

RECOGNIZING THE
CONTRIBUTIONS OF EVE NEWMAN

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Eve Newman for her contributions and dedicated service to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I first met Mrs. Newman when I was a teenager working alongside her daughter, Lee, as a volunteer for the Republican National Committee. Her impressive, professional nature inspired the young volunteers she was overseeing at the time. Mrs. Newman and her husband, the late Eugene L. Newman, were longtime residents of Fairfax County and unselfishly served their community over the years. Mrs. Newman and her daughter now reside in Strasburg, Virginia, where she remains active in her community.

Over her lifetime, Mrs. Newman has held several distinguished positions and has received countless awards for her service. Mrs. Newman served as the general registrar for Fairfax County for eight years, was president of the Voter Registrars Association of Virginia, president of the Republican Women's Club and Board member of the State Board of Republican Women. With each organization, she dedicated herself fully to each cause and came up with innovative ideas to improve the organization. While serving on the State Board of Republican Women, she organized a scrap booking contest that was an instant success for a number of years. While serving as the registrar for Fairfax County, she created a tabulation system utilizing age brackets as an election prediction tool.

Her love and dedication to the Republican Party is matched by her love for the arts. She studied at the Art Institute in Philadelphia, and has she served on the Board of Directors of the Wayside Theatre located in the Shenandoah Valley. Mrs. Newman was not a board member that simply warmed a seat; she served as an active participant who contributed immensely to the theatre. Her assistance was merited in 2002 when she was awarded the theatre's highest honor, the Leo M. Bernstein Award. Mrs. Newman is also an accomplished artist; her most notable artistic contribution can be seen on each official document of the Virginia Federation of Republican Women, as she is the designer of the official seal.

On Saturday, November 20th, many from around the Commonwealth will gather with Eve at a luncheon in her honor. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I call upon my colleagues to join me in recognizing her accomplishments and applauding her for all that she has done.

TO RECOGNIZE THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION OF SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of the founding

of the Economic Opportunity Commission of San Luis Obispo County (EOC), which will be celebrated on December 9th. I would like to congratulate the board members, staff and volunteers of the EOC for all they have accomplished and wish them well as they continue to serve the residents of San Luis Obispo and nine other counties in California.

The EOC is a private, nonprofit public benefit community action agency (CAA) that was designated by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors as the CAA for the County in December 1965. The EOC strives to address and alleviate poverty in San Luis Obispo County, in part through community-based programs designed to help individuals and families develop the skills needed to enhance their stability and economic independence. In addition, the EOC also uses strong community partnerships with churches, county government, and other service providers to assist the local community.

I appreciate the assistance the EOC provides to the residents of San Luis Obispo County. Its Board of Commissioners, employees, and volunteers are to be commended for their efforts, which have helped thousands of people over the past 40 years. Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the EOC as they celebrate their 40th anniversary.

REGARDING WASHINGTON STATE
PROFESSOR OF THE YEAR
BRUCE PALMQUIST

HON. DOC HASTINGS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to 2005 Washington State Professor of the Year—Mr. Bruce Palmquist.

The U.S. Professors of the Year awards, sponsored by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, recognize college and university professors for their excellence in undergraduate teaching and mentoring.

For over a decade, Mr. Palmquist has taught science to students at Central Washington University using innovative teaching strategies to actively engage his students in learning. He has taught his students to embrace the University's motto "by teaching, we learn." This teaching approach has motivated students to achieve a higher standard.

Mr. Palmquist recognizes the importance of access to higher education. He worked to establish a teacher education program at a community college one hundred miles from Central Washington University, so that students could more easily access higher education. Mr. Palmquist's dedication to the program and students is apparent as he travels over 200 miles per week to advise enrolled and potential students, promote the program, and help students with course work.

In a society where teachers do not always receive the appreciation they deserve, I am pleased to honor and commend Mr. Palmquist for his dedication to students in Central Washington. Mr. Palmquist is a teacher who is willing to work hard for his students, and expects his students to work hard for him in return.

To Mr. Palmquist and the professors across America that are educating tomorrow's leaders, thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 597, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AZERBAIJAN ELECTIONS

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share a few thoughts with my colleagues on recent the elections in Azerbaijan.

While the recent November 6th parliamentary elections in Azerbaijan failed to meet U.S. and international standards for a free and fair process, there were some notable improvements over the previous elections.

According to the State Department, the Government of Azerbaijan: allowed large numbers of candidates to register; provided candidates with greater access to the media; allowed exit polls and extensive monitoring by domestic and foreign observers; improved voter lists; and took other actions contributing to a more orderly and transparent vote.

However, there were widespread reports of major irregularities and fraud—including concerning vote tabulation, as well as intimidation of voters and observers—that may have disenfranchised voters in many districts.

In response, Azerbaijani leader Aliyev has, thus far, reportedly: ordered the Justice Minister to fully investigate the election results; dismissed two governors and other officials for election fraud; annulled the outcome of the elections in a fourth voting district; and is probing the results from 20 of the country's voting constituencies for possible violations.

Just this week, it was reported that Aliyev dismissed Vagif Ragimov, the governor of Zagatala, a region in western Azerbaijan near the border with Georgia, for alleged interference in ballot counting. Two days earlier, after a three-hour discussion, the Central Election Commission (CEC) reportedly canceled results in the #110 Zagatala constituency in response to reported violations in a majority of the polling stations.

Ragimov was reportedly the third governor to be dismissed for attempted vote tampering.

These are positive steps but further corrective actions must be taken. For example, investigations should not be limited exclusively to election day problems but must address reports of post-election crackdowns and suppression of dissent.

I therefore urge Mr. Aliyev to continue to work closely with the United States, the rest of the international community, and all segments of Azerbaijani society to undertake the necessary reforms to provide for a future in which free, fair and transparent elections are regularly held in a fully democratic Azerbaijan.

A REPORT PREPARED BY EUGENE
B. KOGAN

HON. DIANE E. WATSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report prepared by Eugene B. Kogan on the role of Congress in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Kogan is the John Kenneth Galbraith Fellow at the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA). The report is entitled *The War Congress: Shouldering the Responsibilities of A U.S. Global Role*.

Mr. Kogan's report is particularly timely in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, and the U.S. intervention in Iraq. The report focuses on the role of Congress in these two seminal events and its abdication of effective oversight over the Bush administration's foreign policy decisions.

Mr. Kogan states in the report: "The lack of congressional oversight over the Bush Administration's foreign policy can compromise the ability of the United States to build a more secure world. Accountability is eroded in wartime, and the war on terrorism is not any different, except that it will shape America's world role for the next half a century or more. In this critical period of U.S. history, it is important for Congress to exercise its Constitutional responsibility by holding the Executive Branch accountable for its foreign policy decisions."

Congress plays a vital role in the formulation of our Nation's foreign policy. I commend Mr. Kogan's report to my colleagues as they consider the future congressional role in the war on terrorism and U.S. intervention in Iraq.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not deserve to pass and I certainly will not vote for it.

That's not because I think all is well with the budget—far from it. Even before the hurricane winds and waves arrived and the levees broke, the Federal budget was already on a dangerous course marked by tidal waves of red ink and towering piles of debt. Since 2001, the budget surplus that President Clinton and a Republican Congress bequeathed President Bush had been erased and our country was now in debt to the tune of \$8 trillion, or \$25,000 for every American man, woman and child.

And then, as they brought death and destruction, Katrina and Rita delivered another blow to the Federal budget—and sounded a wake-up call about the fiscal and economic risks we have been running. I had hoped that the result might be recognition by both the Bush Administration and Congress that now we need to face hard reality and not continue with budget policies based on defying the laws of fiscal gravity. It's about time. But this bill—which would implement part of an overall Re-

publican budget—goes in exactly the wrong direction.

As it comes to the floor, the bill would cut more than \$50 billion over 5 years from a wide variety of programs—not because they are no longer needed and not because they are wasteful, but because the Republican leadership has decided the Americans served by these programs must sacrifice in order to help offset the cost of over \$106 billion in tax cuts. And, after imposing these penalties on millions of Americans, the overall plan—service cuts for many Americans, tax cuts for relatively few—will not result in a balanced budget, but even bigger deficits and more delay in correcting our fiscal course.

In short, the Republican prescription for our budget problems is a toxic compound of misguided priorities and fiscal irresponsibility—in other words, more of the same mistakes as before, except worse.

And it's not like there aren't better ways to approach our budgetary problems.

For example, there is H.R. 3966, the Stimulating Leadership In Cutting Expenditures (or "SLICE") Act, a bill I introduced last month that is cosponsored by Members on both sides of the aisle and endorsed by the American Conservative Union, Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste, Freedom Works, the Small Business Enterprise Council, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Its purpose is to promote Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability on proposals to reduce other spending in order to offset the costs of responding to the recent natural disasters.

Toward that end, it would authorize the President to identify specific items of Federal spending that he thinks should be cut and would require Congress to vote on each of those items. It would apply not only to regular appropriations, but also to the transportation bill that was passed and signed into law earlier this year. In each case, if the president proposes a cut, Congress would have to vote on it—we could not ignore the proposal, as can be done under current law—and if a majority approved the cut, it would take effect.

As our budget situation has grown worse, there has been a lot of talk about "earmarks," meaning funding allocations initially proposed by Members of Congress rather than by the Administration. Some people are opposed to all earmarks—but I am not one of them. I think Members of Congress know the needs of their communities, and that Congress as a whole can and should exercise its judgment on how tax dollars are to be spent. So, I have sought earmarks for various items that have benefited Colorado and I will continue to do so. But I know—everyone knows—that some earmarks might not be approved if they were considered separately, because they would be seen as unnecessary, inappropriate, or excessive.

Dealing with that problem requires leadership and accountability. The SLICE bill would promote both, and by requiring us to focus on individual spending items it would make it possible to weigh the relative costs and benefits of each. But the Republican leadership has rejected that approach. Instead, they are insisting on bringing up this omnibus bill without allowing the House to even consider any amendments—except ones they decide they must make in order to pass it with only votes by Republican Members.

That is the wrong approach, and the bill is the wrong result—for the whole country, and particularly for Colorado and the West.

The bill is especially bad for Colorado because of some parts of it—developed by the Resources Committee—will directly affect our State. For example, there is the part that deals with oil shale.

Oil shale has great potential as an energy source, so it's an important part of our energy policy. And it's important to the taxpayers, who own most of it. They have an interest in what return they will get for this resource. But it's particularly important for Colorado, because our State has some of the most important deposits of oil shale, and Coloradans—particularly those on the Western Slope—will be directly affected by its development.

A new report from the Rand Corporation spells out the great benefits that can come from developing oil shale. But it also makes clear it's important for the development to happen in the right way. The report says oil shale development will have significant effects, not just on the land but also on air quality and on both the quality and quantity of our very limited water supplies. And it says what Coloradans know already—large-scale oil shale development will bring significant population growth and is likely to put stress on the ability of local communities to provide needed services.

In short, the report reminds us how much Colorado and our neighbors had at stake when Congress debated the oil shale provisions of the new Energy Policy Act that's been on the books for just over 2 months now. And while there are lots of things in that law I don't like, I think the parts dealing with oil shale are appropriate and deserve a chance to work before we rush to change them. But this legislation would tear up that part of the new law and replace it with provisions that not only would be bad public policy but would be a direct threat to Colorado.

That's why in the Resources Committee I offered an amendment that would have revised the oil shale sections in several important ways. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership of the committee opposed any changes to those sections, and my amendment was defeated.

What is the significance of that? Well, to begin with, current law says the Interior department has to consult with the Governor of Colorado and other relevant States, as well as with local governments and other interested parties, before going ahead with large-scale oil shale leasing. The bill repeals that requirement for consultation. My amendment would have retained it.

Similarly, current law permits an orderly, measured program for oil shale development. But this bill would mandate a massive development program on a crash basis. It says Interior must lease a minimum of 35% of the oil shale lands in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming within just a one-year period. It's not clear if this means 35% of the three-state total or 35% of the oil-shale lands in each state. Either way, it's a requirement for a fast and massive commercial leasing program.

The Interior Department says there are about 16,000 square miles of oil shale lands in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming combined. That's more than 10 million acres, and about 72% of that is federal land. So, even if the intent is to require leasing 35% of the three-