

direction for our efforts to protect endangered species and the health of our oceans.

MOVING AN AGENDA FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, faced with unprecedented challenges around the world and here at home, President Bush has taken the road less traveled. He has not hid behind his already strong record. Instead, he has laid out an agenda for America that answers history's call and meets those challenges on our terms, and in the last four weeks, the House has taken action on major legislation involving every aspect of the President's agenda.

Since we returned from recess in April, we have passed a robust tax relief package to create jobs and grow the economy. Over the long term, the President's jobs and growth package will help ensure our Nation has an economy strong enough to employ everyone willing to work and meet the emerging needs of the American people.

We passed the global HIV/AIDS bill, first announced in the President's State of the Union address, to provide \$15 billion to Africa over the next 5 years to stem the tide of the great plague of our age. We have an opportunity to ease the suffering of millions and save the lives of millions more, and thanks to the President's leadership, we will seize it and send a final bill to his desk this week.

Also this week, we will take up the Defense Department's reauthorization bill which will provide provisions to modernize the Pentagon's management and bring it into the 21st century. Rigid personnel restrictions will be updated, reflecting more flexible management models that have been so successful in the modern business world.

We have tackled adult education and job training and also reformed Federal special education law.

Last week, the House made several reforms to retirement savings law, giving employees more control over their 401(k)s, IRAs and their pensions, and this week we will pass another presidential initiative, this one to maintain our environment by reforming the management of our forests.

Much remains to be done, Mr. Speaker, but so far this House has answered the President's call to pass an agenda worthy of the American people.

MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it seems like not one week goes by without another outrage from this administration with respect to the environment of this country.

I rise today to submit an article from a recent newspaper in my city which I think everyone ought to read before they vote on this change in environmental regulations for the military. The column details a recent sonar test that was conducted by the navy near my hometown and the effects of the marine mammals that were observed by a University of Washington class who happened to be studying the area.

There is a lot of worry in my area about the orcas and about the porpoises, and there are a number of people who are involved in this kind of study, and they were up there watching, observing the sonar, what was going on and with cameras what was going on with these animals, and along comes a ship and sets off a sonic boom. They say they have to test it there. There is no reason why they could not call the University of Washington and say where are the animals, we have some concern, we do not want to kill porpoises, we do not want to kill whales, but no, they set off the boom, and soon, porpoises were floating to the surface, dead, and whales were beginning to act very strangely, and this is unnecessary.

The military should be held to the same account that everybody else is. A few weeks ago, they were out there shooting shells into the water with depleted uranium on the end of them. Everybody knows there are questions about the effects of depleted uranium and what it does to the human body. The salmon fishery off the Washington coast is right where they are shooting the shells. They could not even figure out how to get out far enough or something to get out of the fishing grounds.

To make it even worse, this issue of depleted uranium is a big issue in Iraq. We dumped 300 tons of depleted uranium over southern Iraq in 1991, and we have had recorded, at least by the Iraqi medical people, a 1- to 300-percent increase in cancer and deformities at birth in children. In the last 6 months, we dumped 600 tons, twice as much, and the military continues to put out the word that there is no problem.

The British Government, the Royal Society of Medicine in England said, there is a problem and we are going to clean up the area around Basra which is where the British are responsible, but the United States, in Baghdad, in Mosul and Kirkuk and all these places, we say no problem.

The military is unwilling to confront the environmental damage they bring about, and when called to account for it, they say, well, it is a national security matter. Look, we can test sonar devices 300 miles out in the ocean. We do not have to do it 50 yards, through a pod of whales. There is no reason for that, and they know they are there. It is not as though it is some mystery.

The science is very good. They simply did not think they had to worry about the environment. They are the military, and this bill that is going through here with an exemption for military from the environmental regulations is simply an absolute atrocity.

In all the places in the world where they have nuclear weapons, where they have all kinds of chemicals, in Anniston, Alabama, they put in a facility to burn the waste gases they have created from making the weapons of mass destruction in the United States, and they burn it right in Anniston, Alabama, 10 blocks from a school with no protection for that school. This kind of thing is unacceptable in the United States, and the United States Congress should not endorse it and make it okay. It is wrong.

I will enter into the RECORD an article from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer dated May 19, 2003, at this point.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, May 19, 2003]

IN THE NORTHWEST: SONAR TESTS' EFFECTS ON WILDLIFE SHOULD SET OFF ALARMS

(By Joel Connelly)

Lovers of Washington's inland waters, including this part-time Whidbey resident, enjoy a living tip sheet in www.orcanetwork.org, a Web site filled with recent sightings and locations of killer whales, gray whales and other great marine mammals.

Last week, however, the customary light-hearted dispatches yielded to a gripping account of the extreme distress of marine creatures during a Navy sonar test earlier this month.

The episode, on May 5, raises major new questions about whether Congress should roll over for a Pentagon campaign designed to exempt the military from complying with landmark federal environmental laws.

Without these laws, the natural systems and marine life of our Puget Sound-Strait of Georgia region would possess no defense against the Department of Defense.

Orcanetwork's dispatch came from David Bain, a University of Washington faculty member. With students, he witnessed what happened when the Everett-based guided missile destroyer *Shoup* conducted a midfrequency sonar training exercise off San Juan Island.

"The passage of naval vessel 86 (*Shoup*) was observed by me and the marine mammal class at Friday harbor laboratories," Bain wrote. "Collectively, we observed effects on three species. These were:

Porpoises: Bain and students watched Dall's porpoises in a bay north of Lime Kiln Lighthouse, an island landmark. "After the (Navy) ship passed, they were observed traveling away from the ship at high speeds," Bain wrote. "This is similar to the behavior of Dall's porpoises in the presence of other loud sounds, such as air-gun blasts."

Since the sonar tests, bodies of seven porpoises have been found—three beached in the Strait of June de Fuca near Haro Strait, and three more in the San Juan Islands.

A number of porpoise deaths have occurred in recent months, Bain noted, some predating the *Shoup's* passage through Haro Strait.

"Midfrequency sonars were heard in April as well, although they seemed to be coming from Juan de Fuca Strait or points south," he wrote. "Thus, these earlier strandings were potentially related to sonar activity."

Minke whales: During the test, a minke whale was spotted porpoising (coming out of

the water) as it swam north of the *Shoup*. Other sightings of similar behavior were recorded at two other locations off San Juan Island.

"It has been about 20 years since I've seen a minke porpoising," wrote Bain.

He speculates that all sightings were of one whale, racing to get away from the naval vessel and its sonar tests.

Killer whales: As he and students watched the widely known J pod of orcas, wrote Bain, "Killer whales were observed behaving normally until the sonar became audible in the air." At that point, however, the J pod moved inshore and grouped tightly. "As we moved inshore with them, the naval vessel disappeared over the horizon, although the sonar was still audible," wrote Bain. The J pod then moved quietly northward, staying near shore and later bunching up again.

Given the recent sharp decline in our resident killer-whale populations, did it make sense for the *Shoup* to be causing apparent distress?

Did the Navy bother to think about this, or to consult beforehand with biologists expert in marine mammal life of the northern Sound?

We are a military-intensive region. The shores of Puget Sound likely would sink were another Navy base, shipyard or testing facility located in our waters.

Aside from pacifists protesting the Trident base—most memorably Archbishop Raymond Hunthausen paddling a kayak—local officials and politicians have embraced bases and jobs.

Once upon a time, too, there were security grounds for so doing. The buildup of the Soviet Pacific fleet was endlessly cited by the late Sen. Henry Jackson. An Everett Navy base, Scoop argued, would be a day's sailing time closer to the Soviet Far East than berthings in California.

As Bain notes, however—with cool understatement—"the threats arrayed against the United States at this time are minor compared to what we faced when the environmental laws proposed to be overturned were first passed."

As well, it should be recalled that Jackson—the Pentagon's most devoted friend—was the chief architect of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Water Act.

Washington's congressional delegation ought to take heed of the distress caused by the *Shoup*'s recent sonar tests.

In recent years, lawmakers have constructively pushed the Navy. Environmentally sensitive construction of the Trident base was one result. Another was forcing the Navy to abandon an untested, risky plan to deposit toxic dredge spoils beneath a berm in Everett's Port Gardner Bay.

What is to be done? First, there should be no exemption from federal environmental laws. If the military ignores regulations, citizens should have recourse in the courts.

Second, the Navy must be made to consult with civilian agencies in case of sensitive or potentially harmful activities. A firm suggestion on this front might come from Rep. Norm Dicks, senior Democrat on the House Defense Appropriations subcommittee.

Third, as noted by Bain, the Department of Defense is reviewing proposals on what it can do to prevent such conflicts as those caused by the *Shoup*'s sonar tests.

"The Navy (should) proceed with caution until such programs are completed and the Navy can accurately predict where it can operate dangerous equipment without causing undue environmental damage," Bain wrote.

Amen. Marine mammals are a big part of what makes the waters of Puget Sound and Strait of Georgia worth defending.

LOSING MANUFACTURING AND OUR HIGH-TECH JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about a couple of issues that concern me a great deal. One, of course, is the growing debt and our unwillingness to deal with the problem of solvency for Social Security.

Social Security is going to run out of money roughly in the next 10 to 15 years, and we are putting off the problem of solving what do we do to keep the program solvent until later. Social Security is probably one of our better programs that we have in the United States, and we should not put off a solution to keep it going.

The other issue, of course, that concerns me is our mounting debt and overspending. This country is now 227 years old. In the first 200 years, we mounted a debt of \$500 billion. Now at \$6.7 trillion we are amassing an additional debt of \$500 billion every year. We have to control overspending. I think it is unconscionable for us to think that our problems today are so great that it justifies borrowing from funds that our kids are going to have to earn.

One reason that we have got the problem right now is revenues are down, and that brings us to jobs and the economy. I want to speak for a moment about losing our manufacturing and our high-tech jobs in this country.

I have been meeting with workers, as I am sure many of my colleagues in Congress have been. All of us should be troubled about the continuing decline in manufacturing in this country. Products from China and other countries are now taking away our business. The manufacturing sector accounted for 41 percent of non-farm employment in 1946. Forty-one percent in 1946, 28 percent in 1980, 18 percent in 1990 and just 12 percent of our total economy today is manufacturing jobs.

What does this mean? This means that millions of people are being pushed out of manufacturing jobs into service sector jobs that often pay less and are less reliable. With other sectors of the economy weakening, we have been depending on high-tech jobs with our research and technology, but Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years we have lost 560,000 high-tech jobs. We need those manufacturing jobs and we need those high-tech jobs if we are going to continue to be competitive, if we are going to continue to increase our productivity.

Manufacturing is important to the economy because it is a leader in innovation. Manufacturing contributes 57 percent of total U.S. research and development funding. Manufacturing has made up almost a constant share of total U.S. GDP since the forties, but over that period it has varied between 20 and 23 percent of U.S. output.

With aggressive improvements in efficiency, we would expect the manufacturing sector to be growing faster in the international market, but it has been under attack from foreign competition, much of which seems to be unfair.

I have spoken with constituents who say that the Chinese companies sell products for less than the raw materials cost here. Many suspect that Chinese companies are receiving covert subsidies from the Chinese Government. It has been suggested that a variety of other governments use similar underhanded methods to boost their sales here and reduce sales in their home markets.

What can we do? One thing that we are going to be talking about in the next several weeks is should we reduce our overzealous taxation and our overzealous regulation on manufacturing. We now tax our manufacturers in the United States approximately 18 percent more than what they would be taxed if they are located in a foreign country. I think we have got to look at the excessive regulation and the excessive taxation. As we approach a tax bill, it would be my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that we concentrate on those tax issues that are going to allow our manufacturing sector and our business sector to be more competitive in an international market.

One especially harmful action has been the steel tariff imposed by the administration. Though the increased price of steel has protected some steel workers from foreign competition, it has also resulted in more layoffs in the steel-using industries than the total employment of the steel making industry. With prices rising by 50 percent or more, hundreds of manufacturers that use steel have simply let workers go or have transferred production out of the country where steel is cheaper.

It isn't healthy to have too much of a service economy where we import most of our goods and fewer and fewer people actually build products. One way to improve things for our manufacturers is to do a better, more careful job of negotiating trade treaties and then enforcing them. Another is to end counterproductive tariffs like the one on steel. We need to make sure our taxes and regulations avoid putting our manufacturers at a significant disadvantage. If we don't do something, we could weaken our economy and lose our productive capacity.

RECENT EVIDENCE OF MARINE MAMMAL HARASSMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to discuss the harassment of whales and other marine mammals in Puget Sound, all the way across the country from my home District in Maine, and a few words by way of background.

I served for 6 years on the Committee on Armed Services in this House. Half