

HONORING SANDRA E. ULSH,  
PRESIDENT OF THE FORD  
MOTOR COMPANY FUND

### HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 2006*

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sandra E. Ulsh. Sandra is president of the Ford Motor Company Fund, a philanthropic organization funded largely by Ford Motor Company profits. Ford Fund supports innovative programs that focus on education, American heritage and legacy, and safety. Under her leadership, Ford Motor Company Fund has also dedicated itself to celebrating cultural diversity and supporting programs that stimulate cross-cultural exchanges.

Sandra received a bachelor's in mathematics and economics from Gettysburg College and an MBA from Lehigh University. She joined Ford as an economic analyst in 1978. She held numerous positions in Finance, including vehicle pricing manager, vehicle program finance manager, manager of business analysis and business plans for Truck Operations, and manager of Investor Relations.

Sandra joined Ford's Governmental Affairs organization in 1996 as a strategic issues associate in the Corporate Economics and Strategies Issues office, and later became a legislative manager on Healthcare and Financial Service matters in Washington, DC. Prior to assuming her current position, Sandra was the director, Public Policy, Governmental Affairs.

Along with her work at Ford Motor Company Fund, Sandra serves on various other non-profit and advisory boards, including the Council of Michigan Foundations, ConnectMichigan Alliance, Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History, U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Foundation Corporate Advisory Board, Dennis Archer Foundation, and America's Promise Leadership Council.

Sandra will be retiring from her position at Ford Motor Company Fund on December 31st. I'm sure I'm not the only one impressed with her professionalism, dedication and the achievements reached by Ford Motor Company Fund during her leadership tenure. I wish to thank her for her exceptional service and wish Sandra well on all her future endeavors.

### FLORIDA DELEGATION FAREWELL TRIBUTE

### HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 2006*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to specially recognize 4 of my colleagues who have so honorably served the residents of Florida and the citizens of the United States over the past 4 to 26 years.

I applaud my friends, CLAY SHAW, MIKE BILIRAKIS, JIM DAVIS, and KATHERINE HARRIS for their admirable service. Over the years, each has made numerous invaluable contributions bettering the lives of their constituents and all Americans.

I've seen first hand how effective and committed these individuals are in serving their

constituents. Our longest serving member with 26 years, CLAY SHAW has been one of seniors' and Social Security's greatest advocates. His expertise in Social Security, trade, and welfare issues will be sorely missed. Serving 24 years, MIKE BILIRAKIS has been one of Congress' primary supporters for veterans' issues. It has truly been my pleasure serving with MIKE on the VA Committee for the past 5 years. Over the past 10 years, JIM DAVIS has been one of the leading sponsors in trying to protect Florida's pristine coastlines and U.S. military missions from offshore drilling. His leadership and passion are lauded and will not be forgotten. KATHERINE HARRIS has left her mark as a strong leader in helping Florida toward its future as an international leader in economic and foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, Florida and the Nation have benefited from their leadership, and each will be truly missed. I would like to thank each for their service to our country and extend my best wishes for their continued success.

### H.R. 6099, UNBORN CHILD PAIN AWARENESS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 6, 2006*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6099, the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act. I would point out that, despite the best efforts of some in this Chamber and from various interest groups to masquerade this as a pro-choice or pro-life issue, this is not about choice. This is quite simply an issue of who is qualified to provide medical information to patients: Congress or doctors? Frankly, patients are better served with medical information coming from a qualified medical professional than from a simple Polish lawyer from Southeast Michigan like myself.

Let me be clear: this bill requires that doctors provide women seeking an abortion past the twentieth week of gestation a brochure produced by the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill very clearly requires that the brochure include text written word for word by Congress. The patient would then have to sign a document saying she received the information. That document, again, would contain specific text written by Congress. The very idea that Congress would require that specific text imparting a medical opinion be handed out to patients is ludicrous. We are in the business of writing laws, not of keeping up on the most recent articles published in medical journals. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, where does this game of Congress playing doctor end? Will we next be writing scripts or brochures advocating for one chemotherapy treatment over another for cancer patients? I think not. I believe that most of us recognize that this is well beyond our capability as lawmakers.

Mr. Speaker, let's leave the decisions about medical science to the scholars and professionals who are qualified to make them and focus on our responsibilities as Members of Congress.

I've always wondered why we don't focus more of our attention on preventing unwanted pregnancies. Reducing the number of abor-

tions performed in this country is certainly a goal we can all agree on and strive for. Instead of imposing ourselves on private relationships between doctors and patients, I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come to the table to discuss how we can further this mutual goal.

### ETHICS IN THE 110TH CONGRESS

### HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 2006*

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the 109th Congress ends and I prepare to leave the House of Representatives after 20 years, I wanted to speak with my colleagues about congressional ethics one last time. This is an honorable House and an ethical House. Most House Members desire to serve honorably and ethically, a few do not. Yet, as James Madison observed in the Federalist 51, "if angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary . . . but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions." The integrity of this House is important to our Nation and our integrity is not as it should be. As Members of Congress, we will never be perfect, but we can strive to be better. As Members of this House we must do better.

In 1952, Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois wrote a small book that had wide influence, "Ethics in Government." Douglas said the book grew out of his experiences on the Chicago City Council and in the Senate, where he served on a committee which investigated the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and chaired a Senate subcommittee which considered the entire range of ethics issues for those involved in public service. His book started with the following words, "[T]he American public has become increasingly uneasy in recent months about the moral practices of many government officials." Sounds familiar, doesn't it? More than 60 years later, Congress is still struggling with many of the issues identified by Senator Douglas. We have made significant progress since the 1950s, but as this past Congress has shown, we have a long way to go.

Before discussing ethics in the Congress while I have served and what I believe we need to do in the future, I think it would be helpful to review some of the conclusions and recommendations of Senator Douglas. After reviewing that state of ethics during the time of the ruling Florentine House of the Medici as described by Machiavelli in "the Prince," Douglas surveyed the state of ethics in Great Britain during the 18th and 19th centuries and of our own Congress during the period before the Civil War and during the Civil War. Despite the evidence of enormous corruption during those times, Douglas stated, "[M]y own conclusion is, therefore, that there has been an appreciable long-time improvement in the level of political morals." However, he also noted that there are frequent periods of "moral relapse," often after wars and that in his own time the standards of behavior were "by no means good enough and need radical improvement."

Let's look at what Douglas was concerned about. First, he identified six "difficulties which