

leadership and integrity makes him a worthy role model for the students and educators who he comes in contact with as President of King's College. I ask that my colleagues pay tribute to Father Tom as he receives this well deserved honor.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 24, 2003*

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber on October 20, 2003. I would like the record to show that had I been present in this chamber, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 563, 564 and 565.

---

OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 24, 2003*

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of President Bush, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and our country's efforts to bring peace and stability to Iraq. I also rise in support of the Pence amendment. This amendment would ensure that we will recoup some of our investment as we work to stabilize Iraq's future.

We supplied our troops with the tools they needed to free Iraq from the Hussein regime. Now we must supply our troops with the tools they need to complete the Iraqi reconstruction and return home. Iraq is in the middle of an international terrorism hotbed. If we fail to support our troops and their efforts, Iraq may regress, and the sacrifice would be for naught. I cannot, and will not, let this happen. Our troops have fought too hard to liberate Iraq.

Just as our troops make sacrifices for a successful Iraqi government and secure Iraqi economy so must we, the American taxpayers, make a financial sacrifice to invest in the future of a free Iraq. A stable Iraq strengthens the safety of our own homeland, and this security is worth the price. This investment is an investment in the future of democracy.

---

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF GALLATIN'S FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

**HON. BART GORDON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 24, 2003*

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 175th year of existence of the First Presbyterian Church in Gallatin, Tennessee. The congregation will celebrate the church's 175th anniversary on Sunday, October 26, 2003.

The historical church was organized on October 25, 1828, after a revival led by the Rev. John W. Hall. Constructed in 1836–37, the building is registered by the Historical Society of Philadelphia as an American Presbyterian

and Reformed Historical Site. The church's sanctuary was even used as a hospital by federal troops during the Civil War.

The Middle Tennessee church has served its community and congregation well for nearly two centuries, a time during which our nation struggled through much change and innovation. Through all of it, though, the First Presbyterian Church never faltered in its commitment to bring the Lord's word to the people.

Gallatin is a much stronger community because of the work of the church and its congregation. Members of the church actively participate in all facets of community life in Gallatin and elsewhere, including helping the less fortunate in Matamoros, Mexico. I congratulate the congregation's dedicated service to humanity and wish the church continued success during its next 175 years of existence.

---

SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEBANESE SOVEREIGNTY RESTORATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

**HON. JEFF FLAKE**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 15, 2003*

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in condemning Syria for its support for international terrorism. I do not support the Syria Accountability Act, however, because I believe it limits the President's options in dealing with Syria at a time when he should have flexibility. Furthermore, I do not believe that unilateral economic sanctions are effective—especially against regimes who are only concerned with remaining in power. Such regimes will still have food on their plates and roofs over their heads while the ordinary people of their countries are left to suffer even more.

---

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 6 ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

**HON. NITA M. LOWEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 21, 2003*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by my colleague and good friend from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY. The motion instructs the conferees to the Energy bill to adopt the unclear security provisions included in the House bill and subsequently dropped in the conference report.

Since September 11, 2001, intelligence officials have amassed a critical body of evidence suggesting terrorist intentions to strike our nuclear infrastructure. Plans of U.S. nuclear facilities discovered in al Qaeda caves during U.S. military operations in Afghanistan provided perhaps the earliest indication that terrorists had not casually contemplated but rather carefully studied the option of sabotaging a nuclear reactor. In early March, 2003 fresh intelligence confirmed our worst fears: terrorists continued to plot attacks against nuclear and other critical infrastructure. Subsequent reports of a terrorist plan to sabotage the Palo Verde nuclear power plants in Arizona were suffi-

ciently serious that the National Guard was immediately deployed to secure the plant.

In light of these facts, the conferees' decision to weaken nuclear security language included in the House report is incomprehensible. I'd like to focus on the two changes that concern me the most:

(1) Federal Oversight of Emergency Preparedness at Nuclear Power Plants—the House bill required the NRC to consult with the Department of Homeland Security before issuing or renewing a license to operate a new or existing power plant to ensure adequate steps could be taken to protect the public in the event of a terrorist strike. Unfortunately, the conferees appear ready to eliminate this most basic protective standard. Failure to adopt the House language would permit the NRC to continue its present neglect of the post-September 11th reality. Indeed, the NRC, the agency responsible for assuring the safety and security of the country's 103 commercial reactors, has flatly denied petitions by citizen groups for reinforcement of the spent fuel pools at Millstone Nuclear Power Station in Connecticut, stating "the possibility of a terrorist attack is speculative . . . and simply too far removed from the natural or expected consequences of agency action."

NRC's oversight of emergency preparedness at the Indian Point Energy Center, a nuclear facility located just north of my district in Buchanan, New York, was wholly inadequate, and demonstrates the need for greater consultation with DHS. NRC, defying the opinions of numerous experts, insisted that emergency planning for an accidental and terrorist-related radiation release were identical. A terrorist attack, which could create paranoia, provoke residents to self-evacuate, and damage evacuation roads and reception centers, would surely pose unique planning challenges. The Commission also contended that a radiological release from a terrorist attack would be no larger and spread no faster than that from an accident. Indeed, it incorrectly assumed that any radiological plume would develop over 8 hours, even though a terrorist attack could result in a radiological release in as little as 40 minutes. Entergy, which owns Indian Point, has optimistically estimated that evacuation of the 10-mile radius around the plants would take 11 hours, making public exposure to radiation likely. Westchester County has publicly stated that mobilizing emergency response teams and notifying the public within the new time requirements would be nearly impossible. Despite these facts, NRC refused to perform an independent review of Indian Point's emergency response plans, instead certifying them within one hour of FEMA's approval. I fear that in the absence of a legal requirement to consult with DHS, NRC neglect of terrorist threats will persist.

(2) Upgrade of the Design Basis Threat. The House bill mandated that the NRC issue regulations, "including changes to the design basis threat, to ensure that licensees address the threats" of a terrorist attack within one year of enactment of the bill. The conference report would authorize but not mandate that NRC upgrade nuclear security regulations to reflect the findings of a comprehensive study on air, land, and water-based threats to nuclear reactors. Some 25 months after September 11th, NRC still rejects the possibility of a coordinated strike on a nuclear power plant involving several large teams of

terrorists using sophisticated tactics and weaponry. NRC requires that nuclear security personnel be prepared to defend against the design basis threat, or DBT, an assumption about the size and tactics of an attacking force. While the precise details of the DBT are classified, nuclear experts suspect that the NRC continues to assume a far smaller and less sophisticated force than the one that struck on September 11th.

While the NRC has required power plants to make cosmetic security improvements, such as installation of barb wire fencing, larger threats have been neglected. For example, a recent NRC study found spent fuel spools adjacent to commercial reactors were highly vulnerable to a passenger aircraft crash, which would result in a substantial release of radioactive material. Nevertheless, nuclear licensees have not required additional hardening of spent fuel pools or the containment domes enveloping reactors.

Nuclear security personnel have consistently complained that they lack the weaponry and tactical and physical training to thwart a terrorist strike. In the absence of a statutory requirement to upgrade security, I question whether NRC will act on the recommendations of the vulnerability assessment mandated in this energy bill. Frustrated by sub-standard hiring and training standards for guards, I joined Congressman MARKEY in introducing legislation that would federalize the guard force at commercial nuclear facilities. In my judgment, energy companies chiefly concerned with their bottom lines cannot be trusted to secure the nation's nuclear infrastructure. Under the Nuclear Security Act, personnel would have to meet strict qualification standards, background checks, training requirements, and proficiency reviews.

I once again want to thank my friend from Massachusetts for his leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the motion.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 24, 2003*

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 532 on the Motion to suspend the rules and agree on H. Con. Res. 274, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 533 on the Bishop Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 534 on the Flake Motion to instruct conferees on H. R. 1, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 535 on the Passage of H.R. 3108, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 536 on the Motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 2297, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 537 on the Motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 2998, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 538 on the Motion to suspend the rules and agree on H. Res. 355, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 539 on the Motion to suspend the rules and agree on H. Res. 372, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 540 on the Capps Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 6, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 541 on the Crowley Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1308, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 542 on the Schakowsky Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 543 on the Motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1828, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 544 on Ordering the previous question regarding H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 545 on Agreeing to the Resolution, as amended, H. Res. 198, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 546 on Agreeing to the Obey Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 547 on Agreeing to the Obey Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 548 on Agreeing to the Waxman Amendment to H.R.

3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 549 on Agreeing to the Kirk Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 550 on Agreeing to the Markey Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 551 on Agreeing to the Holt Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 552 on Agreeing to the Loretta Sanchez (CA) Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 553 on Agreeing to the Kind Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 554 on Agreeing to the Stupak Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 555 on Agreeing to the Reyes Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 556 on Agreeing to the Jackson-Lee Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 557 on Agreeing to the Sherman Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 558 on Agreeing to the Weiner Amendment to H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 559 on Ordering the previous question regarding H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 560 on Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 401, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 561 on the Obey Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 562 on the Passage of H.R. 3289, I was unavailable for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."