

sites. And hundreds of thousands of brown-fields across the nation sit idle instead of being returned to productive use. Can we really continue to afford leapfrogging existing and valuable infrastructure to build anew?

That's why the Superfund needs dedicated revenue. In 1995 when the tax expired, the Superfund held a significant surplus, so few people were concerned. Today, however, as many had predicted, the surplus is gone. An empty trust fund, annual budget squabbles, recent budget cuts, and larger and more complex site cleanups have hurt the superfund program, slowing or delaying cleanups. The lack of dedicated revenue for superfund has also put pressure on other parts of the EPA's budget. That pressure surely has been felt by the Brownfields program, which is our premier program to bring sites back to productive use and hasn't yet been fully funded at authorized levels.

It is all the more distressing that we let the corporate environmental income tax lapse 10 years ago—forgoing \$7 billion of dedicated funding for cleanup and redevelopment.

That is why it is time to rededicate ourselves to creating jobs, rebuilding urban America, and eliminating this core cancer in so many of our communities. And isn't it refreshing to advocate for a plan with worthy objectives and a method to pay for it!

#### HONORING ROSA PARKS

#### HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 2, 2005

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mrs. Rosa Lee Parks.

Mrs. Parks's refusal to give up her seat to a white man on a bus in Alabama in 1955 triggered a 381-day boycott of buses, organized by the then little-known Baptist minister Martin Luther King Jr. She did so without knowing the support she would rally.

Her single act of quiet courage and defiance on that December day undeniably became a watershed moment in the history of U.S. civil rights.

It's most fitting that at today's funeral in Detroit, R&B legend Aretha Franklin sang "The Impossible Dream" in honor of Mrs. Parks. It was that action nearly 50 years ago that sparked what seemed at the time to be the impossible dream of the modern civil rights movement, culminating in the 1964 federal Civil Rights Bill.

In 1996, Mrs. Parks received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, awarded to civilians who make outstanding contributions to American life. In 1999, she was awarded the Congressional gold medal, the nation's highest civilian honor.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of this House, I would like to enter into the RECORD the words of a civil rights leader in my community, the Rev. Dr. Benjamin K. Watts, Pastor of the Shiloh Baptist Church in New London (CT).

"Rosa Parks was a woman of character, commitment and courage. When she sat down the world stood up against injustice, bigotry and hatred. Mrs. Parks was not the first to refuse to live down to the status quo of inequality yet because of her unimpeach-

able character she unwittingly became a spark that ignited the flame of passion that created ultimate change. Like Jackie Robinson breaking the color barrier in baseball, the right character was necessary in order to break the back of racism. Her commitment to social justice gave her iconoclastic status as the epitome of courage and commitment. Her passing leaves a void in civil society that each one of us should seek to fill by living lives of high moral value always refusing to sit at the back of the bus of life and ready to accept our place at the forefront of the battle for social change."—Rev. Dr. Benjamin K. Watts

Mrs. Rosa Lee Parks, this great American hero, deserves not only our tributes and gratitude, but our continuing commitment to peace, justice, equality, and freedom for all.

May God rest her soul.

#### IRAN NONPROLIFERATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

#### HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 26, 2005

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify a confusing or mistaken impression that may have been left by one of my colleagues during the House floor debate on S. 1713, the Iran Nonproliferation Amendments Act of 2005, for which I served as the majority floor manager.

The purpose of enacting S. 1713, as amended by the House, is twofold: to strengthen our nonproliferation tools in dealing with Iran and also Syria, and at the same time enable necessary cooperation between NASA and U.S. businesses with their Russian counterparts on the International Space Station. Just to be clear, in no way does S. 1713 favor our space goals at the expense of effectiveness in nonproliferation. In fact, the time-limited authority we give NASA to purchase, either directly or through U.S. companies, Russian space goods and services, is in my view a net plus for nonproliferation, not a minus.

That said, I want to stress that the legislation the House adopted, and the intent of that legislation, allows NASA significant flexibility in using Russian space goods and services to support the assembly and operation of the International Space Station between now and January 1, 2012. NASA is free to make payments pursuant to the Intergovernmental Agreement on ISS "or any protocol, agreement, memorandum of understanding, or contract related thereto." As Chairman HYDE pointed out in his floor statement, this means that after enactment of this legislation, NASA can enter into new arrangements to meet our needs regarding ISS, but that NASA will not enter into new obligations beyond or unrelated to the ISS.

The primary limitations with respect to ISS payments are the sunset date of January 1, 2012, and the existing statutory requirement that the specific Russian entities to be paid have not been sanctioned as proliferators under the earlier sections of the Iran Nonproliferation Act.

I point all of this out because my friend and colleague, Mr. SHERMAN, mistakenly suggested during the floor debate that the phrase

"necessary to meet United States obligations" added to the Hyde-Lantos substitute to S. 1713 implies that NASA could not purchase Russian goods or services if any other alternative was available. That is certainly not the plain meaning of the phrase, nor the intent behind it. However, because Mr. SHERMAN explicitly invited correction, I am doing so here in some detail.

Here are three examples of arrangements that are wholly consistent with the legislative text, the Senate and House floor statements by the architects of this legislation, and the Administration's request for relief, but which would not be allowed under Mr. SHERMAN's interpretation.

First, NASA has stated it wants to use the Russian Soyuz crew capsule to exchange long-term ISS research crews, even during the time the Space Shuttle is flying, because this will allow the Shuttle astronauts to focus on the job of assembling the Space Station to meet our international partner commitments during the Shuttle's limited remaining lifetime. Under the previously negotiated agreements between our countries, Russia is no longer obligated to provide NASA with Soyuz crew transport seats. Therefore, in this example, NASA would not be paying Russia for an obligation they have promised to us. However, because NASA could theoretically use the Space Shuttle as an alternative to carry out crew transfer, albeit at some risk and a cost to our other ISS commitments, Mr. SHERMAN's inference would suggest NASA cannot do this. Given that the primary exigency for adopting this legislation is enabling continued U.S. occupation of ISS beyond April of next year, which requires payment for training and launch to ISS of a NASA astronaut on the next Soyuz launch, Mr. SHERMAN's interpretation is incorrect.

Second, Chairman HYDE's statement explicitly makes clear that cargo resupply services to ISS using technology developed by Russian companies would be legal under the amended Act, again within the limitations I stated above. This would be the case regardless of whether the Space Shuttle might technically be available to deliver cargo to ISS, namely through the middle of 2010.

Third, some bidders may wish to use a very reliable and capable U.S. launch vehicle, one which the Defense Department uses right now to launch critical military satellites, and which happens to incorporate Russian rocket engines. Nothing in this bill was meant to preclude such activities, even though there might be similar launch vehicles which do not use Russian rocket engines. Mr. HYDE's statement makes this clear.

Beyond those examples, I would offer the words of House Science Committee Chairman BOEHLERT as further disputation of Mr. SHERMAN's reading. In his floor statement, Chairman BOEHLERT declares that "by setting a specific end date for our current relationship with the Russians" the bill "encourages NASA to find commercial firms that are not dependent on the Russians to carry cargo in the future." While I may disagree with that goal or a sunset date's effectiveness as a management tool, if Mr. SHERMAN's reading were true, the sunset date would be superfluous, because once a U.S. provider whose service had no Russian content emerged, NASA would be barred from any further payments, let alone purchases, from companies which do use

some Russian content. Clearly Chairman BOEHLERT's interpretation is the same as Chairman HYDE's and my own: Russian content is allowed up until the January 1, 2012 date.

Finally, I would just echo the comments made by Chairman CALVERT during the floor debate: the ISS program requires long-term flexibility for NASA to safely and cost-effectively execute both for our taxpayers and to meet our international commitments. We are partners with Russia in the Space Station. Both NASA and its commercial providers need to be able to exchange goods and services at ISS with nonproliferation compliant Russian entities for the lifetime of the station, particularly as we seek to engage the U.S. private sector in ISS operations. Last week the House made clear that even in a time of great concern over the manifest threat from Iran, we want NASA and industry to have this ability at least through January 1, 2012.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 2, 2005*

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 1, 2005, I was unable to vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3548, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located on Franklin Avenue in Pearl River, New York, as the "Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. Post Office Building (rollcall 557); and on H.R. 3989, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 37598 Goodhue Avenue in Dennison, Minnesota, as the "Albert Harold Quie Post Office (rollcall 558). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 2, 2005*

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes today on the House floor because of an untimely and unexpected crisis requiring me to travel back home to be with my family in California. Unfortunately, I missed recorded votes and would like my intentions included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 1606—Online Freedom of Speech Act.

I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 4061—Department of Veterans Affairs Information Technology Management Improvement Act of 2005. This important bill will help improve Veterans' health services by improving the technology resources of the Veterans' Affairs Department.

The VA has spent about \$1 billion per year for the last decade to improve its information technology systems. This new bill will provide some key oversight to ensure that this money is spent in the most efficient way possible, and to reorganize the VA's information technology to best serve the healthcare needs of the Nation's Veterans.

While there has been recent improvement in the VA's technology systems, there is a lot they can do to provide better healthcare to Veterans. I am proud to support this effort to better the lives of the men and women who have given so much for this country.

Had I been present, I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 1691—John H. Bradley Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic Designation Act.

#### SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTING CONFEREES ON THE FY2006 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

### HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 2, 2005*

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for instructing conferees on the FY2006 Defense Appropriations bill to include the amendment by our colleague in the Senate, JOHN MCCAIN. This provision would simply provide for uniform standards for the interrogation of persons under the detention of the Defense Department and a prohibition on cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment of persons under custody or control of the U.S. Government.

Senator MCCAIN knows the ravages of war and devastating effects of inhumane treatment at the hands of an enemy. He and other American soldiers during the Vietnam War were subjected to terrible treatment that no human being ought to endure. In recent floor remarks, Senator MCCAIN explained that during his time in captivity he and his fellow American soldiers drew strength from knowing that the institution to which they belonged, the U.S. military, and the country they served stood for the highest of principles and ideals. They believed that the U.S. would never treat prisoners of war the way that they were being treated.

No one would disagree that "torture, cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment" is unjust, but there is clear evidence that it is also ineffective. When put under extreme levels of pain or duress during interrogation, a detainee is more likely to say anything to stop the pain, regardless of its accuracy. Moreover, our own cruel treatment of others legitimizes the torture of American citizens. Look no further than the desecrated bodies of American citizens and soldiers killed in Iraq for tragic evidence of this reaction. Furthermore, torture and inhumane treatment aids in the recruitment of terrorists and fuels further terrorist activity.

As members of Congress, we have the Constitutional obligation, under Article I, Section 8, to speak out on this issue and others related to treatment of foreign detainees in war. We also have a moral obligation to oppose cruel and degrading treatment of human beings, and a patriotic obligation to stand up for the honor of this country.

In the wake of the scrutiny and embarrassment that our nation has endured following the treatment of detainees at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, it is imperative that we proclaim to the rest of the world that this policy reflects the law of the land and the conscience of our country. Providing our soldiers with clear, written guidance on how to treat detainees not only protects their interests but under-

scores the freedoms and values we cherish as Americans and that we claim to be the reason we have gone to war in Iraq, Afghanistan and other parts of the world.

Today, as a Congress we must respect and honor our nation, those that risk their lives to serve it, and the high standards and ideals on which it is based. Supporting the McCain amendment is not an issue of political difference; it is an issue of national identity.

The McCain amendment is needed to close a loophole in current policy that does not explicitly describe standards for foreigners held under U.S. custody abroad. This amendment reiterates and clarifies our existing policy that prohibits the use of torture, cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment by U.S. soldiers and agents who are detaining and interrogating prisoners in the global war on terror, requiring that they use the techniques sanctioned in the Army Field Manual on Intelligence and Interrogation.

I urge my colleagues to resist any efforts to accept a watered down version of Senator MCCAIN's language that would grant exceptions for the CIA to conduct its own investigations of detainees in locations overseas that are independent of the Army Field Manual. Such a move, which apparently is being orchestrated by the Vice President's office, would only defeat the intent of the provision adopted in the Senate and cause further confusion among military and civilian service people charged with detainee interrogations.

The Army Field Manual has been used as the standard for interrogation guidance since it was established during the Reagan Administration. The Manual does not cast any technique into stone, but changes with time and includes techniques and descriptions that are classified so as not to be uncovered by enemies.

In a sign of broad bipartisan support, the Senate overwhelmingly approved the McCain amendment in a 90 to 9 vote. In addition, 28 retired military leaders, including General Shalikhshvili, General Hoar, and General Colin Powell, have supported legislating the use of the Army Field Manual through the McCain amendment.

In today's global war on terror, men and women in the armed forces are charged with the critical task of detaining and interrogating prisoners of war and enemy combatants without clear instructions on what is and what is not permissible. These ambiguities contributed to the absence of standards that resulted in the degrading and inhumane treatment that we, and the rest of the world, witnessed at Abu Ghraib and what apparently occurred at Guantanamo at the hands of young and ill-advised soldiers.

The abuses at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo stained the honor of our country and our military. I know that most of our constituents want to amend these wrongdoings. In order to do this, and to help protect the treatment of American soldiers who may be held as prisoners of war, we must give our troops clear instructions on acceptable treatment during detainment and interrogation, without equivocation.

Let us not shrink from the responsibility that stands before us; let us rise as a united body