Well, let's wait and see. Let's give them the benefit of the doubt." I was very skeptical, even for just a matter of 2 weeks, but within 2 weeks there was no doubt what these people were about: Making women stay inside their homes. They could not get adequate medical treatment, much less have jobs. Repression of any type. Listening to music much less expressing some type of opposition to their government. No, these were fascist Islamicists. Instead of letting them be defeated, the Clinton administration, Mr. Inderfurth

and Mr. Richardson, went there and saved the Taliban and they convinced them not to take advantage of this one opportunity they had.

So let me underscore this again. We knew by that time that the Taliban were evil. Yet we helped save them because we had made a deal with Pakistan and with Saudi Arabia to create the Taliban and to keep them in power. Just to note, right after the cease-fire and the release of prisoners that were brokered by these high-level Clinton administration officials, the Pakistanis began a Berlin-like airlift to resupply and re-equip the Taliban which was obviously financed with Saudi money. If I knew of this massive resupply effort, certainly the Clinton administration officials who set up this disastrous scenario also knew. Why were the anti-Taliban leaders not notified of this situation? Why did we continue to enforce an arms embargo which only affected the anti-Taliban forces even as the Taliban were being rearmed and resupplied by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia? The answer is, it was U.S. policy to keep the Taliban in power during the Clinton administration. So add the Clinton appointees, Assistant Secretary of State Rick Inderfurth and U.S. Ambassador Bill Richardson on the 9/11 blame list, but, to be fair, they were obviously carrying out policies that were made elsewhere and higher up. How much higher up? All the way up to the very top of the Clinton administration.

Last year, the current Foreign Minister of Pakistan visited California. Furious by my repeated accusations that Pakistan was responsible for the Taliban, he blurted out at a well-attended event that from day one, America was part of the deal that created the Taliban. I had been trying to prove that the Clinton administration was covertly supporting the Taliban and now at last I had a confirmation. As a member of the Committee on International Relations, it had been my responsibility to oversee this policy. During the last 2 years of the Clinton administration, I made numerous requests, with the support of the committee chairman, Ben Gilman, for Taliban-related documents so I could prove what our policy was and what we were doing behind the scenes in terms of the Taliban in Afghanistan. I asked for these documents. I asked for cables, talking points, meeting notes. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright made a commitment to me and to the chairman of the committee in an open congressional hearing to provide my office and Chairman Gilman all related documents. We were stonewalled. That is it. The elected officials got stonewalled by the permanent government, by the pros who made the policy in the first place, the people who they sent over to take over the policy in Islamabad and oversaw this, protecting themselves but also protecting the secret agreement with Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. So instead of sending the

dossiers, the documents about the Taliban, they sent to us, the people who were elected to oversee that policy, meaningless documents that included innocuous news clippings. This is about as arrogant as it gets, unelected State Department careerists dismissing the requests of elected officials for security-related information.

One wonders if the current independent commission examining 9/11 has asked to see these documents. We will have to see if the commission investigating 9/11 goes into why the Taliban was in power in the first place. This is a vital piece of information. If the Taliban would not have been in power, these radical Islamicists would not have provided bin Laden and the terrorists with the base of operations which led to 9/11. In some ways, it is hard to characterize the Clinton administration's support of the Taliban as covert. The stench was hard to miss. Covert or overt, it was disgraceful and led to 9/11 by creating a safe base of operations for bin Laden and a training base and staging area for al Qaeda.

Bin Laden is from an enormously wealthy Saudi family. While our petrodollars flowed into Saudi Arabia by the hundreds or tens of millions, the Saudi establishment not only turned a blind eye but also attempted to buy off this violent anti-western Islamic fringe in their own country. Billions of our dollars, our petrodollars, came back to bite us in a big way. It obviously continues to this very day. The first gulf war in 1990 and 1991 did nothing but expand bin Laden's hatred for the United States. In terms of our presence in Saudi Arabia, he has piously proclaimed that it is an insult to his faith. Get that. An insult to his faith. This is a mass slaughterer of unarmed people and, of course, slaughtering these unarmed people and these noncombatants as we saw on 9/11 and others who he has slaughtered is perfectly consistent with his faith, but he is insulted by America being in the Middle East. Perhaps we should quit taking seriously all of this self-righteousness from radical Islamicists because in reality what we are talking about are psychopathic killers. And whatever religion they would be part of, whether it is Christianity or Hindus or Israelis or Americans, whoever we are talking about, there are psychopathic killers in every society, only what we have got here is in the name of the Muslim faith, these people have managed to wrestle leverage which gives them enormous power to attack us and to kill our people.

In the mid 1990s, bin Laden and his cohorts began to set up his terrorist underground army for the war that he intended to wage on America. In the mid 1990s, he operated not out of Afghanistan but out of Sudan. America's official position was that bin Laden was a terrorist on our most wanted list. In fact, CIA director George Tenet declared him the CIA's number one target. Inexplicably while designated as such this self-aggrandizing monster or-

ganized, financed and implemented attacks that caused tens of millions of dollars of damage and the deaths of thousands of innocent people, not just in the United States on 9/11 but in a worldwide campaign over a 2-year period.

□ 2300

Yet the same CIA that declared bin Laden as their number one target, with all the power, the money, the technology, and other assets available to our CIA, they could not thwart 9/11 nor did they even warn us about 9/11. Remember, 9/11 was a major operation planned and carried out by the CIA's number one target and hundreds of others, many of whom were also on that most-wanted list.

If this is not incompetence on the part of our intelligence establishment, then what is? Furthermore, there were mind-boggling missed opportunities to get bin Laden before 9/11. Either intentionally or as a matter of policy or through incompetence, bin Laden was never stopped, even though there were numerous opportunities to stop him permanently.

The government of Sudan paid close attention to bin Laden when he operated in that country. I am told they catalogued all the people to whom he spoke on the phone and in person. The former Ambassador for Sudan in the United States, Mr. Mahdi Ibrahim Mohamed, told me personally that he offered our government this terrorist catalogue, which was a silver bullet for the total destruction of bin Laden's terrorist network.

Vanity Fair reports that the Sudanese government's offer was abruptly turned down by none other than Secretary of State Madeleine Albright herself. Reportedly she instructed that no one look at the material or copy the material offered by Sudan. So in bold print add to the list of those responsible to 9/11 Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

I should note that former President Clinton is denying that he turned down such an offer from the Sudan, and it is not unreasonable to assume that the wording of his denial has been crafted in such a way that we really do not know what is, is.

And while we are at it, we can add Richard Clarke to the list. Let us take a look at Richard Clarke, who got much attention a few months back by criticizing President George W. Bush before the investigating 9/11 panel. Clarke was a senior government policy official. And while all of that that I am describing took place, Richard Clarke was there in high-level positions of authority. He either approved of what was going on in all these things, especially that were happening during the Clinton administration; he either approved of the policy of the Taliban, he approved of not following up on these leads to get bin Laden, or he did nothing. Either way, he is certainly high on the 9/11 blame list, and he has no credi-

bility in criticizing our President, who, as we now know, when he was sworn in as President of the United States, the 9/11 plot to attack the United States was well on the way, that it had been planned long before George Bush was even elected. It was planned and started and put into place during the time when Richard Clarke was a senior guy at the White House and could have done something about it and instead did nothing.

From the first attack to the World Trade Center in 1993, to the bombing of the U.S. military barracks in Saudi Arabia, to the attack on the USS Cole, and the destruction of our embassies in Africa, the response from the last administration was so tepid and so weak that the perpetrators thought Americans were cowards. That was why they went ahead with 9/11, which was aimed at killing not just 3,000 Americans but tens of thousands of Americans that they thought they were going to kill in those towers. This we have learned from those we have captured since 9/11. It was the weakness of the 1990s that led to the war that we are in today. It was the weakness during the Clinton administration years and the weak response and limp-wrist response that we gave to the terrorists that encouraged them to move forward with a monstrous attack on 9/11.

By the way, after one attack it is reported that Richard Clarke was the White House official who insisted that retaliation be taken against guess what target they chose after an attack where our people died? The target was a pharmaceutical factory in the Sudan, which had nothing to do with terrorism. This was while our government was still helping the Taliban stay in power. So we attacked a pharmaceutical company in Sudan. Something stinks about this situation, and some day we are going to get to the bottom of it and we will learn what forces were at play and what the positions of our government and those people really were.

Then an even more personal incident happened about bin Laden. In April and May of 1999, America, our country, had an incredible opportunity to be capture bin Laden. And, yes, I was personally involved in this one. It is, unfortunately, another example of incompetence by those we trust to protect us from attacks like the one that occurred on 9/11. In April of 1999, a friend of mine, a long-time friend, who was deeply involved in the Afghan fight against Soviet occupation, contacted me. My friend, an American, had an impeccable record, had credentials, and he was widely known and admired among the Afghan people. My friend called to tip me off that bin Laden was out of Afghanistan and could be easily captured. I told him I would pass on his phone number and his name to the CIA, and I did so the very next day. There I passed on my friend's name and phone number and explained that they had to get to him right away because he could

give them bin Laden on a platter and that he had great credentials, so he was believable.

A week passed, and my friend was not called by the CIA. So I went back to the CIA, and this time they were adamant that they would contact my friend because they insisted they wanted to get bin Laden.

As time passed, guess what. They did not call my friend again. So I went to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), who is the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and let me note that I have deep respect for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and hope that he becomes the next Director of the CIA because he is a man who knows that agency and a man who is committed to the security of our country and whom I trust explicitly.

When the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) heard my story, he immediately went into action and arranged a meeting for the next day. At that time I met with not just the CIA but with representatives from NSA, National Security Agency, and the FBI. They were the "bin Laden Task Force." I told them what had happened. They apologized for those dunderheads at the CIA, they will never get it right, and they promised they would get on it. Another week passed, and my friend still was not contacted.

So here we had bin Laden vulnerable for weeks, and our intelligence establishment did nothing. I mentioned it to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). He was appalled. The very next day, and I am sure it had something to do with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a representative from an intelligence agency called my friend, but the caller's tone of voice suggested that the call was obligatory and he really was not interested but he made the call, but it would not make any difference anyway because by then the trail was too cold to follow.

This was very strange and very disheartening. We had passed up a chance again to get the America's most-wanted terrorist, and there was no explanation. Either incompetence or by design, I do not know. Clearly, however, there was something dreadfully wrong at the CIA or with American policy.

Over at the FBI, it was just as bad, if not worse. It is widely known now that 2 months before the September 11 attacks, Phoenix FBI agent Kenneth Williams sent a memo to FBI headquarters in Washington and New York warning that bin Laden's disciples might be training at U.S. flight schools, and he asked for a review of documents and a review of the situation to determine if bin Laden's people were being trained in other parts of the country. The Williams memo was ignored by David Frasca, the Supervisory Special Agent in Washington, D.C.

One month before 9/11, Minnesota FBI agent Colleen Rowley asked FBI headquarters to issue a warrant allowing agents to search would-be terrorist

Zacarias Moussaoui's computer. They determined that he might have links to the terrorists, and when this FBI agent asked that his computer be searched, the FBI headquarters ignored her warnings and ignored her. So agent Rowley basically notified the CIA about the Moussaoui case, and the FBI, when they learned that she had told the CIA to watch out for this guy, reprimanded her.

□ 2310

There is something terribly wrong in a culture at the FBI if when they get admonished for telling the CIA, and they will not investigate themselves, and then admonish the person for contacting the CIA.

Clinton appointee Louis Freeh headed the Bureau for almost 8 years. The new director, Robert Mueller, took over just 7 days before 9/11. The Bureau obviously needed a major overhaul, and this became painfully evident shortly after the World Trade Center crashed to the ground and shocked the Nation.

The troubles at the FBI were not just organizational, but there was a mindset there, and that was a problem, but there were also mandates and restrictions that were put on the Bureau during this time period.

Let me note that we had all sorts of political restrictions put on the FBI, especially during the 1990s. The one case in point, Jamie Gorelick, who now passes judgment on the Bush administration as part of the 9/11 investigation, she is part of that committee. In the 1990s, she was in the Clinton administration. She ran our domestic terrorist law enforcement and intelligence operations, and she wrote a memo while a Clinton lawyer forbidding any cooperation between intelligence organizations and law enforcement agencies.

So right here on the 9/11 investigating panel is an example of why we suffered 9/11. The presence of Jamie Gorelick on the investigating panel represents a massive conflict of interest, and this was well-known and has been well-known. She should have been removed a long time ago. The panel thus is demonstrating the same inflexibility and aversion to correct action as it is investigating.

The Gorelick directives reflected a mindset in the last administration, a mindset that was reflected even by high-level career intelligence officials.

The Defense Intelligence Agency, for example, is supposed to provide the Pentagon with detailed information necessary for it to deal with any potential threat. With all that is spent by the DIA, the Pentagon, like the rest of the government, let us just note, the Pentagon was caught off guard and unprepared for 9/11, just like the rest, even though we spent enormous amounts on the DIA.

The Pentagon's lack of information and analysis almost had disastrous results beyond 9/11. A counterattack strategy almost implemented would

have sent American military forces into Afghanistan from the south, where the goal was occupying a few major cities like Jalalabad and Kabul, leaving the Taliban in charge of the countryside. We would then negotiate with the Taliban and offer to withdraw our forces if they turned over bin Laden.

The Taliban would have been left in power. That is insane, but that was what the policy was. The plan was to come in through the south and to have our troops supplied out of bases in northwestern frontier areas in Pakistan, an area that we now know as being an anti-American stronghold.

An alternative plan, based cooperation with the battle-tested troops of the Northern Alliance took time to develop, because the Pentagon didn't know who the players were, much less what the anti-Taliban forces in the north could do. My staff, my personal staff, ended up providing the Pentagon with the names and satellite cell phone numbers of those significant Afghan leaders who opposed the Taliban who could help drive them out of Afghanistan.

That the Pentagon was unprepared was no surprise to me. In early 1999, a DIA analyst came to me for help. She was in the process of being fired, and her story tells us volumes about why 9/11 caught America off guard and ill-prepared.

Julie Sirrs was one of a small number of Afghan analysts at the DIA. She took her job seriously, as she should have. She, in fact, went to Afghanistan, but was only permitted in those areas controlled by the Taliban.

Upon returning, she realized that her one-dimensional view of Afghanistan left gaping holes in the Department of Defense's understanding of the situation. She requested to go to Northern Afghanistan, especially to that area controlled by anti-Taliban Commander Masoud. She was denied permission to go.

Realizing the danger posed by her lack of information, Julie Sirrs took the initiative. She paid her own way, organized her own trip to the Panjshir Valley in Northern Afghanistan, which is the bastion of Commander Masoud, and he was the last Afghan holdout against the Taliban.

Well, I met with Masoud in one of his mountain strongholds 2 years before and had dinner with him and discussed strategy. That was risky. What Julie Sirrs did was even riskier for her. What she did was heroic.

When she got to the Panjshir Valley, she found out her assumptions were right. Something vital to America's security was happening, something she was not allowed to discover when she visited the Taliban-controlled areas.

Commander Masoud told her he was facing a new enemy in Afghanistan. Masoud's militia was finding itself in fire fights with some kind of fundamentalist foreign legion. Apparently, bin Laden was making Afghanistan his base of operations and importing Islamic radicals from around the world,

training them as terrorist killers and then setting them against Masoud's troops for combat experience.

Masoud offered to let Julie and other Americans interrogate these foreign prisoners, many of whom he had captured.

This was an intelligence bonanza. Julie Sirrs was uncovering the creation, the organization and the training of bin Laden terrorist army, al Qaeda. She only had a short time. She collected enough information for a preliminary report and then she headed home.

The minute she got back, she was ordered not to distribute her report and limit her briefings within her own agency. The commanding officer of DIA labeled her as insubordinate, fired her, and when she fought her dismissal, he set out to destroy her.

Amidst the fight to save her job, the DIA Director complained that he was upset with Julie because she had made contact with Masoud, who, according to the DIA, was a bad guy. This general was sending his people to be briefed by the Taliban, but refused them any contact with Masoud or he would dismiss them.

Something is terribly wrong with this picture. The vitriol in the attack against Sirrs were shockingly false. Patently false charges were brought against her to overwhelm her defenses and to intimidate her and force her to go quietly.

She was charged, for example, with lying, even though the agency lie detector test proved she was telling the truth. She was charged with misusing equipment, having borrowed an office camera to take pictures of Afghanistan. She returned the camera when she got back, and she had taken valuable pictures of Northern Afghanistan.

The attacks on this sincere and responsible intelligence analyst were arrogant, nasty, malevolent and loathsome. The brutal treatment of Sirrs sent a negative message to anyone at that time in the DIA who had idea of taking the initiative or thinking creatively.

Let me just note that Julie Sirrs was fired. She was fired by a general who was in charge of the DIA, who I had come to my office. That general, General Hughes, is now, unfortunately, a high level official in our Department of Homeland Security in charge of analysis.

There are many things that we need to do, where we need to hold people accountable. General Hughes was wrong and put our country in jeopardy. These other individuals that I have mentioned tonight, their decisions were wrong, the policies were wrong. We must hold them accountable.

We are looking forward to the report by the 9/11 Commission that will be up this week to see if they name names, hold people accountable, hold policy accountable, and we will be having a further talk on this issue later on.

Julie came to me because she had no one else to whom she could turn. I was the one

elected official with experience in Afghanistan. I requested a meeting with the General and right off the bat he insisted Sirrs was insubordinate. I told him that from my view she was a hero, risking her job, and her life, spending her own money, all this to get information she believed necessary for our country to be prepared if something happened in Afghanistan.

After hearing each other out, I recommended to the General that we compromise. If he just gave her back her job she'd end up neither hero nor scofflaw. I'd back off and he could use political pressure from me as an excuse for reinstating her.

After the General left my office he not only reaffirmed the firing of Julie Sirrs, but later stripped her of her security clearance as well, thus eliminating her ability to earn a living as an intelligence analyst. He demonstrated how he could destroy anyone who would deviate from his program or defy his directives. "Insubordination" was the ultimate challenge to his authority, and reaffirming his authority, was more important than the security of the United States of America.

A few months later the General retired and all this would have been a regrettable but forgotten incident, except for the resultant 9/11 tragedy. Except for how terribly unprepared the Pentagon was for a war in Afghanistan.

It is my sad duty to report to my colleagues that the General to whom I'm referring is Lt. General Patrick Hughes, who today is one of the top officials, as Assistant Secretary for Information Analysis at the Department of Homeland Security. I am certain that over his long and distinguished career he made many contributions, but his indefensible conduct in the Sirrs case cast serious doubt over his judgment. I have notified Secretary Ridge of this side of General Hughes' character and recommended that he should not hold the high level position in the Department of Homeland Security that he does.

When George W. Bush took office in January of 2001, the 9/11 terrorist operation, unbeknownst to anyone in our government, was already well underway. But the threat posed by the radical anti-western Islamic regime in Afghanistan was known, and policy towards it needed to go. Having worked in the Reagan White House I understood it took time for a new President to appoint staff, set policy and begin to take control of government. Nevertheless, during that brief interlude between Bush's inaugural and 9/11, I met the new National Security Council staff on three occasions, including one meeting with Condoleezza Rice, to discuss Afghanistan. There were, in fact, signs noted in an overview story in the Washington Post that some steps were being made to break away from the previous administration's Afghan policy.

One thing was certain to me at that time, George W. Bush, unlike his predecessor, would have an unmistakable response to bin Laden's terrorist attacks. As I stated earlier we know now that those who planned and financed the 9/11 attack did not believe the United States would act as forcefully and as unrelentingly as we have. This calculation was a result of the tepid American response to earlier al Qaeda attacks from Africa to New York City.

Here again, was an example of the rotten policy that led to 9/11. And yes, had we retaliated more aggressively when our Embassies were blown up in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998

the terrorists we have captured now tell us that it may have been given them second thoughts.

I took pride in those days as being one of the few Members of Congress who had maintained an interest in Afghanistan, which I saw as a potential major national security threat to our country.

Then, 2 days before 9/11, the news came that Commander Masoud had been murdered in Afghanistan. I felt as if I had lost a friend. As I mourned his loss I struggled to fully understand the significance of his death. Then it dawned on me why Masoud had been assassinated. America was going to be attacked and it would be so monstrous that bin Laden's gang in Afghanistan wanted to cut us off from the means of counterattacking. We would have turned to Masoud if we were attacked; now he was dead. Perhaps his death was a signal to set the planned attack in motion.

So on the 10th of September I tried to alert anyone and everyone who would listen to my warning of an imminent terrorist attack. A few people listened as a courtesy but for most their eyes simply glazed over as I tried to warn them. One of my colleagues, JIM GREENWOOD, stood behind me in an elevator and overheard me lamenting that something horrible was about to happen and that I couldn't get anyone to take my warnings seriously. It's like the Twilight Zone, I said. As I got off the elevator he lightheartedly patted me on the back and with a smile told me not to be so melodramatic and certainly not so apocryphal.

Undeterred, I called the White House and asked for an emergency appointment to see Condoleezza Rice in order to warn her of a major impending attack. Her office apologized that she was incredibly busy that day, but she respected my opinion and would see me at 3 p.m. the next day. The next day was 9/11. The plans began flying into the buildings at 8:48 a.m.

In the afternoon of that chaotic and fateful day, my colleague, Congressman GREENWOOD, approached me. I've been telling everyone how you tried to warn people of this. You knew it was about to happen? How did you know? We must ask, how is it that one Member of Congress, with the help of one staff member, was able to analyze the situation and determine that the terrorists based in Afghanistan were about to launch a major attack on us, when the CIA and others failed to do so. The question is not how did I know. It is why didn't the rest of the establishment know. Those whose job it is to protect us should be held accountable for 9/11, for not thwarting the attack or even warning us.

On 9/11 there was an incident that underscored that something was dreadfully wrong at the CIA. Shortly after the attack I called King Zahir Shah in Rome. He was now America's greatest asset in any action against the terrorist forces in Afghanistan. Masoud was dead, but the Afghan people would rally behind the King. If I could figure that out so could the Taliban, so I was shocked to find that the King had no protection. He was totally vulnerable. I told the King to stay put and went to work. I called the CIA and managed to speak directly to one of Tenet's top lieutenants. I explained the situation and he acknowledged the importance of the King, assuring me he would take care of it.

About 5 hours later, I happened to run into this gentleman. I will never forget his response

when I asked if the King was now being protected. "You don't expect us to act that fast do you?"

Just like at the FBI, there was something wrong with the mindset at the CIA. Yes, George Tenet must be placed on that 9/11 blame list; perhaps his name should be underlined.

It is time for those who made possible the rest of the Taliban; the rise of bin Laden and yes, the tragedy of 9/11 to be held personally accountable.

The list stretches over both Republican and Democratic administrations. Through the failures of the CIA under Reagan to the blunders of the State Department under Bush to the incompetence and disingenuous posturing of the diplomats under Clinton, accountability requires that their names be given.

Retired General Patrick Hughes, who as head of the DIA fired Julie Sirrs and who today holds a high position in the Department of Homeland Security.

Former Ambassador and now Governor Bill Richardson, who save the Taliban from military defeat.

Former senior CIA Officer Milt Bearden, who armed the most fanatic of the Afghan factions in this struggle against Soviet Occupation.

Former Assistant Secretary of State Rick Inderfurth, who weakened the anti-Taliban forces.

Former CIA Director George Tenet, whose culpability should have led him to resign long ago.

Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, who was the point person for the policy of covert support for the Taliban, and who derailed the opportunity to receive a detailed account of the entire al Qaeda terrorist network.

And finally, Richard Clarke, former senior Clinton official, who along with a few others was in a position to argue against if not to change the grotesquely mistaken policies of the 80s and 90s, but failed to do so.

If another 9/11 is to be avoided, we need accountability, not rearranging of bureaucratic organization charts. There was nothing wrong with our system that brought on 9/11, which will not be corrected by having different policies in place and different people in positions of authority.

Let us now, if nothing else, be honest with each other and insist on an honest accounting. Then let's beat our murderous enemy so completely that no one will ever miscalculate about our power and courage ever again.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor this evening in the continued responsibility of keeping a very close eye on this administration's policy in Iraq in the continued series of what we style the Iraq watch.

I will be joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) this evening, and hopefully the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND.)

We have been now coming once a week to the floor of the House because

we believe that the House has a duty not to sweep under the rug the accumulation of errors, misjudgments and deceptions that have been foisted on the American people by the Bush administration leading to the war in Iraq.

The reason we are here every week is that there is too much tendency to forget the sacrifices that are being made by our men and women in uniform in Iraq; to treat them as sort of background noise; to sort of say, well, the casualties are down to several a week, so we can just sort of forget about Iraq. That is wrong.

We have been here for months blowing the whistle on this administration's repeated failures in Iraq, and we will continue to do so, because this Nation owes it to our men and women in uniform to continue to be vigilant about what this administration is doing and not doing in Iraq.

□ 2320

Perhaps, even more importantly, we owe it to the cause of democracy itself not to allow it to go unnoted when a President of the United States starts a war based on deception of the American people. We are here to say there is perhaps no greater abuse of democracy, no more dangerous event in the great American democratic experiment, than for an American President to foist falsehoods on the American people to start a war, which we believe occurred in this case.

Now, I would like to start our discussion tonight by quickly setting the stage for the history of the Iraq war to date. Unfortunately, this administration has made not 1, not 2, but 10 serious mistakes, deceptions, errors of judgment, negligence, and carelessness that have led to the troubles that our people are facing in Iraq. I would like to run through those very quickly before I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

There are 10 major errors the Bush administration has made in Iraq. Error number 1: This administration told America in no uncertain terms, with no doubt, with no vagueness, with no ambiguity whatsoever, that it was required to start a war in Iraq because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. The President said, in a culmination of his multiple statements, and this must not be forgotten; on August 26, 2002, the President said, "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction." And there was not only no weapons of mass destruction, there was plenty of doubt. This President's statement was false, and this was falsehood number 1.

Error number 2: The President told us on repeated occasions, and his administration, that they had clear, convincing and cogent evidence that there was a working relationship between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda which led to the attack on September 11. They told us this over and over and over again, and now that the evidence has been made clear from the multiple

reports that have come in on a bipartisan basis, this President's statement that Saddam Hussein was associated with the attack on this country, this venal, evil attack on this country was false, and it led to a war. And there is no greater error, breach of democracy than an American President saying that when this was false. And it continues to this day. With all of this mountain of evidence showing the falsehood of this President's statement, the Vice President of the United States has the chutzpa, if one can stretch that word that far, to try to continue to foist this on the American people, and it is falsehood number 2.

Number 3: The American people were told repeatedly that we would be welcome as liberators in Iraq. We would be welcome with rose petals at our feet. We would be welcome with nothing but clear sailing because the people would see us as liberators. There is no question in the belief that Saddam Hussein was an evil tyrant, and there is no question he abused thousands of Iraqis. But this President made a massive misjudgment by listening to Mr. Chalabi, one of the great sycophants in failures of predictions in international history, and the President was suckered and the American people were suckered by this misstatement, and we have paid dearly with our treasure and our lives and the health of our service personnel in Iraq.

Falsehood number 4: This President ignored the clear, professional judgment of people who said we needed to have more boots on the ground to prevent anarchy in Iraq, but this President ignored that advice because he has wanted to fight this fight on the cheap from day 1, and we have suffered as a result. General Shinseki told him that we needed several hundred thousand people in Iraq to quell disturbance after the Iraq war, and he ignored it, and our people paid dearly for error and falsehood number 4.

Number 5: The President said we did not need the United Nations, we could go in there alone, as long as we had the Philippines and a couple of other small island nations. Well, the Philippines have now withdrawn. This President decided to go it alone in Iraq, and our people have suffered dearly. Falsehood number 5.

Falsehood number 6: The President said that by implication, everything would be aboveboard. There would not be any war profiteering in Iraq, people would not make millions of dollars worth of profits in Iraq. Now we see Halliburton, this company so intimately tied with this administration, reaping millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, wrongfully. The GAO has reported on it. This is a scandal, and Harry Truman rooted out world profiteering in World War II. We need to get to the bottom of this war profiteering by Halliburton and the like. Falsehood number 6.

Falsehood number 7, and error number 7: This President and this administration led us down one of the most

embarrassing breaches of American integrity, and that is the horrendous occasions of abuse at the Abu Ghraib prison, and it happened because people at the top of this administration gave a green light to stretching our well-accepted rules of following the Geneva Convention. The memos are now in and public information that multiple memos were sent saying that we did not have to give the protections of the Geneva Convention to people. This is something we do to protect our own troops so that they will be not abused if they are captive. This is a long held principle of America. But out of hubris, out of outright arrogance, this administration ignored those rules and we have suffered in the eyes of the world grievously. Make no mistake, 99.9 percent of our troops are doing a magnificent job, but this was error number 7.

Error number 8: This President sent American troops into battle without adequate armor. Even today, our troops are driving around thin-skinned Humvees that should have armor, and I believe our people have been injured with shrapnel grievously.

Error number 9, and this is one that is going to haunt us for a long time: The President started and continued a war with absolutely no plan whatsoever in how to pay for it. He has tried to hide the ball over and over again on the costs of this war to the American taxpayer, and he is still doing it. This year, this budget my colleagues in the majority party put out with \$25 billion, we know it is going to be \$60 billion next year. There is no question about this. Why did they hide this information from the American people? Do they think the American people will be so sleepy they will ignore the fact that another \$60 billion will go to Iraq instead of schools and health care in America? Do they think that will be forgotten? I do not think so. This deficit is now in the billions of dollars and it is growing rapidly because the President wants our children to pay for the Iraq war rather than us. And this is that continued attitude of trying to fight this war on the cheap. This President needs to be honest and forthright with the American people about the real costs of this war, which are grievous. Error number 9.

And error number 10: And this one rankles me greatly as a person who has read the casualty reports of what hot steel and shrapnel has done to our troops, sending our troops into combat without flak jackets, and it took us a year-and-a-half to get this administration to get flak jackets. Is that too much to ask of an administration for our troops? Error number 10.

Those are a quick summary of the errors that have been made in Iraq. Today we heard about some new ones. We found out that, in fact, it was Iran that was allowing 10 of the terrorists who injured us so terribly on September 11, they were passing through Iran, not Iraq. The President never leveled with us and told us that. It turns

out it was Iran that was trying to buy the Iranian yellow cake, not Iraq. It is not a good enough excuse that they are one letter apart. That is not a good enough excuse for this President.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Maybe it is the wrong enemy, maybe it is the wrong war.

But before I explore that, I thought I would just take a few minutes to amplify a bit on two of the points that the gentleman made. The cost of this war in terms of dollars and cents. I have this memory of the Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wolfowitz, testifying before a congressional committee saying that there would be no cost to the American taxpayers because Iraqi oil would obviously be more than sufficient to pay for the costs, not just of our military presence, our security presence, but the cost of reconstruction.

□ 2330

Well, that clearly was a mistake. In fact, I thought it was interesting that the criticism from the other side of the aisle, from Republicans, about the costs and the misestimates was probably even louder than that that came from this side, from Democrats.

I have a memory of reading a particular column that was penned by Senator DICK LUGAR, the prestigious Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where he described the postwar phase. Of course, I would suggest we are still at war. When one reads the casualty list, on a weekly basis it is clear that American troops are still being killed, and a large number of course are wounded. Many of us have visited them at Walter Reed and Bethesda Hospital here in Washington, DC, but going back to what Senator LUGAR said, he said the postwar planning was totally inadequate. And, again, where is that oil money?

And a further observation. If we remember the first Gulf War, the cost to the American taxpayers was approximately \$4 billion. We have already expended somewhere between \$150 and \$200 billion, and as you suggest, many hundreds of billions of dollars more will be added to the bill, the bill that will be passed on to the American taxpayers for generations.

In the first Gulf War, there was a real coalition, a genuine coalition of the willing. There was participation in terms of the military presence. There were more non-American troops in the first Gulf War than there were American troops. Other than those forces from Great Britain, as you indicated, there are only small detachments of security forces from other countries.

And as was noted in a story last Thursday in the Washington Post, four countries have already left, four more are due to leave by September, and others are now making known their intention to lying down a depart before the political transition is complete next year.

Norway pulled out its 455 military engineers this month. New Zealand intends to pull out its 60 engineers by September, while Thailand plans to withdraw its more than 450 troops that same month. The Netherlands is likely to pull out next spring after the first of three Iraqi elections, while Polish military officials told the Pentagon that Poland's large contingent will leave probably in less than a year. And as you indicated, the Filipinos withdrew already. The Spanish have withdrawn. We are going to end up there alone, Mr. Speaker, and the bill will be paid for by the American taxpayers.

Now, much was stated back five or six months ago about a donors' conference in Madrid, Mr. Speaker, where the coalition was brought together in an effort to have nations other than the United States contribute, contribute financially even if they had no military presence there.

Well, quoting the Los Angeles Times of July 12, "Little of the \$13 billion promised for rebuilding has been donated, and countries are hesitant to waive that, frustrating the new Iraqi government." Countries have provided only a small fraction of the reconstruction aid they promised at a conference nine months ago, Mr. Speaker. Of the \$13 billion in non-American aid pledged, less than \$1 billion has been turned over to the United Nations and the World Bank, funds set up to take in most of the donations.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INSLEE. I think it is important to realize what this President's unilateralism has done to the American taxpayer by putting it in context, vis-a-vis the first Iraq war, because the first President Bush did in fact work with the rest of the world community, and as a result, the rest of the world paid well over the majority. I think it was close to 80, 90 percent of the total cost of the first Iraq war. It was not borne by the American taxpayer.

But the cost of this second President Bush's go-it-alone strategy to the American taxpayer is enormous, because as of May the American taxpayers had spent \$174 billion. Now, to put that in perspective, we are going to pass the total inflation-adjusted cost of World War I sometime early next year in the cost of Iraq, which was \$199 billion. And, again, the insidious part about this is that the President, because he is unwilling to do what Winston Churchill did, which was to call for blood, toil, sweat and tears, this President just wants to put this war on the credit card, and every single dollar of the Iraq war is going to deficit spending.

We have a \$7 trillion debt. This President Bush's budget is out of balance \$368 billion a year, and he is adding every single dollar of this going straight on our national debt. And it is our children that are going to suffer as

a result of this. Why? Because the President is unwilling to really face the truth in Iraq. He was unwilling to face the truth about weapons of mass destruction. He was unwilling to face the truth about a purported connection with al Qaeda. He was unwilling to face the truth about how many troops we were going to need. He was unwilling to face the truth about the armor that we needed. He was unwilling to face the truth, you name it, about anything you can think of in Iraq. And this is a continuing sore on our fiscal house as well as the suffering that we have had.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. As was indicated, it is only going to get worse, because I would suggest that what we are going to find is as time moves on, there will be fewer and fewer even pledges that will be made, let alone honored. We now know they are not being honored, at least if you accept the report from the Los Angeles Times.

It is easy to go out and say, yeah, America, you come up with \$19 billion to build roads in Iraq, to provide universal health care coverage, to rehab schools and to build affordable housing. If you do that, American taxpayer, we will promise that we will pledge or we will pledge at least half of what you do, and now we find out that less than \$1 billion has actually been transferred to the appropriate agencies. In fact, half of that \$1 billion comes from a single nation, Japan.

But I would like to get on to something else for just a minute. The President is prone to be saying, particularly at campaign rallies, that America is safer than ever. It is safer than it was three years ago. In fact, he extends it to the entire world. He is saying that the world is safer than it was three years ago. And yet, ironically, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I think it was on Fox News, one of the magazine editions, there was an interview with the current, the so-called interim director of the Central Intelligence Agency, John McLaughlin.

□ 2340

And he said that while several al Qaeda plots against the United States, against our homeland have been foiled, the truth remains that the threat is as high as it ever was.

Now, there is an inconsistency here. All we have to do is count 14 to 15 days and there will be a new terror alert. How often do we turn on one of the cable news networks or turn on our TV and we see the Attorney General or we see Secretary Ridge talking about an elevated threat? In fact, Secretary Ridge was in my hometown of Boston, Massachusetts just recently talking about the threat. And here we have the new Director of the CIA contradicting the President of the United States who, and maybe he was simply indulging in campaign rhetoric, saying that we are much safer now and the world is safer.

And yet here, "U.S. Spy Chief: Al Qaeda Threat Strong As Ever."

Is this what we call winning the war on terror, Mr. Speaker. Is this making the world safer? I do not know that answer. I do not think the President really does either.

Mr. INSLEE. The fact of the matter is, and the sad fact is that this administration has taken its eye off the ball of the people who killed almost 3,000 Americans on September 11, al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden.

When is the last time you actually heard the President of the United States say the name Osama bin Laden? It is like he is the great forgotten person in this terrible tragedy that we suffered. I remember him and I think that our focus ought to remain on him.

Let me give an anecdote why it is not. We found out the other day in the Committee on Financial Services, the secret of stopping terrorists, you cut off their money. You cut off their money, you kill the beast, in part.

We found out that this administration has more people, more agents of the Treasury Department, this is the agency that is supposed to be in charge of lopping off the conduit of funds to al Qaeda, this administration has more agents chasing American tourists going to Cuba than it does chasing off money that goes to al Qaeda.

That is just one sort of sad indication that this administration has not focused on where the real threat has been which is al Qaeda which is still out there and which is still a meaningful threat.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me give another example in terms of seriousness. The administration's position, vis-a-vis tracking down the terrorists. There was a Committee on Ways and Means hearing where a representative of the IRS was posed a question and in response to the question indicated that the IRS's request for an additional 80 investigators who would be assigned to tracking terrorist financing throughout the world was rejected by the White House through the Office of Management and Budget. Is this how you fight the war against terror?

Mr. INSLEE. I bet they have got 80 bean counters that the American taxpayer are funding who work for Halliburton. This administration has no problem dishing out the dough for Halliburton and we cannot get 80 inspectors to track down Osama bin Laden. How is that for a sad commentary on taking your eye off the ball.

Now, I want to suggest how this has happened a little bit, how this emphasis has been misplaced. And it has because of this President's administration's focus on Iraq and their efforts to hoodwink the American people into believing that the real culprit or at least one of the culprits behind September 11 was Saddam Hussein. I want to spend just a moment talking about that because I think one of the single most serious affronts and dangers in a democratic system is for elected officials,

particularly in the powerful position of the President, to tell things to the American people which are false that end up starting a war.

We found out that last September a poll of American people said that 65 percent of American people believed that Saddam Hussein was behind the attacks on us on September 11, and Saddam Hussein has a list longer than my arm of his depredations against the Iraqi people. But 65 percent of the Americans had been convinced by someone that Iraq was behind the attack on September 11.

Now, who was that someone? Where did the American people get that idea which has turned out to be false and it is pretty clear where they got it. They got it from the President of the United States who was standing right there and tried to convince, and he did by and large, convince the American people of something that is false. The President did not let this slip on one iota. We all make mistakes and misspeak on occasion. This was a concerted, organized and consistent effort to fool the American people into believing that the culprit was Saddam Hussein behind September 11.

Look at some of his quotes. May 1, 2003, the President says, "The liberation of Iraq is a crucial advance in the campaign against terror. We have removed an ally of al Qaeda and cut off a source of terrorist funding." Vice President CHENEY, September 14, 2003, says, "If we are successful in Iraq, then we will have struck a major blow right at the heart of the base, if you will, the geographic base of the terrorists who had us under assault for the many years but most especially on September 11."

What do we find the truth is? Our intelligence people knew at that time but was shielded from the American people? The bipartisan committee under the chairmanship of a Republican Governor Keen concluded there was "no credible evidence of a link between al Qaeda and the attacks against the United States." No credible evidence. Not some credible evidence but not much. Not just a scintilla of credible evidence. Not a couple of ounces.

They said no credible evidence, but this President stood right there and started a war based on a falsehood, and he knew he was doing this to the American people and he is responsible for this. He is personally accountable for this and the American people need to hold him accountable for this depredation and affront to democracy as soon as they can.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Is not it ironic that on Sunday there appears a story in the New York Times about that report that will be forthcoming later this week, and the gentleman alluded to it earlier, when he mentioned Iran. And by the way, the acting director of the CIA confirmed the fact yesterday on the Fox News Program, yesterday morning that, yes, there was information that a number of the 9-11 hijackers had safe

passage through Iran, Iran, not Iraq but Iran. I guess we made a mistake as far as what country to invade.

But seriously, let me just read several excerpts from the Sunday editions of the New York Times. "The final report of the commission investigating the September 11 attacks will offer new evidence of cooperative ties between Iran and al Qaeda including information drawn from intelligence reports suggesting that Iran provided several of the hijackers with safe passage in the year before the attacks, government official said. The evidence raised enough questions about why the Bush administration focused on the possibility of Iraqi ties to be Osama bin Laden's terror network after 9-11 when there may have been far more extensive evidence of the Iranian connection. The panel had recently obtained intelligence showing that Iran had ordered guards at its border stations not to stop the passports of al Qaeda members from Saudi Arabia who were moving through Iran after training at terrorists camps in Afghanistan."

□ 2350

My memory is this Iran, according to the President, was a member of the axis of evil club, but as you pointed out, there is no collaborative relationship according to the commission between Iraq and Iran. But why did we end up attacking Iraq rather than Iran?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question. The reason we attacked Iraq is that the day after September 11, maybe it was 2 days after, it has been reported that the Secretary of Defense goes in to the President and says now is our chance, now is our chance to go after Iraq. This was like 48 hours after September 11. There was no evidence whatsoever that Iraq was associated with September 11, but this President and his political advisers knew one thing. They knew if they could fool the American people into believing that Saddam Hussein was behind September 11, the neo-cons could con the American people into supporting a war in Iraq, and to some degree, their maliciousness was successful to the detriment of our proud men and women in service who are there tonight in the heat of Iraq, 130 degrees, suffering, dying in the sands of Iraq because an American President's administration was not forthright with the American people and consciously, willfully gave false information to our fellow countrymen.

This is not just a little happenstance. We have a memo from a political operative of the President about how to talk about this. This was a cold-blooded, calculated act, and you talk about having your missed priority and what country you would be involved in.

I have been asked by one of my constituents if I have seen the movie "Fahrenheit 9/11." He said, JAY, is it true, did the President allow the family members of Osama bin Laden, who

are Saudi Arabian, to fly out of the country when all the other planes were grounded in the country? Did this administration let his friends from Saudi Arabia fly out of the country without a full and thorough investigation of their relationship? Did that really happen?

The sad fact is, yes, it did, and we have discovered that, in fact, did occur in our Committee on Financial Services hearing, and I pressed for an answer of who made that decision. I never got that answer, who made that decision, and 3 days later, the President is on the south portico of the White House smoking cigars with Prince Bandahar, the ambassador of Saudi Arabia, where two-thirds of the terrorists came from that attacked this country, and we let their families fly out without even a decent interrogation of them. Talk about having a mixed-up relationship about who our enemies are and who our friends are.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Does it come as a surprise to you that at least according to Bob Woodward in his most recent book, a book that was praised by the White House, in fact, there are excerpts of it I understand on the President's campaign Web site, but in that particular book, it was noted by the author that Prince Bandahar was informed of the attack on Iraq prior to the Secretary of State Colin Powell.

Let me go back just for a moment, because I know we are wrapping up, to another observation by Mr. Woodward, and this I would suggest is where ideology colors reality and affects the truth, the objective truth.

The passion of some in this administration, and I put beside you there a Newsweek cover with a picture of the Vice President DICK CHENEY, emblazoned that says how DICK CHENEY sold the war. It was clear that this individual was obsessed with Iraq, for whatever reason. I am not questioning his motives.

But in the book by Mr. Woodward, it is noted on page 175, for those who might have it, that the Secretary of State "detected a kind of fever in CHENEY. He was not the steady, unemotional rock that he had witnessed a dozen years earlier during the run-up to the Gulf War. The Vice President was hell-bent for action against Saddam Hussein." It is very dangerous when ideology colors the objective truth and reality. In the end, it gets us in a mess, and this is where we are now.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I am going to close with a couple of comments.

We are here to discuss a basic principle of American democracy, and that is, accountability, that people in public service need to be held accountable, both for their successes and their failures.

There is a group that we should recognize for valor and effectiveness and honor in our government and our government personnel, and that is our Army, navy, air corps, Coast Guard, marines, who are serving in Iraq. Those

folks deserve to be held accountable by being praised for their tremendous service to this country in difficult circumstances tonight, and they are still continuing to suffer the pangs of war tonight, and we have come here to make sure that their sacrifice is not forgotten and that we treat them with as great an honor as we can and that we restore our Veterans Administration health care system so that when they come home they are not exposed to the cuts in the veterans health care system that this administration has proposed.

This group of public servants, we cannot forget their contribution. It should never be forgotten, but there is another group of public servants whose massive failures and deceit should not be forgotten either, and that is the Bush administration who has made at least 10 major failure, falsehoods, negligence and carelessness, to the great cost of the American public, and those public servants should not be forgotten in their failure either and should be held accountable, and we will continue to have this discussion until they are.

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) like to close? Do you have any closing comments?

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, I concur with those sentiments.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2004, AT PAGE H5851

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following enrolled bill:

S. 15. An act to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide protections and countermeasures against chemical, radiological, or nuclear agents that may be used in a terrorist attack against the United States by giving the National Institutes of Health contracting flexibility, infrastructure improvements, and expediting the scientific peer review process, and streamlining the Food and Drug Administration approval process of countermeasures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of physician's advice.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FROST (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the death of his father.

Mr. RENZI (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of his speaking to the Navajo Nation Tribal Council.

Mr. BARTON of Texas (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOYD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HERSETH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and July 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. COX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, July 21.

Mr. GOODE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, July 21.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 20 and 21.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, July 20 and 21.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2479. An act to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Federal employees to make elections to make, modify, and terminate contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on July 14, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 3846. To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement or contract with Indian tribes meeting certain criteria to carry out projects to protect Indian forest land.

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on July 16, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 218. To amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 20, 2004, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9137. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intent to transfer funds provided in Pub. L. 107-38, the 2001 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Acts on the United States, to the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction; (H. Doc. No. 108-202); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9138. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's Report to Congress on the Plutonium Storage at the Department of Energy's Savannah River Site, pursuant to Public Law 107-314, section 3183; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9139. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Michael L. Cowan, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9140. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Charles W. Moore, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9141. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9142. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Lo-

gistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the report of the results of the study of the adequacy of the beryllium industrial base, pursuant to Public Law 108-136, section 824; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9143. A letter from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program for Fiscal Year 2003, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2902(d)(3) and (g)(2) Public Law 101-510; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9144. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the circulation of the Golden Dollar coin at resale activities on domestic military installations as requested by Senate Report 108-87 on the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for FY 2004; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9145. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report entitled, "Merger Decisions 2003," in accordance with Section 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9146. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting Annual uranium marketing report for 2003, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2296b-5; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9147. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the final report on the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) program for FY 2003, pursuant to Public Law 105-388 42 U.S.C. 13211-13219; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9148. A letter from the Chairman, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, pursuant to Public Law 104-191, section 263; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9149. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 04-11), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9150. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 04-10), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9151. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on economic conditions in Egypt 2003, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2346 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

9152. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that no offensive biological weapons research prohibited by international law is being conducted at the listed facilities and that appropriate security measures have begun to be, or will be, put in place at the listed facilities to prevent theft of dangerous pathogens from the facilities, pursuant to Public Law 108-136, section 1304; to the Committee on International Relations.

9153. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2004-31, Waiving Prohibition on

United States Military Assistance with Respect to Burkina Faso and Dominica, pursuant to Public Law 107-206, section 2007(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

9154. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the fourth annual Trafficking in Persons Report, pursuant to Public Law 106-386, section 110; to the Committee on International Relations.

9155. A letter from the Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary Commission, Department of Education, transmitting a report describing the activities of the Commission during the calendar year 2003, an accounting of any funds received or expended by the Commission and recommendations for any legislation or administrative action which the Commission considers appropriate, pursuant to Public Law 107-41, section 6a (115 Stat. 228); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9156. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two Semiannual Reports which were prepared separately by Treasury's Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) for the period ended March 31, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9157. A letter from the Secretary and Director, Department of Homeland Security & Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a joint prescription for a new human resources system for some or all of the organizational units of the Department of Homeland Security, pursuant to Public Law 107-296; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9158. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's thirtieth report on audit final action, as well as the semiannual report on Office of Inspector General auditing activity, pursuant to Public Law 100-504, section 5; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9159. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum 04-07, the Administration's report on competitive sourcing efforts; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9160. A letter from the Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Board & Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting Pursuant to Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, the Corporation's Annual Report for FY 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9161. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the 2003 Annual Report describing the activities performed by the Commission, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(a)(9); to the Committee on House Administration.

9162. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management—Eastern States, Department of the Interior, transmitting the FY 2003 Annual Report entitled "Guardians of the Past—Stewards for the Future"; to the Committee on Resources.

9163. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report to Congress detailing the number of times since 1993 that the Department has inspected the records of any producer of materials regulated under the relevant U.S. Code, pursuant to Public Law 108-21, section 511 18 U.S.C. 2257; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9164. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, Department

of Justice, transmitting a report as required by Section 202(a)(1)(c) of Pub. L. 107-273, the "21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act," related to certain settlements and injunctive relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9165. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting notice that the Department will not appeal the district court's order in the case United States v. Robert Mendoza, No. CR 03-730 DT (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2004), pursuant to Public Law 108-21, section 401(d) (117 Stat. 650); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9166. A letter from the General Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, Calendar Year 2003, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4610; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9167. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Shipping — Technical Amendments [Docket No. MARAD 2004-18059] (RIN: 2133-AB59) received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9168. A letter from the Senior Attorney, RSPA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Harmonization with the United Nations Recommendations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and International Civil Aviation Organization's Technical Instructions [Docket No. RSPA-2003-13658(HM-215E)] (RIN: 2137-AD94) received June 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9169. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Maritime Security Program [Docket No. MARAD-2004-18489] (RIN: 2133-AB62) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9170. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations: Hazardous Materials Safety Permits [Docket No. FMCSA-97-2180] (RIN: 2126-AA07) (RIN: 2126-AA07) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9171. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and -400F Series Airplanes Equipped With Rolls Royce Engines [Docket No. 2003-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-13648; AD 2004-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9172. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model BAe.125 Series 800A (Including C-29A and U-125 Variant) and 800B Airplanes; and Model Hawker 800 (Including U-125A Variant), and 800XP Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-13646; AD 2004-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9173. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-18-AD; Amendment 39-13647; AD 2004-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received

July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9174. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, -200B, and -200F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-149-AD; Amendment 39-13682; AD 2004-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9175. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-18231; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-94-AD; Amendment 39-13683; AD 2004-05-12 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9176. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-17-AD; Amendment 39-13662; AD 2004-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9177. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-13688; AD 2004-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9178. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) [Docket No. 2003-NM-65-AD; Amendment 39-13695; AD 2004-13-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9179. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Equipped with Garmin AT, Apollo GX Series Global Positioning System (GPS) Navigation Units with Software Versions 3.0 through 3.4 Inclusive [Docket No. 2002-NM-254-AD; Amendment 39-13702; AD 2004-13-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9180. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3-60 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-236-AD; Amendment 39-13690; AD 2004-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9181. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3-60 SHERPA Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-13703; AD 2004-13-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9182. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Scottsbluff, NE. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17429; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-28] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9183. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Kimball, NE. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17433; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-31] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9184. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Zanesville, OH; Correction [Docket No. FAA-2003-15876; Airspace Docket No. 03-AGL-14] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9185. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Restricted Area 6604 (R-6004); Chincoteague Inlet, VA [Docket No. FAA-2004-17772; Airspace Docket No. 04-AEA-05] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9186. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Coopers-town, NY [Docket No. FAA-2004-17513; Airspace Docket No. 04-AEA-04] received July 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9187. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Goldsboro, NC [Docket No. FAA-2004-17345; Airspace Docket No. 04-ASO-5] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9188. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; St. Cloud, MN; Modification of Class E Airspace; St. Cloud, MN. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16693; Airspace Docket No. 03-AGL-21] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9189. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Broken Bow, NE [Docket No. FAA-2004-18010; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-39] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9190. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Trinidad, CO [Docket No. FAA-2003-15996; Airspace Docket No. 03-ANM-04] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9191. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendment [Docket No. 30417; Amdt. No. 449] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9192. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland Model MBB-BK 117 A-1, A-3, A-4, B-1, B-2, and C-1 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-38-AD; Amendment 39-13686; AD 2004-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9193. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A Model A109C, A109E, A109K2 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-15-AD; Amendment 39-13687; AD 2001-24-07 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9194. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3-SHERPA Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-13685; AD 2004-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9195. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 875-17, Trent 877-17, Trent 884-17, Trent 884B-17, Trent 892-17, Trent 892B-17, and Trent 895-17 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-13693; AD 2004-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9196. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines (Formerly Textron Lycoming), Direct-Drive Reciprocating Engines; Correction [Docket No. 89-ANE-10-AD; Amendment 39-13644; AD 2004-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9197. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 Series Airplanes; Model A300 B4 Series Airplanes; and Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, C4 605R Variant F, and P4-600R (Collectively Called A300-600) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-52-AD; Amendment 39-13696; AD 2004-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9198. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-208-AD; Amendment 39-13689; AD 2004-13-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9199. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and -400D Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-13697; AD 2004-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9200. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-301, -311, -315 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-297-AD; Amendment 39-13691; AD 2004-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9201. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-102, -103, -106, -201, -202, -301, -311, and -315 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-331-AD; Amendment 39-13692; AD 2004-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9202. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 and -145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-13698; AD 2004-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9203. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30416; Amdt. No. 3099] received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9204. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Defense and Space Group Model 234 Helicopters [Docket No. 2004-SW-09-AD; Aemdnemtn 39-13651; AD 2004-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9205. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model BAe.125 Series 800A, 800A (C-29A), and 800B Airplanes; and Model Hawker 800 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-244-AD; Amendment 39-13661; AD 2004-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9206. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and A300 B4 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-337-AD; Amendment 39-13663; AD 2004-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9207. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-94-AD; Amendment 39-13664; AD 2004-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9208. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318, A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-17996; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-13659; AD 2004-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9209. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher Model ASW 27 Sailplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-53-AD; Amendment 39-13658; AD 2004-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9210. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa "PZL-Bielsko" Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" Sailplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-66-AD; Amendment 39-13656; AD 2004-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9211. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330, A340-200, and A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-111-AD; Amendment 39-13654; AD 2004-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9212. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, 737-700, 737-700C, 737-800, and 737-900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-323-AD; Amendment 39-13657; AD 2004-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9213. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87), and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-13653; AD 2004-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9214. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-251-AD; Amendment 39-13655; AD 2004-11-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9215. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109E Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-32-AD; Amendment 39-13652; AD 2004-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9216. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC 130 B4 and AS 350B3 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-29-AD; Amendment 39-13650; AD 2004-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9217. A letter from the Acting Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the report, "Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering:

2004," the twelfth in a biennial series mandated by the Science and Technology Equal Opportunities Act (Pub. L. 96-516); to the Committee on Science.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4850. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4492. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4625. A bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4170. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit volunteers to assist with, or facilitate, the activities of various agencies and offices of the Department of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. 108-613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3313. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdiction over questions under the Defense of Marriage Act; with an amendment (Rept. 108-614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 724. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4850) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 725. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3574) to require the mandatory expensing of stock options granted to executive officers, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-616). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following actions occurred on July 16, 2004]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration, H.R. 3574 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration, H.R. 4011 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4851. A bill to reform Social Security by establishing a Personal Social Security Savings Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 4852. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security (Select), and in addition to the Committees on Science, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Government Reform, Agriculture, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. FROST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the women's business center program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BACA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 4854. A bill to establish the Commission to Establish the National Museum of the American Latino to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of the National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, D.C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 4855. A bill to establish an Independent National Security Classification Board in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 4856. A bill to provide States with improved incentives, more flexibility, and increased funds to develop child welfare services that meet the unique needs of children and families and enhance children's prospects for safe and permanent living arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon:

H.R. 4857. A bill to require the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to enter into a memorandum of understanding to guide the integration of the

automated fingerprint identification systems of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 4858. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance for the construction, improvement, and rehabilitation of farmers markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve the collection of child support, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia:

H.R. 4860. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow States to regulate tow truck operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SWEENEY (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 4861. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for failure to pay certain obligations to spouses and ex-spouses that are similar to the penalties imposed for failure to pay child support obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 723. A resolution recognizing the 35th anniversary of the Apollo 11 lunar landing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 726. A resolution congratulating the people of Serbia and government of Serbia for conducting a democratic, free and fair presidential election and for reaffirming Serbia's commitment to peace, democracy, and the rule of law; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RENZI, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 727. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regard-

ing the policy of the United States at the 56th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

392. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 75 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize and fund the establishment of the Coastal Forest Reserve Program, and to memorialize the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry, and the Louisiana State University School of Renewable Natural Resources, with the assistance from the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and other Louisiana universities, to provide an inventory and assessment of coastal forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

393. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 212 memorializing the Federal Government to conduct a thorough evaluation of the condition of the 187-acre property situated in Waikane Valley that was used by the United States Marine Corps for ordnance training until 1976, plan for and conduct as thorough a clean-up and removal of ordnance as is technologically possible, conduct an environmental assessment of the potential risk to human health and safety, and return the land to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

394. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 supporting the retention and expansion of all military bases and centers in Ohio and to urge that local governments and community, industry, and labor leaders work with the Governor's All-Ohio Task Force to Save Defense Jobs for that purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

395. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 44 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize state and national banks to participate in lotteries and related activities for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

396. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 2 memorializing the Congress of the United States make special education funding mandatory and fulfill its commitment to provide funding at the 40% level; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

397. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to repeal the ban against the government negotiating price reductions of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

398. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 24 memorializing the Congress of the United States to support Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization and to deplore the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners, Christians, and members of other religious groups in the People's Republic of China and to urge that specified actions be taken to end that persecution; to the Committee on International Relations.

399. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate

Concurrent Resolution No. 47 memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue to support and expand the operations of the National Finance Center in New Orleans, including the renewal of its contract with the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board; to the Committee on Government Reform.

400. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 167 recognizing Native Hawaiians as traditional, indigenous knowledge holders and recognizing their collective intellectual property rights; to the Committee on Resources.

401. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 17 memorializing the Utah Attorney General to immediately commence an investigation into apparent breaches of trust and constitutional violations and that he report to the Legislature on the progress of the investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

402. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 memorializing the Congress of the United States to review and modify United States Immigration law so as to minimize the circumstances under which United States Citizen children are separated from their undocumented parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

403. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 04-004 memorializing the Congress of the United States to vote to repeal the individual and corporate alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

404. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1206 memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow for the deduction of state and local sales taxes in the computation of Federal income tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1206 memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow for the deduction of state and local sales taxes in the computation of Federal income tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

406. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 171 memorializing the Congress of the United States and the federal government to work with Michigan officials to align the ownership of mineral rights and surface rights on state and federal lands in Michigan; jointly to the Committees on Resources and Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SIMMONS introduced a bill (H.R. 4862) for the relief of Majan Jean; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 206: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 266: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 480: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 861: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1052: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 1080: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 1083: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 1157: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1212: Mr. SNYDER.
 H.R. 1258: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1422: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 1501: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1701: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1717: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1800: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1818: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1824: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 1868: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1993: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1994: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2096: Ms. HERSETH and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2260: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 2387: Mr. OLVER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2727: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 2797: Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 2897: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BACA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 2933: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2971: Mr. FARR and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 3180: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 3382: Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 3388: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 3482: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 3484: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 3619: Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 3676: Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 3765: Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 3799: Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. MOORE.
 H.R. 3965: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 4043: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4057: Mr. BERETER.
 H.R. 4067: Mr. STARK, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 4077: Mrs. BONO and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 4101: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 4116: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 4316: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 4342: Mr. RADANOVICH.
 H.R. 4375: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 4415: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4431: Mr. SANDLIN and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 4449: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4468: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. STENHOLM.
 H.R. 4578: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 4586: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 4605: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4610: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 4633: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 4657: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4658: Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4662: Mr. CHOCOLA.
 H.R. 4669: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 4674: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 4676: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4679: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MATHE-SON.
 H.R. 4680: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 4682: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms.

KILPATRICK, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DICKS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 4769: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
 H.R. 4792: Mr. STARK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 4793: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 4809: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHOCOLA, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 4812: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 4840: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. MOORE.
 H. Con. Res. 304: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 415: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H. Con. Res. 467: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Con. Res. 469: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. TERRY.
 H. Res. 556: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 632: Mr. WEINER.
 H. Res. 689: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H. Res. 699: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H. Res. 700: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

93. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Madera, California, relative to Resolution 04-113 supporting Taiwan's entry into the World Health Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

94. Also, a petition of the City Council of Parma, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 141-04 supporting the passage of the bill known as "The No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2004 (NOPEC)"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. Also, a petition of Ms. Shiela A. Miller, a Citizen of Kyle, Texas, relative to a notice of fraud, and petitioning the United States Congress for redress of grievances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4837

OFFERED BY: MR. FARR

AMENDMENT No. 1: Add at the end, before the short title, the following new section:

SPECIAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY, FORT HUNTER LIGGETT, CALIFORNIA

SEC. ____ (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when all or any portion of Fort Hunter Liggett, California, comprising approximately 165,000 acres, is determined by the Secretary of the Army to be excess to Federal military needs, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the right of first refusal to negotiate with the Secretary of the Army and to accept, without reimbursement, the administrative jurisdiction of the lands determined to be excess for incorporation into the National Forest System.

(b) Lands transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (a) shall be included the Los Padres National Forest and managed under the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act), and other laws relating to the National Forest System. Such lands shall be subject to the concurrent jurisdiction of the State of California.

(c) In anticipation of the transfer of land under subsection (a), the boundaries of the Los Padres National Forest are hereby revised as depicted on the map entitled "Los Padres National Forest Boundary Modification" and dated May, 2004, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service. For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9), the boundaries of the the Los Padres National Forest, as modified by this subsection, shall be considered to be boundaries of the Los Padres National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

(d) Prior to transfer of all or any portion of Fort Hunter Liggett, the Secretary of the Army shall provide the Secretary of Agriculture all documentation and information on the environmental condition of Fort Hunter Liggett, including an environmental baseline survey or its equivalent, and the Secretary of the Army shall perform all environmental response and restoration actions necessary to protect human health and the environment, consistent with the use of the transferred lands for National Forest System purposes.

(e) The transfer of land under this section shall not affect the responsibilities and liabilities of the Secretary of the Army under any applicable environmental law, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and, after transfer, the Secretary of the Army shall perform all necessary response and restoration actions consistent with the use of the transferred land for National Forest System purposes with respect to environmental contamination or injury to natural resources attributable to military activities, and neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor any employee of the Department of Agriculture shall be liable or responsible under such laws for matters related to any military activities.

(f) Subject to reasonable terms and conditions, as agreed upon by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture, on the lands transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under this section, the Secretary of the Army shall provide for protection of public health and safety for land on which the Army has environmental remediation responsibilities.

H.R. 4850

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. XXX. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to permit voting in District of Columbia elections by individuals who are not citizens of the United States.

H.R. 4850

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 139. Total Federal appropriations made in this Act (other than appropriations required to be made by a provision of law) are hereby reduced by \$5,600,000.