

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2827 and commend my good friends and colleagues, Ms. MOORE and Mr. DOLD and Ranking Member FRANK, and everyone else who worked very hard on this bill and for their willingness to work in a bipartisan way.

It is helpful to recall that the original Dodd-Frank regulations relating to municipal bond advisers only came about because of a number of manmade financial disasters involving municipalities and their advisers who were unregulated. It was just about a year ago that Jefferson County, Alabama, filed the biggest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history. They joined the ranks of 11 other entities to file a chapter 9 bankruptcy that year, including Boise County, Idaho; Central Falls, Rhode Island; and Harrisonburg, Pennsylvania. They all had unique problems, but one of the things that they had in common was that they got some pretty costly advice, and it will haunt taxpayers for years.

This was an area that was completely unregulated before the financial crisis; and the Dodd-Frank reforms, including the municipal adviser registration requirement, were enacted to respond to those crises. The Dodd-Frank reforms require individuals who advise municipalities to register with the SEC and be subject to regulation by the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board. This is a very good thing, but most of us agree that the SEC's proposed original rule went just a little bit too far and made the definition of a municipal adviser a little bit too broad. It was defined in a way that could have potentially captured those who were not actually providing investment advice.

For example, I know many institutions were concerned that under the SEC's proposed rule merely providing a bank account to a municipality could mean that an institution would have to register as an adviser and be subject to MSRB regulation all because they just provided basic banking services. As someone who was there during the consideration of Dodd-Frank, I can tell you that that was not what Congress intended; however, I was concerned that the original version of this bill went too far in the other direction, and that could have opened up such a gaping hole you could have driven a truck full of other people's money through it. I was concerned that the draft bill eliminated the critical fiduciary duty standard that we included in Dodd-Frank. The fiduciary duty is a vital element that ensures that the advisers provide advice that is in the best interest of the municipality.

I think that with this revised bill we have struck a good balance. Fiduciary duty is back in, and unintended capture is out. The revised language clear-

ly and reasonably defines the activities that municipal advisers engage in and describes the kinds of advice that they provide. This bill now gives clear legislative guidance to ensure that the goal of heightened supervision of municipal advisers is realized. It keeps taxpayers a little bit safer, credit markets more stable, and regulations a bit fair.

All in all, I would say that it is a job well done, done in a bipartisan spirit with a great deal of time and commitment. I commend the two major sponsors who are speaking with us today; and I thank my good friend, GWEN MOORE, for her work on this bill.

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

I just want to say again that I think we need to credit Mr. DOLD, who is a fairly new Member. We actually listened to Members who were senior Members and didn't base it on our partisan differences as so often occurs. We really respected people's experience, and listened to their advice very earnestly.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any other speakers, but I do want to wrap up with a couple of thank-yous.

I certainly want to thank Chairman BACHUS for allowing this markup to move forward, and I certainly appreciated his help and support. I want to again highlight how this was able to move forward in a bipartisan fashion, and I certainly want to thank my good friend, Ms. MOORE from Wisconsin, for all of her work and efforts to work with me on what I hope is going to be a bill that everyone here in this Chamber will support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2827, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2827, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 118, DISAPPROVING RULE RELATING TO WAIVER AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3409, STOP THE WAR ON COAL ACT OF 2012; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 22, 2012, THROUGH NOVEMBER 12, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during consideration of H.R. 2827), from the Com-

mittee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-680) on the resolution (H. Res. 788) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Family Assistance of the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services relating to waiver and expenditure authority under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315) with respect to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3409) to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations before December 31, 2013, under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977; and providing for proceedings during the period from September 22, 2012, through November 12, 2012, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1950

MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5987) to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Manhattan Project was an unprecedented top-secret program implemented during World War II to produce an atomic bomb before Nazi Germany;

(2) a panel of experts convened by the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in 2001—

(A) stated that "the development and use of the atomic bomb during World War II has been called 'the single most significant event of the 20th century'"; and

(B) recommended that nationally significant sites associated with the Manhattan Project be formally established as a collective unit and be administered for preservation, commemoration, and public interpretation in cooperation with the National Park Service;

(3) the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Study Act (Public Law 108-340; 118 Stat. 1362) directed the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a special resource study of the historically significant sites associated with the Manhattan Project to assess the national significance, suitability, and feasibility of designating one or more sites as a unit of the National Park System;

(4) after significant public input, the National Park Service study found that "including Manhattan Project-related sites in

the national park system will expand and enhance the protection and preservation of such resources and provide for comprehensive interpretation and public understanding of this nationally significant story in the 20th century American history”;

(5) the Department of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Department of Energy, recommended the establishment of a Manhattan Project National Historical Park comprised of resources at—

(A) Oak Ridge, Tennessee;
(B) Los Alamos, New Mexico; and
(C) Hanford, in the Tri-Cities area, Washington; and

(6) designation of a Manhattan Project National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System would improve the preservation of, interpretation of, and access to the nationally significant historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project for present and future generations to gain a better understanding of the Manhattan Project, including the significant, far-reaching, and complex legacy of the Manhattan Project.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to preserve and protect for the benefit of present and future generations the nationally significant historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project;

(2) to improve public understanding of the Manhattan Project and the legacy of the Manhattan Project through interpretation of the historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project;

(3) to enhance public access to the Historical Park consistent with protection of public safety, national security, and other aspects of the mission of the Department of Energy; and

(4) to assist the Department of Energy, Historical Park communities, historical societies, and other interested organizations and individuals in efforts to preserve and protect the historically significant resources associated with the Manhattan Project.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **HISTORICAL PARK.**—The term “Historical Park” means the Manhattan Project National Historical Park established under section 5.

(2) **MANHATTAN PROJECT.**—The term “Manhattan Project” means the Federal program to develop an atomic bomb ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **DATE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

(2) **AREAS INCLUDED.**—The Historical Park shall consist of facilities and areas listed under subsection (b) as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary shall include the area referred to in subsection (b)(3)(A), the B Reactor National Historic Landmark, in the Historical Park.

(b) **ELIGIBLE AREAS.**—The Historical Park may only be comprised of one or more of the following areas, or portions of the areas, as generally depicted in the map titled “Manhattan Project National Historical Park Sites”, numbered 540/108,834-C, and dated September 2012:

(1) **OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE.**—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(A) at Buildings 9204-3 and 9731 at the Y-12 National Security Complex;

(B) at the X-10 Graphite Reactor at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(C) at the K-25 Building site at the East Tennessee Technology Park; and

(D) at the former Guest House located at 210 East Madison Road.

(2) **LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO.**—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(A) in the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory National Historic Landmark District, or any addition to the Landmark District proposed in the National Historic Landmark Nomination—Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (LASL) NHL District (Working Draft of NHL Revision), Los Alamos National Laboratory document LA-UR 12-00387 (January 26, 2012);

(B) at the former East Cafeteria located at 1670 Nectar Street; and

(C) at the former dormitory located at 1725 17th Street.

(3) **HANFORD, WASHINGTON.**—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(A) the B Reactor National Historic Landmark;

(B) the Hanford High School in the town of Hanford and Hanford Construction Camp Historic District;

(C) the White Bluffs Bank building in the White Bluffs Historic District;

(D) the warehouse at the Bruggemann’s Agricultural Complex;

(E) the Hanford Irrigation District Pump House; and

(F) the T Plant (221-T Process Building).

(c) **WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER.**—No non-Federal property may be included in the Historical Park without the written consent of the owner.

SEC. 6. AGREEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy (acting through the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Richland site offices) shall enter into an agreement governing the respective roles of the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy in administering the facilities, land, or interests in land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Energy that is to be included in the Historical Park under section 5(b), including provisions for enhanced public access, management, interpretation, and historic preservation.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.**—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the Secretary shall—

(1) have decisionmaking authority for the content of historic interpretation of the Manhattan Project for purposes of administering the Historical Park; and

(2) ensure that the agreement provides an appropriate advisory role for the National Park Service in preserving the historic resources covered by the agreement.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY.**—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the Secretary of Energy—

(1) shall ensure that the agreement appropriately protects public safety, national security, and other aspects of the ongoing mission of the Department of Energy at the Oak Ridge Reservation, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Hanford Site;

(2) may consult with and provide historical information to the Secretary concerning the Manhattan Project;

(3) shall retain responsibility, in accordance with applicable law, for any environmental remediation that may be necessary in or around the facilities, land, or interests in land governed by the agreement; and

(4) shall retain authority and legal obligations for historic preservation and general maintenance, including to ensure safe access, in connection with the Department’s Manhattan Project resources.

(d) **AMENDMENTS.**—The agreement under subsection (a) may be amended, including to add to the Historical Park facilities, land, or interests in land within the eligible areas described in section 5(b) that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall consult with interested State, county, and local officials, organizations, and interested members of the public—

(1) before executing any agreement under section 6; and

(2) in the development of the general management plan under section 8(b).

(b) **NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which an agreement under section 6 is entered into, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the Historical Park, including an official boundary map.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The official boundary map published under subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. The map shall be updated to reflect any additions to the Historical Park from eligible areas described in section 5(b).

(d) **ADDITIONS.**—Any land, interest in land, or facility within the eligible areas described in section 5(b) that is acquired by the Secretary or included in an amendment to the agreement under section 6(d) shall be added to the Historical Park.

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall administer the Historical Park in accordance with—

(1) this Act; and

(2) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) **GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy, and in consultation and collaboration with the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos and Richland Department of Energy site offices, shall complete a general management plan for the Historical Park in accordance with section 12(b) of Public Law 91-383 (commonly known as the “National Park Service General Authorities Act”) (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)).

(c) **INTERPRETIVE TOURS.**—The Secretary may, subject to applicable law, provide interpretive tours of historically significant Manhattan Project sites and resources in the States of Tennessee, New Mexico, and Washington that are located outside the boundary of the Historical Park.

(d) **LAND ACQUISITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the eligible areas described in section 5(b) by—

(A) transfer of administrative jurisdiction from the Department of Energy by agreement between the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy;

(B) donation; or

(C) exchange.

(2) **NO USE OF CONDEMNATION.**—The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land under this Act or for the purposes of this Act.

(e) **DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **FEDERAL FACILITIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may enter into one or more agreements with the head of a Federal agency to provide public access

to, and management, interpretation, and historic preservation of, historically significant Manhattan Project resources under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal agency.

(B) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may accept donations from, and enter into cooperative agreements with, State governments, units of local government, tribal governments, organizations, or individuals to further the purpose of an interagency agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) or to provide visitor services and administrative facilities within reasonable proximity to the Historical Park.

(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to State, local, or tribal governments, organizations, or individuals for the management, interpretation, and historic preservation of historically significant Manhattan Project resources not included within the Historical Park.

(3) DONATIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For the purposes of this Act, or for the purpose of preserving and providing access to historically significant Manhattan Project resources, the Secretary of Energy may accept, hold, administer, and use gifts, bequests, and devises (including labor and services).

SEC. 9. CLARIFICATION.

(a) NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.—Nothing in this Act, the establishment of the Historical Park, or the management plan for the Historical Park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the Historical Park. That an activity can be seen and heard from within the Historical Park shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the Historical Park.

(b) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this Act shall constitute a cause of action with respect to activities outside or adjacent to the established boundary of the Historical Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5987 is a bipartisan bill authored by me that will establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park. Mr. Speaker, there is a like bill, a bipartisan bill, also pending in the Senate.

The park will encompass three locations that were integral to the tremendous engineering and human achievements of the Manhattan Project. The three locations are the Hanford site in my home State of Washington, Los Alamos in New Mexico, and Oak Ridge in Tennessee.

The vast majority of the facilities that are eligible to be included in this

park are already owned by the Federal Government, and they are located on lands owned and controlled by the Department of Energy.

Our Nation already possesses these pieces of history, and the real purpose of this bill is to officially declare the importance of preserving the history, providing access to the public, and include the unique abilities of the Park Service to help tell this story.

Currently, some of these facilities slated for inclusion in this park are scheduled to be destroyed at considerable taxpayer expense. A great many local community leaders in all three States and interested citizens have worked to coordinate a commitment to preserving this piece of our history. Additionally, the government will save millions of dollars from foregone destruction, as opposed to the minimal cost of providing public access and park administration.

In recognition of the important contributions to the Manhattan Project by the men and women at sites across the country, the bill contains a provision allowing communities like Dayton, Ohio, for example, outside the historical park, to receive technical assistance and support from the Department of the Interior as they seek to preserve and manage their own Manhattan Project park resources.

This is a good piece of legislation, and it is part of our history, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To my friend, Mr. HASTINGS, the technology which created the bomb cannot be separated from the horror which the bomb created. The celebration of the technology of the bomb bespeaks a moral blindness to its effects, which include not only the devastation of the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but the \$10 trillion Cold War between the U.S. and Russia and the tens of thousands of nuclear weapons which today hang over the world like so many swords of Damocles.

At a time when we should be organizing the world towards abolishing nuclear weapons before they abolish us, we are instead indulging in admiration at our cleverness as a species. The bomb is about graveyards; it's not about national parks.

The philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead once wrote:

The major advances in civilization are processes that all but wreck the societies in which they occur.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend from Ohio I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to yield back if he is prepared to yield back.

Mr. KUCINICH. I shall continue then.

When you walk into the Bradbury Science Museum at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, you're greeted on your immediate left

by replicas of Fat Man and Little Boy, the two bombs that dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The space surrounding them does not include a picture of the leveled Japanese cities, pictures of children with massive birth defects, or stories of families and hundreds of years of history obliterated in the blink of an eye. It does not include a discussion of the health effects of worldwide distribution of radiation from the bombs or from the larger proliferation of nuclear technology that emanated from Los Alamos.

I am speaking about the Bradbury Science Museum. The bombs reside in a section of the museum called Defense, which presents information on the nuclear arsenal, the nuclear stockpile, plutonium, and explosives. Other sections discuss how nuclear energy works and how the bomb was triggered, how the bomb was triggered.

A substantive discussion of the myriad negative impacts of the technology that came out of the Manhattan Project is relegated to obscurity. A public forum tucked away in a corner provides space for public input.

When the U.S. dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August of 1945, more than 200,000 people were killed instantly. In the years that followed, over 100,000 additional people died of radiation poisoning. The Japanese people today continue to experience the devastating and long-term effects of the bomb.

It is now widely acknowledged by many top U.S. Government officials at the time of the war that dropping the bomb on Japan was completely unnecessary. I want to get into that section at this moment so that those who say, well, we need to create a memorial to the bomb because it ended the war, well, that's not true. I'm going to give you some quotes, Mr. Speaker.

This is from Dwight David Eisenhower, who was general of the armies and also, later on, President of the United States. He said:

In July 1945, Secretary of War Stimson, visiting my headquarters in Germany, informed me that our government was preparing to drop an atomic bomb on Japan. I was one of those who felt that there were a number of cogent reasons to question the wisdom of such an act. The Secretary, upon giving me the news of the successful bomb test in New Mexico and of the plan for using it, asked for my reaction, apparently expecting a vigorous assent.

During his recitation of the relevant facts, I had been conscious of a feeling of depression, and so I voiced to him my grave misgivings, first on the basis of my belief that Japan was already defeated and that dropping the bomb was completely unnecessary, and secondly because I thought that our country should avoid shocking world opinion by the use of a weapon whose employment was, I thought, no longer mandatory as a measure to save American lives. It was my belief that Japan was, at that very moment, seeking some way to surrender with a minimum loss of "face." The Secretary was deeply perturbed by my attitude.

That's Dwight Eisenhower in a book called "Mandate for Change," page 360.

□ 2000

From General Douglas MacArthur.

Norman Cousins was a consultant to General MacArthur during the American occupation of Japan. Cousins writes of his conversations with MacArthur:

MacArthur's views about the decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were starkly different from what the general public supposed.

Cousins continues:

When I asked General MacArthur about the decision to drop the bomb, I was surprised to learn he had not even been consulted. What, I asked, would his advice have been? He replied that he saw no military justification for the dropping of the bomb. The war might have ended weeks earlier, he said, if the United States had agreed, as it later did anyway, to the retention of the institution of the Emperor.

That's from a book called "The Pathology of Power," Norman Cousins.

Leo Szilard was the first scientist to conceive of how an atomic bomb might be made. That was in 1933. He speaks of a meeting with J. Robert Oppenheimer, the head scientist of the Manhattan Project:

Szilard: I told Oppenheimer that I thought it would be a very serious mistake to use the bomb against the cities of Japan. Oppenheimer didn't share my views. Well, said Oppenheimer, don't you think that if we tell the Russians what we intend to do and then use the bomb in Japan, the Russians will understand it? They'll understand it only too well, Szilard replied.

Brigadier General Carter Clarke, who was the military intelligence officer in charge of preparing intercepted Japanese cables:

We didn't need to do it, and we knew we didn't need to do it, and they knew that we didn't need to do it, we used them as an experiment for two atomic bombs.

This is quoted in Gar Alperovitz, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb." Alperovitz, by the way, who did 30 years of research on the subject, said:

I think it can be proven that the bomb not only was unnecessary, but known in advance not to be necessary.

Another quote. Henry H. Arnold, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Air Forces:

The Japanese position was hopeless even before the first atomic bomb fell because the Japanese had lost control of their own air.

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet:

The Japanese had, in fact, already sued for peace. The atomic bomb played no decisive part from a purely military point of view in the defeat of Japan.

The use of atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender.

This is Admiral William D. Leahy, chief of staff to President Truman:

Certainly, prior to 31 December 1945, and in all probability, prior to 1 November 1945, Japan would have surrendered even if atomic bombs had not been dropped.

That's from the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey.

This is from Major General Curtis LeMay:

The war would have been over in 2 weeks without the Russians entering and without the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb had nothing to do with the end of the war at all.

Now it's just not disputable that this technology was not necessary. So let's go back to the creation of a national park and the naming of the park after the Manhattan Project.

May I ask how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you.

We have to now ask ourselves, since it can be widely disputed—and by top military officials—that the dropping of the bomb was not necessary, then why are we honoring this technology with a national park? It's really a legitimate question.

When the U.S. dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August of 1945, again, 200,000 people were killed. And to have this discussion in the context of honoring a technology that created a bomb, I think, really raises questions about where we are with this country and where we are with the bomb. The splitting of the atom and the use of the split atom to create an atomic bomb actually bespeaks a split consciousness in this country. It was, in a sense, an intensification of dichotomized thinking, of us versus them, whoever they are. We then decided that all of our problems in humanity could be solved by technology, that the bomb then was put in place of reason, that the bomb was put in place of diplomacy, that the bomb was put in place of talking with each other and settling our differences. No, the bomb then became the metaphor for how technology rules over humanity. We're captives of our own machines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I remember as a young person going to elementary school and that children would have to do drills called duck-and-cover because we believed that the United States was going to be targeted by nuclear weapons launched by the Soviet Union. The fear drove an entire generation's dreams. The fear caused the United States to spend trillions of dollars on a Cold War that took away from the needs of the people. The fear resides in the world today when there are some who urge an attack on Iran. Why? Because they are said to be developing a nuclear weapon.

Where does this stop? We cannot honor this technology. We cannot celebrate ingenuity that was used to put all of humanity at risk. We have to begin to reassess who we are as human beings and ask ourselves whether or not we have essentially reached the limits of our ability to develop technology which we can control.

And it's not only about nuclear weapons. When you learn that the globe itself is experiencing tremendous upset because of the human activity, when you learn that science can now create

genetically modified organisms that can change the nature of food. As a matter of fact, life itself can be changed through cloning. We act as these mini gods who can endlessly tinker with our planet and life itself and then name parks after it. No.

In the scheme of things, someone will say, Dennis, this is just a park. What are you getting so excited about? This is about naming a new national park after the Manhattan Project. And we have to just stop and reflect on where this takes us. There should be a discussion about the full legacy of the Manhattan Project, including its devastating effects upon the Japanese people and upon the rest of the world.

If there was going to be a new park, it should serve as a solemn monument to Japanese American friendship that rose from the ashes and the worldwide work for nuclear disarmament that continues to this day, rather than a celebration of a technology that has brought such destruction to the world. Failure to recognize this dimension, even in its first iteration, really is a significant injustice.

I looked at the CRS report on this, and there's no mention of how this is going to be framed or phrased. The museum at Los Alamos is a celebration of the triumph of technology over humanity. It's a powerful illustration that we're developing technology at a rate that far exceeds our ability to manage it. Now we are faced with the choice to memorialize this point of view into a national park.

I would ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4½ minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. In the last 4½ minutes I want to read a poem by Henry Reed. He juxtaposes in this poem Japan before the dropping of the bomb and the technical aspects of the bomb itself.

□ 2010

It's called "The Naming of Parts":

Today we have the naming of parts. Yesterday, we had daily cleaning. And tomorrow morning, we shall have what to do after firing. But today, today we have the naming of parts. Japonica glistens like coral in all of the neighboring gardens, and today we have naming of parts.

This is the lower sling swivel. And this is the upper sling swivel, whose use you will see when you are given your slings. And this is the piling swivel, which in your case you have not got. The branches hold in the gardens their silent, eloquent gestures, which in our case we have not got.

This is the safety-catch, which is always released with an easy flick of the thumb. And please do not let me see anyone using his finger. You can do it quite easily if you have any strength in your thumb. The blossoms are fragile and motionless, never letting anyone see any of them using their finger.

And this, you can see, is the bolt. The purpose of this is to open the breech, as you see. We can slide it rapidly backwards and forwards: we call this easing the spring. And rapidly backwards and forwards. The early bees are assaulting and fumbling the flowers: They call it easing the spring.

We're naming a park today. Yesterday we had the naming of parts, and not just Japan but our humanity was obliterated. Do we get a chance to reclaim it?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield back his time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is really not as complicated as my good friend from Ohio tries to make it appear to be.

Now, I recognize, and we've had conversations on this when the bill was introduced, and I respect his opinion, but I respectfully disagree with his opinion and his arguments. There is nothing wrong with that. After all, we're Americans, and we can do that in America.

But I want to, and with the gentleman, what I heard him saying was dealing in what if and what would be an ideal world. Well, we'd all like to have an ideal world. But let's talk about reality at that time.

We were forced into the Second World War. Germany, of course, had started, some can say, started that war with their blitzkrieg on September 1, 1939, into Poland. You could say it may have started when Japan started expanding where they were going in the Pacific, and certainly when they attacked us on December 7, 1941.

Whether we liked it or not, we were in a war for survival. There is no question about that. That is simply the facts.

In the process of carrying out that war, and by the way, Mr. Speaker, let me say that war is absolutely unpredictable, but because if you're logically thinking about war, if it were predictable, it wouldn't have happened in the first place. But the very nature of war is unpredictable.

So we didn't know where we were, but we had heard that Nazi Germany was developing an atomic weapon. Now, they had been building a military machine long before because we were caught a bit off guard in the Second World War. We were not a warring Nation. So we had to use whatever technology we had in order to defend our freedoms. One way that was decided was to build an atomic weapon if we had to use that atomic weapon.

What this bill purports to do is nothing more than to talk about the ingenuity of the American people to develop this weapon when the nuclear industry was relatively in its infancy, and did it in such a short time frame. That is something that we ought to put into our history books because we do put past battles in our history books.

Just earlier this week was the 150th anniversary of Antietam, right up the road here in Sharpsburg, Maryland—the largest single-day casualty in American history at that time. Yet we memorialize the battlefield because it

helped preserve our Union and get our Union back together.

So I think it's right that we look at these from that perspective.

Now, I can only imagine how difficult a decision it was for President Truman shortly after President Roosevelt had died to make this decision; but he made it because in his judgment, given the information he had, it would probably save more lives than it would cost by dropping a bomb. That was the judgment he made.

Let me speak just a little bit about, again, the ingenuity and the technology of what happened, and I can only speak about my area, Hanford, and about, specifically, about the B Reactor.

This is the first nuclear reactor that was built in this country; and from start to finish, it was built in less than a year. The technology at that point wasn't even proven. Yet when they started the B Reactor and went "hot," as they said, it obviously did what it was supposed to do. It was a tremendous scientific achievement.

To open this up to the public and open this up to school children to see what we can do and what we did in this country to protect the freedoms and liberty we have, I think is worth preserving.

Again, all this does is take those three main sites that largely are already owned by the government, transfer them to the National Park Service, and show them to the public so we can learn and remember what happened during that time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I've been down on this floor many times criticizing the Obama administration. But the Obama administration, through Secretary Salazar and the Department of the Interior, is in favor of legislation establishing precisely what this bill and the Senate bill hope to do.

So while I have differences with them, I certainly congratulate them for recognizing how important this legislation is.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5987, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 2020

GLOBAL INVESTMENT IN
AMERICAN JOBS ACT OF 2012

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5910) to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to produce a report on enhancing the competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5910

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) It remains an urgent national priority to improve economic growth and create new jobs.

(2) National security requires economic strength and global engagement.

(3) Businesses today have a wide array of choices when considering where to invest, expand, or establish new operations.

(4) Administrations of both parties have consistently reaffirmed the need to maintain an open investment climate as a key to domestic economic prosperity and security.

(5) The United States has historically been the largest worldwide recipient of global investment but has seen its share of inbound global investment decline relative to its gross domestic product in recent years.

(6) Governors and mayors throughout the United States face increasing competition from other countries as they work to recruit investment from global companies.

(7) Foreign direct investment can benefit the economy and workforce of every State and Commonwealth in the United States.

(8) According to the latest Federal statistics, the United States subsidiaries of companies headquartered abroad contribute to the United States economy in a variety of important ways, including by—

(A) providing jobs for nearly 5,300,000 Americans with average compensation that is approximately 33 percent higher than the national private-sector average, as these jobs are often in high-skilled, high-paying industries;

(B) strengthening the United States industrial base and employing nearly 15 percent of the United States manufacturing sector workforce;

(C) establishing operations in the United States from which to sell goods and services around the world, thereby producing nearly 18 percent of United States exports;

(D) promoting innovation with more than \$41,000,000,000 in annual United States research and development activities;

(E) paying nearly 17 percent of United States corporate income taxes; and

(F) purchasing more than \$1,800,000,000,000 in domestic goods and services annually from local suppliers and small businesses, amounting to 80 cents for every dollar spent on input purchases.

(9) These companies account for 5.8 percent of United States private sector Gross Domestic Product.

(10) The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State have declared increasing inbound global investment to be among their top priorities.