and honor other District veterans and remind the nation of the necessity to pass H.R. 5388, the Fair and Equal House Voting Rights Act which would afford the full vote in the House of Representatives for the first time in American history. Passage of this legislation would be the optimal way to recognize the service of Mr. Brown, D.C. residents who are currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the 44,000 D.C. veterans who have honorably served our nation in the United States Armed Forces.

IN SUPPORT OF MAINTAINING NEUTRALITY WITH REGARD TO THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN AZERBAIJAN AND ARMENIA

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks leading up to the G–8 summit, there was some speculation that the leaders of Azerbaijan and Armenia might be invited to attend the summit as an incentive to help spur further progress on peace negotiations between the two countries over the Nagorno-Karabakh issue. Unfortunately, it appears that that did not happen; and I am deeply disappointed that the world has missed the opportunity this summit offered to help promote peace in a region which has been in conflict for far too long.

Although, in my opinion, a good opportunity to advance peace has been lost, I have not lost hope that, together with other nations, we can help Azerbaijan and Armenia achieve peace, and settle once and for all the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh, which I believe has significantly stunted the development of both nations as well as the broader region.

In 1992, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—CSCE—now the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—OSCE—created the Minsk Group, a coalition of member states dedicated to facilitating a peaceful resolution of the conflict. The co-chairs of the Minsk Group—Russia, France, and the United States—have served as mediators, trying to work in close and effective cooperation with all parties towards a fair and effective settlement of the issues.

I believe though that our success and credibility as a mediator stems from the policy of never appearing to favor one nation's claims over the other. I believe that even the modest steps towards peace which we have witnessed, are a direct result of this neutrality. According to the United States State Department's 2005 Fact Sheet: ''The United States does not recognize Nagorno-Karabakh as an independent country, and its leadership is not recognized internationally or by the United States. The United States supports the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and holds that the future status of Nagorno-Karabakh is a matter of negotiation between the parties.'' This has been the policy of the United States towards this issue through both the Clinton and Bush administrations, and it is important in my opinion that it remains the same. Any outside influence, any shift in neutrality can only result in a false peace. That is why I am deeply concerned when I hear some of my colleagues throwing barbs at the Azeris and attempting to lay all the blame for this complicated issue at their doorstep.

For example, one of my colleagues once said, ''I have long supported the right of self-determination for the people of Nagorno-Karabakh and greatly admire the efforts of the people of this historically Armenian region to build democracy and a market economy in the face of hostility from Azerbaijan.'' So far as I know, the Nagorno-Karabakh region has never been a part of Armenia. To suggest otherwise, and to suggest that the problems in Nagorno-Karabakh are caused solely by Azerbaijan seem to me to distort the facts and potentially undermine our good faith efforts to see this conflict resolved; and to see peace and prosperity come to the people of both Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all of my colleagues to both maintain our neutrality in policy, and to also realize that choosing one side over the other at this point in time is a setback to peace, especially when the side they appear to be choosing may be distorting the facts for its own benefit.

IN HONOR OF DR. EDGAR B. MOORE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Dr. Edgar B. Moore, beloved husband, father, friend, educator, and spiritual leader. Dr. Moore leaves a legacy at Baldwin-Wallace College that reflects his personal passions and professional accomplishments in his roles as both chaplain and professor.

Dr. Moore began his career at Baldwin-Wallace in August 1962, when he was hired as chaplain. He immediately became involved in various chapel activities while counseling and advising students and teaching in the Religion Department. At the end of his first year, the History Department underwent major changes, and Dr. Moore was asked to take a position as professor of history. He accepted and was named chairman while remaining chaplain. Dr. Moore remained in the History Department until his retirement.

Dr. Moore's involvement at Baldwin-Wallace extended far beyond the History Department. His students became babysitters for his and his wife's three children, Cynthia, Robert, and Mary Louise. He chaperoned spring formals and Greek parties and assisted in the formation of the Cosmopolitan Club, which brought American and international students together to promote greater understanding between cultures.

Dr. Moore continued his own education while teaching at Baldwin-Wallace. In January 1966, he earned his doctorate of philosophy from the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. Through a series of visits, he developed a relationship between the schools, which led to the present Academic Studies Abroad program. Dr. Moore attended Northwestern University in the summer of 1969 for graduate classes in African Studies. His new knowledge and ongoing interest in uniting cultures led to the African Studies program.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and gratitude to Dr. Edgar B. Moore, whose outstanding 44-year career was defined by his steadfast commitment to spiritual growth, education, and appreciation of diversified cultures. While his students and colleagues will miss him immensely, his legacy and contributions to the Baldwin-Wallace community will live on for many generations to come.

HONORING THE SOLDIERS OF DETACHMENT 1, 779TH ORDNANCE COMPANY, THE TENNESSEE NATIONAL GUARD

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of Congress, please join me today to honor the soldiers of Detachment 1, 779th Ordnance Company, of the Tennessee National Guard.

The 779th deserves the nation's thanks and praise for serving honorably and contributing mightily to our efforts in the Middle East.

They have served America in such dangerous and strategically vital locations as Ramadi, Habanabi, Al Asad and Al Taqaddum, and they have been absolutely critical in the tactical and operational success of coalition forces.

Without the skilled and dedicated soldiers of the 779th, victory in the Global War on Terrorism would not be possible.

Let us join the rest of Tennessee in saying congratulations, welcome home, and job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record my position on the following votes I missed due to reasons beyond my control.

On Thursday July 13, 2006 I had to tend to some family matters and thus missed rollcall votes Nos. 370, 371, 372, 373 and 374. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on all votes.

On Monday June 19, 2006 I was unavoidably delayed and thus missed rollcall votes Nos. 289, 290 and 291. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on all votes.

On Monday May 22, 2006 I was unavoidably delayed and thus missed rollcall votes Nos. 177 and 178. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on both votes.

INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 916

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. SENSENBRENNER . Mr. Speaker, regrettably, today I am forced to introduce this

resolution calling for an inquiry into grounds for the impeachment of U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, from the Central District of California. This resolution has become necessary due to a breakdown in the judicial branch's enforcement of the judicial discipline statute Congress enacted in 1980. When the judicial branch has failed to address serious allegations of judicial misconduct, as the Ninth Circuit arguably has in this matter, the Constitution provides the Congress only one course of action: opening an impeachment inquiry.

I would caution my colleagues and others not to jump to any conclusions in this matter. Today's resolution merely allows the House Judiciary Committee to open an investigation to determine the facts. Only after the House Judiciary Committee has conducted a fair, thorough, and detailed investigation, will committee members be able to consider whether Articles of Impeachment might be warranted.

The introduced resolution ensures that the investigation will be referred to the House Judiciary Committee. It is modeled after the last three impeachment resolutions that the House used to investigate, respectively, Judge Harry E. Claiborne (1986), Judge Alcee L. Hastings (1988), and Judge Walter L. Nixon (1989). All three were later impeached and removed from office based on the drafting of more detailed articles reported by the committee after the investigations were completed.

According to press reports and legal filings made public, in February 2000 Judge Real allegedly interceded on behalf of a defendant known to him in a joint bankruptcy and California State unlawful-detainer action. The defendant reportedly was going through a messy divorce and was ordered to vacate a home that was held in trust by her husband's family. The defendant filed a bankruptcy petition that automatically stayed eviction proceedings in October 1999, but the stay was eventually lifted. The defendant, represented by counsel, then signed a stipulation that allowed the State court to issue an eviction notice in February 2000, approximately 10 days before Judge Real allegedly interceded.

Judge Real allegedly received ex parte communications from the defendant and through third parties about the matter before he took action. Judge Real was supervising the defendant as part of her probation in a separate criminal case in which she had pled guilty to perjury and loan fraud.

Judge Real withdrew the case from the bankruptcy court and enjoined the State eviction proceeding. He allegedly gave no reasons for his assertion of jurisdiction over the case or his rulings. The defendant was allowed to live rent-free in the home for a period of years. When the trustee appealed by mandamus to the Ninth Circuit, Judge Real transferred the case to another district judge. The trustee reclaimed the property on appeal but reportedly lost at least $35,000 in rent during the proceedings.

According to news reports, in February 2003 a private citizen filed a complaint against Judge Real for his conduct in the bankruptcy and unlawful-detainer actions. This complaint reportedly was dismissed twice by the Chief Judge of the Ninth Circuit, even though the Judicial Council in the second case reportedly recommended that further investigation take place regarding ex parte communications between Judge Real and the litigant.

Judge Alex Kozinski wrote in his dissenting opinion for the Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit, "The fact of the matter is that the judge's conduct here caused real harm. It certainly harmed innocent creditors to the tune of $50,000 or more. Worse, it harmed public confidence in the fair administration of justice in the courts of this circuit. The prohibition against ex parte communications, rules of procedure, principles of law—all of these are not trinkets that judges may discard whenever they become a nuisance. Rather, they are the mainstays of our judicial system, our guarantee to every litigant that we will administer justice, as our oath requires, 'without respect to person'. . . . [T]he majority's exiguous order seems far more concerned with not hurting the feelings of the judge in question. But our first duty as members of the Judicial Council is not to spare the feelings of judges accused of misconduct. It is to maintain public confidence in the judiciary by ensuring that substantial allegations of misconduct are dealt with forthrightly and appropriately. This the majority has failed to do."

Judge Real's actions are under further review by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and have been the subject of numerous news reports by the Los Angeles Times and others.

Based upon these news reports and legal proceedings made public, Judge Real's behavior in the bankruptcy and unlawful-detainer actions may constitute impeachable conduct. Some of the issues that I hope will be reviewed during the Committee investigation include—

His intercession on behalf of a litigant known to him;

His alleged ex parte communications with the litigant known to him;

His assertion of jurisdiction over proceedings in which he lacked jurisdiction;

His alleged failure to explain his assertion of jurisdiction to counsel;

His alleged failure to provide any legal authority for his actions;

His reply, on at least one occasion, to counsel when questioned as to the basis of a ruling ("Just because I said it, Counsel.").

I expect the next step in this process to involve the establishment of a bipartisan impeachment inquiry team in the near future.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS BASED UPON NEWS REPORTS AND LEGAL FILINGS IMPEACHMENT INVESTIGATION OF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE MANUEL L. REAL, PREPARED BY HOUSE JUDICIARY MAJORITY COMMITTEE STAFF

September 11, 1991: Alan and Elizabeth Canter purchase a Los Angeles home as an investment.

September 25, 1991: Their son, Gary, and his wife, Deborah, take up residence at the home. Gary pays rent thereafter.

1997: Title to the home is transferred to a trust (the "Canter Family Trust").

February 24, 1999: Gary and Deborah Canter separate. Gary moves out and rent payments cease thereafter.

August 13, 1999: Alan Canter files an unlawful-detainer action in California state court, seeking Deborah's eviction from the property and $5,000 back rent.

October 26, 1999: Deborah Canter files a Chapter 13 bankruptcy petition 24 minutes before her unlawful-detainer trial commences. The trial is stayed.

January 24, 2000: Deborah Canter and Judge Real conduct a probation review meeting in his chambers. (Judge Real was supervising Deborah Canter as part of her probation in a separate criminal case in which she pled guilty to perjury and loan fraud.)

January 26, 2000: The bankruptcy court lifts the stay at the request of the Canter Family Trust, thereby allowing the unlawful-detainer action to proceed. Alan Canter and Deborah Canter subsequently sign a stipulated judgment that Deborah vacate the premises.

February 7, 2000: The California state court enters a judgment pursuant to the stipulation and orders that Alan Canter recover possession of the property from Deborah Canter.

February 17, 2000: Judge Real withdraws the case from the bankruptcy court.

February 29, 2000: Judge Real stays enforcement of the California state court judgment.

Sometime in 2000 or 2001: Judge Real refuses to lift the stay upon motion by the Canter Family Trust.

June 18, 2001: Judge Real again refuses to lift the stay upon motion by the Canter Family Trust. When counsel for the Trust requested a reason, Judge Real replied: "Just because I said it, Counsel."

July 2001: Judge Real transfers the bankruptcy proceeding to a second U.S. district judge. The second judge re-refers the proceeding to the bankruptcy court. (The stay of the unlawful-detainer action remains in effect.)

January 2002: the bankruptcy court grants a motion by the Trust to abandon Deborah Canter's interest in the property.

August 15, 2002: the Ninth Circuit court of appeals vacates Judge Real's order withdrawing the case from the bankruptcy court and the accompanying order staying enforcement of the California state court judgment.

February 2003: A judicial misconduct complaint is filed against Judge Real.

July 14, 2003: The Chief Judge of the Ninth Circuit dismisses the complaint.

December 18, 2003: A Ninth Circuit Judicial Council enters an orderer recommending that the Chief Judge undertake further investigation into ex parte communications between Judge Real and Deborah Canter.

November 4, 2004: the Chief Judge enters a supplemental order and dismiss the complaint again.

September 29, 2005: A complaint regarding the Chief Judge's November 4, 2004, order is dismissed.

May 23, 2006: Ninth Circuit Chief Judge orders a "special committee" to investigate consolidated complaints against Judge Real.

H. RES. 916

Resolved, That Manuel L. Real, judge of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF DAVID AND REBECCA JEWEL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of David and Becky Jewel, united in marriage and united in their exceptional service to our Nation's veterans, upon the occasion of their retirement that follows more than 53 years of combined, outstanding service within the medical facilities of the Veterans Administration.

Rebecca Jewel is a registered dietician and has guided veterans in nutrition health, awareness and education at VA facilities across the Nation, including VA medical centers in Hines,