

programs would be used for our growing human and infrastructure needs, such as housing, health care, Social Security and the environment.

I chose to introduce the NDECA before the March 20th memorial service for William Thomas, who sat in front of the White House in an anti-nuclear vigil for nearly 28 years. His efforts have been called the longest uninterrupted war protest in U.S. history. He truly embodied our inalienable First Amendment rights. Tragically, instead of nuclear disarmament, nations around the world have increased efforts to seek or acquire nuclear capability with Iran's failure to halt uranium enrichment captured attention until recently, China's nuclear weapons and today North Korea continues testing missile long range missiles and there is little doubt that North Korea has acquired a nuclear device. India and Pakistan continue to fight over the Kashmir region and with the recent terrorist strikes in India, the instability in the region persists. Pakistan assures us that its weapons are safe, as nuclear secrets are sold by its top scientists, the streets are riled with protests, a military coup is not out of the question, and the semi-autonomous regions are dominated by Al-Qaeda and the Taliban.

The invasion of Iraq cost the United States much of its leadership on nuclear proliferation and other urgent international issues. This country reached a non-credible status in dissuading other nations who aspire to become or remain nuclear powers as we ourselves took greater initiative in increasing our own nuclear weapons program. We moved in the right direction when the Senate ratified the Moscow Treaty in 2003, which provides that by 2012 both the U.S. and Russia will reduce their long-range warheads by two-thirds from approximately 6,000 warheads each to 2,200. However, the Bush administration failed to build on this effort. According to the study, "Securing The Bomb: An Agenda for Action" (May, 2004; prepared by the Belfer Center, Harvard University Kennedy School of Government): "Total nuclear-threat-reduction spending remains less than one quarter of one percent of the U.S. military budget. Indeed, on average, the Bush administration requests for nuclear-threat-reduction spending over FY 2002–2005 were less, in real terms, than the last Clinton administration request, made long before the 9/11 attacks ever occurred." Instead, the Bush administration moved to increase the country's nuclear capacity.

However, the problem today is even more complicated than nuclear disarmament by nation states. The greatest threat today is from inadequately defended and guarded sites in many countries where there is enough material to make nuclear weapons and many opportunities for terrorists or nations without weapons to secure nuclear materials. Astonishingly, because of the previous administration's absence of leadership, less nuclear material was seized in the two years following the 9/11 attacks than in the two years immediately preceding the attacks ("Securing The Bomb: An Agenda for Action", May 2004).

In my work on the Homeland Security Committee, I know that threats from nuclear proliferation and available nuclear material are more dangerous in the post 9/11 era than in 1994, when I first introduced the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act. It is more urgent than ever to begin closing down nuclear capability here and around the world.

Today, our country has a hobbled economy, 45 million people still without health insurance, a long list of other urgent domestic needs put on the back burner following the invasion of Iraq, large tax cuts for wealthy people and corporations, and millions of Americans losing their homes and jobs. As the only nation that has used nuclear weapons in war, and still possesses the largest arsenal, the U.S. has an obligation to begin the arduous process of leading the world in the transfer of nuclear weapons funds to urgent domestic needs.

CONGRATULATING GUNDERSEN
LUTHERAN BREAST CENTER

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2009

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gundersen Lutheran's Norma J. Vinger Center for Breast Care on becoming the first breast cancer treatment center in the nation to achieve the highest level of distinction from the National Quality Measures for Breast Centers (NQMBC) program. The honor was presented to Gundersen Lutheran because they ranked at or above a designated threshold of performance for 90 percent of the measures specified by the NQMBC. This honor reflects the center's commitment to providing the highest level of quality care to breast cancer patients and their families at the lowest possible costs. I am extremely proud Wisconsin's Third Congressional District is home to a breast care facility that is a national leader in the measurement of treatment and outcomes.

The Norma J. Vinger Center for Breast Care provides state-of-the-art patient and family care emphasizing prevention, education, early detection, and clinical research. Their approach to breast care is holistic and interdisciplinary with a staff that includes experienced physicians, surgeons, nurses, and technologists who are skilled in the latest methods of early diagnosis, treatment, and reconstructive surgery. The Norma J. Vinger Center for Breast Care has discovered numerous breakthroughs in research and breast cancer care that have provided countless patients with hope and access to the most advanced care available in the country.

In addition to the NQMBC honor, Gundersen Lutheran is also one of two organizations in the country that has every available accreditation for the full scope of breast care, diagnosis, and treatment from the American College of Radiology. The Center also boasts two fellowship-trained clinical breast radiologists that specialize in breast cancer care. The Center for Breast Care has demonstrated continued excellence in measuring and comparing quality performance. The staff is also committed to utilizing new advances in technology to ensure that the Center remains a national leader in breast cancer care and research.

Providing care that promotes early detection, is outcome based, and utilizes innovative technology is the most efficient way to administer health care. I am proud to have this La Crosse based breast cancer facility in Wisconsin's Third Congressional District and hope that the great work they are conducting will serve as a model for the rest of the country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ACCESS TO
JUSTICE ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2009

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Access to Justice Act. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a right for an alien to file a motion to reopen a case in removal proceedings if the alien can demonstrate that counsel or a certified representative provided deficient performance.

In one of his last actions as Attorney General, Michael Mukasey ruled that immigrants have no constitutional right to effective legal representation in deportation hearings. After more than 20 years of precedent in special immigration courts overseen by the Justice Department, those now facing deportation have no remedy for the errors committed by incompetent, inattentive lawyers, or even those who claim to be lawyers.

This 11th hour regulation not only goes counter to what has already been established by a long line of decisions in the federal courts and the Board of Immigration Appeals but also is a matter of equal protection/due process. In fact, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit stated in an opinion, "Vulnerable immigrants are preyed upon by unlicensed notaries and unscrupulous appearance attorneys who extract fees in exchange for false promises and shoddy, ineffective representation."

The Supreme Court has found that non-citizens are ineligible for court appointed counsel in civil cases. Removal proceedings are not considered criminal and therefore, immigrants who are in the process of being deported must find their own counsel. Judge Katzmann on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals said in a recent New York Times article, "Justice should not depend on the income level of immigrants." A study in the Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics found that only 35% of individuals in removal proceedings had counsel; yet asylum seekers who have counsel are three times more likely to succeed in their claim compared to those without representation.

Because of this Supreme Court decision incompetent legal representation is now "discretionary" and thus unreviewable. So the former Attorney General, the final arbiter in immigration cases, decided in his final hours in office without any consultation with Congress that the 6th amendment right to counsel only applies to criminals, not to non-criminals who have privately retained lawyers in civil removal proceedings. Imagine in our great melting pot of an immigrant nation a decision that gives greater access to justice to those who might have committed a felony more than to those who want to be Americans. When a lawyer fails to show up to court or forgets to file the required paperwork, the individual being deported will have no legal right to appeal on the grounds of deficient counsel.

That is why I am introducing The Access to Justice Act, a bill that would create a legislative fix to the Mukasey decision. This bill creates a right to file a motion to reopen a removal case if deficient performance of counsel can be demonstrated. To provide relief to