

Texas schools, and 250 schools nationwide, honored as a "No Child Left Behind" Blue Ribbon School.

No Child Left Behind is the landmark education reform law designed to change the culture of America's schools by closing the achievement gap, offering more flexibility, giving parents more options and teaching students based on what works. Foremost among the four key principles is an insistence on stronger accountability for results.

As we work to improve our education system, it is important that we have accurate information about the performance of our schools and our ability to teach our students. With that information, we need to praise these schools, teachers and administrations which meet the high standards of "No Child Left Behind."

Glen Park Elementary is a stellar example for Texas school and is a strong example for all American schools. Glen Park has high scholastics marks and continues to be a premier school in our community.

I am proud of the education system in Texas; especially our involved parents and teachers at Glen Park Elementary who commit their lives and time to fostering growth in their students. Congratulations to the student, parents, teachers and administration at Glen Park Elementary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 25, I was unable to be present during consideration of H. Con. Res. 16, Congratulating the people of the Ukraine and Victor Yushchenko on his election as President of Ukraine and his commitment to democracy and reform (rollcall 8); and H. Res. 39, Commending Countries and Organizations for Marking the 60th Anniversary of the Liberation of Auschwitz and Urging a Strengthening of the Fight Against Racism, Intolerance, Bigotry, Prejudice, Discrimination and Anti-Semitism (rollcall 9). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

ARTICLE ABOUT THE MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MATSUI

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to a wonderfully written column by Norman Ornstein about the memory of our colleague, the Honorable Robert T. Matsui, who passed away on January 1. Mr. Ornstein's column, published in the January 26 edition of Roll Call, captured the very essence of Bob's spirit and reminded us why we all will miss him so much—because he was an "all-around great guy" whose warmth, wit and bipartisanship will live on and inspire future leaders in this chamber to serve with the same kind of grace and style that Bob possessed in spades.

[From Roll Call, Jan. 26, 2005]

BOB MATSUI: WONK, FIGHTER, AND ALL-AROUND GREAT GUY

(By Norman Ornstein)

Some years ago, I had the good fortune (or misfortune) of appearing on the cover of a now-defunct glossy magazine called Washington Dossier, wearing a fancy tuxedo while dancing with an elegant model (who was about 6 inches taller than me).

A couple of weeks later, I got a call from the office of Rep. Bob Matsui (D-Calif.) asking me to come by for a meeting on some issue he was dealing with on the Ways and Means Committee. I dutifully showed up, to find that it was a pretext for Bob to give me a nicely framed picture with the Dossier cover and the inside picture.

I treasure that picture—but I treasure even more the photograph I received later. It was taken by one of Bob's staffers, showing Matsui giving me the gift, beaming about the surprise he'd managed to pull off.

That was vintage Bob Matsui: a delight in surprising one of his friends, a warmth and goodness that is rare in any group of people but even rarer at the top reaches of rough-and-tumble politics. Weeks after the fact, I am still having trouble coming to grips with the reality that he is gone.

I first met Bob and his wife, Doris, soon after he was elected to the House in 1978. Bob drew people to him because he was so warm, open, unpretentious and bright. I shared with him a love of baseball and of politics. He and Doris and my wife and I became good friends, sharing news of our kids growing up, dissecting current events, talking about the Orioles and sometimes going to games.

Unlike many people in elite levels of politics, television, law or business, Bob was not self-absorbed. The line, "But enough about me. What do you think of me?" applies: to many (as each of us could name) but it did not apply to him. He was genuinely interested in others, and took genuine delight in their achievements.

Through the years, I watched Bob up close as his career in Congress soared. He first shot to national prominence when he led the effort to get reparations for the Japanese-Americans who had been forced into internment camps during World War II. Of course, he had been among them, spending the first few years of his life in such a camp. He and his House colleague Norm Mineta (D-Calif.) handled that issue with determination and drive—but without bitterness or recrimination. The process became a template for reconciliation. It also showed Bob as a proud American, not cynical or bitter but simply wanting to see his country make amends for a huge mistake.

That alone would have made a terrific career. But Bob made his mark in so many more areas. In trade, he was a model bipartisan, willing often to take on his own party as he fought for the free-trade ideals he believed in, looking to find common ground with allies such as Reps. Jim Kolbe (R-Ariz.) and David Dreier (R-Calif.), and looking as well to find common ground on issues such as labor and environmental standards as a way of broadening the free-trade coalition. (He was disappointed to find that the current House was not interested in broadening coalitions beyond the majority of the majority party.)

Bob became a world-class expert on welfare and Social Security. He was a policy wonk who loved politics, a gentle man who had a fierce attachment to his values and policy views, a partisan who also wanted to work with those across the aisle, and a man who could use ferocious rhetoric to defend the downtrodden but who seemed to have no enemies, even among those he excoriated.

I have had the privilege of having many members of the House and Senate as friends, spanning both parties and all viewpoints. They have included many currently serving or recently retired, along with such now-deceased leaders as Speaker Tip O'Neill (D-Mass.) and House Minority Leader John Rhodes (R-Ariz.), and superstars—of public service like Rep. Barber Conable (R-N.Y.) and Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.).

I think what all my friends in Congress have shared is their love and respect for the institution, their joy of serving, and their delight in politics. That was true, in spades, of Bob. He embodied all that is right about politics and the legislative process, all that is great about America. As partisan as he grew in the ever-more-partisan House, he refused to divide the world into friends and enemies. He carried himself with class. His dismay with the House led him to take the brutal job as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, which he did dutifully and well over the past two years, without any of the sleaze now so common in elections.

During the beautiful memorial service for him in Statuary Hall, Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.) provided the take-home phrase: She hoped that during the coming years, as we face nasty and brutish partisan politics and debate, that we could pause from time to time for a "Matsui Moment."

Everybody in the hall understood what she meant, including Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.), who had the class to allow the memorial service to be held in that hallowed and rarely used space. Despite the tension of recent years, the Speaker noted that Bob Matsui never failed to come across the aisle to say hello to him, to be pleasant and forthcoming. I hope he, and his colleagues, will remember the idea of the Matsui Moment and apply it. God knows such moments have been in short supply.

Bob knew about his disease for some months. He and Doris decided that he was not going to change his life or curb his energy in face of it. Rather, he was going to carry on with what he believed in and what he was dedicated to do. That included finishing his responsibilities with the DCCC and preparing for his crucial role as point man for the Democrats on Social Security. Up to the last, he followed what was going on in the world and worked on a strategy for Social Security.

My family and I got back from our holiday late on the evening of Jan. 1. I opened the mail, and went right for the famous Matsui Christmas card, which was especially delightful this year, with its gorgeous pictures showcasing Bob and Doris' beautiful pride and joy, granddaughter Anna. The next morning, I checked my e-mail and saw the news about his death—and literally fell off my chair.

I am glad that Bob will be replaced by Doris, who, like Lindy Boggs, will come to Congress as a remarkable talent from day one. But I miss my friend and miss even more what he brought to politics, to Congress and to America.

DEFENDING CIVIL LIBERTIES

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 31st, 2005, I held a town meeting at the Vermont Law School on the state of civil liberties in America. Joining me at the meeting

were Professor Cheryl Hanna of Vermont Law School; Professor Stephen Dycus of Vermont Law School; Trina Magi, Past President of the Vermont Library Association; and Ben Scotch, the Former Executive Director of the Vermont American Civil Liberties Union. Well over 200 people participated in the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States today there is a great concern about terrorism. Our country suffered a horrendous tragedy on September 11th, 2001—and there is no doubt in my mind that there are people on this earth who would like to attack us again.

Is terrorism a serious problem? The answer is “Yes, it is.” Should the United States and the rest of the world do all that we can to protect innocent people from terrorist attacks? The answer, once again in my view, is “Yes, we should.”

But the question that we are struggling with in Congress and throughout our country is: “Do we have to sacrifice our basic liberties and constitutional rights in order to protect ourselves from the threat of global terrorism?” And in my view, the answer to that question must be a resounding “No.”

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit an article that ran in the Rutland Herald on Tuesday, February 1, 2005, about this town meeting.

PANEL DISCUSSES CIVIL LIBERTIES

ROYALTON.—Big Brother might not be watching just yet, but many believe George Orwell’s nightmare is becoming more plausible by the day.

“We need to be aware that a cancer is threatening our basic civil liberties, our constitutional rights and our privacy rights,” Rep. Bernard Sanders, I-Vt., said Monday night to a crowd of more than 200 people at Vermont Law School.

The audience filled the Jonathan B. Chase Community Center for the panel discussion on civil liberties and national security with Sanders, VLS professors Stephen Dycus and Cheryl Hanna, former Vermont Library Association president Trina Magi and former Vermont American Civil Liberties Union president Ben Scotch.

Much of the discussion centered on the USA Patriot Act, passed in the wake of Sept. 11, 2001.

Sanders said the issue alone was not just the Patriot Act, which broadened the powers of law enforcement and the federal government, but also how those who want to keep track of people are gaining more ways of doing so.

Sanders said there was an effort in Congress last year to require trackable computer chips in all drivers’ licenses.

“Someone with the right kind of device could track your every movement,” he said. “George Orwell, here we are. In a few short years, unless we change it, every single thing we do, every place we go, every person we meet could be recorded in a database.”

Hanna said the provisions of the Patriot Act that civil libertarians find most troublesome and unconstitutional have been difficult to challenge in court because of the secrecy with which the law allows the government to operate.

“In order to challenge something, you have to have a case,” she said. “You need someone who has been harmed. With the Patriot Act, so much of the harm has been clandestine. You might not even know if you were the target of an investigation.”

Scotch argued that the real dangers of the Patriot Act were its vagaries and the ways in which it challenged established legal language.

Scotch presented provisions of a bill he called “The Free Speech Enhancement Act

of 2005,” that would outlaw several forms of speaking out against the government during wartime. He then revealed that the law had been passed, under another name in 1918 and had since been repealed.

“Bills that restrict freedom are more and more subtle and more and more clever,” he said. “That’s what we’re seeing in the USA Patriot Act. When the Sedition Act of 1918 says we’re going to ban disloyal speech, it comes out and says it.”

Magi said she was worried that the provisions allowing investigators to look at the records of any business, including libraries, without a warrant would destroy the effectiveness of libraries.

“As an academic librarian, it is my job to help students really dig deeper,” she said. “In order to do that, students must feel that the library is a safe place to seek information.”

Dycus challenged the notion that “normal Americans” who are not terrorists don’t need to fear the Patriot Act.

“It would be a terrible mistake to believe none of this concerns you,” he said. “You might be right to think that you will never be taken away in the night and detained in a military brig . . . but you shouldn’t be so sure. Besides, what our government does with our knowledge it also does in our name.”

The floor was opened to questions from the audience, which ranged from angry rants against the Bush administration to questions about what can be done.

One student challenged the one-sidedness of the discussion.

“I was a little surprised the Vermont Law School would have only one side presented,” she said. “I would think they would want both sides presented so we, as law students, could learn.”

Sanders said the make-up of the panel was his doing and not the school’s.

The student went on to challenge some of the assertions about the Patriot Act, saying her understanding was the “sneak and peek” provisions merely expanded capabilities that law enforcement already had.

Scotch replied that the earlier law on which those provisions were based included a requirement similar to probable cause, but the Patriot Act does not.

One man asked how to best strike a balance between preserving civil liberties and vigilance against terrorist threats. Magi said it was something people would have to decide for themselves.

“I think it’s really legitimate to be afraid of terrorists,” she said. “We can also be afraid of an overreaching government that stretches too far into our lives. There are plenty of examples of lives that were ruined by a government that was not restrained.”

Sanders said there was more to the issue than a simple tradeoff and that reductions in privacy don’t necessarily lead to increases in security.

Sanders cited the deportation of people advocating trade unions in the 1920s, the internment of Japanese citizens during World War II, the McCarthyism of the 1950s and government surveillance during the 1960s as examples of how the government can be just as much of a threat to the people as those from whom it is supposed to protect them.

“We have got to be vigilant,” he said.

Sanders said people need to put as much effort into defending their civil liberties as the Republican Party leadership has put into promoting the policies of the Bush Administration.

“Tom Delay works day and night, fighting for what he believes in,” he said. “You have to begin to think about changing the political culture. All of us are going to have to roll up our sleeves and talk to our neighbors.”

The key, Sanders said, lies not in just organizing liberals, but reaching out to conservatives.

“It is not moderate Republicans, it is conservative Republicans, people who love their guns and don’t want their guns taken away, who are going to join you,” he said. “Do you talk to them and or just think they’re jerks who aren’t as bright as you? Well, that’s what they think about you.”

Sanders said nobody on the left has the luxury of being depressed or defeatist.

“On issues like this, I believe that once people hear the issues, they understand we can deal with terrorism without the provisions of the Patriot Act,” he said.

IN HONOR OF MR. JOHN FREITAS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. John L. Freitas, who is retiring after 18 years as Executive Director of the Carmel Foundation in Carmel, California. The Carmel Foundation was established in 1950 with the purpose of providing “. . . for the residence, health, care and good living and the welfare and well being of persons in and about Carmel who are advanced in years and not otherwise sufficiently cared for.”

Under John’s direction, the foundation procured vehicles to provide the residents and members with the independence that mobility affords. Facilities were outfitted with fixtures and appliances designed for both able and disabled people. More than fifty classes and programs were made available to enrich the lives of the members. A new computer learning center was added and became so popular that one thousand members graduated from its classes in the first 5 years, proving John’s faith in the interest and ability of these seniors to learn difficult new skills.

John Freitas’ strong sense of community and fine balance with his board made it possible for the Carmel Foundation to continue to add enrichment programs. In-home supportive services, assistance with accounting, home safety checks, a weekend meal program, parties and potlucks are just a few of the elements that enhance their members’ quality of life and ensure a loyal following. This loyalty flows over to the employees, who can see every day that what they do makes a tangible difference in the lives of all the people.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud John Freitas’ many accomplishments, and commend him for the tremendous amount of personal time, thought, and dedication he put into this project. I join the Carmel community in honoring this truly remarkable man for all of his lifelong achievements.

THE RETIREMENT OF THOMAS N. CLARK

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement of Thomas Newton Clark, General Manager of the Kern County Water Agency. Tom has worked at the