

More water in the river. But no water for farmers.

The Endangered Species Act is supposed to have a reasonable and prudent test, so I ask you, is it reasonable and prudent to bankrupt nearly 2,000 farm families? Is it reasonable and prudent to bring economic disaster to an entire basin? Is it a reasonable and prudent operations plan for the project to not operate the project? Monday, a Federal Court basically said yes.

Well, I could not disagree more, and these new requirements are anything but reasonable and prudent for the farming families and the communities in the Klamath Basin.

So today we are facing a disaster, and today we must decide as a Nation if we are going to pass laws for the "benefit" of the whole country; then, if those laws bring about the demise of a few, the whole Nation needs to compensate the few for their loss.

So I am proceeding with aggressive efforts to get disaster relief to the farmers and others in the Basin who are living this hardship every day. I am also working closely with the Bush administration to step up efforts to add to the water storage in the Basin, so that fish and farmers will have adequate supplies in the years ahead.

If the government is going to allocate more water than it has, then it darn well better figure out how to keep its commitment by adding to the storage.

I commend the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) for appointing a bipartisan task force to look into the Endangered Species Act and how it is affecting people and communities. Today I have asked him to use the situation in the Klamath Basin specifically as a perfect example of the problem we face.

Too often in the past, the Federal Government has set the standards and then gotten in the way of our ability to achieve them. Today, I met with Federal officials and urged them to let Oregonians have more say in how we meet Federal laws. What we need most right now is for the Federal Government to work with us, not against us; to stand up for balance, not disaster.

This administration has tried in vain to find a way to provide water to farmers this year, but they were boxed in by the unworkable requirements of the Endangered Species Act. They have inherited a mess, but at least they are working with us to bring a change.

From the dust bowl and disaster that will result this summer perhaps will rise the change that is so needed and so overdue. We should never have ended up in this place.

Perhaps the recognition will come that people and communities must be part of any successful effort to improve our environment and not simply double-crossed and run off the land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

PROTECTING ROADLESS AREAS IMPORTANT TO COUNTRY

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well today to alert the House to a decision that the administration will make this Friday, May 4, extremely important to the future of our forests in this Nation, because this Friday, this administration will either come to the aid, to the preservation of our roadless areas and our Forest Service land, or it will take a dive and refuse, in fact, to defend the law of the United States that is designed to protect these roadless areas in a lawsuit in Idaho. I am here to urge this administration to follow the law, to follow the will of the American people to protect these last remaining roadless areas in our forest lands.

Let me tell you why I feel strongly about that. A couple months ago the President came to this Chamber and gave a speech that was well received. One of the things he said, he quoted Yogi Berra, which I liked, he quoted Yogi Berra in the famous quote, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." But unfortunately, recently this President has taken the fork and he stuck it in every environmental policy that has come before him on his plate.

May 4, this Friday, is an opportunity for this President to change that pattern of failure for our environment by, in fact, defending the roadless area policy that needs defending in a lawsuit in Idaho.

Let me tell you why, clearly, the administration ought to take these steps. Number one, the American people want it. In one of the most exhaustive processes in adopting the roadless area policy, we have come to a very clear consensus that in fact the American people want this roadless policy. They want their wilderness areas protected. They want their old growth protected from the incursions of roads for clear-cutting, for oil drilling, for mining.

How do I know that? I know that because the Forest Service conducted over 600 meetings over the last couple of years in every corner of this country. In my State of Washington they had scores of meetings, in towns like Morton and Okanogan, not just Seattle, but little areas, 600 meetings, where over 1.6 million Americans told their Federal Government what they thought about the roadless policy.

The results were amazing. In Washington State there were tens of thousands of people who contacted their government. You know what they told their Federal Government? Ninety-six percent of the people who responded in the State of Washington told their Fed-

eral Government to protect these roadless areas. As a consequence, the last administration issued a rule that did exactly that, that followed 96 percent of the people in the State of Washington, who responded to this issue, to protect these roadless areas.

So it seems to me, when 96 percent of the people tell their Federal Government what they want, the Federal Government ought to respond, ought to listen to those wishes. But, unfortunately, following a long series of listening to the special interests, we are very concerned that the Bush administration will in fact take a dive in this lawsuit of folks who are seeking to overturn this rule.

The reason I say that is a recent Washington Post article that revealed that the administration had asked the Attorney General for ways to get out from underneath this rule, to in fact take a dive. We had testimony in my Committee on Resources a couple of weeks ago where a Department of Agriculture official revealed, in fact, they had been asked about how to do exactly that in this rule. That would be wrong. What would be right would be to listen to the will of the American people and let this roadless policy stand.

I will tell you why Americans feel so strongly about it. It is my second point here today. This roadless area policy is required to respond to certain American values of taking care of your natural world, to preserve it for your heritage and your kids and grandkids and great-grandkids.

In fact, what we found the testimony in these 600 meetings revealed is, people do not want to see their salmon habitats destroyed by clear-cutting, because what we found in the State of Washington is, when you do this clear-cutting in these roadless areas, you get erosion off the hills and that silts up the salmon streams and that destroys the salmon and that creates an endangered species, and that ends salmon fishing in the Northwest, a heritage that we have enjoyed throughout the generations.

This roadless area is designed to prevent the end of salmon in the Pacific Northwest and other places. We need this administration to listen to the people who said we want to preserve our salmon.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to say it is not the time to start drilling in our National Forests. We ought to stick with this roadless policy. It certainly would be wrong to drill in our National Forests at the same time we do not increase the average mileage for our vehicles.

GOVERNMENT BANKRUPTING KLAMATH BASIN AREA

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, a government-caused disaster is bankrupting an

entire farming community in the Klamath Basin of Northern California. Families are being told simply that there is zero water for farming this year. It is an unspeakable tragedy and an appalling example of the power of the Endangered Species Act.

This is a poster child for the need to reform this misguided law and for all that is wrong, unjust and unbalanced with extreme environmental policies. It is a heartbreaking example of how people, families and, indeed, entire communities, can be sacrificed at the stroke of a biologist's pen, and based on nothing more than incomplete data, speculation and guesswork.

There is little consideration given to the human species under the Endangered Species Act. Once an animal or fish species is listed, its needs must come first, before the rights and livelihoods of the American people. This is not reasonable, it is not balanced, it is not prudent.

Farmers should be irrigating right now, but the normally bustling towns of the Klamath Basin in Northern California and Southern Oregon are quiet. Without water for the crops that drive this economy, farmers cannot work in their fields; the fertilizer companies, the maintenance shops, all agricultural-related businesses are closing. Delivery trucks and processing plants sit idle. Unemployment will rise.

More than 12 years ago the government decided that a species of fish was in decline and had to be protected under the Endangered Species Act, despite the fact that nobody really knows how many fish there are, how many there have been historically, and how many there should be. But because the ESA requires protection at any cost and all costs, the water has been shut off completely and there will be no farming this year. The Federal Government has reneged on its promise and has left these farmers wondering how this could happen.

But, Mr. Speaker, this need not happen. Three decades ago this country put men on the moon. With technology and know-how, the impossible became possible, and I know that we can do this in the Klamath Basin and throughout the country.

Protecting the environment and maintaining our local economies need not be mutually exclusive. In fact, we have studies that tell us, as surprising as this may seem, that more water does not necessarily equal more fish.

□ 1630

The issue is one of water quality, and we can do some things to improve that for the fish without simply taking water from our farmers. But the extreme environmentalists want this to be an either/or proposition.

Many of us have been working for years to fundamentally change the ESA, knowing that it allows for just this kind of tragic result. We have simply asked for reasonableness, for common sense, for balance between the needs of people and the needs of fish.

We have seen lives lost because of the Endangered Species Act, preventing us from fixing levees. We have seen the rights of property owners trampled. Now we are seeing people lose all they have or worked for. The loss of life, the loss of livelihoods, the trouncing of fundamental rights to freedom and the pursuit of the American dream, all of this is occurring under the extremes of the Endangered Species Act.

I would venture to guess that this is not what the American people truly want, and that this is not what Congress envisioned when it crafted this legislation more than 30 years ago.

I am committed to making sure the entire Nation knows that this is happening, and to working with this Congress and with the administration in making sure that it does not happen ever again. We need a fundamental change in this law so that we can prevent our local economies and the environment from being pitted against one another. If we put a man on the moon, I know that we can do this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PLATTS 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 Colorado (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado 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. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SANCHEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION RELIEF FOR THE SUPPORT STAFF OF FERDINAND MARCOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to re-introduce a bill that provides immigration relief for the support staff of Ferdinand Marcos. This bill is similar to H.R. 4370, which I introduced in the 106th Congress.

In 1986, President Marcos of the Philippines was granted political asylum in the United

States to avert civil conflagration because of a popular uprising against his regime. The civil unrest arose following a controversial election in which President Marcos claimed to have defeated Corazon Aquino but was widely accused of election fraud. Growing street demonstrations in support of Mrs. Aquino raised fears of violence against what many viewed as a fraudulent election result. President Marcos left the Philippines on February 25, 1986 at U.S. urging and went into exile in Hawaii.

President Marcos, his wife Imelda and 88 members of his staff and their families were advised that they were being allowed into the United States with "parole" status for the convenience of the U.S. Government. This status is a legal fiction in which the individual is physically present in the United States but had never been "admitted" to the United States. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) can terminate parole status at any time. The individual can be treated as if he or she had entered the United States illegally and had no right to be here. In this case, it is extremely unfair.

INS has instituted proceedings to expel some of these individuals and their families but not all of them. The only pattern which seems to exist is that only individuals living in Hawaii are targeted for removal or exclusion proceedings. Based on reports I have received, no member of the Marcos entourage who moved to the mainland had been the target of any exclusion, deportation or removal proceeding.

These immigrants were invited to the United States to help care for President Marcos who was already ailing and died in 1989. They were told that they could bring their families with them. They have been in the United States for fourteen years and are fully integrated into our society. These people should not be deported. They came to the U.S. for an important reason. Because that reason is now past should not cause us to turn against them.

To rectify this unfair treatment, the bill grants the individuals and their families the right to remain in the United States. These honest, hardworking people came to the United States at the invitation of our government. Their presence was known and they have done nothing to violate our immigration laws. To uproot them would be an injustice to them and their families that we should not allow.

The exile Marcos government in Hawaii was instigated by the U.S. to save the Philippines from political turmoil and rebellion. Those who came to implement this policy to end civil unrest in the Philippines should have the protection of this government.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN SUPPORT OF A MISSILE DEFENSE SHIELD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has stated to the world that he is going to embark on a program to defend the American people from incoming ballistic missiles.

This position, this statement, has started the machinery of dissent