

the Senate leaders said so in the Senate. No fallout shelter will keep us safe from the nuclear winter they plunge America into.

The radical Republican right has an agenda and they intend to use every weapon at their disposal to enforce their will upon the American people. The radical Republican right wants to dictate what a woman can and cannot do with her body. The radical Republican right wants to abolish women's rights one court decision at a time. Republicans just gave the radical extremist the right to abolish *Roe v. Wade*. Republicans just handed the radical right the keys to our democracy. Women's rights will be nuked.

Republican extremists will replace a woman's right to choose with a requirement to be subservient. The Republican Party intends to stack the Court and stack the deck against women.

They intend to violate the environment, too. Republican extremists want to stack the courts so their corporate lobbyists and special interests are shielded from liability, protected from acting responsibly, and given the right to foul the air, pollute the water, dump toxins on the ground, and spew carcinogens in the atmosphere.

Greed is God to these radicals who are attempting to subvert democracy with religious idolatry. Run for your lives, America, the Republicans are coming. Right wing extremists in the Republican Party control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they want the new trophy, and it is called the Supreme Court.

They want to send their militants into your homes, into your lives, next to your death bed, to force their will upon you. The Republicans in charge today want to replace the Constitution with the Bible. The Republicans in charge today would like nothing better than to enforce a literal interpretation of the Bible in every American home, every American school, and every American mind.

The Republican majority leader from Tennessee wants America to return to 1925 when the Butler Act in his State told people what to think and what to believe. But before the Republicans shout their Hosannas on high, let me recite a passage from the Bible. It was used by the defense in the Scopes monkey trial.

Dayton, Tennessee, science teacher, 25 years old, John T. Scopes was persecuted and prosecuted for teaching science and not religion in the classroom. The great attorney, Clarence Darrow, who defended Scopes, called upon the Bible. "A holy book, a good book, but not the only book," Darrow said, in defense of a man who was convicted but later acquitted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

And I recall his words today to remind the Senate majority leader and every Republican intimidated into hypocrisy to remember the Bible. Clarence Darrow quoted Proverbs, chapter

11, verse 29, and here is what the Bible says: "He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind."

Tonight we begin the ice age because the wind is going to be cold coming out of that Senate. Remember, "He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for a new national security strategy because our current path will only lead to future acts of terrorism and an increasingly insecure United States of America.

Most Americans understand that the best way to protect our country is through smarter policies right here at home, not through aggressive military combat abroad. In fact, a poll released today indicates that support for the war in Iraq is at its lowest level yet. Maybe that is because most Americans know that Iraq never possessed weapons of mass destruction, never had a connection to al Qaeda, and never played a role in the terrorist attacks of September 11.

Yet the Bush administration claimed each of these examples as fact in order to justify going to a war in Iraq and just over 2 years ago the U.S. invaded Iraq. Since then, more than 1,600 American soldiers, at least 24,000 noninsurgents Iraqi civilians, have paid for this false war with their lives, and over 12,000 American soldiers have been wounded forever.

Clearly the Presidential national security platform is not just immoral, it is incompetent. There has to be a better way, a better way than this. Fortunately, there is. Earlier tonight I reintroduced the SMART Security reso-

lution for the 21st century. SMART security clearly has increasing support among Members of Congress because at the end of the 108th Congress we had 50 cosponsors to the SMART security bill. This year alone, SMART already has 49 original cosponsors, and myself, and it was just introduced today. SMART, which is Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism, has five major components.

First, we must prevent future acts of terrorism by strengthening international institutions and the rule of law. For the past 4 years, the Bush administration has worked to discourage international cooperation. Most recently, his example of hostility toward diplomacy is the nomination of the hard-line unilateralist John Bolton to represent our country to the United Nations. Unilateralism is not the answer because terrorism is not just America's problem.

We can reinvigorate our international relationships by encouraging our United Nations and NATO partners to help us root out terrorist networks and put a stop to financing international terrorist groups.

Second, we must stop the proliferation and spread of weapons of mass destruction. In the past, President Bush has indicated this is the greatest threat America faces. Yet he has both aggressively pursued new nuclear weapons like the bunker buster bomb, and he does not support international treaties that seek to end the spread of chemical and biological weapons.

□ 1945

Not only does SMART security promote compliance with America's commitments to existing treaties, it also calls for the United States to set an example for the rest of the world by renouncing the development and testing of new nuclear weapons.

Third, we must address the root causes of terrorism. The first front line in the war on terror has to be confronting the despair and deprivation that foster it. There is a demonstrated link between an educated citizenry and a decrease in support for terrorism which is why SMART security wholly encourages democracy-building; human rights education; sustainable development; and education, particularly for women and girls in these nations. These are the programs we need to pursue in Iraq, not continued military operations.

Fourth, we must shift America's budget priorities to more effectively meet our security needs. We need stronger investments in peacekeeping, in reconstruction, and humanitarian and developmental aid. We simply cannot afford to spend billions each year on outdated or unproven weapons systems like the missile defense shield which has yet to be proven successful.

Fifth, the U.S. must pursue to the fullest extent alternatives to war. War needs to be the very last resort, to be considered only after every single possible diplomatic solution has been exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, the security of the American people is perhaps the most important issue we must address in the post-September 11 world, but we must address it in a smart way. As the world's largest democracy, we have a responsibility to utilize all diplomatic possibilities before resorting to force.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2361, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-87) on the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus has been in the forefront of the fight to preserve the filibuster, a much-used, indeed used more against African Americans than any others. We do not want to see and will not stand to see the rules changed when it could now be used to protect us from judges who would overturn our rights.

We have supported the idea of a compromise, if one could be found; but I

come to the floor this evening to say that we are horrified to hear of a possible compromise involving two judges that would be most unacceptable to the 43 members of the Congressional Black Caucus who unanimously oppose elimination of the filibuster and unanimously oppose these two judges: Attorney General William Pryor, who would be nominated to the 11th Circuit; and Janice Rogers Brown, who would be nominated to the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Briefly, Attorney General Pryor in this year when we are starting the reauthorization of the 1965 Voting Rights Act would simply be totally unacceptable to us and we think to most Americans. This is a man who sought to repeal the critical section of the Voting Rights Act, who has indicated that some rights now protected by the Constitution should be regarded as social disputes and essentially has indicated that some of these rights now protected by the Constitution should indeed be left to the States. This is a man who belongs perhaps on the Supreme Court in the 19th century, not today.

We are particularly insulted that President Bush would resubmit the name of Janice Rogers Brown. Has he done so because she is African American and somehow he believes that for that reason people will go easy on her and not look at what in fact she has stood for? We regard her nomination as nothing short of insulting. When she was first nominated to the California Supreme Court, the signal from the California Association of Black Lawyers who opposed her nomination was that her appointment could be detrimental, as they put it, to black America with nothing short of, as they put it, far reaching circumstances for generations to come. How right they proved to be. When she was renominated to the California Supreme Court, 20 of the 23 members of the California bar found her to be not qualified because of the way she inserted her personal opinions, her personal views, into her judicial opinions.

Janice Rogers Brown and the rule of law are strangers. She has no regard for precedent. How else to explain a ruling of hers where she found that racially derogatory on-the-job speech was unconstitutional even though the Supreme Court long ago found that such speech is not protected by title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Why did she find herself in dissent reaching this conclusion?

I recite the cases because you hear that these judges are extreme. We mean to make you understand, hopefully, what we mean by extreme. Proposition 209 passed, an anti-affirmative action proposition, passed in California. The judge who was on her side of the case, the Chief Justice, Ronald George, also appointed by Governor Pete Wilson, said when he read her concurrence, remember, concurrence with him, that the concurrence raised "a se-

rious distortion of history," indicating that it would be widely and correctly viewed as presenting an unfair and inaccurate caricature of affirmative action programs. When a judge on your side appointed by the same Governor as you characterizes your agreement with him in this way, is he not telling the Senate something it must listen to?

Here is a woman who found that black women in a case involving a prosecution where the prosecution may have used racial preemptory challenges found that black women are not a cognizable group. Again, she has often found herself in dissent even from her own Republican colleagues.

We do not need this woman on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals where she would bring her views that "the New Deal was the triumph of our own socialist revolution" to Washington.

SERGEANT MIKE LANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor Sergeant Mike Lane, a lifelong Texan, member of the Beaumont Police Department for 33 years. Each day a person who wears the badge walks the thin blue line between life and death. Their spouses wonder when their police officer mate reports for duty if that person will return safely home. Last year, 156 of them did not return home to their families. Texas, along with California, each led the Nation last year with 14 police officers killed in the line of duty. Sergeant Mike Lane was one of them.

Mike Lane graduated from Beaumont High School in 1969 and received his pilot's license even prior to high school graduation at the young age of 17. He attended Lamar Tech, now Lamar University, until he decided to answer the call of law enforcement. In 1972, Sergeant Lane joined the Beaumont Police Department where his lengthy legacy began. He spent 32 years with the same police department in southeast Texas, fighting crime, helping people.

A son of a retired Air Force member, Mike Lane was raised in airplane hangars all over the world from Japan to the United States. He had the passion of the Wright brothers for flying. He had aviation in his Texas blood. In the mid-80s, the Beaumont Police Department seized a plane used to smuggle drugs from Belize to Texas. After acquiring the plane, they began using it for local missions. Sergeant Lane immediately jumped at the chance to get in the pilot's seat for the citizens of Jefferson County. He was one of the two designated pilots for the Beaumont Police Department.

Just as policemen are drawn together by common goals, pilots seem to congregate together as well. His partner in the sky was another pilot in the police department, Deputy Chief Weldon