

everyone is very excited about the possibilities that his earthquake warning system has to offer. Currently, Adam is in the process of modifying his invention into a smaller, more convenient prototype that can be installed directly into a user's computer.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Adam Curry before this body of Congress and this nation for his outstanding accomplishment in the fields of science and electronics. It is very satisfying and encouraging to see our upcoming generation of young people committed to the prosperity of knowledge and to the progress of academic achievement. Adam Curry has only begun to reveal the true merits of his potential, and we shall witness many more accomplishments and contributions from him in the years to come. Congratulations on your achievement, Adam, and keep up the good work.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UPRISING OF THE BURMESE PEOPLE

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2002

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 14th anniversary of the uprising of the Burmese people against the drug dealing military dictatorship that rules their nation. On this solemn occasion we need to ask ourselves what we can do to help those brave people help themselves.

The people of Burma and their elected leaders, Aung San Suu Kyi and members of the National League for Democracy (the NLD), have struggled for over a decade to bring an end to the military dictatorship. In 1991 Daw Aung San Suu Kyi won the Nobel Peace Prize for defying great odds in standing firm against this heinous regime. She has spent years under house arrest and hundreds of members of her political party, the National League for Democracy, have disappeared into Burma's notorious prison system.

Fourteen years ago the Army slaughtered thousands in cold blood on the streets of Rangoon and imprisoned and tortured thousands more.

The people of Burma believe that the people and the government of our great Nation stand strongly behind them. Today some governments in the world are struggling to decide whether or not to support the war against terrorism while they sponsor acts of domestic terrorism against their own citizens. We need to ensure that we keep the friends that we have by not making any deals with such governments as the Burmese junta or Chinese communists. By supporting the people of Burma over the totalitarian regime that is currently in power, we will not only help the people of Burma to help free themselves but we will be creating the good will in the future that will enable us to fight terrorism in that area of the world.

Lately though, I have seen some news about Burma that greatly disturbs me. The military dictators have come knocking on the door of the United States asking for money for what they call humanitarian aid, while simultaneously spending \$130 million on MIG fighter planes from the Russians. This is nonsensical.

We should not waste American taxpayer money on aid money that encourages the regime to spend more on weapons. We should also not forget who has caused the humanitarian crisis in Burma and why. The regime is entirely responsible for the sufferings of the Burmese people; their lack of good governance—any form of governance—has resulted in a debacle of the public health sector.

Even more disturbing than this, however, I have recently seen evidence that the military regime has sent its scientists to Russia to learn to build a nuclear reactor. The United States must do everything in its power to ensure this does not happen. The Burmese regime has proven repeatedly not only its callous brutality, but complete disregard for international opinion. Nuclear power in the hands of the Burmese dictators that terrorize their own people makes Southeast Asia and the world a more dangerous place.

The United States and the international community ought to inform the Burmese junta that in no uncertain terms it should immediately begin full-scale political talks with the elected leaders of Burma, the National League for Democracy, and ethnic nationalities aimed at speedy transition to democracy. I have met many of the leaders of Burma's struggle for freedom myself and I can tell you they would be outstanding partners for the United States and the world. In the meantime, to ignore the threat posed by an armed, nuclear Burmese military regime would be a serious error.

HONORING THE CAREER OF REDONDO COUNCILMAN KEVIN SULLIVAN

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2002

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of a constituent and friend—Redondo Beach City Councilman Kevin Sullivan, who resigned from the city council earlier this year.

As a dedicated council member, Kevin served the city of Redondo Beach for more than five years. He was a representative from the Second District of the city, which includes not only my district office but also both a power plant and a beautiful harbor. Kevin knew how to balance the needs of these two potentially competing interests.

In general, Kevin's career was focused on the best interests of the community, from his seat on a local committee against LAX expansion to holding local town meetings for the public. He was a person who could be counted on to take care of the community's needs while making the time to return his constituents' phone calls.

Kevin has always been there for the community. As a union leader for many years, he was thought of as a great negotiator. His skills served the people in his union while gaining him respect from others who watched him fight for causes he thought worthy. He never ducked the tough fights.

I loved Kevin's Boston accent—which fit in particularly well at the Redondo Lobster Festival. He knows everyone, and I have been fortunate over many years to have his strong support and help.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that Kevin has decided to leave public service, but I expect he will return one day. Meanwhile, I am certain I will miss his smile, pleasant humor and good deeds. He has added a great deal. Well done, my friend!

OPPOSING THE WAR ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2002

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I remain strongly opposed to the continued efforts by President Bush, Attorney General Ashcroft and the Administration to seriously endanger our country's civil liberties. In the aftermath of the September 11 tragedies, Congress moved quickly to enact sweeping legislation granting additional powers to federal, state and local law enforcement authorities in the name of fighting terrorism. I voted against that measure because I believed, and still believe, that such measures intrude significantly on the important civil liberties that make American democracy invaluable and unique.

The "anti-terrorism" legislation contained numerous provisions that had little or nothing to do with the war on terrorist activities. Amongst other things, the law authorized covert searches for any Federal criminal investigation, including the IRS, without restricting those to terrorist activities; provided for unprecedented wiretapping authority; gave access to confidential financial and medical information granted by a secret court; and allowed indefinite detention of immigrants solely on the basis of suspicion.

In a September 10, 2002 editorial, the New York Times outlines the continuing and substantial nature of the assault on our civil liberties. In the wake of September 11, the administration has shown its "contempt for basic rights in its enthusiasm for military tribunals."

Today, one year after the events that so tragically shook the nation, our precious civil liberties continue to be endangered in the name of "anti-terrorism efforts." Such a secret, covert and, ultimately un-American agenda serves only to increase paranoia, rouse unnecessary public fear and stifle the protections that are fundamental to freedom, democracy and an open society. Rather than increasing security, such actions serve only to asphyxiate the public trust. Rather than protecting against terrorism, the foundations and principles upon which American democracy exist are slowly being eroded. The 4th Amendment was created for the purpose of ensuring our rights and protecting against the very violations to which our government would now subject us. The war on terror can be fought without surrendering our rights. As so amply stated in the New York Times, "Fear is no guide to the Constitution. We must fight the enemies abroad without yielding to those at home."

I urge my colleagues to read the September 10, 2002 New York Times editorial entitled, "The War on Civil Liberties."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 10, 2002]

THE WAR ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

It would be easy to dismiss the harm that has been done to our civil liberties in the past year. Most of us do not know anyone

whose rights have been seriously curtailed. The 1,200 detainees rounded up after Sept. 11 and held in secret were mainly Muslim men with immigration problems. So were the people the government tried to deport in closed hearings. The two Americans who were labeled "enemy combatants," hustled off to military brigs and denied the right even to meet with a lawyer, are a Saudi American man captured in Afghanistan and a onetime Chicago gang member.

There is also no denying that the need for effective law enforcement is greater than ever. The Constitution, Justice Arthur Goldberg once noted, is not a suicide pact.

And yet to curtail individual rights, as the Bush administration has done, is to draw exactly the wrong lessons from history. Every time the country has felt threatened and tightened the screws on civil liberties, it later wished it had not done so. In each case—whether the barring of government criticism under the Sedition Act of 1798 and the Espionage Act of 1918, the internment of Japanese-Americans in World War II or the McCarthyite witch hunts of the cold war—profound regrets set in later.

When we are afraid, as we have all been this year, civil liberties can seem abstract. But they are at the core of what separates this country from nearly all others; they are what we are defending when we go to war. To slash away at liberty in order to defend it is not only illogical, it has proved to be a failure. Yet that is what has been happening.

Since last September, the Bush administration has held people in prison indefinitely and refused to tell the public who is being held or even how many detainees there are. No less odious than the administration's secret arrests are its secret trials. The government has barred the public and the press from deportation hearings for immigrants suspected of ties to terrorism.

The administration has also shown contempt for basic rights in its enthusiasm for military tribunals. In November, when President Bush first issued the order setting these up, it seemed the administration wanted to try anyone alleged to have ties to terrorism, even American citizens arrested in the United States, in military courts. Faced with an uproar, the administration backed down, announcing that the tribunals would accord defendants some rights. It then decided to try several prominent terrorism suspects in civilian courts.

This summer the administration unveiled, with great fanfare, the TIPS program (for Terrorism Information and Prevention System), to recruit Americans to spy on their fellow Americans. As originally conceived, TIPS was to include mail carriers, utility workers and others with access to people's homes. Again, after a popular outcry the administration scaled TIPS back.

In times of conflict, the president seeks to increase his power. Congress, sensitive to public fears over safety, cannot always be counted on to stand up to him. That leaves the Judiciary and members of the public to worry about the trampling of rights. This year a number of judges have stood out for their courage. Gladys Kessler, of Federal District Court in Washington, D.C., declared that secret arrests were "odious to a democratic society," and ordered the government to release the names of all detainees. It has not done so. And Judge Robert Doumar of Federal District Court in Norfolk, Va., who is presiding over one of the "enemy combatant" cases, recently told prosecutors to submit documents for his review so he could determine if the defendant was in fact an enemy combatant. The Justice Department, disgracefully, defied his order.

As the Bush administration continues down its path, the American people need to

make clear that they have learned from history and will not allow their rights to be rolled back. The world has changed since Sept. 11, but the values this country was founded on have not. Fear is no guide to the Constitution. We must fight the enemies of freedom abroad without yielding to those at home.

FIRE ISLAND AND THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2002

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins the process of reauthorizing the Water Resources Development Act, I wanted to inform my colleagues of correspondence between myself, the gentleman from New York, Mr. GRUCCI, and the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Les Brownlee.

Mr. GRUCCI and I wrote to the Assistant Secretary in June to note the fact that, in our opinion, the Army Corps of Engineers has not suitably complied with Section 342 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. I ask that our letter of June 19, 2002 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Today my office received a reply from the Assistant Secretary, which I now ask be printed in the RECORD. In his reply, the Assistant Secretary noted that the Army Corps "deferred all investigations on the Fire Island Interim project in July 2001" due to the State's desire to focus on the Fire Island Reformulation project, which is slated to end in November 2005.

I bring these letters to the attention of my colleagues to help them in their deliberations on the Water Resources Development Act.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2002.

Hon. CRAIG MANSON,
Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife and Parks, U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, DC.

Hon. LES BROWNLEE,
Under Secretary of the Army and Acting Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, U.S. Department of the Army, Washington, DC.

DEAR ASSISTANT SECRETARY MANSON AND UNDER SECRETARY BROWNLEE: In 1999, the Congress passed, and the President signed, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. Within that legislation was a Section of particular concern to us as Representatives of the South Shore of Suffolk County, New York. Section 342 of that law concerns the Fire Island Interim Project (FIIP), a routine beach nourishment project made necessary by the severe northeast storms of 1991-96. Those storms gravely weakened the barrier island, which protects the communities of the South Shore.

In an effort to resolve differences between the Army Corps of Engineers, the Fish & Wildlife Service and the National Park Service, the statute required your agencies to "complete all procedures and reviews expeditiously and to adopt and submit to Congress, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment . . . a mutually acceptable shore erosion plan for the Fire Island to Moriches Inlet reach of the project." Almost three years have passed, but Congress has yet to receive such a plan. This continued inaction raises serious concerns as to why your agencies could not agree on a plan that would

allow this beach preservation effort to go forward.

As you may know, the FIIP is an interim segment of a storm damage reduction and hurricane protection plan authorized by Congress more than 40 years ago. It arose in response to a request by New York State for Corps recommendations in the wake of the storms of the early 1990s. The Corps recommended, and then-Governor Cuomo's Coastal Erosion Task Force endorsed, a project that would serve as a bridge to a final "reformulated" plan for protecting Long Island's South Shore. Unfortunately, this important project has been constantly delayed.

This project is fully justified economically on the basis of reduction of storm damage to properties, both on the barrier island and in low-lying areas of the mainland. It is also of vital importance to the region's tourist economy and to the continued health of wildlife habitat, including that of certain endangered species, on the barrier. We are also concerned by the fact that despite a clear legal mandate, your agencies have not given Congress a "mutually acceptable shore erosion plan for the Fire Island to Moriches Inlet reach of the project."

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to hearing a response from your agencies as soon as possible and we hope to work with you in the future to resolve this issue.

Sincerely,

FELIX J. GRUCCI, JR.,
STEVE ISRAEL,
Members of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
CIVIL WORKS

Washington DC, September 17, 2002.

Hon. STEVEN J. ISRAEL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ISRAEL: Thank you for your letter of June 19, 2002, co-signed by Congressman Felix J. Grucci, Jr. concerning the Fire Island Interim project and the Congressional directive contained in Section 342 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

In accordance with the 1999 Partnership Agreement between the Departments of Army and Interior, the New York District prepared a draft decision document for the Fire Island Interim project. This project was a short-term project to reduce the potential for storm damages along the south shore of Long Island until completion and implementation of a more comprehensive plan, which could result from the ongoing reformulation study for Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point. In a letter dated December 17, 1999, Dr. Joseph Westphal wrote to the Speaker of the House concerning our progress, specifically noting the draft decision document and draft Environmental Impact Statement, and our hope that a mutually acceptable solution would emerge as a result of the public and agency review.

During 2000, the New York District received many comments on the proposed Fire Island Interim project. The Department of Interior and the State of New York shared many concerns. Based on these concerns, the time that had passed to reach agreement on an interim project, and the time remaining to complete the reformulation study, the state decided not to support the proposed interim project. Instead, the State wished to focus on completing the reformulation study. Therefore, the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) deferred all investigations on the Fire Island Interim project in July 2001.

The Corps has currently scheduled completion of the reformulation study in November