free. In many cases, they gave so others could also have a chance to live as we do, because we believe freedom-loving democracies will live at peace with us.

So as we honor all who serve with this resolution, I especially honor those who have made the greatest sacrifice. A moment of silence is especially appropriate for these fallen heroes, men and women, to whom we owe a debt of gratitude that is simply unpayable.

It allows us to reflect on our freedom; but mostly, Mr. Speaker, it captures the enormity of their individual sacrifices. Forever, each has fallen silent. For those who love them, there is consolation in knowing that our Nation will remember their sacrifice.

So let us take a moment to reflect upon and honor their memory. Today, as I read off the names of Guam's fallen heroes in the war on terror, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we observe a brief moment of silence here today in this House on this floor to honor these men and women who sacrificed and continue to sacrifice like they did:

Specialist Christopher Wesley; First Lieutenant Michael Aguon Vega; Sergeant Yihjyh Lang Chen; Corporal JayGee Meluat; Sergeant Skipper Soram; Specialist Jonathon Pangelinan Santos; Staff Sergeant Steven Bayow; Specialist Derence Jack; Sergeant Wilgene Lieto; Specialist Richard Naputi; and Specialist Kasper Dudkiewicz.

Now for a brief moment of silence.

God bless our service men and women, and God bless our great country, the United States of America.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

□ 1500

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very, very strong support of this resolution offered by my colleague from the great State of Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. Speaker, since September 11, 2001, our Nation has been at war against the cowardly terrorists who attacked our Nation on that horrible day. The men and the women who served in our Armed Forces have made tremendous sacrifices to make America and the world a safer place.

They toppled the Taliban and they brought freedom and democracy to 25 million people in Afghanistan. Because of that service and that sacrifice, Mr. Speaker, Afghanistan today is a partner and an ally in the war on terror, instead of the friendly host of our enemy.

For the past 3 years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom. That mission has been very long, very difficult, and the sacrifices have been many. But the mission is being achieved. The Iraqi people have gone to the polls three times and are now finishing the work on establishing a Democratic national unity government.

Once democracy takes root in Iraq, freedom will have gained another foothold in a part of the world where it is so desperately needed. None of these incredible accomplishments would have been possible without the sacrifice of our men and our women in uniform.

All of our volunteer military, made up of citizen soldiers, are the best emissaries of freedom our Nation has to offer. These are men and women willing to give up their lives to spread freedom and to make our Nation more secure. And for that we owe them a debt which can never be repaid.

The least we can do as Americans is to pause to reflect on everything that they have sacrificed, for the incredible service that they have given to the cause of freedom. And so to every soldier in the Army, to every airman in the Air Force, to every sailor in the Navy, to every Marine, to every member of the National Guard or the Reserves, to every brave member of the Coast Guard, thank you.

Thank you for your service and thank you for your sacrifice. Thank you all for serving the cause of freedom. Every American should observe the moment of silence asked for by this resolution and reflect upon all of our Armed Forces and all that they have done to protect our freedoms, our liberty, our democracy. And following that moment of silence, we should also personally thank every service member that we meet in our everyday lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and thank the gentleman (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for introducing it. No matter what one's views are on the Iraq war, or war in general, our men and women in uniform sacrifice a great deal so that we may live freely.

It is a fact of life that in every war anyone who serves in war runs the very real risk of losing their lives. This is a tremendous burden that few of us can ever imagine. However, from the moment they rise in the morning, every U.S. soldier knows that they could fall in the line of duty that day.

Unfortunately, 2,309 U.S. soldiers have paid the ultimate price in Iraq and 278 have died in Afghanistan. Thousands have died in the wars that the U.S. has fought—Vietnam, World War I and World War II, Korea, Desert Storm and others. All of these soldiers, regardless of when they served, deserve our thanks, our prayers, and our respect.

This burden is shared by not only every man and woman that puts on the uniform, but each of their families, too. In order to adequately honor those that have fallen, we must continue our responsibility to those that they have left behind.

Mr. Speaker, we must show our support for these fallen heroes and their families. This resolution is a small way of showing our gratitude.

I strongly support this resolution and thank our soldiers for their service. My prayers are with those who have lost their lives and their families.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 698.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACCESS OF MILITARY RECRUITERS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 354) expressing the continued support of Congress for requiring an institution of higher education to provide military recruiters with access to the institution's campus and students at least equal in quality and scope to that which is provided to any other employer in order to be eligible for the receipt of certain Federal funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 354

Whereas on March 6, 2006, the Supreme Court ruled 8–0 in favor of the Government in the case of Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights, Inc., upholding the authority of Congress to withhold Federal funds from an institution of higher education that prevents military recruiters from gaining access to the institution's campus and students in a manner that is at least equal in quality and scope to that which is provided to any other employer;

Whereas this important decision comes at a time when the Nation finds itself at war and reaffirms the constitutional obligation of the Government to provide for the defense of the Nation;

Whereas the decision recognizes the authority of Congress under section 8 of article I of the Constitution to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

Whereas the national security interests of the United States are best served by a high level of military personnel readiness;

Whereas the ability of the Armed Forces to recruit the best possible candidates from the widest available pool of talent is of paramount importance to national security;

Whereas institutions of higher education are an important source of recruits for the Armed Forces;

Whereas an institution of higher education that prevents military recruiters from gaining access to the institution's campus or students in a manner that is at least equal in quality and scope to that which is provided to any other employer does a disservice to those students who desire the opportunity to serve in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas section 983 of title 10, United States Code, requires institutions of higher education to provide such equal access to military recruiters in order to be eligible for the receipt of certain Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That Congress expresses

continued support for requiring an institution of higher education to provide military recruiters with access to the institution's campus and students at least equal in quality and scope to that which is provided to any other employer in order to be eligible for the receipt of certain Federal funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 2006, the Supreme Court of the United States, in unanimously deciding in favor of the government's position in the case Rumsfeld v. the Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights, Inc., sent an emphatic rebuke to those who would view opposition to military recruiting as a form of protest.

The military recruiting process within our colleges and universities is an important pillar of our national security that we can ill afford to cavalierly cast aside because of a policy disagreement.

The Supreme Court's decision upheld the Solomon Amendment named for the late U.S. Representative, Gerald Solomon, and strongly supported from its inception in 1994 by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. Solomon's and Mr. POMBO's initial objective was simple. No institution may deny access to recruiters, to students and student information, or student access to Reserve Officer Training Corps, or ROTC programs, without forfeiting their Federal grants and other funding.

Under a number of modifications over the years, the language ruled on by the court requires access to military recruiters that is at least equal in quality and scope to the access provided to any other employer.

While the law initially put only Department of Defense funding at risk, the current law, upheld by the court's ruling, would allow the funding from eight agencies to be withheld, including the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

The group, representing a number of law schools and professors, had persuaded the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Philadelphia that the Solomon Amendment violated the Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine, because it forced a law school to choose between surrendering first amendment rights of speech and association and losing Federal funding for its university.

At the center of the debate was the objection of certain organizations to the Department of Defense policy that denies military service to open homosexuals. The Supreme Court decision discredited the case by clarifying that the Solomon Amendment regulated conduct and not speech, and that it was clear that the policy on homosexuals was a government statement and not the policy of the law schools.

The decision also noted that the Solomon Amendment presented no risk to the freedom of association of the law schools since there was no capability for recruiters to become part of an institution and actively hijack the public perception of the institution's views.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 354, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), is a celebration of a wise and just decision by our Supreme Court and a strong statement of Congressional support for the Solomon Amendment.

The Solomon Amendment expresses the inherent wisdom of its author and the finest traditions of our Nation. In Mr. Solomon's view, barring military recruiters was an intrusion on Federal prerogatives, a slap in the face to our Nation's military personnel, and an impediment to a sound national security policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Solomon Amendment really does work to protect the future of our Nation. Today, there are only three small law schools that have chosen to deny recruiters access to campuses and student information. They simply do not require Federal funding to survive, and they have chosen to protest the Department of Defense policy on homosexuals in the military as is their right.

But for the overwhelming majority of colleges and universities, the worthy messages of patriotism and service to Nation are being heard by America's youth and they are stepping forward to confront our enemies in this long war against terror.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. POMBO for introducing this resolution. It is imperative that everyone in our Nation understand the importance of military recruiting and the unequivocal committee support of the Congress for the Solomon Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 354.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 354, which expresses Congress' continued support to require institutions of higher education to provide military recruiters the same access to students as they provide to other employers.

I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) in support of this measure. I would also like to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) for bringing this measure forward today.

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 2006 just a few days ago, the United States Supreme Court affirmed the statutory provision that requires institutions of higher education to provide access to students at least equal in quality and equal in scope to those that are provided to other employers in order to be eligible for receipt of Federal funds.

The statutory provision, commonly referred to as the Solomon Amendment, was first enacted in 1994, and has subsequently been amended over the past several years. However, the basic underlying premise of the provision is that a college or university that denies military recruiters access equal to other recruiters would lose their Federal funds.

The Supreme Court found that the Solomon Amendment does not violate the first amendment, and that Congress can require law schools to provide equal access to military recruiters without violating the school's freedom of speech or association as schools are free to not accept Federal funding.

We are a Nation at war, and military recruiters need to be able to recruit individuals from all walks of life, from the high school graduate, to the person completing their doctorate and all of those in between, whether they are undergraduates in liberal arts, whether they are law school students or medical professionals completing their residency.

The military, in many ways, is just a microcosm of our society as a whole. And Congress has a responsibility to ensure that all Americans, all Americans are afforded the knowledge and the opportunity to serve their Nation if they choose to do so.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in this House, we are continually voting for increased funding for institutions of higher learning in our Nation, and it is certainly right and it is proper that we do so, because our future depends or our young people being able to receive the education that they so rightly deserve.

But what has been troubling in recent years has been attempts by many of these same institutions that receive Federal funding to restrict or to bar military recruiters from their campuses in violation of the law.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court voted in an 8–0 decision to uphold the requirement that military recruiters be given access to students

like any other perspective employer, or that institution could lose their Federal funding. This policy is very, very important to the future of our military, of our freedom, and of our democracy.

The young men and women on our college campuses should not be denied the great opportunities available to them, to so many of them in the United States military, just because some college administrator may not agree with our national policy.

We have freedom in our Nation, but that freedom is not free. And there are many young people in our Nation's colleges, in our Nation's universities who are willing to pay the price of service and of sacrifice in order to protect the freedom of every one of their fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution restates the policy and sends a very clear message to our Nation's colleges and to our Nation's universities. We as a Nation want to support their mission to educate our young people. They must allow equal access to our military recruiters to give those students a chance to see if serving their country is perhaps the right career move for them or the right personal choice for them.

Mr. Speaker, not one person in this Nation is drafted into military service. We have an all-volunteer military. It makes us strong and it keeps us free. Free people make free decisions. Let us let our young people continue to make theirs an informed decision.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the recognition to speak so that I can make my remarks with the proper perspective.

My father, Frank Kucinich, was a World War II Marine Corps veteran.

□ 1515

My brother Frank Kucinich, Jr., was a Vietnam veteran in the Marines. My brother Gary Kucinich was a Marine Corps veteran, 1968 to 1972. My sister Beth Ann Kucinich served in the United States Army. I would have served as well except that I was not able to get in as I have a heart murmur.

We have a tradition of service in my family. My nephew Gary Kucinich, my brother Gary's son, is in Iraq right now. But having said all that, I want to say that while I believe it is honorable to serve our country and we should praise those who do serve, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 354 and in support of the necessity and importance of nondiscrimination policies.

The military's misguided Don't Ask, Don't Tell ban on lesbian, gay and bisexual servicemembers is clearly not compatible with university policies that prohibit campus recruiting by employers who discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

There is no lack of ''equal'' access for any employer that seeks to recruit on America's college campuses, assuming those employers do not discriminate. But granting access to an employer, whether military, private sector or otherwise, that fails to meet a school's nondiscrimination policy is not equal access, but special access. It is a unique right to discriminate, granted only to the military.

This Congress should be leading the way in the fight against discrimination, not supporting policies that allow the military to sidestep nondiscrimination policies. We should ensure that all men and women who wish to serve in the Armed Forces are allowed to do so by repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Requiring schools to suspend their nondiscrimination policies for military recruiters and their openly discriminatory policies is a step backwards. Rather than condone and supporting these discriminatory policies, this Congress should work diligently to eliminate the need for nondiscrimination policies. I urge my colleagues to take the lead in the fight against discrimination. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H. Con. Res. 354. As chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee and a member of the Armed Services Committee, this measure touches on two issues very near and dear to my heart: higher education and our national security.

Just over a week ago, the U.S. Supreme Court announced a unanimous decision to protect the rights of military recruiters seeking access to colleges and universities that accept Federal funding. I applaud the Supreme Court's decision, which embodies the same spirit as many of our own legislative efforts here in Congress.

Since its enactment in 1996, the Solomon amendment has found many allies on the Education and the Workforce and the Armed Services Committees, as well as throughout the entire House. Our consistent message has been this: Whether in a time of war or a time of peace, if colleges and universities are willing to accept taxpayer dollars to operate, they also must be willing to accept those who recruit the men and women who defend our Nation—and our freedom.

At no time in recent memory has our Nation placed more responsibility upon the shoulders of our men and women in uniform. We're fighting a war unlike any we have ever fought before and doing so on multiple fronts. As we struggle to preserve our very way of life, it is essential that we promote military service as an option for college students across the country. Indeed, if we are going to find success in defending our freedom and protecting our homeland, then our military recruiters must have access to our Nation's best and brightest students. And that access is what the Solomon amendment, last week's unanimous Supreme Court decision, and our ongoing efforts here in Congress continue to protect.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has established a record of action on national security issues, from supporting our military to providing for a strong national defense to fighting and winning the war on terror. We remain committed to standing behind our troops and defending our Nation from every threat, and this resolution is a reflection of that fact. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to H. Con. Res. 354.

Last year, students at the University of California at Santa Cruz in my district organized a demonstration protesting the Department of Defense's ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell'' policy and the presence of military recruiters to campus. How did DOD respond? They sent someone to spy on the protest and deemed the participants, students exercising their constitutional rights, a ''credible threat''! .

Our country was founded on the principle that its citizens have the authority to disagree with their government. As Edward R. Murrow said, ''We must not confuse dissent with disloyalty.'' Unwarranted domestic spying is the kind of extreme DOD reaction that concerns me if military recruiters are allowed unfettered access to campuses across the Nation.

The Republican leadership may be eager to endorse the recent Supreme Court decision requiring higher education institutions to provide access to a Government agency that practices blatant discriminatory practices, but my constituents and I are not.

Conditional Federal funding may be constitutional, but discrimination in all practices should not be.

Congress should be working to encourage civil rights and non-discriminatory practices, not endorsing a decision that forces universities to disregard their own values and the constitutional rights of their students. Equating equal opportunity employers with a Government agency that abides by the discriminatory ''Don't ask, don't tell'' policy is unreasonable and unjust.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 354 because the military should not discriminate based on sexual orientation. Colleges and universities should be able to deny access to military recruiters without losing Federal funds.

In 1948, President Harry S. Truman courageously integrated the Armed Forces, signing Executive Order 9981 when many in his party opposed racial equality. As a result, the military has since served as an example for private and public organizations alike, encouraging racial equality and opportunity in hiring and promotion.

In contrast, President Bush promotes divisive prejudices and his friends in Congress are here today promoting a backward agenda. This resolution declares support for a court decision that prevents institutions of higher education from promoting higher understanding.

President Truman demonstrated great courage by racially integrating the military. President Bush and his Republican cronies show great cowardice in failing to advance additional civil rights today. If they were in power in 1948, I doubt they would have acted then either.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and allow universities to continue to promote racial, religious, gender—and sexual—equality.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my support for this resolution is reluctant because, while I believe that allowing military recruiters

equal access to institutions of higher education is beneficial to both the military and the students, I am also strongly opposed to policies that discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, such ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell.'' This policy has deprived the military of over 10,000 highly trained soldiers during a time of war and continues to cost the government millions of dollars in wasted training and enforcement costs. If we want to bridge the divide between the military and universities, we should, instead of passing resolutions like H. Con. Res. 354, pass H.R. 1059, the ''Military Readiness Enhancement Act,'' which, by repealing ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'' would end the dispute over equal access for military recruiters. At the end of the day, our security is best served by giving all qualified Americans the freedom to serve our country.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 354.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. DRAKE. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## WAIVING PASSPORT FEES FOR RELATIVES OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1184) to waive the passport fees for a relative of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1184

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

**SECTION 1. PASSPORT FEES.**

Section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 750, chapter 223; 22 U.S.C. 214) is amended in the third sentence by striking ''or from a widow, child, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member'' and inserting ''or from a widow, widower, child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1184, as passed by the Senate, corrects a minor flaw in current passport law. While this flaw is minor in the sense of its legal impact, the possible impact it has had and could have on family members of our brave servicemen and -women who have made the ultimate sacrifice is significant enough that we should move to correct it quickly.

Under current law, the State Department waives passport fees for family members traveling abroad to official grave sites of armed servicemembers. However, the current law does not make a similar exception for family members traveling to attend a funeral or memorial service for a servicemember killed in action and then buried or memorialized overseas. S. 1184 would rightly extend this fee waiver to these families as well.

The ability to attend a funeral or memorial service for one who has paid the ultimate price in the service of our country is just as necessary an aspect of paying our final respects as being able to visit their grave.

Mr. Speaker, the logistical and financial burden imposed by these fees on grieving families can quickly build up. This small flaw in our current law has had large ramifications, and it does a disservice to the families of our fallen heroes and creates undue stress and pain that could easily be corrected.

Correcting this flaw would mean a great deal to those families who have given most. In this regard, I urge that S. 1184 be passed quickly and sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, represents a small, but important, change to existing law to help ease in one small way the suffering of U.S. citizens whose relatives have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. Hundreds of thousands of Americans from both our regular forces and from the National Guard and Reserves have been deployed in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other countries around the globe. Our forces have been subject to more stress than any time since the Vietnam War when the United States had the draft.

The men and women who have performed so magnificently for their country deserve all the support we can give them, and their families deserve every possible relief we can give them as well.

The legislation before us today affords those families some relief at a time of unimaginable loss.

Many members of our Armed Forces have developed ties and families abroad, and a few of them are being buried at private cemeteries in foreign lands after making the ultimate sacrifice. At present, our law requires grieving parents, grandparents, and other relatives to pay nearly $100 in first-time passport fees when all they want to do is to attend their family member's final honor. For a large family these costs can add up and for no good reason.

The legislation before us remedies this problem. It authorizes the Department of State to waive the passport fees in this situation, just as the Department is currently allowed to do when the family member is being buried in a U.S. military cemetery. It also extends the waiver to allow grandparents to be eligible for it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that affects relatively few people. Indeed, the Congressional Budget Office has concluded that it would have no significant impact on the Federal budget; but when it does happen, it can be a godsend to those who have lost so much.

I commend my dear friend, the Senate sponsor of this legislation, Senator JOE BIDEN of Delaware, for introducing this humanitarian measure; and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our men and women bravely serving in the Armed Forces—past, present, and future. As they fight the forces of terrorism around the globe we must seek to honor their sacrifices made to preserve our freedoms.

As we remember them on March 26, National Support the Troops Day, it is only fitting that we participate in a moment of silence to reflect on their service. Those currently serving in our Armed Forces are protecting liberty that was established by the Founding Fathers and has been preserved by our Nation's veterans. Soldiers, sailors, and airmen daily risk their lives fighting those who wish to enslave mankind to religious extremism, oppression, and tyranny.

Today I also rise in support of S. 1184, an effort to properly honor those whose loved ones have fallen in combat. It is the least we can do to waive passport fees for those who must travel overseas in order to visit the resting place of their relatives who have given the full measure of service. From the beaches of France to deserts of Africa, American soldiers have given their lives and been interred on foreign soil.

We are ever grateful for their sacrifice and this is but a small way we can now support their relatives.