

leadership's budget resolution. We are at war in Iraq; we are in fiscal crisis at home. We have critical needs for our hometown security.

Next week, this House will debate the President's \$75 billion supplemental request to support the immediate costs of the war and the immediate needs of homeland security. This House was also going to take up a tax bill to approve at least the \$726 billion in tax cuts desired by the President. That tax bill might now be temporarily postponed because yesterday the other body was shocked into a moment of clarity. If only this House might also be jolted into facing reality.

Mr. Speaker, I had, and I still have, great reservations about our policy in Iraq. I continue to believe that this Congress has abdicated its responsibilities by not having a real debate about the war for more than 5 months. As parliaments and assemblies and congresses around the world debated this issue, the United States House of Representatives was silent. What a shameful performance.

We must not repeat that mistake by failing to ask the tough, necessary questions: How much will this war cost? What are the long-term consequences of occupying Iraq? How will that affect our ability to fund other priorities? What does it mean for our war on terrorism?

I believed then and I believe today that Congress must have the basic information to meet its foreign and domestic obligations. We were told during the budget debate that the administration did not know how much the war might cost or what might be in the supplemental. Two days after the House passed its budget, however, they obviously had a very clear idea and a very specific request for \$74.7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this House passed a budget that makes a mockery of our duty to protect and promote the common good of the American people. We are not responding to the needs of the people when we pass a budget that closes down hospitals, lays off police and firefighters, shuts down after-school programs and child care centers, and cuts \$15 billion from veterans health and benefits.

We are now preparing to debate a supplemental that deliberately fails to provide Congress information on the full cost of the war, of rebuilding Iraq, and of protecting our communities. Now it is being described as the first installment; but we do not know how many other installments are coming, or when, or for what purpose. We do know that this first installment includes items that have nothing to do with the war, the reconstruction of Afghanistan, or homeland security. In fact, Colombia receives more aid for military security in this supplemental than my State of Massachusetts does for homeland security.

How sad. We must do better. We must make sure that America can meet its critical needs at home and abroad. We

need to support our troops, and we also need to support their families and our States and our communities right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I urge my colleagues to get real.

ALERTING MEMBERS TO NEW REPRESSION IN CUBA

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my concern regarding a disturbing chain of events that have unfolded in Cuba over the last week and a half.

With the United States and the world preoccupied with the situation in Iraq, Castro is using this opportunity to take steps to dismantle the pro-democracy movement on the island. Hoping his actions would be overshadowed by world events, the regime has arrested and detained over 70 nonviolent human rights activists, pro-democracy leaders and independent journalists. These are the harshest acts of oppression taken by the Castro regime to silence opposition in recent years. Many worry these are only the first steps in an all-out campaign to silence all opposition on the island.

Last Monday, Castro issued an official communique that accused dissidents on the island of conspiring with U.S. Interests Section Chief James Cason and other American diplomats to undermine the island's leadership.

On Tuesday, Castro agents began the first wave of a series of arrests on the island, rounding up dissidents, independent journalists, owners of independent libraries, leaders of opposition political parties, and pro-democracy advocates who have worked to gather signatures for the Varela Project.

Detainees have been charged with counts of counterrevolutionary activities, subversion, and conspiracy with U.S. diplomats. Many fear that Castro will use this as an opportunity to prosecute the prisoners under a much-criticized 1999 Cuban law that makes it a crime to publish subversive materials provided by the U.S. Government, and that carries with it a sentence of up to 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, leading up to last week's events, Castro was becoming increasingly agitated by Cason and other American diplomats on the island who have met in public with opposition leaders in an effort to encourage democracy in Cuba. Cason and his associates have logged countless miles of travel and have crisscrossed Cuba to distribute shortwave radios and a wide array of books and pamphlets aimed at promoting American culture, democracy, and human rights.

In an effort to silence these efforts, the Cuban Government announced on Tuesday that it was restricting the travel of Cason and other Americans at

the U.S. Interests Section, and quarantining our diplomatic officials in the province of Havana.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to note that one of the independent journalists currently in custody is Omar Rodriguez Saludes, whose work I have mentioned during previous speeches on the House floor, and who was featured in a story last June by The New York Times.

At the time, Omar shared his struggles and those of other independent journalists currently working in Cuba. He told of how he traveled around Havana on a battered child-sized bicycle and wrote his articles in longhand, or on a 20-year-old typewriter that a group of reporters share; and how he gathered every 2 weeks with other journalists in a cramped apartment in Havana to wait his turn to place a phone call and dictate his stories to audiences in the United States.

Castro believed the U.S. and other nations would be too engaged in world matters to notice the atrocities that he and his regime were committing against Omar Rodriguez and other voices for change in Cuba. I urge my colleagues to join with me and speak on the House floor and in other public forums to shed light on the situation in Cuba and show Castro that the world is indeed watching.

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

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

A RUSH TO EXEMPT DEFENSE DEPARTMENT FROM MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of our march to war with Iraq, too little attention has been placed on the rush to exempt the Department of Defense from most of America's major environmental laws.

□ 1930

This is more than just another misguided assault on the environment by the Bush administration. It is a significant missed opportunity for the military.

Our defense-related activities are the source of the Nation's largest pollution and Superfund sites. From the radioactive legacy at Hanford, Washington, to the toxic residue of our chemical testing and manufacturing around American University here in Washington, D.C., every State, district and territory struggles with this problem.

More exemptions are not going to help. A lack of controls created this toxic legacy across America in the first

place. These exemptions will actually cost us money. Much of the tens of billions of dollars that will be necessary to clean up after our military activity is a result of delay and lack of commitment. States will be forced to step in where the Federal Government has walked away.

Failure to invest in technologies of cleanup will put lives at risk. Land mines, unexploded ordnance kill people at home and abroad.

Even the sprawl that vexes communities around the country hits at the military. Isolated areas that were once perfect for testing weapons and training soldiers are now victims of our headlong rush for urban development. Sprawl is one of the greatest challenges to military readiness as civilian uses encroach upon and around military bases and ranges.

For too long, Congress has been missing in action in this critical area. It should not just reject the Bush administration's ill-conceived but cleverly-timed effort. Now is the time for Congress to help the military fulfill its environmental obligations.

As the finest fighting force in the world, our military achieves astounding results. All they need are direct orders and adequate resources. Why not put them to work to enhance and protect the environment, rather than create more environmental threats in the future while we ignore the challenges of today?

Since I came to Congress I have been working on this problem, fighting to at least inventory the areas that are blighted by unexploded ordnance, to put somebody in charge and incrementally increase funding for cleanup and research.

As a gusher of money flows to defense, just half the budget for the ill-conceived national missile defense program could revolutionize military cleanup. Instead of a rate of spending that will now take centuries, maybe millennia, we could finish the job in a few decades.

In the long term, investing in cleanup can actually save substantial sums of money. As technologies are developed and economies of scale are achieved in environmental cleanup, there will be a wide range of civilian contractors willing, able and eager to expand their business.

Additional money for research will do far more than merely hasten cleanup and lower costs. It will have a profound implication not just for soldiers but for children and farmers who are killed and maimed every day as a result of unexploded ordnance and land mines. And this just does not happen overseas. They have been able to document over 60 American victims, including children, who have been victims here in this country.

At a time when we are deeply concerned about our economy, these investments will provide tens of thousands of family-wage jobs. Accelerated cleanup will speed the return of some

of America's most interesting, scenic and valuable properties to productive uses and, in some cases, to the tax rolls.

It is not just a fear of job loss that keeps between a quarter and a third of domestic bases that are surplus to our needs in operation. Many communities feel that they will lose not just the economic security and the jobs but they will be left with a white elephant that is polluted, surrounded by barbed wire and a cyclone fence.

The Fort Ord base in California is an example. It contains some of the world's most spectacular landscape, but after 13 years since closure and over \$500 million, the land still has not been fully restored to productive use.

Twenty years ago, a bipartisan coalition of "cheap hawks" made some significant reforms in military weapons procurement. Today, the "hawks" who care about the environment, the budget and military readiness should embrace bold, environmental military action.

Congress should firmly reject the anti-environmental, unnecessary initiatives of the administration and, instead, give the money and instructions to the Department of Defense so they can clean up after themselves. It will boost the economy, save taxpayer money and enhance the environment. It will improve military readiness at home while it enhances the safety of soldiers and civilians around the world.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, 108TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for publication the attached copy of the Rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the U.S. House of Representatives for the 108th Congress. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct adopted these rules pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(1) on March 19, 2003. I am submitting these rules for publication in compliance with House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(2).

RULES—COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT—ADOPTED MARCH 19, 2003 FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help insure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall

be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 108th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

(d) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall have access to such information that they request as necessary to conduct Committee business.

RULE 2. DEFINITIONS

(a) "Committee" means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(b) "Complaint" means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) "Inquiry" means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) "Investigative Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 19(a) to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(e) "Statement of Alleged Violation" means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(f) "Adjudicatory Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 23(a), that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(g) "Sanction Hearing" means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(h) "Respondent" means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of an inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(i) "Office of Advice and Education" refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefits of the House of Representatives.

(j) "Member" means a Representative in, or a Delegate to, or the Resident Commissioner to, the U.S. House of Representatives.

RULE 3. ADVISORY OPINIONS AND WAIVERS

(a) The Office of Advice and Education shall handle inquiries; prepare written opinions providing specific advice; develop general guidance; and organize seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, may request a written opinion with respect to the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of such Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Office of Advice and Education may provide information and guidance regarding