

The Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, based in Arizona and Utah, is believed to be the largest polygamist group in the country. The 10,000-member church openly promotes plural marriage and has been subject to allegations of forced marriages, abusing the welfare system and wife swapping. If large numbers of the polygamist church's followers do end up in Eldorado, residents fear the group could dominate the town of 1,955 about 45 miles south of San Angelo. "They could easily come in here, bring in several thousand followers and take over the hospital board and other elected positions if they wanted to," said Randy Matkin, editor of the Eldorado Success and head of the Schleicher County Hospital District board. "That is what concerns us."

Locals note that the Fundamentalist Church of Latter Day Saints initially tried to hide its purchase of the 1,691-acre ranch last year. And the scale of the construction there leads many to question whether church elders were truthful when they said the ranch will be used as a retreat for 200 members. As part of their beliefs, church members interact with the outside world as little as possible. Followers could not be reached for comment for this article, but their lawyer, Rodney Parker, said the allegations are nothing more than religious persecution.

Polygamist towns—The twin cities of Colorado City, Ariz., and Hildale, Utah, where the church is based, are dominated by the polygamist group. The church owns the houses and controls the police and the schools, even though most children of its members are home-schooled. The group believes that the mainstream Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints strayed from its true beliefs when it renounced plural marriage in 1890. The fundamentalists broke away from the church and have defiantly practiced polygamy ever since.

Eldorado residents became upset in March when they learned that the group had bought the property. One City Council member even suggested the devil had come to town. The Alarm has largely subsided, replaced by apprehension. Residents still grab copies of the Success as soon as they're placed in the racks and call the sheriff when they see large trucks headed to the church compound. From Country Road 300, a two-lane road that surrounds the ranch, the construction is largely out of view. The only evidence of the budding community is a no-trespassing sign and guard shack. The top of a cement batch plant tower is the only visible structure.

But it's a different picture from the air. Five buildings, including three large structures, that appear to be living quarters, have been erected in a matter of months. Workers laid another large foundation in mid-June. Getting a clear picture of what this activity means is difficult.

Warren Jeffs took over leadership of the church after his father, Rulon Jeffs, died in 2002. This year Jeffs purged about 20 church elders, including several rivals, leading some observers to think that the move to Texas is a search for greener pastures.

The church already has a community in Bountiful, British Columbia, and there are rumors of another outpost in Mexico.

One author and former member says the group has changed since Warren Jeffs became the leader.

"The biggest thing I've noticed since Warren Jeffs took over is the wife swapping—taking wives from one man and giving them to another," said Benjamin Bistline, who wrote *The Polygamists: A History of Colorado City, Arizona*, a nonfiction account of the church's history published by Scottsdale, Ariz.-based Agreka Books.

Under Jeffs, the group has changed some of its beliefs, said Bistline, who left the church in 1980.

"I've always defended the polygamists," Bistline said. "They're very moral people. But now, since he has taken over, there is more corruption, more abuse of women."

Bistline, who lives just outside Colorado City, said he believes that some young women are forced into marriage to keep them in the fold. Moving to Texas may increase the hold on them, he said.

"I think as isolated as it is down there, it will be much harder for the young people to escape," Bistline said.

Religious persecution. Rodney Parker, the church's lawyer, disputes allegations of abuse and forced marriages, saying that detractors take the group's beliefs out of context.

"With regard to the marriage issue, it's very messy, very complicated," Parker said. "There are marriages between the ages of 16 and 18, and occasionally younger, but they're not commonplace. They're being used by critics to imply that's what the church is about and nothing else. It's grossly inaccurate, a deliberate falsehood. None of these girls are being held prisoner."

Parker also argues that attempts to prosecute polygamists will not withstand legal challenges.

"I think polygamy is constitutionally permitted," he said. "All manner of sexual relationships are now being permitted. To somehow single out this one and say it's illegal doesn't make any sense."

Schleicher County Sheriff David Doran, who has visited Colorado City and the Eldorado property, has been trying to learn about the group and calm locals' concerns.

"They have very different beliefs, but they have a nice town up there in Colorado City, and they let me see everything," Doran said. "I talked to women and young children, and everyone was open and polite. I'm trying to do everything in my power to keep a line of communication open to them."

Yet Doran agrees that the group will do whatever Jeff asks.

"If he gives them an order, whatever it is, I'm sure they'll follow it," Doran said.

Flora Jessup, a Phoenix woman who grew up in the fundamentalist church, has been a vocal critic of the sect. It was she who alerted Eldorado residents that the church had bought the ranch.

"They're very good at putting on a face to the public," said Jessup. "They're told to 'keep sweet.' It is a mask that is portrayed by the community. If you do not portray it right, there is punishment."

She said Eldorado residents shouldn't let their guard down.

"You never get a clear picture of what is going on in these communities," Jessup said. "What you see in public and what is happening in private are two totally different things."

A closed society. In Colorado City, the incorporated town is run as a closed society, said Buster Johnson, a Mohave County, Ariz., supervisor from Lake Havasu City.

"They won't be coming into town and kidnapping children or causing any problems," Johnson said. "But they will try and get every bit of government assistance that they can."

Johnson noted that 66 percent of Hildale residents receive Medicaid. The average in Utah is 6.5 percent, he said.

Some critics have referred to the tactic as "bleeding the beast," a method by which the sect siphons financial resources from non-believers.

Parker, the group's attorney, said that's false.

"That doesn't mean, however, that they don't take advantage of what they're legally entitled to," he said.

Parker said the ranch will be "a new place to get away from the pressure here in Utah."

In that sense, it's a place of refuge, but I think that's about as specific as I can get."

The group is already at odds with the state of Texas over environmental permits. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality issued cease and desist orders to the group in May for failure to obtain permits for a rock crusher, concrete plant and sewage treatment facilities, and for lacking a storm water runoff plan.

When a Star-Telegram reporter and photographer flew over the compound in June, the concrete plant appeared to be in operation.

"I think we'll be out there within a week," John Steib, the commission's deputy director of the office of compliance and enforcement, said Thursday. If there are violations, the agency could impose fines of \$10,000 a day. As for local residents, many say they will tolerate the church as long as no one is harmed. "The only time we're ever going to know is if someone comes in and swears up a complaint," said Justice of the Peace Jimmy Doyle. "If they keep it locked up, I don't know if anyone can get out of an 8-foot, deerproof fence."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND WASTED RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Government Accountability Office issued a report stating that the Pentagon will need an estimated \$12.3 billion to pay for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through September.

The extraordinary amount of money needed to pay for our major military operations is not surprising. What greatly troubles me, once again, is the sheer unwillingness of the Bush administration to adequately plan and prepare for those military operations. The additional \$12.3 billion is triple, triple the amount that General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, projected in April would be needed to make it through September. President Bush and the top brass at the Pentagon have, once again, underestimated the resources needed to sustain our military halfway across the world.

The sad part is that many of us have actually come to expect President Bush to shortchange our troops. Military operations are costing more than the Pentagon estimated, in part because top officials expected that Iraq would be a peaceful democracy by now and we could start bringing our troops home. But it does not take a genius to realize that rebuilding a country from the ground up, an entire country that has been decimated by a brutal dictator, takes years, possibly decades.

The costs of these failures are adding up, Mr. Speaker, both in human and in financial terms. Two days ago the United States reached another disheartening milestone when the 900th American soldier was killed in Iraq. Moreover, due to a shortage of qualified soldiers, the Pentagon has shamefully reenlisted the Ready Reserve, a group of retired soldiers who have moved on to civilian life.

Congress has already appropriated nearly \$200 billion in supplemental funds to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. That number could easily reach \$1 trillion before the end of this decade. We cannot possibly fund the war in Iraq at the rate we are going, especially if we want to truly address the threat of terrorism, that threat which, by the way, was never in Iraq, where weapons of mass destruction have yet to be found. Instead of rooting out terrorist networks in Afghanistan, the Bush administration chose to focus on Saddam Hussein, who had no connection to al-Qaeda.

In the process, we have not only failed to adequately address the growing terrorist threat; we have actually added to that threat by incurring the wrath of thousands of Muslims who think we are fighting a war against Islam.

We need to be much smarter about how we address America's national security, Mr. Speaker. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. In crafting this legislation, my staff and I received the help and support of the Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and Women's Action for New Directions. Without the counsel of these organizations, SMART security would not have happened as it did.

SMART security is more vigilant than President Bush claims to be in fighting terror. Instead of emphasizing military force, SMART focuses on multilateral partnerships and stronger intelligence capabilities to track and detain terrorists, and it does so while respecting human and civil rights.

Terrorism is an international problem, and so it makes sense that the

fight against terrorism should involve the international community. That is why SMART security calls for working closely with the U.N. and with NATO to achieve our goals. Only by actively involving other nations in this fight can we hope to prevent future acts of terrorism.

It is time America got smart about its national security. I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor this vitally important resolution, H. Con. Res. 392, because SMART security is tough, pragmatic, and patriotic, and it will keep America safe.

ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF ISLAND OF CYPRUS BY TURKISH TROOPS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as I have done every year, I rise again today to reiterate my fierce objection to the illegal occupation of the island of Cyprus by Turkish troops and declare my grave concern for the future of the area. The island's three decades of internal division make the status quo absolutely unacceptable.

In July 1974, Turkish troops captured the northern part of Cyprus, seizing more than a third of the island. The Turkish troops expelled 200,000 Greek-Cypriots from their homes and killed 5,000 citizens of the once-peaceful island. The Turkish invasion was a conscious and deliberate attempt at ethnic cleansing. Turkey proceeded to install 40,000 military personnel on Cyprus. Today, these troops, in conjunction with United Nations (U.N.) peace-keeping forces, make the small island of Cyprus one of the most militarized areas in the world. Over a quarter of a century later, approximately 1,500 Greek-Cypriots remain missing, including four Americans.

The Green Line, a 113-mile barbed wire fence, separates the Greek-Cypriot community from its Turkish-Cypriot counterpart. For thirty years, the Turkish Northern Republic of Cyprus (TNRC), recognized by no nation in the world except for Turkey, has prohibited Greek-Cypriots, until recently, from freely crossing the Green Line to visit the towns and communities of their families. With control of about 37 percent of the island, Turkey's military occupation has had severe consequences, most notably the dislocation of the Greek-Cypriot population and the resulting refugees.

Thirty years later, the forced separation of these two communities still exist despite efforts by the U.N. and G-8 leadership to mend this rift between north and south. The U.N., with the explicit support of the United States, has sponsored several rounds of proximity talks between the former President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Glafcos Clerides, and Mr. Rauf Denktash, the self-proclaimed leader of the occupied northern part of the island.

In March 2003, the United Nations-sponsored Cyprus peace talks at the Hague between the President of Cyprus, Tassos Papadopoulos, and Mr. Denktash came to an abrupt halt. Responsibility for this unfortunate setback in the peace process rested largely with Mr. Denktash, who rejected U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan's plan to end the 29-year division of Cyprus. It was shameful that the Secretary General's personal diplo-

macy was met by this kind of flat-out rejection. A large share of the blame also rested with the Turkish military and hard-line nationalists in Ankara, who have maintained the illegal Turkish military occupation of Cyprus since Turkish forces invaded the island in 1974. If the Government of Turkey was sincere about settling the Cyprus problem, it could have put the necessary pressure on Mr. Denktash to say "yes" to the U.N. Plan at that time.

Nearly a year later, the Turkish government finally expressed interest in renewing negotiations using the Annan plan as a basis. However, the clock was ticking toward Cyprus becoming a full member of the European Union (EU) on May 1, 2004. The goal was to have a completed and agreed-to settlement plan by the week before so Cyprus could enter the EU as a united island. Even though both sides knew they were not going to get everything they wanted, each side was guaranteed a fair plan and one that would be immediately functional. Unfortunately, the final version of the Annan plan which was submitted for a referendum vote to both communities was unbalanced and biased against the Greek-Cypriots.

On several occasions, my colleagues and I strongly voiced our serious concerns with the Annan plan through letters, meetings and floor statements. We wanted to make sure that all those involved in the negotiation process were well aware that unless these issues were addressed and resolved, the Greek-Cypriots would not agree to the plan. Greater efforts should have been made to address these legitimate concerns which could have secured a positive vote from the Greek-Cypriots.

On April 24, 2004, the people of Cyprus had the opportunity to speak for themselves and vote on a United Nations settlement plan. The Greek-Cypriots' rejection of the suggested settlement plan should not be interpreted as a vote against reunification, but rather, as an important statement about the fundamental principles that must be addressed in any viable and workable settlement.

The Greek-Cypriot voters have made clear that the suggested settlement plan failed because it did not provide for guarantees to ensure the complete implementation of commitments under the plan. Security was a major concern for the Greek-Cypriots.

The Annan plan did not thoroughly satisfy the condition of the removal of foreign troops from Cyprus and the elimination of the right of the guarantor powers to intervene in Cyprus. Although previous versions of the Annan plan called for the complete withdrawal of Greek and Turkish forces once Turkey joined the E.U., the final version of the Annan plan provided for an indefinite presence of Turkish troops in Cyprus. According to the plan, the number of troops would gradually decrease to 650 over a period of 14 years. However, their continuing presence and intervention rights would make a full and genuine independence of Cyprus impossible.

The plan also provided for the continuation of the Treaty of guarantee. This treaty gives the guarantor powers (Turkey, Greece, United Kingdom (UK)) the right to unilaterally intervene in order to preserve the "constitutional order" of the United Cyprus Republic and its constituent states. However, the Annan plan failed to specifically clarify that this treaty does not authorize military intervention. This was a critical point because Turkey insisted that it