

colleague, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, during this 109th Congress, as we did in the 108th Congress, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2005. Identical legislation was introduced today by Hawaii Senators AKAKA and INOUE, again marking a united commitment by Hawaii's entire delegation to the most vital single piece of legislation for our Hawaii since Statehood.

This legislation affirms the longstanding political relationship between Native Hawaiians, the indigenous peoples of our Hawaii, and our federal government, and extends to Native Hawaiians the time-honored federal policy of self-determination provided other indigenous peoples under U.S. jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to be direct: this is crucial to the Hawaiian people and to our Hawaii. The stakes are nothing more or less than the survival and prosperity not only of our indigenous people and culture, but of the very soul of Hawaii as we know and love it.

I speak to you today on behalf of all of Hawaii's people and all those worldwide for whom Hawaii, in all of her forms, be they natural, environmental, cultural, social, and spiritual, is a truly special and unique place. And I say to you that that Hawaii—the Hawaii that is the indigenous home of all Native Hawaiians, that my own ancestors and many other non-Native Hawaiians committed themselves to since recorded Western discovery in 1778, and that so many throughout the world continue to view as a beacon for what can be in our world—that Hawaii has never been so at risk as today.

It is at risk because it is a creation of and rests upon the foundation of our Native Hawaiian people and culture, and their survival and prosperity are at risk. As they go, so goes Hawaii as we know it, and a Hawaii which is not Hawaiian is not a Hawaii I can bear to accept.

Nor is federal recognition for Native Hawaiians exclusively a Hawaii issue. Census figures show that our country is home to more than 400,000 Native Hawaiians, with 160,000 living outside of Hawaii. And clearly the preservation of the Hawaii that so many throughout our world have come to know and love is of great concern to so many well beyond our borders.

So our goal is not only reaffirming the longstanding historical and legal relationship between Native Hawaiians and the United States, not only delivering fairness and justice to Native Hawaiians, but ensuring the very survival and prosperity of our Native Hawaiian people and culture and, through them, Hawaii itself. And this is a truly common goal, evidenced by broad-based support among Hawaii's political leaders, and Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians alike, which spans ethnic, partisan and other distinctions.

The goal of assisting Native Hawaiians is not new to our Federal Government. Beyond a longstanding relationship that was reaffirmed when Hawaii became a territory in 1900 and a State in 1959, over 160 federal statutes have enacted programs to address the conditions of Native Hawaiians in areas such as Hawaiian homelands, health, education and economic development based on Congress' plenary authority under our U.S. Constitution to address the conditions of indigenous peoples. These have been matched by state and quasi-autonomous entities such as the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, and private entities like

The Kamehameha Schools. And they have borne fruit with a renewed focus on unique Native Hawaiian needs and a renaissance of Native Hawaiian culture. Federal recognition is the means by which these indispensable efforts can be carried forward into the next generation of Native Hawaiian governance.

Federal recognition is also the time-honored means of memorializing our government's relationship with the indigenous peoples of the contiguous 48 states and Alaska. There, either government-to-government treaties or the Bureau of Indian Affairs recognition process or legislative recognition have extended self-determination and affirmed relationships. Although the difference between those peoples and Native Hawaiians is exclusively geographic, such means have simply not been either available or exercised in the case of Native Hawaiians.

Nor is the concept of extending federal recognition to Native Hawaiians a new one. The enactment into law in 1993 of the Apology Resolution (P.L. 103-150) expressed a national commitment to reconciliation efforts between Native Hawaiians and the Federal Government. Subsequent efforts through the Departments of Justice and Interior, as well as the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders established by executive orders of both Presidents Clinton and Bush, yielded federal recognition legislation and the inclusion of Native Hawaiians in federal programs and services as top priorities. During the 106th Congress, the House even passed federal recognition legislation for Native Hawaiians on September 26, 2000.

Most recently, the Department of Interior also moved forward on the establishment of the Office of Hawaiian Relations. Structurally organized under the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget, the new office is a welcome and positive step forward in coordinating policies within the Department as they affect Native Hawaiians. Already, the Department oversees pertinent issues such as Hawaiian home lands, historic preservation, the Native American Graves Protection Act, the Native Hawaiian Culture and Arts Program, and the consideration of Native Hawaiians in natural resources management, including at our Hawaii national parks.

The time has clearly come for our Federal Government to strengthen its relationship with Native Hawaiians in order to resolve longstanding issues and ensure the survival and prosperity of the Native Hawaiian people and culture and of their special home. For all of us in Hawaii, Mr. Speaker, and in fact for all Native Hawaiians, wherever, throughout our country and world they may live, I urge the passage of this vital legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE IMPROVING THE COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2005

HON. TOM OSBORNE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the "Improving the Community Services Block Grant Act of 2005" to reauthorize the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) program.

Unfortunately, last Congress the House and Senate were unable to complete work on reauthorizing CSBG. The bill I am introducing today once again puts forth our effort and ongoing commitment to ensuring that anti-poverty activities for needy families continue.

The CSBG is an anti-poverty block grant that funds a State-administered network of over 1,100 public and private community action agencies delivering social services to low-income Americans. The CSBG Act was established in 1981 in response to President Reagan's proposal to consolidate the Community Services Administration and 11 other anti-poverty programs.

Block grant funds may be used for a wide range of anti-poverty activities to help families and individuals achieve self-sufficiency. Such activities may include providing assistance in finding and retaining employment, obtaining adequate housing, and providing emergency food services. The CSBG also includes funding for certain discretionary activities, including community economic development, rural community facilities improvement, the community food and nutrition assistance, and the national youth sports program. The CSBG program is an essential tool in meeting the unique needs of each area and serves as a conduit for community services.

The bill I am introducing today would build upon improvements made to the program during the last reauthorization. It would promote increased quality by requiring States to re-evaluate whether the lowest performing grantees should continue to receive funding. It retains the current definition of an eligible entity to include the grandfather provisions, but updates the definition to require eligible entities to successfully develop and meet locally determined goals and meet the State goals, standards and performance requirements in order to continue receiving funds.

This bill promotes increased accountability by ensuring that States monitor local grantees to ensure services are provided in the most efficient manner and that services reach those with the greatest need. The bill also requires the development of local grantee determined goals that each local grantee is responsible for meeting.

The bill further encourages initiatives to improve economic conditions and mobilization of new resources in rural areas to help eliminate obstacles to the self-sufficiency of families and individuals in rural communities, and expands opportunities for providing youth mentoring services to encourage education, and youth crime prevention.

Finally, the bill continues the CSBG grants and discretionary programs at current authorization levels and extends them through fiscal year 2010.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that ensures improved services for low-income individuals and families.

NO ATTAINMENT—NO TRADE BILL

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "No Attainment—No Trade bill."

This legislation amends the Clean Air Act to prohibit powerplants and other major point sources of nitrogen oxide (NO_x) pollution that are in an ozone non-attainment area from participating in EPA's emission trading program.

In 1990 Congress passed amendments to the Clean Air Act to deal with the issue of acid rain deposition.

Harmful acid rain was destroying our buildings, personal property and turning freshwater lakes into dead zones.

The new law established an innovative emission trading program to reduce the precursors of acid rain, harmful nitrogen oxides and sulphur dioxides emitted by coal-burning powerplants and major industrial boilers.

Since its establishment, the trading program has worked extremely well, better than even proponents of the 1990 amendment to the Clean Air Act ever expected.

While nitrogen and sulphur dioxides have been reduced, and reduced by millions of tons, an unanticipated new wrinkle has emerged as States and localities work to reduce urban smog and bring ozone non-attainment areas into compliance with other requirements in the Clean Air Act.

States and localities are bumping into the emission trading program for nitrogen oxides.

Not only are nitrogen oxides the precursors of acid rain, they also mix with hydro-carbons and form unhealthy ground level ozone.

Giving power plants in an ozone non-attainment area the authority to buy a credit from elsewhere and avoid nitrogen oxide reductions may help EPA meet its national acid rain reduction goals, but it can frustrate state and local efforts to lower ozone and urban smog and be in compliance with the Clean Air Act. I speak from experience.

Just across the Potomac River in Alexandria we have a power plant operated by Mirant that was in violation of its operating permit.

Aptly named the "Potomac River Plant", the coal-fired facility was built in 1949.

Because it was approaching the end of its useful life expectancy, Congress agreed to exempt it and other older plants from the tougher modern emission requirements under the Clean Air Act.

The exemption was probably a mistake.

Unfortunately, too many utilities found it cheaper to keep these antiquated and dirty plants operating beyond their useful life than replace them with costlier but cleaner power plants.

Had this region replaced all of exempt power plants with modern facilities, this region might be in compliance with the Clean Air Act ozone standards.

Instead, this region has had greater challenge to bring this region into compliance and imposed only modest emission reductions on the Potomac River Plant.

This attainment plan faced a serious setback during the summer of 2003 when the Potomac River Plant violated its clean air emission limits by more than 1,000 tons of nitrogen oxide, double the tonnage allowed under its permit.

Initially, Mirant claimed it could come into compliance by purchasing credits of emission reductions from sources elsewhere, outside this region, to meet its emission reduction goal.

"Not so," said the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The state's position, however, was on less than firm legal ground and it took extensive

enforcement action and the threat of a state-initiated lawsuit before an alternative remedy was agreed upon.

I am pleased that the state held firm and was able to reach a settlement, that while not ideal, will reduce emissions at the Potomac River Plant and the other three local coal-fired plants operated by Mirant.

The agreement will contribute substantially to reduce NO_x emissions throughout the metropolitan Washington, D.C. region and bring it into compliance with the Clean Air Act.

The legislation I am reintroducing today, however, is still necessary.

It gives states the clear legal authority they need and discourages power plants from challenging state ozone implementation plans in court.

This legislation will give other states the authority they need to block power plants in a non-attainment area from engaging in NO_x emission trading and avoiding their responsibility to reduce ozone and urban smog.

It makes no sense, to force this region, or the jurisdictions of any ozone non-attainment area, to ratchet down nitrogen oxides from other sources, beyond what may be necessary, simply because a few large sources are able to buy their way out of compliance.

It isn't fair, and it is not in anyone's best interest to do so.

My legislation puts an end to it. It deserves consideration.

IN HONOR OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF BRANDYWINE'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to the Rotary Club of Brandywine as they celebrate their 50th anniversary in the State of Delaware.

While serving as the Vice President of the Phoenix Steel Corporation, Otis Zwissler chartered the Rotary Club of Brandywine on March 8, 1955. Over its 50-year history, the Rotary Club has raised more than \$500,000 dollars to benefit numerous service projects, both locally and internationally. During this time, the Rotary Club has engaged in efforts to eradicate polio, and has been involved in numerous community food drives. The Rotary Club of Brandywine recently aided in the construction of the Can-Do Playground, which will enable disabled children to join with the rest of their friends in a common play area. In addition, the Rotary Club has hosted many well-known guest speakers over the years, including the former United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and first Cuban-American ever elected to the United States Senate, Senator Mel Martinez; all of the current and several previous members of the Delaware federal delegation; the current Governor of Delaware, as well as many previous Governors; and the President of Rotary International.

The 46 members of the Rotary Club of Brandywine are part of the Delaware Eastern Shore of Maryland Rotary District. This district contains 2,000 Rotarians, and is one of over

31,000 worldwide clubs in 160 countries. Globally, over 1.2 million people take part in Rotary Club activities.

The Rotary Club of Brandywine's accomplishments and service to the State of Delaware deserve to be recognized and I commend the club on their great efforts to support others in our community. I look forward to the Rotary Club of Brandywine's continued success. Its contribution in Delaware should serve as an example to us all.

H.R. 304—AIRCRAFT CARRIER END-STRENGTH ACT

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 304—the Aircraft Carrier End Strength Act. Recently, in a last ditch effort to reach OMB budgetary goals, the Department of the Defense approved drastic cuts in the Navy's Fiscal Year 2006 budget. Only one of these cuts is both operationally unsound AND irreversible . . . that is the reduction in the Navy's fleet of aircraft carriers from twelve to eleven.

This decision was not made by the military and policy experts who are now working on the 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). This irreversible decision was made by budget crunchers looking to reduce the budget topline without considering all of the operational impacts. Congress has worked hard to re-build our national defense architecture and now is not the time to retreat. That is why I have introduced legislation, H.R. 304, which will ensure that the Navy maintains their current minimum requirement of twelve aircraft carriers.

Just last year, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vern Clark, stated; "Aircraft carrier force levels have been set at 12 ships as a result of fiscal constraints; however, real-world experience and analysis indicate that a carrier force level of 15 ships is necessary . . ." And in 2001, then-Vice Admiral Timothy J. Keating stated, "The United States needs 15 carriers to provide continuous combat-credible sovereign presence in each area of responsibility. . . . The United States accepts a risk by leaving areas of the world uncovered at times."

Over the last few years, Congress has heard a consistent message from the Department of Defense—the important tactical missions accomplished in Afghanistan and Iraq would not have been possible without our fleet of aircraft carriers. Aircraft carriers are in constant demand all over the globe and there is no technology that will allow them to be in two places at the same time. In the face of terrorist threats and other dangers that this nation is facing and with the proven operational need of aircraft carriers, now is not the time for the Navy to contemplate decreasing the number of aircraft carriers available for our national security strategy.

Please support H.R. 304—the Aircraft Carrier End-Strength Act.