

During Sergeant Major Brown's career he has participated in Operation Desert Storm and Shield, Operation Joint Endeavor, and the global war on terrorism. Sergeant Major Brown has also been recognized by his peers for exceptional service and dedication, and has been awarded the Ordnance Order of Samuel Sharp Medal; he is also a member of the Audie Murphy Club. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Major Edward Brown, Jr. has played a crucial role in the defense of the United States and in the service of other citizens. It is because of this that I wish to acknowledge him today.

IN HONOR OF MS. WANDA MADGE JONES, THE 2004 MS. TEXAS SENIOR AMERICA

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 2005

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Wanda Madge Jones, the 2004 Ms. Texas Senior America. The Ms. Senior America pageant is aimed at enriching the lives of senior citizens by raising social awareness through education and community service, while promoting the dignity and value of America's seniors.

Ms. Jones has taught dance for over 50 years to over 50,000 students as the owner of the Arabesque Studio of Dance in Dallas, Texas. As a performer, Ms. Jones has been in over 10,000 productions, showcasing her talent by entertaining our troops with the USO during both WWII and the Korean War, including a one time performance for Franklin Roosevelt.

Ms. Jones is active in multiple organizations where she strives to celebrate senior women and their accomplishments, while cultivating her own personal growth through community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and our colleagues will join me in recognizing the many achievements of Ms. Jones, an entrepreneur and true patriot whose hard work and commitment has inspired those around her to achieve great feats in the face of adversity.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6,
ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2005

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, nearly 5 years in the making, the energy bill passed by the House should have provided a vision for addressing our long term energy needs.

Instead, the bill sacrifices our long term economic, national, and environmental security for the short term advantage of oil companies and other energy producers.

Thankfully, some of the most extreme provisions were deleted from the final bill. The provision to give oil refiners liability protection for the damage done to drinking water supplies by the gasoline additive MTBE was removed from the bill. If this provision had been adopted, local communities would be responsible for \$29 to \$85 billion in cleanup costs resulting from MTBE contamination.

The provision opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to drilling was also dropped, but the Majority leadership has promised to pass it in separate legislation.

Despite these omissions, the bill remains deeply flawed. New provisions were added and key policy challenges were not addressed.

The bill fails to address our growing dependence on foreign oil. Today we import more than half of the oil we use, and in 20 years, nearly 70 percent of our oil will come from overseas—whether or not this bill is signed into law.

By doing little to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, we're making ourselves dependent on OPEC and countries that might not share our interests.

This is a concern shared by a number of national security experts of diverse political viewpoints. In a letter to the President sent on March 24th of this year, the Energy Future Coalition (which includes former Reagan Administration National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane, former CIA Director James Woolsey, former Reagan Administration Assistant Defense Secretary Frank Gaffney, and former President George H.W. Bush's Counsel C. Boyden Gray) stated:

The United States' dependence on imported petroleum poses a risk to our homeland security and economic well-being.

With only two percent of the world's oil reserves but 25 percent of current world consumption, the United States cannot eliminate its need for imports through increased domestic production alone.

Since 40 percent of the 20 million barrels of oil we burn every day is used in passenger automobiles, we should be increasing automobile fuel economy requirements, but efforts to add those requirements to this bill were rejected.

Compounding the problem, the bill doesn't invest sufficiently in renewable alternatives. Only about 20 percent of the bill's \$11 billion in tax incentives will go toward developing renewable energy resources which can replace fossil fuels.

The bill fails to address high gasoline prices. Rather than reducing gas prices, the bill guarantees that they'll go up by requiring that at least 7.5 billion gallons of ethanol be blended into gasoline by 2012—triple the current level. According to the Energy Information Administration, the independent forecasting agency within the Department of Energy, this mandate could force consumers to pay an extra \$1.7 billion per year once it's fully implemented.

The bill weakens coastal protections and threatens the environment.

The bill requires an inventory of oil and natural gas resources in offshore areas where drilling is now prohibited, allowing pre-drilling activities in these areas. This includes Coastal California.

The bill undermines the ability of states to ensure that liquefied natural gas, LNG, terminals are properly sited and operate safely.

The bill provides oil and gas drilling operations exemptions under the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act.

The bill fails to address global climate change.

The bill fails to compensate Western consumers for overcharges by electricity generators. The National Energy Policy developed by

Vice President CHENEY was billed in part as a response to the Western "energy crisis" of 2000 and 2001, but there was never an effort to compensate consumers for the market manipulation that occurred in California and the western U.S. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission arbitrarily limited the amount of refunds consumers could receive. My repeated efforts to add language to fully compensate consumers were rejected.

Conclusion. Energy touches all aspects of public policy: Public health, the environment, the economy, and national security. In the coming years and decades, the global competition for non-renewable energy resources will become more frantic. The bill passed by the Congress does not respond to that challenge, and it is comprehensive only in the sense that it contains a hodge-podge of special interest provisions that will benefit each segment of the energy production industry. Supporters of the bill have said that after 5 years we can't afford to kick the can down the road. With this bill, that's exactly what's happened.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2005

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, as a general principle, removing trade barriers and creating new opportunities for the export of American manufactured goods and services in today's global economy should be one of the highest priorities for those of us involved in setting national policy.

Economically, politically and strategically, our nation is better and stronger when there is a free flow of commerce, accompanied by the free exchange of ideas and information between the United States and the major economies of the world. Of course we benefit from the growth of potential markets for U.S. goods, but there is also an enormous mutual benefit when the people of other nations are exposed to the shining example of our democratic system of governance and the merits of a free market economy. Just look at the nations who trade freely and compare them—and the conditions their people endure—with the nations whose economies are essentially closed to external commerce such as North Korea. Just last week in this Chamber during the Joint Session of Congress we witnessed a major address by the Prime Minister of India, a nation whose relatively swift progression to an open economy has lifted millions of people in India out of poverty as they have become a major trading partner of the United States. Not only are we selling more and more U.S. goods to India today, but because of our enhanced economic influence in this area of South Asia, the strategic interests of the United States have been strengthened at a critical time in this region.

We have before us in the House today an opportunity to take another major step forward in promoting free trade and democracy: the U.S.-Dominican Republic-Central America

Free Trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA). It represents an opportunity to expand our trading relationships, to promote the spread of democracy and to reinforce the stability of the entire Central American region. In reviewing the specific provisions of this trade agreement, as well as the promise of expanding democratic influences in the region, my colleagues and I must consider what is best for our constituents, for American workers, and for workers and their families in the Central American nations affected by this agreement. I know there is opposition here in the House to this agreement, much of it from members of my own party. I respectfully disagree with them because I see the enormous positive mutual benefits of this agreement, and because I am convinced that rejecting DR-CAFTA would hurt our nation and our workers, as well as the people in these Central American nations. And I am convinced that rejecting DR-CAFTA will leave our hemisphere less secure.

Certainly for my constituents and my home state of Washington, this agreement will mean more and better paying jobs. Washington continues to be the most trade-dependent State per capita in the country, with more than one in four jobs dependent on trade. And CAFTA markets are becoming more important to producers in my State. Since 2000, trade with these countries has grown more than 250 percent, with Washington State exports exceeding \$110 million last year. Reducing tariff barriers in these countries will significantly boost the attractiveness of Washington State exports to these countries, which includes high tech products, machinery, agriculture, and paper products.

But the benefits of DR-CAFTA do not accrue solely to the workers in my State. There will be positive benefits for working people all across America. While these six nations alone—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic—may not be huge markets, the DR-CAFTA countries make up America's 12th-largest export market worldwide, importing about \$15 billion in U.S. goods and services last year. Together, these countries represent a larger U.S. export market than Russia, India and Indonesia combined. Because of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, these nations already have preferential treatment in our markets; it is time for us to gain the same benefits in their markets. According to an analysis conducted by the Progressive Policy Institute, textile firms, high-tech companies, and many service industries stand to gain immediate benefits from the approval of the agreement.

The benefits for workers from these Central American countries will be more pronounced. Competition from Chinese and Indian garment manufacturers is already intense and is growing. There are provinces in China and India that have greater populations than all six CAFTA nations combined. Currently, the temporary duty-free treatment CAFTA nations enjoy under CBI—nations that use U.S. textiles in their garment production—is keeping these Central American countries competitive. Without CAFTA, this treatment will expire, likely devastating the garment industry in Central America, potentially throwing half a million people out of work. With CAFTA, exports of garments from Central America, using American-made materials, is expected to increase, building jobs on both sides.

The economic arguments for the agreement are strong. But in my opinion, CAFTA is more

critical for promoting regional stability. Over the last 20 years, these nations have struggled out of chaos and civil war to establish fragile democracies, developing critical institutions designed to safeguard freedom and to promote the rule of law. But the ultimate success of these governments is predicated upon economic security. I believe that CAFTA will help to do just that, spurring U.S. investment and promoting the growth of a middle class in each of these nations.

The failure of CAFTA would mean just the opposite, in my judgment. Competition—particularly from China and other Asian nations—is fierce and growing. Without CAFTA, the largest manufacturing sector in Central America may fail, leading to a significant rise in unemployment, economic stagnation, and potentially civil unrest. It is certainly in our nation's best strategic interests to assure that this does not happen. With greater economic stability promoted through increased trade and investment, I believe that the nascent institutions of democracy in these nations will thrive and flourish. I am not alone in believing that freer trade will help the workers in Central America. Former President Jimmy Carter and former Costa Rican President Oscar Arias—whose dedication to the people of Central America and to alleviating the plight of the poor is unquestioned—strongly support the agreement. In the words of President Arias, "CAFTA would allow Central America to thrive by exporting goods through trade rather than exporting people through migration. Opportunities would open for consumers to acquire better and cheaper goods; for small and medium businesses to expand and diversify; for more private investment, access to new technologies and educational opportunities; for a qualitative and quantitative improvement in the job market; and for higher economic growth, government revenue and increased social spending."

I also understand the concerns of those of my colleagues here in the House who have joined together with our friends in organized labor in opposition to this agreement. I share their mistrust and disdain for the domestic labor policies implemented by the administration that negotiated this agreement. In the end, however, I believe that our shared cause will be furthered, not hindered, by the labor provisions of this agreement.

The editorial board of The News Tribune in Tacoma, the largest newspaper in my congressional district, summarized the view I have held in a recent editorial in support of the agreement. The editorial said: "CAFTA is probably the single best thing this country could do for those workers (in Central America). If markets were to expand for Central American goods, Central American labor would be worth more, paid more and treated better. Workers would gain more leverage and find it easier to unionize. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this agreement is good for the country, good for the state of Washington, good for workers in all the participating countries, and good for the security of the Western Hemisphere. I intend to support the agreement. I would like to thank the gentleman again for yielding to me.

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL
GREGORY "SPEEDY" MARTIN

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 2005

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to pay tribute to United States Air Force General Gregory S. "Speedy" Martin for his 35 years of distinguished and honorable service in the United States Air Force and to our Nation.

General Martin has had a distinguished career, beginning with his graduation from the Air Force Academy in 1970 with a commission as a second lieutenant. While at the academy, he became the National Collegiate Parachuting Champion; but jumping out of planes only begins to define his courage. He became a fighter pilot and flew 161 combat missions in Vietnam. He served as the mission commander for Operation Linebacker I and Operation Linebacker II during the Vietnam conflict and secured the release of American POWs.

Prior to serving as Commander of AFMC, General Martin served as Commander of United States Air Forces in Europe and Commander of Allied Forces Northern Europe, Ramstein Air Base, Germany. During Operation Enduring Freedom he directed airdrop support for American forces assisting Afghanistan refugees. During Operation Iraqi Freedom he provided deployment support, combat airdrop operations, and all air delivered sustainment support. In Europe, General Martin was awarded the Order of the Sword, the highest tribute the Air Force enlisted corps can pay to a commander.

As Commander of AFMC, General Martin led the development of a new Air Force Science and Technology vision which will guide critical research and development work to ensure the U.S. Air Force remains superior on the battlefields of tomorrow. He strengthened, unified, and streamlined the Air Force Program Executive Office to ensure more effective acquisition support for current and future Air Force weapon systems. General Martin created the Continuous Process Improvement initiatives in the air logistic centers which allowed AFMC to return \$570 million in savings last year to the Department of Defense to support the Global War on Terror. General Martin has often referred to his assignment at AFMC as "The most satisfying assignment in my career."

He received numerous military awards for his service including: the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 11 oak leaf clusters, and the NATO Meritorious Service Medal. Allied nations also recognized General Martin for his service by bestowing on him the following awards: the Medal of Commander of Order and Valor, Cameroon; the Medal of Merit—Gold, The Netherlands; the Legion of Honor, France; and the Cross of Merit, First Class, of the Minister of Defense, Czech Republic. General Martin is also a command pilot with over 4,600 flight hours in various aircraft, including the F-4, F-15, C-20 and C-21 and is a master parachutist.