



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2005

No. 52

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 26, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM PRICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

LEMELSON FOUNDATION AND INTRODUCTION OF WATER FOR THE POOR ACT OF 2005

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening I had the opportunity and the honor of attending a ceremony where the Lemelson Foundation awarded the annual Lemelson MIT Prize for Innovation, held for the first time in Portland, Oregon.

The foundation was established by one of the most prolific American inventors, the late Jerome Lemelson, and his family.

Although located in Portland, the foundation is truly international in

scope. Jerome Lemelson endowed the foundation to promote innovation and to ensure that its application benefited humankind.

In the United States, their unique foundation supports several grantees whose programs celebrate extraordinary inventors as role models, illustrate the value of invention in the evolution of a great society, and nurture young adults to solve pressing social problems by pursuing careers in invention.

This year the foundation awarded a \$500,000 Lemelson-MIT Prize, the largest cash award for innovation, to Elwood "Woody" Norris for revolutionizing acoustics.

Internationally, the Lemelson Foundation nurtures individual creativity to transform fundamental challenges into opportunities for sustainable progress. Its Invention for Sustainable Development program recognizes inventors and innovators in developing countries, fostering the institutions that support them, and applies their inventions to meet basic human needs and advance sustainable development.

Last week, foundation board member Eric Lemelson discussed foundation initiatives dealing with low-tech, high-impact innovation dealing with drip irrigation, an example of a cost-effective application of new technology to save scarce water resources, save money in a developing country while improving agricultural yields.

This is the type of commonsense approach of applied technology to sustainability that can truly transform people's lives.

I would hope that we in government can undertake the same spirit of innovation in our approach to USAID.

I was pleased to see Senator FRIST return from his trip to Africa convinced that the United States needs to do more with water innovation and has introduced legislation in the Senate. I applaud his bill, the Safe Water Cur-

rency for Peace Act, S. 492. By the same token, I am offering complementary legislation in the House, the Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

This bill will make access to clean water and sanitation a major U.S. foreign policy objective and requires the USAID to develop a strategy to carry out this objective. It supports innovative financing mechanisms that can create additional resources for water and sanitation, while ensuring access and affordability to the very poor.

This legislation is critically needed. The lack of clean water and sanitation is perhaps the world's greatest single health need. More than 1 billion people worldwide lack access to safe drinking water. More than twice as many, 2.3 billion people, one in every three people on the planet, lack access to adequate sanitation, and the consequences are devastating.

Water-related diseases are a human tragedy, killing up to 5 million people every year. At any given time, half the population in the developing world is sick from water-related disease. Tragically, one child dies every 15 seconds for lack of water and sanitation.

At a time when people in every corner of the globe understand the importance of water and the problems of its misuse, I was pleased that the United States and the Bush administration joined 185 other nations committed to cutting in half the percentage of people in the world without access to water and sanitation. I was there in Johannesburg in 2002, watching that consensus come together. I am hopeful that we will be able to follow through.

As Eric Lemelson pointed out in his remarks, the Lemelson Foundation does not have to be responsive to shareholders or the voters so they can afford to be cutting-edge, innovative, and creative. I would like to think that they are pointing the way to more liveable communities around the globe where all our families can be safe,

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2477

healthy, and more economically secure; and they are pointing the way for the Federal Government to follow their lead.

My congratulations to the foundation; and I look forward to working on their innovations, integrating them with U.S. Government policy around the globe.

WHY THE F/A-22 RAPTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to visit Langley Air Force Base in Virginia and spend time with the commander of the Air Combat Command, Lieutenant General William Fraser, and many dedicated, indeed dedicated, members of the United States Air Force. As part of the Air Force Caucus trip, we had almost 50 people participating in the trip.

Much of this trip focused on the F/A-22 Raptor and its importance to the future of the United States Air Force. After visiting with General Fraser and seeing the Raptor up close, I am more convinced and I think the participants who went on this trip are also convinced that the F/A-22 will become an integral part of future military successes.

Mr. Speaker, during my visit I was briefed not only about the warfighting capabilities of this plane but about the maintenance program as well. The Air Force uses cutting-edge technology to maintain this plane; and this, of course, leads to more efficient maintenance. It is the first jet to use an entirely paperless maintenance program, allowing new parts to be ordered or changes to be made significantly faster.

The engine also utilizes new technologies. Its design allows it to be worked on while still on the plane, that is, the engine. In the past, engines often needed to be removed in order to be maintained. This is not the case for the F/A-22. These new technologies mean less time in the shop and, of course, more time in the air.

Also, the maintenance training program has been improved. No longer are there these big, bulky maintenance manuals. The training is digital in real-time, with real-world conditions. It leads to more effective and efficient training. Maintainers spend less time in training and more time actually working on the plane. This, of course, leads to faster maintenance and thus the F/A-22s are not grounded for longer than is necessary.

In the past, and particularly in the post-September 11 environment, homeland security has been our top priority here in Congress and our Nation. The F/A-22 plays a large role in protecting the homeland. According to the Air Force, 238 legacy fighters would be required and needed to protect this

homeland while only 150 F/A-22s would be needed.

The Bush administration unfortunately has proposed cutting \$10 billion from the F/A-22 program over the next 5 years, leaving enough to buy 183 of the 381 planes the Air Force says it needs. Simply put, in my judgment, this number is just not sufficient.

The Air Force will not be able to guarantee air superiority without a sufficient quantity of F/A-22s. The U.S. has not lost a soldier due to an air attack since 1952. The Air Force has made air superiority look so easy that we have begun to take it for granted, but maintaining this air dominance is not easy.

For now, the United States Air Force is the best trained, the best equipped in the world; but Russia, China, India have made huge strides in achieving parity, and, in some cases, have even surpassed U.S. capabilities.

Our current, but badly aging, fighters no longer enjoy technological or aerodynamic superiority when compared to the modern aircraft of potential adversaries. There have been some recent exercises pitting the F-15s, which the F/A-22 Raptor will replace, against one of Russia's primary export fighters, resulting in kill ratios favoring the SU-30.

In contrast, on a recent training mission where a single F/A-22 went against five F-15s, the Raptor killed all the F-15s within 3 minutes. Additionally, due to a lack of stealth assets, the ability of our aircraft to operate in environments where hostile threats exist is inadequate. The only way to address these shortcomings, which will only worsen, I tell my colleagues, is with sufficient numbers of the F/A-22 Raptor. We cannot fight tomorrow's war with yesterday's equipment.

That is why America needs the Raptor. With a variety of internal weapons, the Raptor can destroy or negate the most capable future threats: advance fighters; surface-to-air missile systems; and high-value, mobile ground targets.

The F/A-22's combination of speed, stealth, and integrated avionics bring unmatched capabilities to cope with the 21st-century threat environment. Air dominance gives the joint force freedom from attack, freedom to maneuver and, of course, freedom to succeed. No substitute exists for the F/A-22's unique capabilities.

With the international proliferation of sophisticated aircraft and air defense systems, U.S. fighters are losing their ability to leverage access for U.S. forces in hostile regions. The F/A-22 changes this equation with its revolutionary design and potent array of systems.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we need to fully fund the F/A-22 Raptor over the next 5 years.

ETHICS CHANGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the year, the House has been conducting its business without an organized Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in place to investigate possible unethical behavior by Members of Congress. Republicans have tried to blame Democrats on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for this standoff, but the fact is they have nobody to blame but themselves.

At the beginning of this year, the Republican leadership went ahead and changed the way the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct does its business. In the past, whenever ethics changes were being considered, they were addressed in a bipartisan fashion, with both Democrats and Republicans at the table. That is the only way ethics reform can honestly be addressed, but the Republican leadership ignored that protocol and strong-armed enough of its Members into passing new and weakened ethics rules.

The American people need to understand that these new rules will allow either party, Democrat or Republican, to protect its own Members. Under the new Republican rules, if the majority of the committee cannot determine whether or not an investigation should proceed, after 45 days of receiving a complaint, the complaint would simply be dropped. No action would take place.

Since the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is made up of five Members from each party, either side could prevent an ethics investigation from moving forward against one of its Members. Now, this is not the way the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is supposed to work. Under the old bipartisan rules, if the committee could not come to an agreement on how to proceed after 45 days, an investigative subcommittee was created.

The weakening of the ethics rules by House Republicans did not fool editorial writers, both liberal and conservative, who follow House proceedings closely; and I just wanted to give some examples.

The conservative Chicago Tribune recently said, How do House Republicans respond to ethical lapses? By trying to bury them.

□ 1245

The Hartford Courant concluded, "The committee has been careening toward ethical oblivion in recent years, as the majority Republicans have relaxed the standards, eased up on investigations and created trapdoors through which alleged transgressors could escape."

The Republican leadership did not stop at just weakening the ethics rules, the Republican leadership also purged three Republican Members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, three Members who were not in the pockets of the leadership.