

CALAMITY OVER KLAMATH AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, this generation is facing spiraling electricity prices and increasingly scarce supplies. Californians have had to cut back to the point that their electricity consumption per capita is now lower than that of Guam, Luxembourg, and Aruba.

What is the administration's solution? Interior Secretary Ken Salazar announced yesterday that the administration is moving forward with a plan to destroy four perfectly good hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River, capable of producing 155,000 megawatts of the cleanest and cheapest electricity on the planet, enough for about 155,000 homes.

Now, why would the administration pursue such a ludicrous policy? Well, they say it's necessary to increase the salmon population. Well, the thing is, we did that a long time ago by building the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery. The Iron Gate Fish Hatchery produces 5 million salmon smolt every year—17,000 of which return annually as fully grown adults to spawn. The problem is, they don't include them in the population count. And to add insult to insanity, when they tear down the Iron Gate Dam, we will lose the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery and the 5 million salmon smolt it produces annually.

Declining salmon runs are not unique to the Klamath. We have seen them up and down the Northwest Pacific coast over the last 10 years as a result of the naturally occurring Pacific decadal oscillation—cold water currents that fluctuate over a 10-year cycle between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. In fact, during the same decade that salmon runs have declined throughout the Pacific Northwest, they have exploded in Alaska. We are now at the end of that cycle.

The cost of this madness is currently pegged at a staggering \$290 million, all at the expense of ratepayers and taxpayers. But that's just the cost of removing the dams. Consumers will face permanently higher prices for replacement power, which, we're told, will be wind and solar.

Well, not only are wind and solar many times more expensive; wind and solar require equal amounts of reliable standby power, which is precisely what the dams provide. We're told that, yes, this may be expensive, but it will cost less than retrofitting the dams to meet cost-prohibitive environmental requirements. Well, if that's the case, maybe we should rethink those requirements, not squander more than a quarter billion dollars to destroy desperately needed hydroelectric dams. Or here is a modest suggestion to address the salmon population—count the hatchery fish.

We're told that this is the result of a local agreement between farmers and

stakeholders. Well, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the Klamath agreement was the result of local farmers succumbing to extortion by environmental groups that threatened lawsuits to shut off their water. And obviously the so-called "stakeholders" don't include the ratepayers and taxpayers who will pay dearly for the loss of these dams.

Indeed, local voters have repeatedly and overwhelmingly repudiated the agreement and the politicians responsible for it. The locally elected Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors vigorously opposes it.

□ 1030

Finally, the administration boasts of 1,400 short-term jobs that will be created to tear down these dams. Just imagine how many jobs we could create if we tore down the Hoover Dam or Duluth, Minnesota.

Madam Speaker, amidst a spending spree that threatens to bankrupt this Nation, amidst spiraling electricity prices and chronic shortages, to tear down four perfectly good hydroelectric dams at enormous cost is insane. And to claim that this is good for the economy gives us chilling insight into the breathtakingly bad judgment that is misleading our Nation from the White House.

The President was right about one thing when he spoke here several weeks ago. Fourteen months is a long time to wait to correct the problem. Fortunately, the administration will need congressional approval to move forward with this lunacy, and that's going to require action by this House.

Earlier this year the House voted to put a stop to this nonsense. I trust it will exercise that same good judgment as the administration proceeds with its folly.

HAPPY 50TH BIRTHDAY TO THE UNITED STATES PEACE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a very, very special birthday. It is the 50th birthday of the United States Peace Corps, an incredible organization that was started by President John F. Kennedy and a whole lot of people that thought that this Nation had an opportunity to reach out to the men and women of America, provide them with a challenge: to go out to the world to seek peace, to work for peace, and to help developing nations meet their needs, whether it be in education, community development, economic development, or other activities. And so it has been.

More than 200,000 Americans, young and old, men and women, have become Peace Corps volunteers. They have served in 139 countries around the world, and today they serve in over 70 countries. It's been a terrific program.

It has presented the very best face of America to millions of people around the world.

Today, there are leaders of many countries around this world that have been taught by Peace Corps volunteers in their high schools, in their grammar schools or universities. They have a very special understanding of America. They know Americans. They know that Americans have a big heart and they have a desire to see progress, economic and social progress in every country of this world.

And so today we celebrate 50 years. We celebrate over 200,000 Peace Corps volunteers that have served around the world, and we celebrate those who have been in the administration, the directors, the country directors, the doctors, the nurses, and the others who have been part of this enormously important part of America.

As those Peace Corps volunteers have returned to America, it is now clear in recent polling that they have continued to serve. They serve as volunteers at twice the rate of other Americans. And they are found in the schools, they are found in the community programs, and they're even found in Congress, as strange as that might seem. But, nonetheless, they've served in many, many ways, and they continue to do so.

Earlier today, I met two Peace Corps volunteers who were in the very first effort in Tanzania, then Tanganyika. They returned some 40 years later. I'm going to turn that around. They actually served in Afghanistan in the early sixties and then came back 40 years later to serve once again as Peace Corps volunteers.

And what we have found over these many years, that once you've become a Peace Corps volunteer, you never stop laboring for peace, wherever it may be. And so today we celebrate the 50th anniversary of a remarkable idea that was put forward by President John F. Kennedy, the idea that Americans could reach out to the whole world and serve wherever that need might be.

Happy birthday, Peace Corps.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND A PALESTINIAN STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. I, too, want to send my happy birthday out to the Peace Corps, and certainly it's a great day to celebrate that birthday.

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing at the United Nations this week is a brazen rejection of the basic principle of a negotiated peace. Tomorrow, Mahmoud Abbas will deliver a speech

at the United Nations where he is expected to formally announce a resolution to unilaterally seek the declaration of a Palestinian state.

While we are ultimately committed to a future where the two states, Israel and Palestine, are able to live side by side in long-term peace and security, while all of us in this Chamber heard directly from Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu in May on his nation's commitment to a two-state solution, the question I have and which I wish every nation in the world who will be voting on this issue should ask itself is: Are the Palestinians ready to make peace?

This is the key question and is what Prime Minister Netanyahu laid out in his remarks right here in this Chamber: "The conflict has never been about the establishment of a Palestinian state. It has always been about the existence of the Jewish state. That is what this conflict is about."

Madam Speaker, this unilateral declaration of independence is a direct challenge to the United States and the efforts and the dollars we have committed in recent years to promote a real, lasting peace. It is fundamental that peace cannot be imposed from the outside. It can only be made in Jerusalem and Ramallah.

There are too many difficult core issues which can only adequately be addressed through direct negotiations, which must be mutually accepted by governments on both sides, and, most importantly, which must be ratified by the people who live there. Without these vital elements, you don't have peace. You don't even increase the chances for peace down the road. Rather, you undermine the prospects for achieving it in the future.

This is the point of this unilateral declaration. Where is the commitment to peace on the Palestinian side?

Palestinian officials have made it clear that this unilateral effort is another means of isolating Israel and escalating the conflict against her. Palestinian officials have made it clear that they seek to advance this bid so that they can attack Israel through the international legal system, including taking actions against Israel in the International Court of Justice.

The tragic reality, Madam Speaker, is that Israel lives in a very dangerous region of the world, and the Israeli people absolutely have grave security concerns that should not simply be tossed aside by countries that are allies of the United States of America. The Israeli people are surrounded by hostile neighbors that want to drive Israel out of existence. We here in America must understand the reality on the ground and the threats Israel faces each and every day.

Israel is a peace-seeking democracy, and the Israeli people simply want to live in peace and security. Iran has its proxies closing in: Hamas in Gaza; to the south there's the Muslim Brotherhood, now gaining significant power in Egypt; Hezbollah is in the north; and in the northeast is Syria, led by Assad.

The recent downgrade in relations by Turkey is very serious. The instability of the Sinai is of enormous concern. This is a dangerous neighborhood, and recent events are bringing into sharp view Israel's daily reality—increased isolation and living under siege.

As we witnessed with the flotilla last year, with the storming of Israel's Embassy in Cairo 2 weeks ago, or with Turkey's new aggressive, bellicose rhetoric and actions, Turkey, who until very recently had enjoyed a successful diplomatic and economic partnership with the State of Israel, events in the Middle East can easily spiral out of control and lead to outcomes that nobody desires.

Fortunately, the Members of this Chamber have made it clear to the entire world that we will not sit idly by during the continued delegitimization of the State of Israel and the international community. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues in both parties who have continued to beat the drum and call this unilateral attempt exactly what it is—an effort to circumvent direct negotiations and undermine peace.

□ 1040

I am pleased that the President is committed to vetoing this unilateral attempt in the Security Council if it does come to a vote, and I appreciate his administration's focus on this particular critical issue.

We must continue in our efforts to urge the nations of the world to stand with the United States, support peace efforts in the Middle East, and oppose this resolution.

Peace between Israel and her Palestinian neighbors cannot be achieved unless both sides sit and find common ground. Unilateral declarations and third parties cannot do it for them. The only path forward is for the Israelis and the Palestinians to sit together and find peace. It is time for Mr. Abbas to come back to the table—his actions and decisions here must not be rewarded; our allies in the world should recognize this—otherwise they are legitimizing and ratifying the Palestinian refusals to negotiate.

OPPOSING AUTOMATED KILLER DRONES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, there was an article in The Washington Post earlier this week that we should all find very unsettling and disturbing.

We know that in recent years the Pentagon has increasingly used unmanned drone aircraft to carry out violent acts of war. And frankly, that's bad enough. But now there's a new and even more frightening technology in the works. It's called "lethal autonomy." And under the system, the drones would no longer be remotely op-

erated and controlled by actual human beings. The lethal autonomy drones would be computer programmed to carry out their deadly mission independently. No human hand providing steering and guidance.

I can't even begin to wrap my head around the humanitarian red flags associated with this experiment in robotics.

Software can break down. It could even be hacked. Furthermore, computers don't have a conscience. They aren't nimble, they can't make snap decisions based on new information or ethical considerations. They're programmed to do what they do without judgment, discretion, or scruples. You can just imagine, or I can anyway, mass civilian atrocities thanks to a robot drone raging out of control.

Thankfully, a group called the International Committee for Robot Arms Control is speaking up and making these points. Pointing out that if we have a treaty banning land mines, why not one that outlaws these automatic killer drones.

According to the Post, the military has begun to grapple with the implications of this technology. Well, I can really suggest that they continue grappling before using these technologies and finding the flaws and possible harmful and unpredictable consequences.

One advocate of these new drones believes it's possible to program them to comply with international law regarding the conduct of hostilities. Well, I'm certainly skeptical. We couldn't even get the last President of the United States to understand and abide by the Geneva Conventions. I don't know how we're going to get a robot to do it.

Madam Speaker, the increasing dehumanization of warfare is part of a terrifying trend. Somehow it's easier to kill one another when we have computers and machines to carry it out for us, when we don't have to stare our own mayhem in the face.

As a member of the Science Committee, I'm totally enthusiastic about American high-tech innovation. But I believe we should be using our knowledge and ingenuity to give the civilian economy the boost it needs to create good jobs for hardworking middle class Americans and to create a smarter response to world conflict. All of this money we're funneling to defense contractors to devise evermore sophisticated ways to kill one another must be reinvested in alternatives to warfare and nonviolent ways to resolving conflict.

That's what my Smart Security plan does. I've discussed this many, many times from this very spot. It's called Smart Security. It defines military force as the very, very last resort. And it directs energy and resources toward diplomacy, democracy promotion, development, and peaceful ways of engaging with the rest of the world.

Madam Speaker, in two weeks' time we will have been at war for a full decade. More than 6,000 Americans have