

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE
HON. L. DICK OWEN, JR.

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, Baldwin County, Alabama, and indeed the entire First Congressional District recently lost a dear friend, and I rise today to honor him and pay tribute to his memory.

Senator L. Dick Owen, Jr., was a devoted family man and dedicated public servant throughout his entire life. A native of Bay Minette, Alabama, he was a 1941 graduate of the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa. Governor George Wallace appointed him to the position of Baldwin County Probate Judge in January 1964 following the death of his predecessor, Judge Ramsey Stuart. One year later, he was elected to the Alabama House of Representatives, where he served two terms before running for and winning two terms in the Alabama Senate. His work in the state legislature was met with wide praise, and he was honored by the Alabama Wildlife Federation as "Legislative Conservationist of the Year," and, in 1976, by the Alabama Press Association as "Most Effective Senator."

Senator Owen was also actively involved in his community and was a charter member of the Bay Minette Rotary Club. He was also honored in 1982 when the performing arts center of Faulkner State Community College—an institution which he helped locate in Bay Minette—was named the "L.D. Owen Performing Arts Center." His devotion to his fellow man was unmatched, and I do not think there will ever be a full accounting of the many people he helped over the course of his lifetime.

Senator Owen was also a proud veteran of the United States Army and served with distinction as a member of the famed 82nd Airborne Division during World War II, where he earned six Bronze Stars. During the Korean War, he returned to active duty, and in 1963 retired from the Army Reserve with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering a dedicated public servant and long-time advocate for Baldwin County, Alabama. Senator Owen will be deeply missed by his family—his wife, Annie Ruth Heidelberg Owen; his son, L.D. Owen, III; his brother, James R. Owen; his sister, Nell Owen Davis; his three grandchildren; and his two great-grandchildren—as well as the countless friends he leaves behind. Our thoughts and prayers are with them all at this difficult time.

GAZA: TEST CASE FOR PEACE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I opposed an amendment to the State Department Authorization Bill that would have put restrictions on the ability of the President to decide on the appropriate flow of aid to the Palestinian Authority, because I believe that a Palestinian Authority both willing and

able to confront violent opposition to the peace process with Israel is essential for peace to succeed. Later that day, after our debate, I read—a bit tardily—an excellent article that had been published in the Washington Post, for Wednesday, July 20, by the Israeli Ambassador to the United States, Daniel Ayalon. I believe that Ambassador Ayalon is an extremely able diplomat, who is himself a dedicated supporter of a rational process leading to a genuine two state solution in the Middle East. The article he wrote underlines the importance of a commitment by the Palestinian Authority to take the steps necessary to curtail the activities of those in the Palestinian community who are determined to bring the peace process to a violent halt.

As Ambassador Ayalon notes, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has confronted those within Israel who are opposed to the peace process in general, and very specifically to the withdrawal of Jewish settlers from Gaza. This is of course, as the Ambassador points out, a cause of great anguish within Israel, and Prime Minister Sharon and his allies ought to be commended for the dedication to peace they are showing in their willingness to confront this opposition. It is entirely reasonable for Israel to ask, as Ambassador Ayalon does, for a comparable level of effort from President Abbas of the Palestinian Authority.

I do not mean by this to equate the opposition faced by President Abbas on the one hand and Prime Minister Sharon on the other. While I disagree strongly with those settlers who are seeking to derail the peace process, they have not in any significant degree resorted to the kind of murderous violence that has been the response of Hamas and others within the Palestinian community seeking to put an end to peace. I say that they are people seeking to put an end to the peace process, Mr. Speaker, because there is no other explanation for the decision to engage in terrorist murders of Israelis within Gaza while the Israeli Government is in fact in the process of withdrawing from Gaza. Individual Israelis are not the only victims of these murders—the peace process is also an intended victim.

I believe it is important for the United States to provide strong support for all those trying to go forward with this difficult peace process, and I think it is fair for Ambassador Ayalon to point out that the effort so far of President Abbas have fallen short of what Israel has a right to expect.

I will continue to oppose, as I did last week, measures that seem to me to undercut President Abbas' ability to go forward with this admittedly difficult task. At the same time, I think it is important for those of us who are strong supporters of the peace process to join in reminding President Abbas of the importance of his being more successful than he has in the past in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Daniel Ayalon's article be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 2005]

IN GAZA, A TEST CASE FOR PEACE

(By Daniel Ayalon)

Next month thousands of Israelis will be uprooted from their homes in 25 settlements, against the backdrop of widespread political opposition and intensifying Palestinian terrorism. Israel faces difficult days ahead.

Prime Minister Ariel Sharon is boldly determined to move forward with disengagement from Gaza and the northern West Bank

out of a deep conviction that it is critical to Israel's future. Unfortunately, the Palestinian leadership has failed to meet him halfway. The Palestinian Authority's refusal to disarm terrorist organizations has enabled the terrorists to regroup and renew deadly attacks against Israelis, compounding the difficulties of this engagement and casting an ominous shadow on the possibility of future progress.

The sharp increase in Palestinian terrorist attacks, particularly in the past week, underscores the precariousness of the situation. While Israel is committed to completing the disengagement as planned, we will not sit idly by while our civilians are under attack. Time is running out for the Palestinian leadership to confront the terrorists. Should it fail to do so, Israel will be forced to take the necessary steps to defend its people. Lest the Palestinians miss another historic opportunity, the world should insist that they crack down on terrorism now.

After numerous failed attempts by Israelis and Palestinians to reach peaceful accommodation over the past 15 years, Sharon decided to embark on a different course. Disengagement is an immense political, strategic and indeed historical undertaking, aimed at reducing friction between Israelis and Palestinians, jump-starting the peace process and providing the Palestinians with a unique opportunity to build institutions of responsible self-governance.

At the same time, it puts a terrible burden on thousands of Israelis called on to leave their homes against their will. Many have lived there for more than three generations. Specially trained, unarmed units will move from house to house as part of a massive logistical operation involving some 50,000 security personnel, accompanied by teams of social workers and psychologists. Living, breathing communities, some more than 30 years old, will simply vanish. Businesses, factories and farms will be shut down. Schools, synagogues and cemeteries will be relocated. The removal of graves, including those of terrorism victims, will be especially heart-wrenching.

The trauma of disengagement has unleashed dangerous rifts in Israeli society. While the withdrawal is supported by most of the public, many Israelis deeply oppose it on moral, religious and security grounds. Sharon has demonstrated steadfast leadership in the face of an unprecedented political backlash from his traditional supporters. Given the intense political opposition and growing civil disobedience, the prospect of violent resistance cannot be ruled out. Regardless of the outcome, the repercussions of disengagement will be felt in Israel for years. At stake is not only the success of disengagement but also the very fabric of Israeli society.

Adding fuel to the fire, public anxiety in Israel has increased because of the resurgence of Palestinian terrorism, including suicide bombings, drive-by shootings and rocket attacks. Rather than confront the terrorist organizations and disarm them, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas has invited Hamas into his government, thereby providing a terrorist organization with an official seal of approval. The result has been an emboldened Hamas, a further weakening of the Palestinian Authority and a potentially disastrous perception that disengagement is a victory for terrorism rather than an opportunity for peace.

Abbas must seize the moment and lead the Palestinians toward peace. The terrorist organizations must be disarmed as called for in the "road map" if Palestinian statehood is to be achieved. This is nonnegotiable. Gaza is both the opportunity and the test for the Palestinian leadership. Will that leadership

prove itself capable of governing a functioning democratic society, free from terrorism and focused on improving the lives of its citizens, or will it squander yet another opportunity? After leaving Gaza, Israel will no longer provide an easy excuse for Palestinian failure.

The rock-solid, principled and bipartisan support for Israel in the United States has been vital to our ability to overcome terrorism and prepare the ground for a political initiative. The notion of disengagement would have been unthinkable had Israel not prevailed in the latest round of sustained terrorism waged by the Palestinians since September 2000.

The stakes for Israel are enormous. We are a strong but small country facing a largely hostile region roughly 500 times our size. We can ill afford to make mistakes. Iran's nuclear weapons program is imminent, posing an existential threat. Syria and Iran promote and support Palestinian terrorist groups sworn to our destruction. Hezbollah has intensified terrorist attacks against Israel from Lebanon, opening a second front aimed at derailing any progress. Despite these challenges, Israel has shown it is prepared to take difficult steps to achieve President Bush's vision for peace in the Middle East. The world should insist on no less from the Palestinians.

The writer is Israel's ambassador to the United States.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL EDWARD
HUGHES

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Paul Edward "Ed" Hughes who died Sunday, July 17, 2005, at his home in Sunset Beach, North Carolina.

Mr. Hughes, who retired to Sunset Beach in 1992, was serving his third term on the Sunset Beach City Council. He was born in Pennsboro, West Virginia in 1926 to John and Mary Hughes, and grew up in Baltimore, Maryland. Ed served in the Army Air Corps during the Second World War and later graduated from Loyola College, where he was named an All-American in lacrosse, playing on the All-South team in 1948 and 1949. He later received his master's degree from the University of Pennsylvania.

Ed Hughes moved to Wilmington, Delaware in 1958, where he taught at Tower Hill School for 34 years, chaired the History Department and served as Dean. Over the course of his tenure he introduced anthropology to the school curriculum and headed the summer school program. He wrote a book about his founding of the Junior Humanities program for gifted inner-city students, a model project for which he received the Hollingworth Award. He was a head basketball coach for 14 years, coached football, and started the golf team.

Ed Hughes was a candidate for President of the City Council in Wilmington, Delaware and chaired the Republican City Committee. He was a frequent lecturer on current events and world affairs at Crosslands in Kennett Square, Pennsylvania and was a longtime manager of the Hagley Museum on the Brandywine River. He was a devoted husband, a proud father of five, a golfer, and in later life, a painter. He loved crossword puzzles, his golfing buddies and a good steak.

Ed Hughes is survived by his wife of 54 years, Jody Hughes, his daughters Mary and K.C. Halpern, his sons Paul, John and Mark, as well as seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of knowing Ed Hughes. He was a gentle man with a superb intellect and a wonderful wit. He was a man who was content with his life and achievements, most of all his magnificent children and theirs. Ed Hughes loved his family, his community and his country. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and works of this good man and in extending to his wife and entire family our most sincere sympathy.

USA PATRIOT AND TERRORISM
PREVENTION REAUTHORIZATION
ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3199) to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes:

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States Congress passed the USA PATRIOT Act with broad bipartisan support to better equip law enforcement and intelligence agencies in their struggle to combat terrorism. As the shock of those horrible events subsided, many from both political parties began to question some of the more invasive aspects of the Patriot Act, including a number of provisions that allow Federal investigators to enter homes, tap phone lines, and search library records without a warrant.

Since then, the Patriot Act has become a much-debated issue, symbolizing a Federal Government abusing its power and violating civil liberties for some, and a necessary bulwark against the barbarity of terrorists for others. And yet, all agree that the United States faces a daunting challenge in combating terrorism, both abroad and at home, through continuing efforts to safeguard borders, protect airports, and monitor centers of trade and commerce. In order to overcome these challenges, we must remain vigilant in our fight against terror and continue to strengthen our resolve even in the face of depraved and desperate acts such as the bombings that terrorized London this past week and a few short weeks ago.

The events in London provide a somber and revealing backdrop for the current debate regarding the renewal of a number of provisions contained in the USA PATRIOT Act. Many of my colleagues have voiced well-reasoned and thoughtful objections to the current bill, the USA Patriot and Terrorism Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2005, H.R. 3199, which would make permanent 14 of the 16 provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act. I share the concerns of my colleagues who fear that the proposed legislation will endanger the civil liberties of U.S. citizens and create the potential for abuse of Federal powers. Additionally, I am disturbed by the administration's lack of cooperation in providing detailed information re-

garding the effectiveness of the increased enforcement power contained in the Patriot Act. The members of the 9/11 Commission specifically directed the Bush administration to explain how the expanded powers of the Patriot Act "materially" enhance U.S. security. They also directed the administration to make certain that proper supervision was in place to monitor these enhanced powers. The administration has ignored these recommendations and showed a repeated willingness to place the acquisition of increased power above the common interest of individual citizens.

But as we deliberate over this bill, it is important to consider the ongoing fight against terrorism, so violently displayed in the terrorist bombings in London this past week. These attacks are a reminder that we remain susceptible to terrorism and must protect ourselves from continuing threats. While I have deep concerns regarding the effect of certain provisions of the Patriot Act on the civil rights of Americans, I strongly believe that we must not end this legislation but amend it. "Mend, don't end" should have been the guiding theme in redrafting and analyzing the Patriot Act.

We cannot let our partisan differences obscure our common fight against terrorism. We cannot let our very real concerns about the violation of civil liberties overwhelm our oath to protect the citizens of the United States from further terrorist activity. While I would have preferred a "mend don't end" strategy to reshaping the Patriot Act, the leadership chose a different tactic and brought the bill to the floor with the most disconcerting provisions included. In light of recent events, and our continued war on terrorism, I chose to stand on the side of law enforcement and the intelligence community and protect our country by voting for the Patriot Act reauthorization.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LINDER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast rollcall votes 415 and 416 on July 22, 2005, because I was unavoidably detained on official business with President George W. Bush in Atlanta, Georgia, at a roundtable discussion on retirement security for future generations of Americans. I was also unable to cast rollcall votes 417, 418, and 419 on July 25, 2005, as I was traveling on official legislative/policy business. Had I been present I would have cast the following votes: On rollcall No. 415, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall No. 416, I would have voted "yes"; on rollcall No. 417, I would have voted "yes"; on rollcall No. 418, I would have voted "yes"; and on rollcall No. 419, I would have voted "yes."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2006

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of this