

continue being subject to tariffs ranging from 35 percent to 60 percent. This puts our farmers and ranchers at a significant competitive disadvantage with our international competitors in these growing markets. It would be foolish to turn our backs on an agreement that removes these sort of punitive barriers to our products. If we pass DR-CAFTA, we will open the doors to six countries where the potential U.S. gain for all agricultural exports is expected to reach \$1.5 billion. Put another way, this would mean a near doubling of the U.S. agricultural sales to the region when compared to 2003 levels.

It is for this reason that DR-CAFTA enjoys the strong support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Soybean Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Pork Producers Council, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the USA Rice Federation, the National Association of Wheat Growers and the National Milk Producers Federation, just to name a few. To borrow from Farm Bureau, a vote for DR-CAFTA is a vote for agriculture.

There are many critics who erroneously believe that by ratifying DR-CAFTA, the United States is relinquishing our national sovereignty and opening our borders to floods of immigrants. On the contrary, nothing in the DR-CAFTA will preempt the Constitution, current U.S. laws and our sovereignty. Should a contradiction arise between the terms of DR-CAFTA and U.S. law, the U.S. will maintain its right to change domestic laws as it sees fit.

Moreover, enactment of DR-CAFTA will have no effect on current immigration laws. Congress will maintain its role in crafting U.S. immigration policy. And in fact, DR-CAFTA will help reduce illegal immigration. As the economic opportunities that accompany free market reforms take a stronger hold in Central America, residents of these nations will have a stake in their future and a strong fiscal incentive to remain in their native country.

DR-CAFTA is in our national security interests. Our foreign policy must promote stability and prosperity in Central America. As we saw in the 1980's, instability can give nations who do not share our interests an opportunity to expand their influence in our hemisphere. To promote stability, we should reward democracies that respect human rights and encourage free market economic principles. DR-CAFTA is consistent with this goal. As these evolving democracies continue to grow, we will see their economic viability strengthened, thereby creating jobs and reducing poverty.

Some have expressed concern that DR-CAFTA will weaken labor laws, leaving workers in this region without basic protections. This is simply not true. The International Labor Organization (ILO) has reviewed the labor laws and practices of the six DR-CAFTA countries and found them largely in compliance with the ILO's eight core conventions. With the exception of El Salvador—which has ratified six—every other nation covered by DR-CAFTA has enacted the eight core conventions. In fact, if you look at the labor provisions of other recently enacted free trade agreements, such as the Jordan and Morocco agreements, you will find that the DR-CAFTA labor provisions are more stringent and ensure greater protections for workers.

Over 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside our borders, and it is in our best

interests to pursue a policy that opens these markets to American products. If we fail, we forfeit these markets—both from an economic and national security standpoint—to our international competitors in Asia and Europe.

DR-CAFTA will level the playing field for American farmers and manufacturers and help address an important national security goal. This is a win-win situation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital agreement.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRISTOPHER
J. TAYLOR

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 2005

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Christopher J. Taylor, 22, of Opelika, Alabama, died on July 24, 2005, in Iraq. Sergeant Taylor was assigned to B Battery, 1st Battalion, 41st Field Artillery Regiment, 3rd Infantry Division, at Fort Stewart, Georgia, and according to initial reports died when he was struck by indirect fire on a Coalition forces base. His survivors include his wife Janina, his son Xavier; and his daughter Aaliyah.

Christopher Taylor was proud to serve his country, Mr. Speaker. He was a graduate of Opelika High School and was known in the community as a loving friend and father. Like every soldier, he dutifully left behind his young family and loved ones to serve our country overseas.

Words cannot express the sense of sadness we have for his family, and for the gratitude our country feels for his service. Sergeant Taylor died serving not just the United States, but the entire cause of liberty, on a noble mission to help spread the cause of freedom in Iraq and liberate an oppressed people from tyrannical rule. He was a true American.

We will forever hold him closely in our hearts, and remember his sacrifice and that of his family as a remembrance of his bravery and willingness to serve. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the House's remembrance on this mournful day.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6,
ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2005

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the energy bill conference report, but I do so with very strong reservations. Although I believe we missed many opportunities to make this energy bill truly comprehensive, I also believe that the conference report is an improvement over the House-passed energy bill.

It is a sad indictment of the way the Majority is running this Congress that it has taken us 5 years to pass an energy bill and the final product falls far short of what I believe the American public wants. I will vote for this conference report, but this bill lacks boldness and vision. There is more we can and must do to

reduce our dependence on foreign oil, lower skyrocketing gas prices, protect our environment, and steer our country in a more forward-thinking direction on energy policy. I am pleased, however, that the bill makes strides in encouraging alternative energy research and production. Specifically, \$3.2 billion is included for renewable energy production incentives and \$1.3 billion is allotted for energy efficiency and conservation.

I was disappointed to see that a Renewable Portfolio Standard, RPS, was not included in the bill. The Senate-passed bill included an RPS that would have required utilities to generate 10 percent of their electricity from renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal, by the year 2020. Studies conducted by the Energy Information Administration illustrate that a federal RPS could save consumers \$19 billion. Moreover, 20 States have already enacted RPS requirement, many of which go beyond the Senate-passed provision. A federal RPS would have established a nationwide market-based trading system to ensure that renewables are developed at the lowest possible price. I strongly supported this provision, and over 70 of my colleagues signed onto a letter with me to conferees urging them to keep the RPS in the bill. The Senate conferees voted in a bipartisan manner to keep the RPS in the bill, but the House conferees stripped the provision. I hope that my colleagues will work with me in the future to support H.R. 983, a bill with bipartisan support that I introduced to create a federal RPS of 20 percent by 2027. The time for a federal RPS has come.

We also missed an opportunity to address the serious problem of global warming. I believe that the amendment Senator BINGAMAN offered, and that passed, expressing the sense of the Senate that mandatory action on climate change should be enacted was an important step towards congressional action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. While I am disappointed that we could not do more, and that this sense of the Senate amendment was stripped from the conference report, I am pleased that the conference report includes a provision to establish a new cabinet-level advisory committee, charged with developing a national policy to address climate change and to promote technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the provision allows the Energy Department to authorize demonstration projects designed to test technologies that limit harmful emissions. The long-term solution to solving the global warming problem lies in the creation of new technologies and the Federal Government has a key role to play in promoting technological innovations. I believe we should have done more, something along the lines of the recommendations made recently by the National Commission on Energy Policy, but it is critical that we do something, and this climate change provision is the least we can do to begin the process of slowing global warming.

I am very pleased that a provision included in the House-passed bill, giving \$30 million to uranium mining companies, was stripped from the bill. If enacted, this provision would have posed a grave threat to the water resources of two Navajo communities in northwestern New Mexico where four uranium in-situ leach mines have been granted conditional licenses by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The proposed ISL mining—which could still happen