

learn all she can about the American system of government and in how even a brief visitor from overseas can help serve the people of South Carolina.

Alison is by no means alone in this adventure. Whether it has been Grant Harvey-Mutton in the office of Senator CHUCK HAGEL, or Briony Whitehouse in the office of SEN. CHRISTOPHER DODD, or Tamara Gale with our colleague ALCEE HASTINGS, or Joshua Bolton in the office of JERRY NADLER—each of the students has brightened our days with their curiosity, humanity, and the demeanor of the best tradition of polished diplomats.

Both the U.S. and Australian governments have been strong supporters of this exchange, and rightly so. It is an effort I hope continues on a small staple of US-Australian relations.

Late last month, Mr. Speaker, the Roll Call newspaper offered a small portrait of the program and its participants. I offer that text here to you and our colleagues so that we may all celebrate the value of this exchange, which is so delightfully focused on the students, and from which we can reinforce the values we hold dear about ourselves and about the world in which we live. Mr. Speaker, please join me and my colleagues in thanking everyone involved in creating and shepherding this internship program from its initial concept to the thriving institution it has become. They have done this nation and the Australian people numerous proud acts of public service, which I hope will continue for many years to come.

[From Roll Call, Jan. 27, 2003]

FAR FROM HOME; AUSTRALIANS BRAVE SNOW,
STRONG DOLLAR FOR INTERNSHIPS

(By Raya D. Widenoja)

Coming to Washington is always an adventure, but just imagine coming from the other side of the world. Five students from Flinders University in Adelaide, Australia, have, braving the elements for a back-stage look at American politics.

"It's just so bloody cold," commented Grant Harvey-Mutton, who recently left high summer in Adelaide to intern in Sen. Chuck Hagel's (R-Neb.) office on the 4-year-old program arranged by former Democratic Hill aide Eric Federing.

Federing, who is now the director of business public policy and government affairs for KPMG, was motivated to start the program after traveling and lecturing in Australia. He runs the program on a pro bono basis with professor Don DeBats of Flinders' American studies department. "The idea is to put good people in good places with good people," Federing says of his organizational philosophy. "[The students] learn stuff by being here that they couldn't possibly know otherwise . . . and some have parlayed this experience into good jobs in the Australian government."

Accompanying Harvey-Mutton are Joshua Balfour of Adelaide in Rep. Jerrold Nadler's (D-N.Y.) office; Alison Cupper of Mildura in Rep. James Clyburn's (D-S.C.) office; Tamara Gale of Yacka in Rep. Alcee Hastings' (D-Fla.) office; and Briony Whitehouse of Adelaide in Sen. Chris Dodd's (D-Conn.) office. Their internships will last until Feb. 14, with a reception in their honor at the Australian Embassy on Feb. 5.

The program is as much about bridging the cultural gap between the United States and Australia as it is about politics, says Federing. Although the countries are very similar in some ways, he says what the Australians call "the tyranny of distance" encourages a mutual ignorance.

The students haven't been here long—arriving on Christmas Day—but they already

have interesting tidbits to share about the differences in political culture.

"I was surprised at how polite the Members are to each other [in the chamber]," said Balfour. Members of parliament in Australia are much more "irreverent" when they address one another, Federing explained, and their remarks are generally "less scripted."

Gale said one of the most interesting things she has noticed is the seating arrangement on the House floor. In Australia the two main parties literally "face off" in opposing rows, so it was odd for her to see the Members all facing the Speaker.

Cupper, who studies law as well as international relations, said she was surprised to see how individualism manifests itself in U.S. culture and to observe the comparative weakness of organized labor movements. In Australia, one of the two main parties is called the Labor Party.

The program has garnered high praise from its start. In March 2000, after the first students left, Rep. Loretta Sanchez (D-Calif.) submitted remarks for the Congressional Record praising the program and her intern, Estee Fiebiger, who, among other things, helped Sanchez's office analyze human rights in Vietnam. Back in Australia, Fiebiger was inspired by her experience to start an internship program of her own in the Labor Party.

According to Federing, at least twice as many Congressional offices have expressed interest in hosting the interns than are available. He is considering expanding the program, but despite growing interest among Flinders students—in part because even domestic political internships are uncommon in Australia—few students actually qualify so far.

The students must major either in American studies or political science, but it's the program's cost that really narrows the field. The students' airfare and housing is subsidized, but their out-of-pocket expenses add up to about 8,000 Australian dollars, which translates into \$4,500 for the six-week program.

"Interns would be beating down your door," Harvey-Mutton said, "if it weren't for the cost."

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE DAY
OF REMEMBRANCE—RE-INTRO-
DUCTION OF THE WARTIME PARITY
AND JUSTICE ACT OF 2003

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents to commemorate the Day of Remembrance. As we know, on February 19, 1942, then President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 that led to the internment of 120,000 Americans of Japanese descent. With the stroke of a pen, innocent men, women, and children became prisoners and were branded disloyal to the nation they called home. Lives were disrupted and homes were broken as these Americans were uprooted from their communities and locked behind barbed wire fences.

The force of wartime hysteria darkened the light of justice and reasonable people suddenly embarked on an unreasonable course. Indeed, America was engaged in a monumental struggle as our soldiers engaged the enemy in the European and Pacific Theatre. Here in the United States, many citizens had

faces that looked like that of the enemy. Without any evidence, fear was mounting, and the patriotism of these Japanese Americans was questioned. Some worried that they were intent on doing harm against the very flag they saluted. Decades later, history vindicated these loyal Americans as not even a single documented case of sabotage or espionage was committed by an American of Japanese ancestry during that time.

What our nation found through the disinfectant of time, those who endured internment knew all along. Surrounded by armed guards behind a prison fence, mothers thought of their sons who fought for the freedom of the nation that denied them of their own liberty. Indeed today the annals of military history show that the Japanese American soldiers of the 442nd and combat regiment fought honorably and bravely for ideals they knew our nation had not yet afforded to their own families back home. Still, they were worth fighting for. And this regiment would become the most decorated group of soldiers in American history as they proved their devotion to our nation fighting in both the European and Pacific theatres. It took more than 50 years, but finally in 2000, President Bill Clinton awarded 22 of these heroes with the Medal of Honor.

In 1983, a Presidential Commission concluded that the internment was the result of both racism and wartime hysteria. Five years later, then President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act into law that provided an official apology and redress to most of those confined in U.S. internment camps during World War II. This was the culmination of half a century of struggle to bring justice to those to whom it was denied. I am proud that our nation did the right thing. But fifteen years after the passage of the CLA, we still have unfinished work to be done to rectify and close this regrettable chapter in our nation's history.

Last Congress, I introduced bi-partisan legislation in Congress to finish the remaining work of redress. While most Americans are aware of the internment of Japanese Americans, few know about our government's activities in other countries resulting from prejudice held against people of Japanese ancestry. Recorded thoroughly in government files, the U.S. government involved itself in the expulsion and internment of an estimated 2,000 people of Japanese descent who lived in various Latin American countries. Uprooted from their homes and forced into the United States, these civilians were robbed of their freedom as they were kidnapped from nations not even directly involved in World War II. These individuals are still waiting for equitable redress, and justice cries out for them to receive it. That is why today I re-introduced the Wartime Parity and Justice Act of 2003 to finally turn the last page in this chapter of our nation's history.

This bill provides redress to every Japanese Latin American individual forcibly removed and interned in the United States. These people paid a tremendous price during one of our nation's most trying times. Indeed, America accomplished much during that great struggle. As we celebrate our great achievements as a nation let us also recognize our errors and join together as a nation to correct those mistakes. My legislation is the right thing to do to affirm our commitment to democracy and the rule of law.

In addition, the Wartime Parity and Justice Act of 2003 provides relief to Japanese Americans confined in this country but who never received redress under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 given technicalities in the original law. Our laws must always establish justice. They should never deny it. That is why these provisions ensure that every American who suffered the same injustices will receive the same justice. Finally, my legislation will reauthorize the educational mandate in the 1988 Act which was never fulfilled. This will etch this chapter of our nation's history into our national conscience for generations to come as a reminder never to repeat it again.

Mr. Speaker, let us renew our resolve to build a better future for our community as we dedicate ourselves to remembering how we compromised liberty in the past. Doing so will help us to guard it more closely in the future. As we commemorate the Day of Remembrance, I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the Wartime Parity and Justice Act of 2003.

WESTERN ENVIRONMENTAL
TECHNOLOGY OFFICE

HON. DENNIS R. REHBERG

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of Members of the House to critical federal programs conducted at the Western Environmental Technology Office, or WETO, located in Butte, Montana. These programs involving the National Energy Technology Laboratory are funded under Energy and Water Development Appropriations.

First, I want to commend Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and the members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, for their action to restore over \$11 million in funds that were eliminated from the FY 2003 budget for the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Science and Technology, within the Environmental Management program. The Office of Science and Technology has a critical mission in providing cost effective technology to clean up contaminated federal property across the country, and it deserves the strong support of the Congress.

I continue to be very concerned, however, about the likely adverse effects of proposed Office of Science and Technology cutbacks on our nation's ability to perform cost effective and timely remediation of the DOE's contaminated sites around the country.

More specifically, I am concerned about the continuation of the important work of DOE's Western Environmental Technology Office. At the WETO facility, the National Energy Technology Laboratory provides critical support to DOE's Office of Science and Technology. Their activities help facilitate DOE's demonstration, evaluation and implementation of technologies that promise to provide much-needed solutions to the environmental cleanup challenges at various DOE sites.

DOE's Research and Development contract for the Western Environmental Technology Office, originally awarded in FY 1997, has been extended through the end of FY 2004.

That contract extension provided that DOE would fund WETO at the following levels: \$6

million in FY 2002, \$6 million in FY 2003, and \$4 million in FY 2004. However, in FY 2002 WETO received only \$5 million, \$1 million short of the DOE's contractual obligation.

It is critically important to preserve this commitment to WETO and continue funding on schedule at a rate that will account for last year's shortfall.

I would add that the operations and activities of WETO are very important to the economy in Montana. Many professionals have chosen western Montana as their home while they serve our nation's challenge to clean up contaminated DOE sites.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to my colleagues that when the Department of Energy makes contracts for multi-year programs in such important areas as WETO, where the Department's Science and Technology Office is developing and implementing technologies to remediate contaminated federal sites, these agreements must be honored.

UPON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE
MORRIS K. UDALL ARCTIC WILDERNESS ACT OF 2003

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, we are here to introduce legislation that would permanently protect the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge from development. The Morris K. Udall Wilderness Act of 2003 honors an extraordinary environmentalist by protecting, in his name, this extraordinary piece of America's wilderness. And we are proud of the fact that begin this battle in the 108th Congress with more original cosponsors than in any other previous Congress—133 upon introduction—a testament to the growing national demand to keep the developers out of this precious wilderness and to preserve it in its current pristine, roadless condition for future generations of Americans.

We have a bipartisan legacy to protect, and we take it very seriously. It is a legacy of Republican President Eisenhower, who set aside the core of the Refuge in 1960. It is a legacy of Democratic President Carter, who expanded it in 1980. It is the legacy of Republican Senator Bill Roth and Democratic Representative Bruce Vento and especially Morris Udall, who fought so hard to achieve what we propose today, and twice succeeded in shepherding this wilderness proposal through the House. Now is the time to finish the job they began now is the time to say "Yes" to setting aside the Coastal Plain as a fully protected unit of the Wilderness Preservation System.

The coastal plain of the Refuge is the biological heart of the Refuge ecosystem and critical to the survival of caribou, polar bears and over 160 species of birds. When you drill in the heart, every other part of the biological system suffers.

This Valentine's Day, the oil industry is in a state of lobbying frenzy to give Cupid a bad name. It wants to pierce the heart of the Arctic Refuge with oil wells and drill bits, all the while calling this an act of environmental friendliness. The industry loves the Refuge so much that it wants to brand it with scars for a lifetime.

Turning the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge into an industrial footprint would not only

be bad environmental policy, it is totally unnecessary. According to EPA scientists, if cars, mini-vans, and SUV's improved their average fuel economy just 3 miles per gallon, we would save more oil within ten years than would ever be produced from the Refuge. Can we do that? We already did it once! In 1987, the fleetwide average fuel economy topped 26 miles per gallon, but in the last 13 years, we have slipped back to 24 mpg on average, a level we first reached in 1981! Simply using existing technology will allow us to dramatically increase fuel economy, not just by 3 mpg, but by 15 mpg or more—five times the amount the industry wants to drill out of the Refuge.

Our dependence on foreign oil is real, but we cannot escape it by drilling for oil in the United States. We consume 25 percent of the world's oil but control only 3 percent of the world's reserves. 76 percent of those reserves are in OPEC, so we will continue to look to foreign suppliers as long as we continue to ignore the fuel economy of our cars and as long as we continue to fuel them with gasoline.

The public senses that a drill-in-the-Refuge energy strategy is a loser. Why sacrifice something that can never be re-created this one-of-a-kind wilderness simply to avoid something relatively painless—sensible fuel economy?

Is it any wonder its credibility with the American public has sunk to new lows? According to poll after poll after poll, preserving this public environmental treasure far outweighs the value of developing it. The latest poll, done by Democratic pollster Celinda Lake and Republican pollster Christine Matthews, shows a margin of 62–30 percent opposed to drilling for oil in the refuge. The public is making clear to Congress that other options should be pursued, not just because the Refuge is so special, but because the other options will succeed where continuing to put a polluting fuel in gas-guzzling automobiles is a recipe for failure.

That's the kind of thinking that leads not just to this refuge, but to every other pristine wilderness area, in a desperate search for yet another drop of oil. And it perpetuates a head-in-the-haze attitude towards polluting our atmosphere with greenhouse gases and continuing our reliance on OPEC oil for the foreseeable future.

If we allow drilling in the Arctic Refuge, we will have failed twice—we will remain just as dependent on oil for our energy future, and we will have hastened the demise of an irreplaceable wildlife habitat.

We have many choices to make regarding our energy future, but we have very few choices when it comes to industrial pressures on incomparable natural wonders. Let us be clear with the American people that there are places that are so special for their environmental, wilderness or recreational value that we simply will not drill there as long as alternatives exist. The Arctic Refuge is federal land that was set aside for all the people of the United States. It does not belong to the oil companies, it does not belong to one state. It is a public wilderness treasure, we are the trustees.

We do not dam Yosemite Valley for hydro-power.

We do not strip mine Yellowstone for coal.

And we should not drill for oil and gas in the Arctic Refuge.