

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 2357.

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

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## IS WAR THE ANSWER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as so many of my colleagues, I went home this weekend and talked to our constituents about the very serious and all-important subject of war, and I thought that I would put some of this on the record tonight, because my constituents are asking me, is war the answer? Is war the answer to meet the terrorist threat? Who is really the enemy, and what are the roots of the terrorism that America faces?

I found a great ambivalence among the people, wanting to say, "Well, we want to be united even though we do not understand the cause. We want to stand with the President. We may not agree with what is being done, but if we stand united, then we will win whatever we go into because we remember Vietnam, and the reason we lost in Vietnam is we were not united, and so this time united we stand."

I just wanted to say to those who may not have lived during the Vietnam period, America did not lose in Vietnam because she was not united. America did not carry the day because there was no way any Western power could have carried the day in a country that was undergoing regime change, fundamental, a fight we never should have been into in the first place, and we asked the impossible.

□ 2320

So we think about what is happening with the terrorist situation and some of the breeding grounds for those who hate the West in the Middle East and Central Asia, and it is important to ask ourselves whether war will solve the problem; will solve the problem of

growing terrorism; will solve the problem of hatred expressed against the United States and other Western countries and installations.

I have done quite a bit of research, and I want to put on the RECORD tonight what I call a terrorism chart that covers the entirety of the 20th century and goes back actually to 1902 and to how the original countries in the Middle East and Central Asia were formed. But it reminds us also, it takes us through the Suez crisis back in 1956; and then when I came of political age, the assassination of Robert Kennedy as a Democratic candidate for President by a Jordanian Arab national who felt he had lost his homeland in east Jerusalem. And still remaining, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that remains unsolved and remains a lightning rod and source of discontent in that region of the world. Then, in 1968, the beginning of mass terrorism. One can go through 1979; we probably remember the Iranian hostage-takers, held 52 Americans for 444 days.

The point I wish to make is, with all of the turmoil, all of the assassinations, and the growing level of violence, did the Persian Gulf War really solve the growing level of terrorism and violence we see? Did the wars of the Middle East and Central Asia solve the terrorism that we now see springing up all the way from Malaysia to central and East Africa?

I think it is important for us to understand the roots of the terrorism that have resulted in the loss now last year of 3,025 additional lives here in our country. So I wish to place on the RECORD this summary. It also exists on our Web site.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to quote from a very, very prescient author, Robin Wright, "Sacred Rage," written back during the 1980s and recently updated from the first chapter where she talks about the crusade, that, indeed, the challenge of terrorism is really the challenge of meeting a different point of view arising globally from many sources. She quotes the former Lebanese Prime Minister, Saeb Salam, who said, "The growth of Islamic fundamentalism is an earthquake."

I can remember being elected in 1982, coming here in 1983, in the fall; and we saw the U.S. marine command center at Beirut's International Airport devastated by two car bombs and we lost 240 Marines, and Navy personnel dead. I can remember at that time becoming brutally aware of a changing world and the shifting sands of the politics of that region of the world.

In Robin Wright's book she talks about a wall in our State Department where if you walked in the door at that time, two greenish-black stone plaques listed in gold letters the names and dates of diplomats of the United States killed in the line of duty since the founding of our Republic. Over that period, from 1780 to 1967, over 187 years, we had lost 143 U.S. diplomats killed in the line of duty. But the second plaque

that sits at the State Department was filled in equal number in almost 18 years. And, if one looks at the pace of terrorist attacks against the West, one sees that the pace is increasing in spite of wars, in spite of additional military actions. So one has to ask ourselves whether more wars lead to less terrorism or more terrorism, and whether war is really the answer to give at the root of what the problem is.

I commend this book, "Sacred Rage," to those who are listening among our colleagues here and only end with one of the sentences in the book that points out some of the mistakes, particularly by the West, that have only provoked the Muslim fundamentalists rather than cope realistically with what they represent: "The stakes have never been so high, the potential for misunderstanding and further violence never so great."

Mr. Speaker, war may not be the answer to solving the terrorist threat.

## THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, we have many, many difficult and complex issues that we each face every day. We just heard from the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my friend and colleague, about war. Most of us spend probably the majority of our time, or at least the largest percentage of our time, dealing with economic growth and recovery, jobs, and what we need to do to help attract or keep companies in our district, and the regulatory issues, and many other things. We also work regularly on other issues that come up. For example, I am chairing a hearing Thursday on the West Nile virus which has particularly hit my hometown hard. We just had an hour debate on moral issues.

But in addition to these kinds of issues, we deal inside the Federal budget with an incredible array of issues. I would like to address one tonight that is in danger of being overlooked as we address the big issues that are in front of Congress.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt once said: "Nothing short of defending this country during wartime," which is now, "compares in importance with the great task of leaving this land a better land for our descendants than it is for us."

His legacy was the National Park system. I want to talk a little bit about the financial pressures on our National Park system. This legacy is important. It is not just what we are doing today with the different pieces of legislation, but what are we going to leave for future generations; what are they going to remember America by; are they going to have the natural and cultural beauty.

The Park Service manages 385 sites; has more than 83 million acres of land

to manage; habitat for 168 threatened and endangered species; more than 80 million museum artifacts, some of the greatest collections of museum artifacts than other museums combined, for the most part; 1.5 million archeological sites; and 26,000 historic structures.

Now, the problem that we have is that we have a shortfall of \$600 million just to keep the maintenance backlog covered, which amounts to 32 percent of what the Park Service needs to fulfill its mission, and we are falling more and more deeply behind. What I wanted to address in addition to the very specific thing that a number of us have requested is that the conference committee, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who just a little bit ago and I were debating on another matter have cosponsored legislation or efforts to raise the National Parks funding to \$280 million. We were successful in getting an additional \$118.5 million, working with the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the chairman and ranking member. And the wonderful people on the Interior Committee on Appropriations actually boosted the park funding over the President's request. However, the Senate bill is much less, and we need to make sure we hold that House position.

Let me give an illustration of why this is so important. Earlier this month, this House passed these boundary adjustments for the Pemberton's headquarters in Vicksburg National Military Park, the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation area, the Golden Gate Recreation Area boundary adjustment, and the Allegheny Portage, Pennsylvania Railroad National Historical Park.

We also did land acquisition at the Salt Lake City Museum of Natural History, Salt River Bay St. Croix, Virgin Islands and Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Grand Teton land exchange, James V. Hansen Shoshone National Trail, the Mccloughlin House Preservation and the William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace.

We also passed in this House a study for feasibility and inclusion of the Miami Circle site, a very expensive site, by the way, in the city of Miami, but worthwhile; Gateway Communities Cooperation, Mount Nebo Wilderness Boundary, and Bainbridge Island Japanese American Memorial.

We also voted to establish Victims of Terrorist Attacks Memorial in Washington, D.C. We also asked for more funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities; historic preservation, which could be as high as \$120 million from 2003 to 2007; and we passed the Vancouver, Washington National Historic Reserve Development costs from 5 million to \$25 million.

Tonight, alone, on Monday night we passed the Cedar Creek Battlefield and

Belle Grove Plantation National Historical Park Act. We passed the Spirit Lake and Twin Lakes Land Adjustment Act. We passed the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area Protection Enhancement Act of 2002. We passed tonight the Southern Campaign of the Revolution Heritage Area Study Act. We passed tonight the Andersonville National Historic Site Boundary Adjustment Act.

□ 2330

We also have passed the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act to preserve Civil War battlefields.

These are all worthy projects, but how can we stand here and pass bill after bill after bill after bill after bill to go into the National Park Service, and then say we have no more money, when we have a backlog of \$600 million? There has to be some sort of accountability within this Congress.

I supported these bills. I was here tonight and let them go through on unanimous consent. But then I have an obligation to say we are going to fund these efforts, because otherwise we are pulling the wool over the Americans' eyes. We cannot keep saying that we are going to do this new park, this new park, this new heritage area, we are going to maintain Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks, we are going to make sure the campgrounds are up to snuff, we are going to make sure there are decent roads, we are going to make sure the resources are protected, and then not do the funding.

We need to make sure we hold the House funding level. It is a critical part of our national heritage.

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

(Mr. GREEN of Texas 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 California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER 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 California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD 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 California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER 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 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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON 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 Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas 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 North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ETHERIDGE 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 New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD 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 California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HONDA 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 New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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