

Third, white farmers in California began lobbying ferociously for the removal of all people of Japanese ancestry—not to protect them, and not even really for national security reasons, but to drive the very successful Japanese farming industry out of business.

And fourth, their lobbying, and the voices of the editorialists, succeeded in pushing most of the congressional delegations of the West Coast states to demand mass exclusion.

As Professor Greg Robinson says in his authoritative treatment of the subject, "By Order of the President; FDR, and the Internment of Japanese Americans" (Harvard U. Press, 2001). "the binding factor among these disparate social, economic, and military forces was racial animosity toward Japanese Americans." (p.90)

Through late January and early February, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and his staff fought with the military to prevent mass action against Japanese Americans. But it was too late. On February 11, 1942, Secretary of War Henry Stimson sent FDR a memo asking whether he'd be willing to support "mov[ing] Japanese citizens as well as aliens from restricted areas." Getting no response, Stimson phoned FDR on February 15 to ask for a meeting on the memo. FDR said he was too busy for a meeting, but in "very vigorous" tones told Stimson that the military should do whatever they thought best. FDR predicted that "there would probably be some repercussions but it has got to be dictated by military necessity."

On February 19, 1942, FDR signed Executive Order 9066, which gave the military carte blanche to do what they wished with Japanese, aliens and American citizens of Japanese ancestry along the West Coast.

There is the proof. A concern for protecting Japanese Americans had nothing whatsoever to do with the decision to force Japanese Americans behind barbed wire. Nothing.

(My sources for this account include Greg Robinson's book, *Peter Irons's Justice at War, and Personal Justice Denied*, the report of Congress's Commission on the Wartime Internment and Relocation of Civilians. This, you'll recall, was the fact-finding Commission that Congress created in the early 1980s to investigate the internment. Their report, condemning the internment, led to the passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, signed into law by President Reagan, which apologized to surviving internees for the internment, and authorized the payment to each of them of a token \$20,000 redress payment. You will also recall that you spoke and voted against this bill.

I hope that you will take this opportunity to admit the mistake in your comments of Tuesday morning and apologize for them.

Thank you for considering this.

Sincerely,

ERIC L. MULLER,
Professor of Law.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICA'S WILDERNESS PROTECTION ACT

HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House today to introduce the America's Wilderness Protection Act—a bill to apply urgency and accountability to the process of evaluating potential wilderness by setting firm deadlines.

There are 666 wilderness study areas across the nation that were designated more

than 10 years ago, totaling nearly 23 million acres in 18 states. In Idaho alone there are 86 wilderness study areas totaling about 3.1 million acres.

Sixty-three of the 67 Idaho parcels managed by the Bureau of Land Management have been locked up since the early 1980s—even though 40 of them have been found unsuitable for wilderness protection. The other four have been withdrawn from multiple-use since 1976. Most of the 19 Forest Service wilderness study areas have been in place since the mid-1980s and two have held that status since 1972.

That means Congress has dragged its feet and obstructionists have gladly accepted the do-nothing status quo on these lands through the administrations of seven presidents and during the entire lifetime of many working people in Idaho.

The problem stems from the failure of the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, which created the wilderness study area process, to provide for release of areas eventually deemed unsuitable for wilderness designation.

America's Wilderness Protection Act addresses that intractable situation by establishing a timetable for completion of wilderness studies. Lands designated as study areas would be released from that status on the earlier of: (1) 10 years after the legislation is enacted; (2) the date the area is designated wilderness by Congress, or (3) the date that the secretary of Interior or Agriculture determines the area is unsuitable for wilderness designation.

In the past, some have referred to acreage allowed to languish as wilderness study areas for decades as "de facto wilderness." This term is too kind. Designated wilderness has the advantage under law of being actively managed to retain its values. Wilderness study areas, on the other hand, are virtually un-touchable. These lands are left to overgrowth, disease and infestation by noxious weeds and other invasive species. They become ripe for catastrophic wildfires that threaten not only the acreage being "studied" for preservation but nearby private and public land as well.

Critics contend this bill would eliminate any incentive for ranchers and other multiple-use advocates to become engaged in earnest discussions of possible wilderness designations. The argument goes that they would only have to wait out the process and protection ultimately would be denied any parcel they choose. That couldn't be further from the truth.

There are no more avid outdoors enthusiasts and conservationists than those who make their living from the land. They have a deep understanding of the cycles of life and the value of protecting and cherishing the natural world. They appreciate the importance of stewardship; it's a principle they embody every day.

While the land itself is timeless, the scenic, cultural, habitat and aesthetic values of any particular tract—if left to the ravages of time—are decidedly limited. Just as vulnerable are the economic futures of the many families whose livelihoods have been stripped away by the loss of access to so much of what now can only laughingly be called 'public' land in the West.

This legislation promotes resolution and collaboration. After a generation of paralyzing in-decision and refusal to accept responsibility,

the 108th Congress has an historic opportunity—if it can muster the wisdom and courage to embrace it.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CONGRESS- MAN VERNON J. EHLERS

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my colleague, Congressman VERNON J. EHLERS of Grand Rapids, MI, on receiving the prestigious 2002 Philip Hauge Abelson Prize.

The Abelson Prize is awarded annually to honor a public servant for exceptional contributions to advancing science, or a scientist for a distinguished career of scientific achievement. It is granted by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the world's largest general scientific organization and publisher of the journal, "Science."

This award is much deserved. Congressman EHLERS received his Ph.D. in nuclear physics from the University of California at Berkeley in 1960. In 1966 he began teaching at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, MI and later became chairman of the college's physics department. Following a distinguished career in teaching, scientific research and community service, Congressman EHLERS joined this body in 1994, becoming the nation's first research physicist elected to Congress. He serves the 3rd Congressional District of Michigan, which directly borders the district I represent.

While serving, Congressman EHLERS has employed his scientific expertise to the benefit of our country. In 1997 the House Speaker selected him to review and restate the nation's science policy. The study, "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy," was the first full policy statement on federal science and technology by the U.S. Congress. In addition, he currently serves as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards for the House Science Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman EHLERS brings to this body both a unique scientific background and a strong commitment to use his knowledge and abilities for the public good. Please allow me to congratulate him once again on his most recent honor and thank him for his exemplary public service.

THE PRESIDENT STILL HAS NOT MADE THE CASE THAT WAR AGAINST IRAQ IS NECESSARY AT THIS TIME

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grave concern over the Bush Administration's approach toward Iraq.

I believe that this Administration is now, and has always been, determined to go to war and that it has never taken all the steps available

to avert a war while also achieving its goals toward that country.

This Administration's approach ill serves the American people and is dangerous for America's position in the world.

Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein should adhere to the demands of the United Nations Security Council to destroy any weapons of mass destruction, to refrain from further development of such weapons, and to cease and desist from hostilities towards his own people and his neighbors. He has not yet done so.

But the fact is that the United States has never given the United Nations process its full respect. The President's national security advisors have said they have intelligence to prove that Iraq is failing to comply with the United Nations' resolutions and is deceiving the weapons inspectors, but it has not fully divulged that intelligence to the inspectors.

The President has said that the United Nations must vote to use force because the weapons inspections are not working. And yet he has never advocated for a robust weapons inspection regime. Even though chief weapons inspector Hans Blix is reporting that progress is being made, albeit slowly, the fact is that we could have made even more progress with a tripling of the inspections team and an early insistence on the use of U2 spy plane overflights.

The President has an obligation to take every step possible short of war before determining whether or not war is necessary. I do not believe that the conclusion today can be reached that war is necessary.

I believe that more time can safely be given to weapons inspections without risking a unilateral attack by Iraq against the United States or our allies.

I do not believe that the facts indicate that Iraq poses a threat to the security of the United States.

But perhaps just as important, I believe that the weapons inspection regime is keeping Saddam Hussein occupied and that an even more robust weapons inspection regime would cripple any offensive capability he might contemplate.

Mr. Speaker, America's standing in the world is jeopardized by the President's position on Iraq.

President Bush has stood by while North Korea becomes a nuclear nation, but he has badgered and bullied nearly every nation in the world to support his position against Iraq, whose military capabilities are far more limited than those of North Korea. The world community has rarely received such bellicose and belligerent treatment as they have from the United States on the issue of Iraq.

The President weakens the international alliance against terrorism and other world threats as he bullies nations to support his march to war.

These nations are not admirers of Saddam Hussein, but they are opponents of war when war has not yet been proven to be necessary.

And the American people are not admirers of Saddam Hussein. But they too strongly believe that war must be the last resort and only when absolutely necessary and only with international support. This Administration chose war as its first response and has not changed course since.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Administration would strongly consider world opinion that advocates more time for weapons inspec-

tions. I would hope that this Administration would strongly consider the harm to America's standing in the world as it deals with the members of the United Nations. And I would hope that this Administration would remember that America is a peaceful nation, it is a just nation, and a strong nation. America is not, and should never become, a nation that is proud to go to war.

Should it be determined that war indeed is necessary, I have every confidence that the armed forces of this country will perform their responsibility with strength and character. I have always admired the men and women who choose to serve in the armed forces. I admire them for their hard work, their sense of duty to our country, and their sense of responsibility. But it is because of that very character and sense of duty to our nation that our government must exhaust every alternative to war before placing those men and women in harm's way.

The measure of the strength of a nation is its ability to show appropriate restraint just as much as it is its ability to protect itself and its allies. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans and people throughout the world support allowing more time for weapons inspections. I believe they are right and I believe our nation will be well served to allow more time for a rigorous inspections program.

NATIONAL COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DAY

HON. TIM HOLDEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against domestic violence. Domestic violence is a harsh reality facing our country that we as a Congress must stand up and fight against.

In my seven years as a County Sheriff, I encountered hundreds of domestic violence cases. This is a societal problem that knows no income barriers, no racial barriers, and no geographic barriers.

Within our society, domestic violence causes irreparable damage to the family. Domestic violence is a main cause for child neglect and severely distorts a child's perspective on the relationship between mother and father.

The sight of a victimized mother is a sight no child in this country should ever see. Children who are raised in homes where domestic violence continues live in fear for their own lives, afraid to speak out so they won't become the victim.

Now more than ever, it is time to stand up against these domestic bullies. We must lead the way as a Congress to end this disgrace and provide a safer way of life for all of America's families.

SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES ACT AND AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES RE- SEARCH ACT

HON. JOHN M. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for the National Aquatic Invasive Species Act and the Aquatic Invasive Species Research Act that was reintroduced March 5, 2003. I want to first thank my colleagues, Mr. EHLERS and Mr. GILCHREST, for all of the hard work, initiative, and time that they and their staffs have invested in this much needed legislation.

My district in Upstate New York is impacted, environmentally, economically, and socially, by the health and future viability of the Great Lakes. I know that New York State is only one of many states that directly feel the negative effects of invasive species. Aquatic invasive species are destroying the environment of the Great Lakes, damaging the Great Lakes fisheries, and costing taxpayers an estimated \$138 billion annually. It is important that we set interim standards for balanced water treatment systems so that we can control and see a significant decline in the increasing threat posed by aquatic invasive species to our aquatic ecosystems and natural resources.

These two pieces of comprehensive legislation would reduce the introduction of aquatic invasive species from ships and from other pathways through a variety of standards, research, and management programs. They complement one another in a variety of meaningful ways and I am hopeful that this body will be committed to moving these important pieces of legislation through the legislative process so that we, as a Congress, can properly address this problem.

Aquatic invasive species is one of many reasons I have long stood in opposition to the Great Lakes Navigation System Review study that was recently funded in the Fiscal Year 2003 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. If expansion and dredging of the St. Lawrence Seaway were to occur, we would inevitably see the introduction of and exponential increase of aquatic invasive species. The reasons I voice my support today of the National Aquatic Invasive Species Act and the Aquatic Invasive Species Research are consistent and unwavering with the stand I have taken long before today on this incredibly important issue. I am committed to the discovery of methods, and to fully funding those methods, that would work to decrease, and I hope, one day, eradicate, invasive species of all kinds in the waters of our region.

GLOBAL HIV/AIDS PANDEMIC

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2003

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks to include a letter I referenced during my special order statement yesterday on the issue of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, announced during his State of the Union address