

R. Ford Post Office Building” in honor of my mentor and friend, and Betty’s beloved late husband.

In 1982, The Betty Ford Clinic, now known the world over as the Betty Ford Center, opened its doors on the Eisenhower Medical Center campus to provide those seeking treatment of alcohol and substance abuse addiction with a state of the art program to help them on their journey to recovery. Betty Ford, whose name has become synonymous with recovery and treatment, greeted countless patients and visitors with a simple salutation, “hello, my name is Betty Ford and I’m an alcoholic and drug addict.” Nearly 30 years later, over 90,000 people have been treated at the center, including those of humble means to some of the wealthiest and most famous celebrities in the world.

As Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Prescription Drug Abuse, I dedicate my work on the caucus to her memory and will continue to work tirelessly to advance the causes to which Mrs. Ford devoted much of her adult life. As a woman, I am especially grateful for the path she blazed, and consider her a great role model for any generation of women who want to make our Nation and the world a better place.

And as someone whose family, like so many others, has been affected by addiction, I am personally forever indebted to Mrs. Ford and have the utmost respect for her leadership on this important issue. Mrs. Ford was a great First Lady, a remarkable woman and valued friend. Our Nation has lost a national treasure with her passing, and I extend my deepest condolences to her family and all those who loved her.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in commemorating the life and contributions of First Lady Betty Ford, who departed this earth on July 8, 2011. Her memory will live on through her many good works and our country is enriched for her life and service. May God Bless her, and God Bless America.

BETTER USE OF LIGHT BULBS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2417, the BULB Act. This bill does nothing to shed light on a bipartisan law that will save families money on their energy bills. In fact, this bill repeals that common-sense law.

A question has been circulating in the media regarding this bill lately—how many Members of the House does it take to change a light bulb?

The answer, at least in 2007, was 314—that’s the number of House Members who voted for the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Of those 314 Members 95 were Republicans—so was the President who signed the bill into law.

Why? Because this was a good, common-sense idea: Let’s make new light bulbs that use 25–30 percent less energy than incandescent bulbs by 2012, and 65 percent less by 2020.

For families, that means an average savings of \$200 a year. In Hawaii, where we pay some of the highest energy prices in the country, families will save approximately \$225. The Department of Energy estimates that these standards will save U.S. households nationally \$6 billion in 2015 alone.

What’s even better: Improving energy efficiency has also helped spur innovation on the part of U.S. manufacturers—creating an estimated 2,000 American jobs to date and giving Americans even more offerings to choose from when it comes to light bulbs.

That’s right: Americans have even more choices when it comes to light bulbs. This bipartisan law did not outlaw any type of bulb.

Consumers can still choose to purchase the familiar looking bulbs that were initially invented by Thomas Edison—the only difference is that the new ones use up to 30 percent less electricity. So the idea that this bill is limiting consumer choice is simply false.

But there are many other benefits as well to improving the energy efficiency of our light bulbs: The National Resources Defense Council estimates that over the long-term these standards will save as much energy as produced by 30 large power plants each year. They will also help prevent 100 million tons of carbon dioxide from polluting our air annually.

So these standards will help to expand consumer choice, save families money, increase energy efficiency, lessen air pollution, and create jobs.

Given the state of the economy, it seems to me that instead of wasting time trying to repeal a law that has been such a success, we should be spending our time trying to pass more laws like it.

So I hope that we will short-circuit this ideologically driven legislation, and keep the lights on at the factories and in the homes of the people who are benefitting from these standards.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, as someone who cares deeply about the State of Israel and the rights of the Palestinian people, I have serious concerns with H. Res. 268. This resolution does not advance U.S. interests, fails to contribute constructively to reviving the dormant peace process, and ignores the courageous efforts of Israelis and Palestinians willing to take the very difficult steps needed to achieve peace. Therefore, I cannot endorse a congressional statement that does not further the cause of peace and security for Israelis and Palestinians.

Last month, I visited Israel and the West Bank as a member of a fact finding mission sponsored by the J Street Education Fund. In every meeting I had with Israelis and Palestinians they shared their hopes for the future. They expressed their desires for peace. They want to live with security. They want the op-

portunity to make their own futures. Everyone I met with, from Israeli government officials to regular citizens, from President Abbas to Palestinian civil society leaders, said the status quo is unacceptable and a “two-state solution” is the only outcome that will ensure security and a lasting peace.

Yet, is a “two-state solution” achievable? This is increasingly unclear as Israel and Palestinians continue to take unilateral steps that weaken the prospect for negotiations leading to a comprehensive and final peace agreement. This is both disappointing and detrimental to the ultimate goal both sides claim they seek.

For example, the Palestinian Authority’s diplomatic quest to seek recognition from the United Nations for an independent “State of Palestine” is a mistake, despite the legitimate and deeply felt desires of the Palestinians to live in their own free, independent and sovereign state. I told senior Palestinian officials directly when I was in the West Bank that such a move is not helpful to their goal or U.S. efforts to advance the peace process. Regardless of the outcome of any actions taken at the United Nations in September, the only path to a legitimate, lasting Palestinian state will be the result of a negotiated agreement with Israel. This is the path that both sides must continue to pursue.

With regard to the unity government between Fatah and Hamas, it will likely be impossible for a legitimate peace process and final negotiated agreement to take place with the Palestinian people governed by two distinct political entities. Hamas and Israel are at war, thus the term: Israeli-Palestinian conflict. A peace process that allows the Palestinians to be fragmented and factionalized will not yield peace or security, only lasting conflict—Palestinian against Palestinian, as well as Palestinian against Israeli.

Hamas must agree to the Quartets conditions, but then again there is no possibility that Israel would ever negotiate a final agreement without such conditions. If in-fact Fatah and Hamas (with the on-going help of Egypt) can work together to achieve legitimacy within the international community by renouncing terrorism and recognizing the State of Israel then there is a real opportunity for a path to peace. If this is not possible then I am doubtful the peace process will advance to the point where a Palestinian state can be created.

H. Res. 268 highlights that the U.S. has “provided more than \$3.5 billion cumulatively in direct bilateral assistance to the Palestinians” and calls for an end of U.S. assistance if the unity government does not embrace the Quartets principles. The foreign assistance the U.S. provides the Palestinian Authority contributes to economic stability, security training, infrastructure development, and the building of democratic institutions—the foundation of a future Palestinian state. This aid not only benefits the Palestinian people and their nascent institutions, but Israel as well. Israel cannot negotiate a peace agreement and end the occupation of Palestinian lands if a future a Palestinian state is not viable. Cutting off aid would harm both Palestinian and Israeli interests.

If Congress actually were to cut off aid it would also send a signal to the entire Arab world that the U.S. has abandoned the Palestinian people. The damage to the U.S. status in the Arab and entire Muslim world would be incalculable.

Based on the text of H. Res. 268 it would appear that it is only the actions of Palestinians that undermine the possibility of a negotiated peace. There is no mention in the resolution of, for example, illegal Israeli settlement expansion into Palestinian lands. Obviously illegal Israeli settlements and outposts are a contentious and serious obstacle to peace. Israeli settlements and their continued expansion have been universally condemned by the world community because they make a contiguous Palestinian state increasingly impossible to achieve. If a “two-state solution” is ever to be achieved the settlement issue must be confronted, not ignored as Congress has chosen to do in this resolution.

The policy realities that must be confronted and resolved to achieve a “two-state solution” are complex, sometimes painful, and often fraught with traps. Yet, for many in Congress, “two-state solution” has become a phrase that has many different definitions, most of which could never result in a peace agreement or the creation of a Palestinian state. Member of Congress can utter the phrase “two-state solution” and then act to make such a solution less possible. This resolution is an example of such a proclivity.

In my estimation achieving a “two-state solution” will require the U.S. to maintain its tra-

ditional role as honest-broker in this decades long conflict. During my visit to the region I was constantly surprised by both Israelis and Palestinians who innocently and insistently called upon the U.S. to resolve the conflict, create the environment for negotiations, and achieve the goal of a two-state solution. I reminded everyone I encountered that the responsibility and burden of making the difficult political choices for peace were theirs and not something the U.S. can dictate.

There is no doubt that the U.S. must maintain and strengthen the special relationship we have with the State of Israel. Israel is a trusted ally and will remain so long into the future. At the same time the U.S. has the opportunity to play a historical role in the creation of a new Palestinian state, allowing for the self-determination of the Palestinian people and greater security for Israel.

These relationships provide the U.S. with the opportunity and obligation to remain faithful to facilitating negotiations and putting the difficult, uncomfortable issues to be resolved on the table with the goal of achieving a final peace agreement. President Obama deserves credit for holding both sides accountable and for making both sides feel uncomfortable. If the U.S. abandons our traditional honest-broker role to become an advocate for Israel

or Palestinians then this conflict will never be resolved, it will likely simmer and boil over into a future of violence that we should all fear.

Israelis and Palestinians—and the Americans who care deeply about the future of Israel as well as a future Palestinian state—deserve much more than this resolution offers. They deserve an honest, open, and constructive debate that advances U.S. interests for peace, security, democracy, dignity, freedom, and self-determination throughout the Middle East. The future of Israel is at stake. The future is at stake for millions of Palestinians seeking a national identity and the freedom to make their own state. The American people deserve more than what H. Res. 268 offers.

On H. Res. 268 I will vote present. This resolution is another example of U.S. domestic political interests trumping the best interests of U.S. foreign policy. If a “two-state solution” is to be a reality this resolution does not get Israelis or Palestinians one inch closer to negotiations. Congress should be investing its time and energy as an honest-broker encouraging both sides to end the posturing and cease the obstructions to negotiations. Time is running out and we should be encouraging a revival of the peace process and focused negotiations—before it is too late.