

them and maintained a history of subordination of AI/AN spirituality to the interests of dominating groups. Federal government representatives, leaders of historic religions and judiciary members must develop more tolerance and expand their definitions of what constitutes a proper sacred place.

Culture and legal scholar, Davis Mayberry-Lewis, writes: "American Indian religions consider the earth as sacred, whereas the secular culture that surrounds them considers the earth to be real estate. It is hard for the strong to give up their ingrained habit of overpowering the weak, but it is essential if we are to make multiethnic societies like our own work with a minimum of civility."

Anthropologist Elizabeth Brandt states: "The free practice of many Indian religions requires privacy and undisturbed access to culturally and religiously significant sites and their resources. It is irrevocably tied to specific places in the world which derive their power and sacred character from their natural undisturbed state."

Ultimately, how free are we, really, if the first religions of our great country cannot be protected? Therefore I strongly support H.R. 2085, the Valley of Chiefs Native American Sacred Site Preservation Act, which would safeguard an area very sacred to a number of Indian tribes, and ask that my colleagues support this bill as well.

I also call for additional Sacred Land legislation to be developed in consultation with the majority of AI/AN nations in the United States. Furthermore, the establishment of a government-wide, effective, and comprehensive procedure that safeguards the loss of further AI/AN sacred lands must be enacted. We must move swiftly in conjunction with AI/AN nations before more sacred lands, such as Mt. Shasta and Medicine Lake of California, Devil's Tower and Black Hills of South Dakota, to name a few, are further desecrated and damaged.

I ask you, what if, despite your objections to the contrary, your spiritual place was being bulldozed for economic activity or spiked for scaling purposes? How would you feel, what would you think and what would you do? I ask you to support H.R. 2085 and the initiatives I have discussed related to safeguarding the loss of further AI/AN sacred lands.

#### IN MEMORY OF SCOTT BILLINGSLEY

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. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to pay tribute to Scott Billingsley. Scott died suddenly and unexpectedly on March 25, 2002. He was only 31 years old.

Scott had served ably as Counsel to the Committee on Government Reform for two years before recently leaving to become Legislative Director for Congressman TANCREDO. In his time with the Committee, Scott displayed the best characteristics of a Capitol Hill professional: idealism, honesty, dependability, and selfless devotion to his work. His endearing spirit and infectious good cheer were a blessing to his co-workers with whom he spent countless long hours and late nights. Everyone who knew Scott liked him, and those who knew him best will love and remember him

forever. Scott wanted to make a difference in the world, and he did—not just professionally but personally as well. Others can speak more eloquently about Scott's unique personality, and they have done so in the eulogies that Mr. TANCREDO will place into the RECORD. I want to take this opportunity, however, to say a few words about Scott Billingsley's work for the Committee.

Scott's deeply held belief in the importance of integrity and accountability in government led him to become a Counsel for the Committee on Government Reform. In that position, he played a vital role in our oversight investigations in recent years. Most recently Scott was responsible for drafting the largest and most important section of the Committee's report on abuses of the Presidential pardon power—a chapter on the pardons of Marc Rich and Pincus Green. Scott's work on this chapter represented a substantial share of the final product and formed the solid foundation on which others built. Even though Scott left the Committee before the report was complete, he generously returned to our offices on many occasions to assist the staff in completing what he had begun. He did this under no obligation and on his own time, which says a lot about the kind of person he was. Now, we know how precious little time Scott had left, and we are honored that he chose to spend some of it at the Committee.

Scott's parents—and his fiancée, Katie—should be proud of his professional accomplishments. Scott was an excellent lawyer who chose to defend the principles he held dear. He gladly sacrificed the lure of private sector salaries in favor of public service, working tirelessly to promote what he believed in so passionately. Scott's work reflected his strong conviction that public corruption should be opposed vigorously. His commitment to honesty and integrity in government deserves to be remembered and honored, as does his drive and determination to work toward those goals. Therefore, as a token of our appreciation for his service to the Committee, I will be presenting to Scott's family a special copy of the pardon report on which he worked so diligently—dedicated to the memory of an extraordinary professional: Scott Billingsley.

May he rest in peace.

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

(Ms. BERKLEY 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 Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY 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 Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO U.S. ARMY  
STAFF SGT. BRIAN THOMAS CRAIG

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. While serving his country in Afghanistan, U.S. Army Staff Sgt. Brian Thomas Craig, from my hometown of Houston, was killed on Monday, April 15, 2002, in a field near the former compound of the Taliban leader.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the life of a truly brave American.

Brian Craig was twenty-seven years old and had spent the majority of his adult life in service to our nation. He joined the Army in 1993, shortly after graduating from Klein Forest High School, where he was an excellent student.

Yesterday, the Houston Chronicle reported on Brian's truly patriotic life. I would like to share the following excerpt:

A straight-A student with college potential, Craig wanted to join the Army first. A high school social studies teacher, Scott Boyer, who recently died, instilled a sense of patriotism in Craig as they studied the Gulf War. "We knew from his junior year that he would enlist after graduation," said Joe Georgiana, a retired marketing teacher from Craig's high school. "It was always his objective. He never wavered."

Brian is survived by his parents, Pastor Arthur and Barbara Craig, a brother, Kevin Craig and a sister, Elaine Hurtado.

The United States Army goes out every day to make a difference and Brian Thomas Craig certainly did—some days in a small way, some days in a big way, and on April 15, 2002, at the cost of his life. One cannot ask more from our brave military personnel.

The loss of any life is a tragic event. The Book of John, Chapter 15, verse 13 states: "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

I believe this message has a special meaning today and forever. As a father, I cannot begin to understand the pain and heartache felt by the Craig family. I can only say that his death was not in vain, and we all join together to pray for them.

Staff Sgt. Brian Thomas Craig's dedication and devotion to the citizens of our nation serves as a model for those who have dedicated their lives to defending our country and the ideals we hold dear.

It has been said that the ultimate measure of a person's life is the extent to which they made the world a better place. If this is the measure of worth in life, a grateful nation can attest to the success of the life that Staff Sgt. Brian Thomas Craig led.

Brian will be buried at Arlington National Cemetery, a fitting tribute, and a memorial service is planned for Friday at 2:00 p.m. at the First Baptist Church in Houston.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in expressing our condolences to the Brian Craig family. Our thoughts and prayers are with you.

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

(Mr. KIND 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CONTRADICTIONS IN NATIONAL SOCIAL PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, our last debate today was very instructive when you combine the last debate of the day, which was a debate about whether or not our great Nation will feed legal immigrants by allowing them into the food stamps program, and you combine that debate with the debate we had earlier about making permanent a tax cut which will provide for the richest people of the Nation further tax relief. The tax cut is equal to four times the size of the budget of the entire Department of Education. It is more than three times as large as the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Transportation.

When you look at that combined with the fact that next week we are going to be discussing the reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act, that replacement of the old Aid to Families With Dependent Children, we are looking in America at sort of contradictions. Let us add to that the fact that earlier today we debated the placement of a cap on the farm subsidies act, the farm bill.

□ 1730

The farm subsidies were created in the same spirit that the Aid to Families with Dependent Children was created. It was created in the same spirit as food stamps were created. They were created on the assumption that there are certain Americans who need help. We need a safety net for them. The safety net is there for people who need food, and food stamps were a way to administer and process our assistance to people who need food.

Sometimes there are desperately poor people, most of them are desperately poor, and sometimes they are not so poor, but people who are caught in a temporary situation, where their income falls short and they are unemployed. Even some middle income people unemployed have taken advantage of the food stamp program. If they happen to be legal immigrants, however, we cut them off. In a Nation with plenty, we do not want to give food to legal immigrants.

At the same time, the farm subsidy program is overly generous and has been greatly abused, and the vote we took today was a vote to put a cap on

farm subsidies for farmers. Let us forget about the complications of farm corporations, the fact that the agriculture business is not a business of small farmers anymore, but there are often many large corporations benefiting from the farm subsidies.

But it was not supposed to be a program to benefit anybody except those who were at risk of falling through the safety net, so earlier today we prided ourselves on voting to put a cap, to instruct the conferees who are considering the bill now to put a cap on the farm subsidies at \$175,000. That is per year, my colleagues. \$175,000 per year. That would be the cap. Right now there is no cap, so some get much more than that.

As I progress with this statement tonight, I am going to read some of the examples of the kind of benefits that are being received by America's farmers, who are, after all, not working. They do not have to put in any special volunteer work to do this, to do anything, in order to qualify for the safety net program for farmers. The farm subsidy program is a safety net program for farmers. The food stamp program is a safety net program for hungry Americans.

Legal immigrants, by the way, as one of the speakers pointed out, legal immigrants are allowed to fight in our Armed Forces, and a large number are out there in the Armed Forces right now, and more are being encouraged to enter our Armed Forces. In fact, the recruiting process of our military is such that they are making a special effort to reach immigrant communities. They have set up a large recruitment center just one block from my office in the 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn. They have set up a recruitment center at a place which is a transportation hub for immigrants. Large numbers of people who are immigrants, mostly immigrants from the Caribbean, come through this hub, and they have made an effort to reach them, in particular to get them to sign up for the military. They will reach their quotas faster, because a large percentage ever the people who are now signing up for our military are immigrants.

These people can know go off and fight for America, they can go off to meet our military needs, and yet they are not able to qualify for food stamps. I think one of the speakers previously pointed out that they could not, even if they are soldiers. Some of our soldiers are paid so low that they do qualify, their families do qualify for food stamps, but not if they are legal immigrants. They are soldiers. They can fight and die, but they cannot receive food stamps.

Those are contradictions which I do not think we ought to be content to live with. The American spirit ought to try to wrestle with greater fervor against some of these contradictions. We have, on the one hand, a very generous spirit, which leads us to send food throughout the world. We are

feeding people all over the world with surplus American food.

Certainly, long before we were able to bring the Taliban down in Afghanistan, we were delivering food to Afghanistan, and we sometimes dropped food from airplanes. We understand the need for food, the power of food, and yet the contradiction here is we are not willing to feed legal immigrants within our own borders.

That contradiction will be further highlighted next week when we debate the Temporary Assistance for Families in Need bill. We approach families in need in this country with great contempt, and yet those people who are in need are certainly worthy of some help, worthy of being caught up in the safety net. They are falling in the safety net that is designed for them as much as for anybody else. I will talk a little bit about that.

If we have to talk in military terms, we will talk in military terms. We are all concerned about the fight against terrorism. We are all concerned. The first line of defense is, of course, to deal with the people who have attacked us and to confront them head on and to hit them where their bases are and to break up their whole conglomeration of evil and terror, and I applaud the President for moving in that manner.

I do not consider myself a hawk. I would generally be called a dove. But I think when we moved against bin Laden and the stronghold bin Laden had in Afghanistan, it was the right move. But in order to do that, we move with human beings, and many of those human beings are people who are the sons and daughters of folks that we hold in contempt back in America when we do the Temporary Assistance to Families in Need.

In other words, I am saying that a large number of the people who go off to fight our wars are poor people, and for us to take a position that we have contempt for them and we want to harass them and drive them off the welfare rolls and force them to go to work for less than minimum wage through "workfare" programs, what we are doing is attacking the people who are providing the foot soldiers, the foot soldiers to keep America great, to keep America free, to fight our battles.

I am going to talk a little later about the fact I have done an analysis of who dies in the wars, who died in World War I, who died in World War II, and who our casualties in Vietnam were. They were mostly poor, from the urban centers and from the rural areas. They were mostly poor soldiers, our foot soldier class.

We do not like to think of classes in America. We say there is no class warfare in America. That is an accurate statement. There is no class warfare, because the poor do not have any advocates. They do not have anybody to fight for them, so it is not warfare. There is no warfare. The rich are in control thoroughly, and the tax bill that we passed today is just one more