

I know that in his heart and in his mind, he knew that he had served his State and the people of Georgia to the best of his ability; and, indeed, he served them and us with distinction.

While I know that his son, Michael, daughters, Martha, Marjorie, Mary Jane, and all of the grandchildren will miss him dearly, they know that he longed for that reunion with his beloved Agnes. And I have no doubt that when he took his last breath, and he left this world, he was greeted with the words, Thy race is run. Welcome home, My good and faithful servant.

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

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RETIRING LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, PAULA L. STEINER

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

CONCERNING MISSED ENERGY VOTE

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, initially in the time that you have recognized me for, I would like today to announce to the House that had I been present for the vote on H.R. 6, the energy bill which passed this floor 314-100, I would have voted "yes" on that bill.

Madam Speaker, today the House passed H.R. 6 by a vote of 314-100. This legislation contained a large increase in the Renewable Fuel Standard that will greatly benefit to the western Iowa ethanol producers that I represent.

While previous versions of H.R. 6 also contained an increased RFS, they also contained a large tax increase placed on the backs the oil and gas industry. I opposed the previous versions of H.R. 6 for this reason. I oppose tax increases, and I especially oppose tax increases when they will hurt consumers like the Iowa farmers I represent.

Madam Speaker, I am on record as stating that we need more Btu's of energy in America that are produced in America. We need more ethanol, biodiesel, wind, solar, clean coal, oil, gas, nuclear, and geothermal.

America has the ability to produce the Btu's, Congress just needs to remove the restraints so that industry can produce these Btu's. We need to allow the American energy industry to expand the size of the energy pie.

Every once in a while in each Member's congressional career, there come times when things happen that are beyond our control. At the time the vote occurred, I was detained by a prior engagement. Madam Speaker, I believe in the future of bio-fuels. I think this bill did some good things for them. However, this bill also contained some provisions that I do not agree with.

H.R. 6 contained Davis-Bacon provisions. This labor law is the product of Jim Crow laws and needs to be abolished. I may be the only Member of Congress, I know of no others,

who has earned Davis-Bacon wages and paid Davis-Bacon wages, and I have lived underneath that for over 30 years, 28 years writing paychecks, over 14 consecutive months meeting payroll. I know what this does. I can tell you the history of it also goes back to an Iowan, an Iowan President, Herbert Hoover.

This is the last remaining Jim Crow law on the books that I know of. It was designed to keep blacks out of the construction trade in New York. Davis-Bacon is prevailing wage by definition, union scale in practice. There is no other way to analyze this. Union scale is what gets produced when the Department of Labor produces the proposed prevailing wage.

As an earth moving contractor, I know first hand how Davis-Bacon prevented my Small Business from competing in the market place. Small businesses are discouraged from bidding on Davis-Bacon public projects because of the complex and archaic rules. The inflated wage requirements and significant redtape burdens of Davis-Bacon shut small employers out of the Federal construction market.

The Davis-Bacon wage mandate also inflates the price tag for public, construction projects—costing you your hard earned taxpayer dollars.

There was over a billion dollars invested in renewable energy in my district last year. There will be over a billion dollars invested this year. All this was done without Davis-Bacon. If Congress is going to impose Davis-Bacon wage scales on rail improvement and carbon sequestration it will burn up at least 20 percent of the capital that can be used.

Regardless of my feelings about Davis-Bacon, I would have voted "yes" for this bill. I would ask that the record reflect this.

PAULA STEINER

Madam Speaker, for the balance of the time that you recognized me, I am motivated to come to the floor and say some words about my retiring legislative director, Paula Steiner. In the time that I came here to Congress, elected in 2002 and sworn in on this floor in January of 2003, Paula has done the job inside our legislative shop for those 5 years persistently, relentlessly and reliably and with significant insight.

I regret that she has to move on for family reasons and those obligations, and when I see the family that has surrounded her, I am really gratified because it is far more important that the family see the best of their mother than that I get the most use out of their mother.

But what I do want to say is that as I travel up and down the district in western Iowa, the western third of Iowa, the 32 counties that are the Fifth Congressional District that stretch from Minnesota to Missouri, and I meet the local officials and the people that are involved in and that are engaged in policy, as this news of Paula turning her focus on her family is, as it trickles through the district, they come up to me one by one and say, I am really going to miss Paula. The Siouxland Chamber's emissary on Friday said, we are really going to miss Paula. The Voice of Glenwood in Mills County said, we are really going to miss Paula.

That is what I came here to say, Madam Speaker: we are going to miss Paula. And this Hill is populated with good, hardworking, loyal people that keep our congressional offices functioning and rolling on a day-by-day basis. And sometimes when you go along outside the Cannon Building or the Rayburn Building or the Longworth Building, you will see late at night the lights are on. Sometimes it is because the maintenance people walked in, emptied the trash and left them on. Sometimes it is because dedicated people that keep our jobs going, keep our operations and our trains running on time are up there burning that candle at both ends so we can step down here and represent our district and represent our people.

The people in the Fifth District of Iowa are better represented than they would have been if I hadn't had the privilege of having Paula Steiner working for me, and I know that her family is going to be very well taken care of if they receive half of the kind of work and labor of love that Paula has demonstrated, and I want to add to that the measure of loyalty. And into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I choose not to go down through a series of the anecdotes except to say that it is clear that loyalty is an essential component to a congressional office. It is absolutely there with Paula.

My district says goodbye, thank you very much. I say, Paula, you are part of the extended family. Keep stopping in like you always will. Thank you very much and God bless you.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. McCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CARDOZA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1830

FUNDING THE BUSH PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this should be the season of selfless giving, a season where Americans give without any expectation of reward. This should

be a season of joy and happiness when millions enjoy the company of their families and loved ones. But as some of our Nation's elites celebrate this time of giving, they do so with the knowledge that every dollar they give in politics is actually an investment in influence peddling.

Instead of corrupting this season of giving, I hope our public officials will give something back to the American people, something more powerful than money: hope in our government that should be responding to people's needs, not the needs of the powerful few.

The latest example of this sickness afflicting American politics is reflected in our political system being bought out from under us through the system of Presidential libraries whose principals seek to find investors from other countries to help to promote their legacy in perpetuity. Don't believe the logic? Just then follow the money. With President Bush desperately trying to salvage his legacy, action is heating up on funding his Presidential library. While donors to George W. Bush's Presidential library represent a Who's Who in Republican politics, some of these donors have significant business with the White House. According to a recent Harpers magazine article, a wealthy Texas oil man, Ray Hunt, reportedly gave \$35 million, \$35 million to the Bush Presidential Library.

This same businessman was a big campaign contributor to the Bush-Cheney campaign and, coincidentally, has a stake in a nearly billion-dollar proposal to pipe out Peruvian natural gas. All of our friends who participated in the recent debate on Peru free trade ought to think about this one. In addition, Mr. Hunt is closely involved with a "legally questionable" exploration deal with the Iraqi Kurds. Interesting set of friends in this White House.

Estimates now indicate the George W. Bush Presidential Library will cost up to half a billion dollars. A half a billion dollars. Why should a sitting United States President be involved with raising nearly unlimited amounts of money from those seeking influence? The American people surely are not blind. They understand that money buys influence, and a system allowing millions of dollars in unregulated cash corrupts all tents of democracy. We must patch this gaping loophole and prevent the leader of the free world from raising unlimited and unregulated funds for a pet project. This creates as direct a link as one can imagine between money and influence.

With House passage of H.R. 1254, the House of Representatives has clearly demonstrated its intent to provide more accountability for donations made to Presidential libraries. While this legislation is an important step in mandating the disclosure of all donations of more than \$200, it does not require the disclosure of all donations from foreign governments, foreign individuals and foreign corporations. The

Senate, the other body, should act on Congressman WEXLER's legislation and move forward in giving this legislation teeth.

I would like to place in the RECORD an important article that I referenced in Harper's Magazine, the title of which is, "On the Hunt: Bush backer seeks \$1 billion for Peru project," and also an excellent article that was in The Washington Post this past weekend, the headline of which reads, "Clinton Library Got Funds From Abroad. Saudis said to have given \$10 million." I ask to include these articles in the RECORD.

This article then goes on to talk about President Bill Clinton's Presidential library, its cost over \$165 million, in which foreign sources helped contribute to that, with the most generous overseas donation coming from Saudi Arabia. Now, the last time I looked, Saudi Arabia is the country that sent the vast majority of 9/11 hijackers here. So why should any United States President take money from those kinds of interests?

It seems to me that these Presidential libraries have gone way overboard. Why can't the Archives just take the records. Why do we need all these palaces created around the country for some of these Presidents? What kind of legacy are they leaving us anyway; a Nation that has been hemorrhaging jobs from coast to coast, a Nation that is terribly in debt, in hock, with over half of our U.S. Government bonds now being sold to foreign interests.

President Lincoln never did anything like that. His service was so great, the American people recognized it for what it was. The same was true with Franklin Roosevelt. Why do we have to have these modern-day palaces to egos of these current-day Presidents? It seems to me that Congress ought to curb this really disgusting behavior, because you never really know when you're meeting with a President of the United States and a foreign leader if they are going to be begging money for a library they wish to create for themselves.

Madam Speaker, we need reform in this area as well.

[From Harper's Magazine, Dec. 18, 2007]
ON THE HUNT: BUSH BACKER SEEKS \$1 BILLION
FOR PERU PROJECT
(By Ken Silverstein)

Beginning tomorrow and over the next few weeks, the World Bank and other lenders will be voting, apparently in favor, on a package worth more than \$1 billion to support a controversial pipeline project in Peru. The primary company that would benefit from that money is Hunt Oil, which is headed by Ray Hunt, a Texas oilman who raised huge sums for the Bush/Cheney campaigns and who reportedly has given \$35 million for the upcoming Bush Presidential Library. Hunt Oil has recently generated controversy of its own, by signing what the New York Times called a "legally questionable" exploration deal with Iraqi Kurds.

The Hunt-led project would "build a pipeline, a gas liquefaction plant, marine terminal and other facilities to export 4.4 million tons of liquid natural gas annually," ac-

cording to a 2006 story in the Washington Post. The pipeline would ship liquid natural gas that originates in the Camisea Field of Peru's Amazonian rain forest and send it to Mexico and from there, possibly, to U.S. markets.

The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), in which the U.S. holds a thirty percent stake, will vote tomorrow on up to \$900 million in loans for the Hunt Oil project. The U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im) decides Thursday whether to allocate several hundred million dollars worth of support, and the World Bank will vote on a similar amount in January. The IDB already backed an earlier phase of the Camisea project, which has been plagued by problems. Among the troubles, the Post said, were the spilling of "thousands of barrels into pristine rivers and killing the fish upon which indigenous communities depend for their livelihood."

A number of Peruvian and American groups—including Environmental Defense, Oxfam America, and World Wildlife Fund—are asking for further evaluation of the project before multilateral loans are approved. They point to three broad areas of concern. First are social and environmental issues, as the project runs through a spectacular stretch of the Amazon that is home to 12,000 indigenous people. "The lenders have sold themselves cheap and are not setting high enough standards for their participation," said Aaron Goldzimer of Environmental Defense.

Similar concerns were expressed in a December 12 letter to Ex-Im from Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont—chairman of the subcommittee which monitors Ex-Im and approves the U.S. contribution to the IDB and World Bank—and his House counterpart, Congresswoman Nita Lowey of New York. They wrote:

It is . . . our understanding that there are unfulfilled commitments and serious failures, risks and concerns still pending from the first phase of the project. These include a lack of fully independent monitoring; ongoing corruption investigations . . . new planned infrastructure in the Nahua Kugapakori Reserve which may violate previous commitments; a government audit released last month that identified significant problems with pipeline construction . . . and significant impacts on local culture, human health, fisheries and biodiversity that have not been adequately assessed much less addressed.

Second, the Peruvian government of President Alan Garcia has embarked on an aggressive campaign to dismantle the country's already weak social and environmental institutions. The government recently fired nearly all the directors of a federal environmental authority, and replaced them with political hacks. (Sound familiar?) Garcia recently axed the country's superintendent of protected areas when he voiced objections to a proposal that would opened up a large swath of the Bahuaja Sonene National Park for energy exploration.

Garcia has been attacking critics of domestic energy projects as commies and pro-poverty advocates. Meanwhile, the entire Peruvian Amazon has been divided into concessions for oil and gas development. Two years ago, only 15 percent of the Amazon had been parceled out for energy development. Garcia will undoubtedly take multilateral bank support for the Hunt project as a stamp of approval for his approach and use it to further steamroll his domestic opponents.

Lastly, the economic benefits of the project for Hunt Oil are quite clear but far more dubious in the case of Peru. In their letter to Ex-Im, Leahy and Lowey said they were concerned that Peru did not have sufficient gas reserves to meet both long-term export requirements and domestic demand.

What that means is that Peru might well pay more for energy imports down the road than it gets now for its exports. Glenn Jenkins, founder of the Program on Investment Appraisal and Management at the Harvard Institute for International Development, prepared an economic analysis of the project for Environmental Defense. He concluded that massive new reserves are discovered, Peru would be worse off from an economic perspective if the project proceeds.

Back in 2003, the Ex-Im, surprisingly, rejected support for the first phase of the project on environmental grounds, and the Bush Administration abstained during the IDB vote. Ray Hunt and his company have been aggressively lobbying in Washington to make sure the administration supports the proposed multilateral funding this time around. Early indications are that the company has succeeded and that the IDB, Ex-Im and World Bank will end up approving support.

[From washingtonpost.com, Dec. 15, 2007]

CLINTON LIBRARY GOT FUNDS FROM ABROAD—

SAUDIS SAID TO HAVE GIVEN \$10 MILLION

(By John Solomon and Jeffrey H. Birnbaum)

Bill Clinton's presidential library raised more than 10 percent of the cost of its \$165 million facility from foreign sources, with the most generous overseas donation coming from Saudi Arabia, according to interviews yesterday.

The royal family of Saudi Arabia gave the Clinton facility in Little Rock about \$10 million, roughly the same amount it gave toward the presidential library of George H.W. Bush, according to people directly familiar with the contributions.

The presidential campaign of Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.) has for months faced questions about the source of the money for her husband's presidential library. During a September debate, moderator Tim Russert asked the senator whether her husband would release a donor list. Clinton said she was sure her husband would "be happy to consider that," though the former president later declined to provide a list of donors.

Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) has made an issue of the large yet unidentified contributors to presidential libraries, saying that he wants to avoid even the appearance of impropriety in such donations. Obama has introduced legislation that would require disclosure of all contributions to presidential libraries, including Clinton's, and Congress has actively debated such a proposal. Unlike campaign donations, money given to presidential libraries is often done with limited or no disclosure.

The Clinton library has steadfastly declined to reveal its donors, saying they were promised confidentiality. The William J. Clinton Foundation, which funds the library, is considered a charity whose contributors can remain anonymous.

In response to questions from The Washington Post, the foundation reiterated that it would not discuss specific sizes or sources of donations to honor the commitment it made to donors. But it acknowledged that some of the money Clinton received from the library came from foreign sources.

"As president, he was beloved around the world, so it should come as no surprise that there has been an outpouring of financial support from around the world to sustain his post-presidential work," a foundation statement said.

Bill Clinton has solicited donations for the library personally, aides said, but he also delegated much of the fundraising to others, especially Terence R. McAuliffe, a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the chairman of Hillary Clinton's

presidential campaign. The foundation statement stressed that he has turned over the facility to taxpayers, as other former presidents have.

A handful of major donors' names to the Clinton library were disclosed in 2004 when a New York Sun reporter accessed a public computer terminal at the library that provided a list of donors. Soon after the article appeared, the list of donors was removed.

The amount of the contribution from Saudi Arabia and several other countries, as well as the percentage of the total given by foreigners, had not been revealed.

The Post confirmed numerous seven-figure donors to the library through interviews and tax records of foundations. Several foreign governments gave at least \$1 million, including the Middle Eastern nations of Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, as well as the governments of Taiwan and Brunei.

In addition, a handful of Middle Eastern business executives and officials also gave at least \$1 million each, according to the interviews. They include Saudi businessmen Abdullah al-Dabbagh, Nasser al-Rashid and Walid Juffali, as well as Issam Fares, a U.S. citizen who previously served as deputy prime minister of Lebanon.

EXPLAINING VOTE ON CHRISTMAS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, there are times when it is important for people to admit when they have made mistakes, and I made one. I voted last week "present" on a resolution that it was Christmas. Now, when I read the resolution, I decided to vote "present" because it made some controversial statements about the constitutional history of the United States and the role of Christianity in that.

I am not a historian. I don't know whether that was an accurate statement or not, and I didn't want to vote on it one way or the other. It also made a number of statements about Christian theology, about which I am even less expert, being Jewish and not being an expert in other religions. So I voted "present."

But it was then called to my attention that earlier this year I had voted for a resolution congratulating people for observing Ramadan, so I was in the awkward position of having voted in favor of celebrating Ramadan and having abstained on Christmas, and the mistake was I should have abstained on Ramadan as well.

The point is, and this reinforces it to me, it is really none of the business of the Congress of the United States as an official body whether or not people celebrate religious holidays. Our job is to preserve a free society in which people are able to celebrate their religious holidays if they wish to. But picking and choosing among religious holidays, seems to me, is odd.

By the way, when you announce you have the power to approve a holiday, I assume that means ordinarily you have the power to disapprove it. Does that

mean that we could have said we don't approve of Ramadan or we don't approve of Christmas? Again, these are examples of the intrusiveness.

As I said, I find myself in an odd position, where people said, Are you pro-Ramadan and anti-Christmas? Frankly, I observe neither holiday. I wish well those who do, but as an individual, not as a Member of Congress. In fact, I have had obviously, living in this society, much more association with Christmas. But, again, that's as an individual.

That was driven home to me when I see a debate, particularly on the Republican side, between candidates as to the nature of the religion of my former Governor. This whole tendency further to entangle religion and politics is harmful to both, in my judgment. So I will acknowledge, and I understood when the Ramadan resolution came forward, in fact it was brought forward, let's be honest, for a broadly political reason. People thought that having us celebrate Ramadan might in some way alleviate an anti-American feeling that has grown out of the Iraq war. That is not what you talk about religion for.

So I should have voted "present" on both, not out of any disrespect for either religion, but out of respect for a system of democratic governance in which we politicians don't decide what is or isn't good religion. I would hope that that would no longer be part of the Republican Presidential debate. I don't believe Mormon theology has any point there. I will say this: I am no great fan of Governor Romney, nor he of me, but he served for 4 years as Governor of Massachusetts, and I don't remember a day when his religion was relevant.

Deciding that will alleviate any anti-American feelings on Ramadan, and then, okay, we will get back and show you that we are going to talk about Christmas. And we're going to talk about the constitutional history of the United States in these terms, and then let's have a debate about religion. It is not negative about religion to say that religion is best served when politicians do not seek to use it, intrude into it. Our job, again, is to preserve a Nation of freedom in which people can practice religion as they wish. No one ought to be looking for my approval as to this or that religious holiday.

So I will announce in the future I will not applaud people for Ramadan or for Christmas or for Yom Kippur or for any of the other holidays. I will work very hard to make sure every American and everyone in this country can observe those religious freedoms. But entangling us into religion for political purposes is simply a great mistake and serves no good.

Therefore, I do apologize. I erred when I voted for the Ramadan resolution. I should have voted "present" on Ramadan. I should have voted "present" on Christmas. But, even better, we should simply abstain from bringing into this very political body