

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF EUREKA, HUMBOLDT COUNTY, CA

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the City of Eureka, Humboldt County, CA.

The search for gold in the nearby Trinity Mountains brought the first settlers to Humboldt Bay in 1850. By 1856, the burgeoning settlement—Eureka, I have found it!—was designated the seat of government for Humboldt County by the California Legislature, and on April 18th of the same year officially became the city of Eureka.

The massive stands of redwoods and abundant salmon did not go unnoticed by early entrepreneurs, and soon Eureka had many lumber mills and fishing boats. This wealth of natural resources set the stage for Eureka to dominate the regional timber and fishing industries for the next 150 years.

Eureka, the heart of the “Redwood Empire,” has been a destination for travelers since it was first discovered. In 1914, the first railroad was constructed that tied the community by land to San Francisco. Roads, and the automobile, followed and brought even greater appreciation of the natural splendor of the city and its surroundings. Tourism remains an important part of the area’s economy.

The preservation of the architectural heritage of the community was acknowledged by the Eureka Heritage Society’s effort in 1987 that identified over 1,200 historically significant and diverse buildings in the city. This unique heritage, and the celebrated Carson Mansion, draw tourists from around the world to enjoy the diversity of architecture, antique shops, art galleries, and fine restaurants.

Eureka’s waterfront harkens back to its reputation as a lively place for timber workers, sailors, fishermen, and miners. A walk along today’s waterfront reflects a 30-year renaissance led by the city to celebrate longstanding traditions and a dynamic future—the Woodley Island Marina, a newly constructed public boardwalk and fisherman’s dock, the Sacco Amphitheater, Adorni Center, Wharfinger Building, Small Boat Basin and the Eureka Main Library.

The citizens of Eureka have always set a high standard for cultural achievement. In 1879, Eureka established the first publicly supported library in the State of California; in 2000 they gathered to celebrate the conversion of the Carnegie Library to house the Morris Graves Museum of the Arts. Eureka is a vibrant cultural center with repertory theater, dance and music, and a celebrated Arts Alive that connects people and art and business. Today the city of Eureka carries on the proud traditions of its early founders, while incorporating the best of modern life into its historic character.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize the city of Eureka, one of the finest and most vibrant cities in California, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF  
CHIEF JACK MURPHY

**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 Chief Jack Murphy, whose recent retirement as the chief of police with the city of Brooklyn reflects 40 years of excellence in law enforcement, framed by leadership, accomplishment, integrity and an unwavering commitment on behalf of the security and safety of the people of Brooklyn.

Chief Murphy’s illustrious career in law enforcement began in 1966, when he became a police officer with the city of Brooklyn. He honorably served our Nation in Vietnam, and soon thereafter resumed his vocation in law enforcement. Chief Murphy and his wife Marie continue to hold family and community as the foundation of their lives. Together they raised four children: Ann Marie, Matthew, Mary Beth and Maureen. Both Chief Murphy and Marie Murphy followed the call of service to others and instilled the significance of integrity, hard work and giving back to others within their children. Marie has devoted her career to the teaching profession.

Beyond his expertise in law enforcement and exceptional leadership abilities, Chief Murphy is known for his unwavering work ethic, affable nature and personal and professional integrity. Straightforward, fair and honest, Chief Murphy garnered the admiration and respect of everyone around him, and was consistently unfazed by the inevitable ebb and flow of small town politics.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor, gratitude and recognition of Chief Jack Murphy. His exceptional tenure as police officer and chief with the city of Brooklyn is forever framed in integrity, efficiency and accomplishment, and will continue to strengthen the foundation of safety and security for every resident and business owner of Brooklyn. I wish Chief Murphy, his wife Marie, and their three daughters and son, an abundance of health, peace and happiness as he journeys onward from here.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act reauthorization. Since the law’s inception in 1965, this landmark legislation has protected the right to vote for millions of United States citizens.

There has been great progress made since the Voting Rights Act was signed into law by President Johnson on August 6, 1965. But, so much more must be done. There are still many places in our country where Americans experience discrimination when they go to the polls. In order for the United States to truly be the greatest nation ever known, we must ensure that when citizens choose to go to the polls, they do not face obstacles created to disenfranchise them.

Our Nation’s history is replete with examples of people’s right to vote being impeded. Furthermore, unconscionable violence and discriminatory obstacles such as poll taxes, literacy tests and grandfather clauses were used to deny African American citizens the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act provided extensive protection to minority communities by prohibiting any voting practice that would abridge the right to vote on the basis of race. In 1975, the Voting Rights Act was expanded to protect the voting rights of other minority voters—such as Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Alaskan Natives—by requiring language assistance at the polls.

From California to Texas to my home State of New York, minority voters have a greater voice in elections due to the Voting Rights Act. In fact, my home State of New York is directly affected by two important sections of the Voting Rights Act. Voters in the majority of districts in New York State are provided with important language materials to assist them in the voting process if English is not their native language. In addition, voters are also protected by having any new State voting rules and regulations approved by the Federal Government before they can be enacted. Extending the Voting Rights Act is essential to protecting the voting rights of New Yorkers as well as voters throughout the country.

The Voting Rights Act is one of the most effective civil rights laws ever enacted. Reauthorizing the Act is vital to ensure that the progress made, is preserved.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, after careful and thoughtful consideration, I could not in good conscience vote in support of H.R. 9, the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act (VRA). The 1965 VRA successfully protected minority voters from disenfranchisement and strengthened our democracy. I support that law and realize its valuable contributions to our society.

Every citizen of this great Nation, regardless of race, should have the opportunity to cast their vote without fear of threats or discrimination. The VRA was a good idea and necessary in 1965, however, times have changed drastically since it was originally enacted more than 40 years ago.

During the debate, a good friend of mine, Rep. ROSCOE BARTLETT of Maryland, made the comment: "When you get sick, you go to the doctor and you get a prescription. Once you get well you stop taking the medicine." The provisions of the Voting Rights Act we voted on today do not recognize the accomplishments and progress made by covered States since the original VRA was enacted.

Today, the majority of electoral discrimination cases come from outside the jurisdictions that are covered under Section 5. The Voting Rights Act up for debate today should have recognized the many changes and improvements in the American South. Under the bill that passed today, Texas remains one of only eight States subject to this gross infringement on State's rights. Today, Texas is one of the most diverse States in the entire Nation with thriving minority communities throughout the state.

Not only do the reauthorized provisions in the VRA not take into account the progress that has been made, these provisions will be used as an unfunded mandate on southern States for the next 25 years. Legislation created in 1965 to fix a problem of that era, will still be in effect in 2032; far too long to pay a penalty for things that happened generations ago.

I support the valuable history and importance of the Voting Rights Act that passed in 1965, but the discriminatory problems we face today were not addressed or considered in this reauthorization. I support most of the provisions and the spirit of the VRA; however, H.R. 9 does not advance our democracy and keeps in place the taints of previous generations that are no longer deserved.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. AL GREEN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of equality, non-discrimination, and the full participation in our society by all Americans. I rise in support of reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Voting is the most important tool Americans have to influence government policies that affect every aspect of our lives. It affects: the types of schools our children attend, the quality of our health care, the decision whether to send our sons and daughters to fight and die in a foreign land.

The right to vote is the foundation of our democracy. The Voting Rights Act provides the legal basis to protect this right for all Americans.

On the eve of the 41st anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we cannot overstate the impact that this landmark piece of legislation has had on the face of this Nation.

Before passage of the Voting Rights Act we had 300 African-American elected officials. We now have more than 9,100.

Before passage of section 203 of the Voting Rights Act, we had 1,200 Latino elected officials. We now have more than 6,000.

We now have hundreds more Asian-Americans and Native Americans serving as elected officials.

The Voting Rights Act was enacted in response to our Nation's long history of discrimination. But the critical moment leading to the VRA's passage occurred in March 1965 on a bridge outside Selma, AL.

On March 7, 1965, voting rights supporters planned a march from Selma to the State capitol in Montgomery to present then-Governor George Wallace with a list of grievances. They were stopped on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma by State troopers and sheriff's deputies on horseback who, in front of television cameras, attacked the more than 500 demonstrators by firing toxic tear gas, charging the marchers, and beating people with clubs and whips.

Eight days after "Bloody Sunday," President Lyndon Johnson addressed a special joint session of Congress before a national television audience and said that:

Experience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books . . . can ensure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it . . . This time, on this issue, there must be no delay, no hesi-

tation and no compromise with our purpose . . ."

By August 6, 1965, Congress had passed the Voting Rights Act by an overwhelming majority and President Johnson had signed it into law.

The VRA not only abolished literacy and other tests which had been used to deny African Americans and other minorities the right to vote, it also prohibited "covered jurisdictions" from implementing new voting practices without first pre-clearing them with Federal officials.

And when the act was expanded and strengthened in 1975 to include protections for language minorities who had suffered systematic exclusion from the political process, Latinos, Asian-Americans, Native Americans and Alaskan Natives also gained new tools to ensure fundamental fairness in the voting process.

Most of the provisions of the VRA are permanent, but some will expire next year if they are not renewed. The expiring sections include:

Section 5, which requires covered jurisdictions to obtain "preclearance" from the Justice Department or the U.S. District Court in DC before they can change voting practices or procedures.

Section 203, which requires election officials to provide written and oral assistance for certain citizens who have limited English proficiency.

Sections 6–9, which authorize the U.S. Attorney General to appoint examiners and send Federal observers to monitor elections when there is evidence to suggest voter intimidation at the polls.

While the days of discrimination in the form of literacy tests and poll taxes may be over, it is clear that voter inequities, disparities, and obstacles still remain for far too many minority voters.

In Harris County, TX, citizens of Vietnamese descent are under the protection of the VRA. Because of this, under the language assistance provisions of the VRA, Harris County is required to:

Provide election information including ballots and registration information in Vietnamese, as well as English and Spanish.

Ensure that there are adequate bilingual poll workers to meet the needs of the language minority communities.

In 2003, Harris County election officials failed to comply with this law.

Pressure from the Asian American Legal Center of Texas, the Asian American Justice Center, and the Justice Department resulted in an agreement whereby the county agreed to ensure compliance with the language provisions of the VRA in the future.

As a result of these changes, in the November 2004 election, Hubert Vo became the first Vietnamese candidate ever to win a seat on the Texas Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, everyone's right to vote is at risk when anyone's right to vote is denied. The Voting Rights Act is good for minorities and great for America.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006. The right to vote is the very foundation of our democracy. Yet millions of minority voters face discrimination when exercising this crucial right. As the most effective civil rights statute ever enacted, it is our duty to support the Voting Rights Act. H.R. 9 will better safeguard the rights of minorities. Throughout our history, minority groups have struggled hard to achieve the right to vote. Key provisions of the Voting Rights Act will expire if this legislation is not passed. We need to ensure that these hard-won gains are not rolled back.

The fight against voter discrimination is far from over. H.R. 9 provides more accountability in the voting process so that the votes of American citizens who are not fluent in English will be properly counted. In addition, this will effectively combat discrimination against voting minority groups. As a representative of a territory where the native language of Chamorro is widely spoken, among other languages, I can personally attest to the importance of accommodating non-native English speakers.

H.R. 9 is a necessary reinforcement to the cornerstone of our democracy. Minorities have a much greater voice today than decades before thanks to the Voting Rights Act. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL PARISH

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, rise today in honor and recognition of the leaders and members of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, of Cleveland, Ohio, as they celebrate 80 years of faith, guidance and support, embracing generations of citizens throughout our Westside Cleveland community.

In 1926, Our Lady of Mount Carmel was established to serve the spiritual and cultural needs of the Italian-American residents of this neighborhood. Father Sante Gattuso and Father Martin Compango were selected by then-Cleveland Bishop John Farrelly to assist and guide the needs of the growing population of Italian-American families, including newly arrived immigrants from Italy.

Father Sante slowly garnered the trust and admiration of the people of the West 69th neighborhood and people began gathering on

the front porch of the Fascano family home, where services were first conducted. Storefront space was rented for many years until ground was broken on West 70th Street in 1949, the year that the parish and newly built grade school found a permanent home—all of which was made possible by the faith, commitment and devotion of Father Sante Gattuso and the faithful Italian-American community of the Westside.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of every leader and member of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, as they celebrate 80 years of cultivating faith, hope and heritage for generations of families within our Cleveland community. We also rise in honor and memory of the struggle, sacrifice and triumph of the founding members of this parish, who journeyed to America with few possessions beyond faith, love and hope in their hearts and the grit to survive. Love and faith still shines from Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, encircling this neighborhood with light, strength and hope rising on the dawn of every new day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 2006 I missed rollcall votes Nos. 358 and 359. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 358 and 359.

CONGRATULATING II-VI INCORPORATED

**HON. MELISSA A. HART**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate II-VI Incorporated, one of the leading high tech companies in southwestern Pennsylvania, as they celebrate the 35th anniversary of their founding.

In 1971, II-VI Inc. began by producing materials available for the manufacture of high-powered industrial CO<sub>2</sub> laser optics. II-VI Inc. has grown into a global company with headquarters in Saxonburg, Pennsylvania. Today, CEO Carl Johnson carries on II-VI's tradition of serving the needs of western Pennsylvania.

More than 30 years after its founding, this western Pennsylvania-based company is racing to keep up with record demand for its infrared optics, radiation detection products and crystals used in laser and telecommunications equipment. The company was recently selected as one of Businessweek's Hot Growth Companies.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating II-VI Incorporated. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute this wonderful company.

ON THE RESOLUTION HONORING WESLEY BROWN, THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN GRADUATE OF THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the first African American graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and a venerable District of Columbia resident, Retired Lieutenant Commander Wesley Brown. On the Fourth of July, I urged District residents to commemorate the day by celebrating the service of Wesley Brown as a tribute to his historic achievement and as a way of reminding the nation on this day of liberty that thousands of men like Wesley Brown have served their country in the armed forces without equal representation in Congress and that the pending District of Columbia Fair and Equal House Voting Rights Act affords a way to begin to right this wrong.

Wesley Brown is an alumnus of Dunbar High School, and upon graduation, entered the United States Naval Academy. There, he not only met the tough academic and military requirements to graduate from the Naval Academy in 1949, but also prevailed over racial discrimination and physical and mental abuse at the Academy. Mr. Brown served honorably in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. He retired from the Navy at the rank of lieutenant commander. In recognition of his achievement, the Academy named a building after Mr. Brown last year. His remarkable life story is chronicled in the book "Breaking the Color Barrier: The U.S. Naval Academy's First Black Midshipmen and the Struggle for Racial Equality" by Robert Schneller. I am particularly and personally grateful to Mr. Brown, who chaired my first Service Academy Selection Board, which assists me in nominating D.C. high school students for appointments to the military academies, and remains Chairperson Emeritus.

Wesley Brown has become a historical figure living among us. His graduation was a pivotal moment in the nation's efforts to integrate the armed forces of the United States and to improve racial conditions. His leadership paved the way for over 1,600 African Americans who have since graduated from the Naval Academy. Today, nearly 23 percent of the Academy's students are from minority groups.

Wesley Brown deserves special recognition for this pioneering accomplishment, and the service he rendered to the cause of equal treatment for all Americans by courageously accepting unusually difficult challenges for a young Black man before the armed forces themselves were integrated. He did so as generations of Washingtonians have done for the past 230 years in serving the Armed Forces of the United States, always without equal representation in the Congress of the United States and always paying taxes without representation, notwithstanding that this form of tyranny was one of the major causes of the War for Independence which led to the founding of the United States of America.

In the spirit of another great Washingtonian, Frederick Douglass, who challenged the nation in a July 4th address to live up to its stated ideals of freedom and equality, I recognize

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 BE-  
TWEEN AZERBAIJAN AND ARME-  
NIA

**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 con-

cerned 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 DE-  
TACHMENT 1, 779TH ORDNANCE  
COMPANY, THE TENNESSEE NA-  
TIONAL 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 order 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,

IL, Fort Wayne, IN, and in Cleveland and Brecksville, OH. Her medical career also includes work at Parma Community General Hospital in Parma, OH, and Christ Hospital in Cincinnati. Besides serving as the Advanced Systems Dietician, Rebecca provides on-going tech support and training for nutrition employees, and also serves a facilitator for many Goal Sharing teams within her department.

David Jewel, the chief of External Affairs for the Louis Stokes VA in Cleveland, has also served at VA medical centers in Ann Arbor, MI, and Cincinnati, OH. David has consistently led efforts to ensure that veterans are fully informed about the benefits entitled to them. He has led the effort to upgrade vital areas of communication within the VA, with a focus on minority veteran's affairs, community affairs programs and public relations. David has been the codirector of the Medical Center's Combined Federal Campaign for the past 4 years.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor, recognition and gratitude to David and Rebecca Jewel, whose individual and united dedication to our Nation's veterans is framed by commitment, compassion, integrity and accomplishment. Their service and leadership has been a significant component that reflects the strength and quality within the VA, and is a brilliant example of service for anyone who will follow. I wish David and Rebecca Jewel an abundance of health, peace and happiness as they journey onward from here.

HONORING GAYE HYDE'S SERVICE  
TO CALIFORNIA'S EAST BAY  
COMMUNITY

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Gaye Hyde, my lead caseworker in Fremont, CA, district office, who will be retiring on July 31, 2006.

Gaye has worked for me, and more importantly for the people of California's 13th Congressional District, for 31 years. I dare say that her level of commitment is hard—if not impossible—to match. I'm honored that she's stuck with me for so many years. But, it is my constituents who have been the real winners.

Gaye has presided over tens of thousands of cases herself and has trained every caseworker who has come and gone from my staff over the past 30 years.

She started handling constituent casework in the days before computers were used in the office. She had to type initial inquiries to agencies for assistance, have them mailed to Washington, DC for my approval, and then track their progress through written correspondence from various agencies and seldom returned phone calls. Typically, she took piles of letters home and fact checked and typed responses late into the night. She was always pushing to resolve cases and didn't feel there was time in the day to meet her standards or constituents' needs.

How times have changed. Today, many constituents e-mail their requests for assistance. Gaye is able to e-mail constituent liaison offices in a variety of agencies, and much of the work is done via the Internet. The process makes communication faster, provides better

accountability, and produces much less paper waste—all of which are great advancements.

What hasn't changed over time is the importance of the role of congressional caseworkers. These staff members get little of the glory, but are the key component for an effective Member of Congress.

Constituents who reach out for help from their Member of Congress usually are in great need. They are trying to file immigration documents for a loved one, obtain a lost Social Security check upon which their parent depends, or applying for a federal grant which could make or break their organization's ability to continue providing important services to the community.

With Gaye at the helm of my casework operation, I've never had to worry about my constituents being served—and served superbly. Her retirement is well deserved, but those of us lucky enough to work with her, and thousands of East Bay residents she's helped over the years, will miss her tremendously.

A TRIBUTE TO MARTIN RUBIN

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Martin Rubin. Mr. Rubin will be greatly missed. The transportation engineering world lost a legend whose influence in the development of the Los Angeles Metro Rail and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit, BART, systems, among other critical transportation projects, continues to facilitate the commutes of residents in some of our nations most expansive metropolitan areas.

A native of Brooklyn, New York, Martin Rubin entered into the United States Army following his graduation from City College of New York. In 1956, he joined Parsons Brinckerhoff, a 120-year-old international engineering firm based in New York City. After moving to Southern California in 1981, he worked indefatigably to expand the prestigious representation of Parsons Brinckerhoff to the western United States, and simultaneously managed a wide array of transportation projects.

Mr. Rubin's undeniably selfless dedication earned him the honor of being in charge of the Western region of Parsons Brinckerhoff in the 1980s, followed in 1990 by his selection as the president and chief operating officer of the firm's United States infrastructure arm. Always dedicated to service, he relinquished those titles to assume his duties in the development of the Los Angeles Metro Rail system where he oversaw the engineering and construction for the Blue Line, Green Line, and Red Line, as well as overseeing preliminary efforts on the Pasadena to Los Angeles Gold Line. He was subsequently honored by being named the chairman of Parsons Brinckerhoff in 1994, an honor that he held until 1997. His retirement in 2004 was a fitting end to his 48 years of distinguished service to his firm, and to the citizens of California.

I ask all Members of the House of Representatives to pause to honor a great man, Martin Rubin, who touched so many people through his deeds in life. He will be missed not only by his surviving wife and his four chil-

dren, but also by all of those who have benefited from the works to which he dedicated his life.

HONORING "MOTHER" RUTH  
VILLIA JONES

**HON. BARBARA LEE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and work of Ruth Villia Jones of Oakland, California. Known to most simply as Mother Ruth, she has been a leader, an activist, and an icon in the Oakland community for decades, providing care and guidance to countless others throughout her life, and on July 16, 2006, the friends and family of Mother Ruth will gather to celebrate this remarkable woman's 100th birthday.

Mother Ruth was born July 12, 1906 in Louisiana, soon after the great quake of San Francisco. She grew up during a time of extreme social and racial segregation, and learned about racial and gender discrimination from her family's experiences. These experiences shaped her resolve to challenge the status quo and begin her quest for social and human rights in the 1930s and as a Red Cross volunteer during World War II in the 1940s.

Throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, Mother Ruth combined her deep spiritual commitment with her desire for social justice, becoming active in the civil rights movement and fighting to end racial discrimination in our country. She marched and worked with the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Reverend Jesse Jackson, and the Reverend Cecil Williams. In the 1960s and 1970s Mother Ruth supported the work of a young group of African American activists, known as the Black Panthers, by joining them on picket lines, in the Free Breakfast Programs and Schools, eventually earning her the esteemed honor of "Mother" to these young men.

As "Mother Ruth," through her vision and activism, she has mentored and enriched the lives of many local leaders, such as Oakland Mayor Lionel Wilson, Congressman Ron Dellums, and myself when I was becoming politically active in the 1970s. Working with her helped to instill in me not only a deep sense of community, but also a fundamental commitment to fighting for social equity and social justice throughout my life. She has been a mentor and a friend to me throughout most of my life, and I am deeply thankful to her for sharing with me her wisdom, her compassion, and her support.

Throughout the Bay Area, Mother Ruth is also known for helping to start the meals program at Glide Memorial Church, which continues to this day. In the 1980s and 1990s Ruth Villia Jones turned her energy and expertise to professional organizations, such as the Glide Foundation, the California Legislative Council for Older Americans, the Alameda County Advisory Commission on Aging, the Black Women Organized for Political Action, the Black Women Organized for Educational Development, the National Black Women's Resource Center, the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs to name a few. Through her various

roles in these organizations, Mother Ruth has continued the fight for social justice and equality on numerous fronts, and inspired countless new leaders along the way.

Mother Ruth Villia Jones has been awarded recognition and praise for her activism on many occasions, including being named one of the 2003 Eternal Voices of the Oakland African Museum, the 1984 Ella Hill Hutch Award, the 1980 Glide Community Award, and many others.

Mother Ruth Villia Jones has been a loving sister, mother, wife, a proud grandmother and great grandmother, a friend to many and a "Mother" to us all. On this very special occasion, Oakland and the entire Bay Area community comes together to celebrate Mother Ruth Villia Jones' 100th birthday and honor her for a lifetime of pursuing peace and fighting for social justice. I am honored to add my voice, on behalf of California's 9th U.S. Congressional District, all those gathered here today to thank and salute Mother Ruth for her immeasurable contributions to her community, our country, and our world.

SUBMISSION OF TEXAS SENATE  
RESOLUTION 9, URGING THE U.S.  
CONGRESS, TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS  
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF  
VETERANS AFFAIRS

**HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in an effort to bring attention to the insufficient policies that this nation has levied toward our veterans. The great sacrifices made by our military personnel should be acknowledged, at the very least, through a secure retirement. Yet time and again, the rhetoric presented by Members of Congress does not match the policies that are created.

It is imperative that we address the needs of veterans through real proposals that will be flexible and hold up against the course of time, as opposed to short-term fixes. I believe that we can provide military retirees with the degree of support that is reasonable in light of the sacrifices that they have made in service to this nation.

This belief is reflected in a measure adopted by the Texas State Senate on May 15, 2006. Texas Senate Resolution No. 9 (S.R. 9), which was authored by Texas State Senator Leticia Van de Putte, urges Congress to address problems in the Department of Veterans Affairs and to enact legislation that assures predictable and adequate funding of the Veterans Health Administration.

I would like to submit the text of S.R. 9 to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we in the Federal Government might be reminded of our duty to provide appropriate services to the men and women of our military who have served our nation so proudly. I am hopeful that we can make the needs of veterans a greater priority and that we will thusly adopt policies that recognize the profound commitment and steadfast courage our military personnel demonstrate every day.

TEXAS SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, military veterans who have served their country honorably and who were

promised and have earned health care and benefits from the Federal Government through the Department of Veterans Affairs are now in need of these benefits; and

Whereas, the funding of the health care programs of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs has failed to reflect the admission of newly eligible veterans in the wake of the Veterans' Health Care Eligibility Reform Act of 1996 and has fallen short of the amount needed to counter soaring medical care inflation, resulting in a funding shortfall of at least \$10 billion; and

Whereas, the current discretionary method of funding the health care programs of the Veterans Health Administration is uncertain and is subject annually to the whims and competing priorities of Congress, to the detriment of the veterans being served; and

Whereas, the Vietnam Veterans of America organization supports the adoption of a new funding mechanism for the health care programs of the Veterans Health Administration that is indexed to medical inflation and the per capita use of the administration's health care system; and

Whereas, the substantial delay in adjudicating veterans' claims for service-connected disability compensation is the cause of much anguish and anger among veterans and is the result of a lack of funding of the Veterans Benefits Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, which has led to an insufficient number of adjudicators and the inadequate training and supervision of adjudicators; and

Whereas, while the vast majority of Department of Veterans Affairs employees are dedicated to serving veterans, it is necessary to ensure that employee accountability standards be strengthened at senior and junior levels; and

Whereas, while more than five million veterans use the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs for their health care needs, tens of thousands more are eligible for benefits of which they are unaware due to inadequate outreach efforts by the department; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 79th Legislature, 3rd Called Session, hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to address problems in the Department of Veterans Affairs related to the provision of health care and benefits, the adjudication of claims, accountability, and outreach and to enact legislation that creates an appropriation formula that ensures predictable and adequate funding of the health care programs of the Veterans Health Administration; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate forward official copies of this Resolution to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and all members of the Texas delegation to the Congress with the request that this Resolution be officially entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

HONORING PUBLIC DEFENDER  
JAMES J. STEINBERG, HUMBOLDT COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Humboldt County

Public Defender James J. Steinberg on the occasion of his retirement after nearly 30 years of service to the people of Humboldt County.

James Steinberg began his public service career as a Humboldt County Deputy Public Defender in 1977, shortly after graduating from the University of California Hastings School of Law in 1976. Promoted to Assistant Public Defender in 1989, Mr. Steinberg was then appointed as Public Defender in 1997. During this period, he represented well over 15,000 clients, including Three Strikes and death penalty cases.

In addition to his dedicated performance in the Public Defenders office, Mr. Steinberg has served as the Humboldt County Bar Association President and the President of the Board of Trustees for the Humboldt County Law Library. Mr. Steinberg has also been a member of the North-Coast Co-op Board of Directors, the City of Arcata Budget Advisory Committee, and as a lecturer and instructor at both Humboldt State University and College of the Redwoods. Mr. Steinberg is a founding member of the Teen Court, which conducts trials by peers for first-time juvenile offenders, giving young people a hands-on experience in how our justice system works.

Mr. Steinberg was recognized in 1997 as the Democrat of the Year by the Humboldt County Democratic Central Committee. He graciously accepted the award in an unforgettable address, delivered in rhymed verse. Mr. Steinberg is well-known and highly regarded by his colleagues for his patience, leadership, quick wit, superior intelligence and steadfast commitment to public service.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize Public Defender James J. Steinberg for his valuable service over three decades to the people of California, and extend our best wishes to him on the occasion of his retirement.

HONORING JOHN F. "RICKY"  
GOODRICH

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to honor CW5 John F. "Ricky" Goodrich of the Tennessee Army National Guard.

Recently, Chief Goodrich celebrated his 60th birthday at the Ali ai-Salem Airbase in Kuwait while serving there with the Guard's Operational Support Airlift Detachment 25. While he may be far from home, we're thinking of him and wishing him well as he works to defend America's national security.

This is not the first birthday Ricky Goodrich has spent away from home while serving his county though. Nearly 40 years ago, Chief Goodrich spent his 22nd birthday as a young soldier in Vietnam.

Chief Goodrich, the command chief warrant officer of the Tennessee Army National Guard, volunteered for this most recent deployment. And in addition to his administrative responsibilities, he routinely flies his C-12 aircraft into Iraq and Afghanistan.

I would not only like to extend our birthday wishes, but also thank him for his years of exceptional service to the United States Army

and the Tennessee Army National Guard. America's fortunate to have men like Ricky and we honor him today.

HONORING CHERI FLEMING

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cheri Fleming, a lovely lady from Santa Clarita, CA. On May 22, Newsweek presented her with the prestigious 2006 Dealer of the Year Award from the American International Automobile Dealers Association, AIADA.

Founded in 1970, AIADA represents 11,000 American automobile dealerships. The members of the association provide nearly 500,000 American jobs and have a positive economic impact both nationally and in their communities. Every May, in recognition of exceptional community contributions and staunch commitment to the advancement of the industry, the Dealer of the Year program acknowledges 10 finalists from across the Nation. Winning the first time she was nominated, Cheri was the only woman proposed this year for the prestigious award.

Partners in business, philanthropy and in life, Cheri and her husband, Don, purchased Valencia Acura in 1997. Although soon to change, at the time the dealership's national ranking was dead last for sales and also in customer satisfaction. Cheri and Don adopted the philosophy of "friendship" instead of "dealership" and began treating their customers just as they would like to be treated. Today, Valencia Acura is one of the top Acura dealerships in the country and also ranks amongst the highest in customer satisfaction with repeat and referral customers comprising over 75 percent of the business. In a relatively short amount of time, Valencia Acura has won many accolades from Acura and Customer Satisfaction Index awards, including: Acura's Precision Team—2002–2004, Honda's Council of Excellence—2004–2005, "Best New Car Dealership in Santa Clarita"—2003–2005, "Most Community Minded Owners in Santa Clarita"—2003–2005 and Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce "2001 Business of the Year" for the medium-sized category.

With the success of Valencia Acura, Cheri and Don rapidly became vital forces in the Santa Clarita Valley and have donated nearly \$3 million to community organizations in the past 7 years. Their community involvement transcends financial support as they can often be found participating in community organizations and generously giving their time, energy and efforts for a variety of causes. For their hard work and dedication, Don and Cheri were selected as Santa Clarita's Man and Woman of the Year for 2004. Never before in the history of the program has a husband and wife received the award in the same year.

Although at the helm of a thriving business, Cheri finds time for her extensive volunteer endeavors. Currently, she is the vice president at-large and a director for the Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Health Foundation, governor-elect for the Soroptimist International Camino Real Region, member and past-president of the Soroptimist International of Santa

Clarita Valley, vice president of Special Events and a director for the Child and Family Center Foundation, a director for the Roar Foundation Advisory Board, chair-elect and a director for the American Cancer Society Unit Council and the Los Angeles Regional Unit Council, vice president of the Sheila R. Veloz Breast Imaging Center Advisory Board, chair of the Arthritis Foundation Walk and with Don as her co-chair, has headed the Boys & Girls Club Auction for the past 3 years. In addition, Cheri just fulfilled her \$100,000 pledge to help with a cardiac-catheter lab and new emergency room for our local hospital. Recently, Cheri chaired the Santa Clarita Valley Arthritis Walk raising over \$60,000 and Don's efforts for the Fleming-Crawford Golf Invitational raised over \$113,000 for the Sheila R. Veloz Breast Imaging Center.

The AIADA acknowledged Cheri Fleming's exceptional community contributions and business acumen with the 2006 Dealer of the Year Award and I would like to commend Cheri for her success as well. Sir Winston Churchill once said, "We make a living by what we get. We make a life by what we give." Supported by Don, there is no one who embodies that statement better than Cheri Fleming. Together, their efforts have made the Santa Clarita Valley a much better place to live and I salute them for their efforts.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS R.  
MERRILL OF LAKE COUNTY, FL

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas R. Merrill of Groveland, Florida. Recognized as the longest serving police chief in the Nation, Chief Merrill was honored at the Florida Peace Officers Association awards ceremony as the first-ever recipient of their Distinguished Service Award.

For the past 37 years, Chief Merrill has served as Groveland's chief of police and has proved to be an inspiration to his community and area residents. In addition to his high morals and integrity, Chief Merrill's long tenure has demonstrated his great dedication and commitment to his profession, as well as to the city of Groveland.

Born and raised in Umatilla, FL, Chief Merrill joined the military after graduating from college, serving in the U.S. Air Force from 1959 to 1963 as a nuclear weapons specialist. Chief Merrill later became an officer with the Eustis Police Department, where he remained for 3 years. After taking a brief leave of absence from the force to spend time with his family, Chief Merrill soon thereafter accepted the position as Groveland's police chief. He has been there ever since, serving Groveland with pride and seeing the city through many changes.

After raising his children in Groveland, Chief Merrill is committed to keeping his community safe for future generations. He has enjoyed watching the police department and the city grow during his tenure, and with greater expansion likely for the future, Chief Merrill has no plans to retire anytime soon.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Merrill's career shows that loyalty and dedication to one's community

can indeed bring success and accomplishment. I congratulate him on being the first recipient of the Distinguished Service Award and commend him on his commitment and devotion to his career and to Groveland.

"ACTIVISM FOR THE RIGHT,  
RESTRAINT FOR THE LEFT"

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the great intellectual inconsistencies of our time is the assertion by conservatives that they are opposed to "judicial activism" and wish to have important public policy questions left to elected officials. Of course that is true only in those cases where they agree with what the elected officials have done, and they have shown very little restraint when their ideology calls for judicial invalidation of public policy. Indeed, some of the greatest anger I have heard expressed toward judiciary recently by my conservative colleagues has been against the eminent domain decision, in which the justices are guilty in the eyes of my conservative colleagues of being insufficiently activist—that is, the court majority allowed the actions of elected State and local officials in Connecticut to stand. I agree that eminent domain has been abused, but so is intellectual integrity when people insist that the courts defer to elected bodies on the one hand, and then denounce the Supreme Court precisely for doing that in the Kelo case.

Chief Justice Roberts to date appears to be very much in the mode of this one-sided condemnation of activism, as Adam Cohen cogently points out in the July 10 column in the New York Times—given the importance of consistency in the application of judicial principles, I ask that Mr. Cohen's very thoughtful analysis of the Chief Justice's inconsistency be printed here.

[From the Editorial Observer, July 10, 2006]

WHAT CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS FORGOT IN HIS FIRST TERM: JUDICIAL MODESTY

(By Adam Cohen)

At the confirmation hearings for John Roberts, there were two theories about what kind of a chief justice he would be. His critics maintained that he was an extreme conservative whose politics would drive his legal rulings. Judge Roberts, on the other hand, insisted that he was "not an ideologue," and that his judicial philosophy was to be "modest," which he defined as recognizing that judges should "decide the cases before them" and not try to legislate or "execute the laws."

Judicial modesty is an intriguing idea, with appeal across the political spectrum. For all the talk of liberal activist judges, anyone who is paying attention knows that conservative judges are every bit as activist as liberal ones; they just act for different reasons. A truly modest chief justice could be more deferential to the decisions of the democratically elected branches of government, both liberal and conservative, and perhaps even usher in a new, post-ideological era on the court.

That is not, however, how Chief Justice Roberts voted in his first term. He was modest in some cases, certainly, but generally

ones in which criminal defendants, Democrats and other parties conservatives dislike were asking for something. When real estate developers, wealthy campaign contributors and other powerful parties wanted help, he was more inclined to support judicial action, even if it meant trampling on Congress and the states.

The term's major environmental ruling was a striking case in point. A developer sued when the Army Corps of Engineers denied him a permit to build on what it determined to be protected wetlands. The corps is under the Defense Department, ultimately part of an elected branch, and it was interpreting the Clean Water Act, passed by the other elected branch. Courts are supposed to give an enormous amount of deference to agencies' interpretations of the statutes they are charged with enforcing.

But Chief Justice Roberts did not defer. He joined a stridently anti-environmentalist opinion by Justice Antonin Scalia that sided with the developer and mocked the corps's interpretation of the law—an interpretation four justices agreed with as “beyond parody.” The opinion also complained that the corps's approach was too costly. Justice John Paul Stevens dryly noted that whether benefits outweighed costs was a policy question that “should not be answered by appointed judges.”

In an opinion on assisted suicide, Chief Justice Roberts was again a conservative activist. The case involved Attorney General John Ashcroft's attempt to invoke an irrelevant federal statute to block Oregon's assisted suicide law, which the state's voters had adopted by referendum. Even though it meant overruling the voters, intruding on state sovereignty and mangling the words of a federal statute, Chief Justice Roberts dissented to support Mr. Ashcroft's position.

Chief Justice Roberts voted against another democratically enacted, progressive law when the court struck down Vermont's strict limits on campaign contributions. He joined an opinion that not only held that the law violated the First Amendment, but also engaged in the kind of fine judicial line-drawing—in this case, about the precise dollar limits the Constitution allows states to impose—that is often considered a hallmark of judicial activism.

One of the court's most nakedly activist undertakings in recent years is the series of hoops it has forced Congress to jump through when it passes laws that apply to the states. Judge John Noonan Jr., a federal appeals court judge appointed by President Ronald Reagan, has complained that the justices have set themselves up as the overseers of Congress. But Chief Justice Roberts voted to put up yet another hoop, requiring Congress to put the states on “clear notice”—whatever that means—before requiring them to pay for expert witnesses in lawsuits involving special education. It is a made-up rule that shows little respect for the people's representatives.

These cases make Chief Justice Roberts seem like a raging judicial activist. But in cases where conservative actions were being challenged, he was quite the opposite. When a whistle-blower in the Los Angeles district attorney's office claimed he was demoted for speaking out, Chief Justice Roberts could find no First Amendment injury. When Democrats challenged Republicans' partisan gerrymandering of Texas's Congressional districts, he could find no basis for interceding.

The Roberts court's first term was not radically conservative, but only because Justice Anthony Kennedy, the swing justice, steered it on a centrist path. If Chief Justice Roberts—who voted with Justice Scalia a remarkable 88 percent of the time in nonunani-

mous cases—had commanded a majority, it would have been an ideologically driven court that was both highly conservative and just about as activist as it needed to be to get the results it wanted.

Chief Justice Roberts still probably views himself as judicially modest, and in some ways he may be. He has been reasonably respectful of precedent, notably when he provided a fifth vote to uphold *Buckley v. Valeo*, a critically important campaign finance decision that is under attack from the right. He has also been inclined to decide cases narrowly, rather than to issue sweeping judicial pronouncements. But at his confirmation hearings, he defined judicial modesty as not usurping the legislative and executive roles.

His approach to his new job is no doubt still evolving, which could be a good thing. The respect for the elected branches that he invoked while testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee is hardly a perfect judicial philosophy especially today, when we need the court to resist the president's dangerous view of his own power. Still, that principled approach would do more for the court and the nation than the predictable arch-conservatism the chief justice's opinions have shown so far.

FANNIE, LOU HAMER, ROSA  
PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT  
KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS  
ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in proud support of H.R. 9, the “Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006.” Had I and several of my colleagues not heeded the requests of the bipartisan leadership of the Committee and the House, there might be an amendment to the bill adding the name of our colleague, JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, to the pantheon of civil rights giants listed in the short title.

Mr. Chairman, with our vote today on H.R. 9, each of us will earn a place in history. Therefore, the question before the House is whether our vote on the Voting Rights Act will mark this moment in history as a “day of infamy,” in FDR's immortal words, or will commend us to and through future generations as the great defenders of the right to vote, the most precious of rights because it is preservative of all other rights. For my part, I stand Fannie Lou Hamer and Rosa Parks and Coretta Scott King, great Americans who gave all and risked all to help America live up to the promise of its creed. I will vote to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act for the next 25 years.

I will oppose all of the poison pill amendments offered by offered by the gentlemen from Iowa, Georgia, and, sadly, my home state of Texas. Collectively, these amendments eviscerate the preclearance provisions of Section 5, end assistance to language mi-

norities, and shorten the period of renewal by 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents of these amendments claim their amendments are intended to “save” or “preserve” or “strengthen” the Voting Rights Acts. To claim that you are strengthening the Voting Rights Act by offering amendments that weaken it is like saying you must destroy a village in order to save it. There will be time enough to discuss in detail each of the weakening amendments when they are offered later today. But at this time I think it very important to discuss the provisions of the Voting Rights Act which I believe an overwhelming majority of the members of this House will vote to adopt today. I also want to spend some time reminding my colleagues, and the American people, why this nation needed a Voting Rights Act in 1965 and still needs it today. The American people are entitled to know why the Voting Rights Act is widely regarded as the most successful civil rights legislation in history. For all the progress this nation has made in becoming a more inclusive, equitable, and pluralistic society, it is the Voting Rights Act “that has brought us thus far along the way.”

I. BEFORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Chairman, today most Americans take the right to vote for granted, so much so that just over half of eligible Americans vote in a presidential election. Americans generally assume that anyone can register and vote if a person is over 18 and a citizen. Most of us learned in school that discrimination based on race, creed or national origin has been barred by the Constitution since the end of the Civil War.

Before the 1965 Voting Rights Act, however, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most black Americans. And, until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot. Even though the Indian Citizenship Act gave Native Americans the right to vote in 1924, state law determined who could actually vote, which effectively excluded many Native Americans from political participation for decades. Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also have suffered systematic exclusion from the political process and it has taken a series of reforms, including repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and passage of amendments strengthening the Voting Rights Act three decades later, to fully extend the franchise to Asian Americans. It was with this history in mind that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was designed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans.

Through the years leading up to the passage of the Voting Rights Act, courageous men and women braved threats, harassment, intimidation, and violence to gain the right to vote for disenfranchised Americans.

When the Civil Rights Movement came to Ruleville, Mississippi in 1962, Fannie Lou Hamer quickly became an active participant. With training and encouragement from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Hamer and several other local residents attempted to register to vote, but were unsuccessful because they did not pass the infamous literacy tests. In retaliation for trying to register, Hamer was fired from her job, received phone threats, and was nearly a victim of 16 gunshots fired into a friend's home. But Hamer was not intimidated: by 1963 she was

a field secretary for SNCC and had successfully registered to vote. Once, when asked whether she was concerned that agitating for civil rights might stir up a backlash from white Mississippians, Fannie Lou Hamer famously said:

I do remember, one time, a man came to me after the students began to work in Mississippi, and he said the white people were getting tired and they were getting tense and anything might happen. Well, I asked him, "how long he thinks we had been getting tired?" . . . All my life I've been sick and tired. Now I'm sick and tired of being sick and tired.

Mr. Chairman, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, was enacted to remedy a long and sorry history of discrimination in certain areas of the country. Presented with a record of systematic defiance by certain States and jurisdictions that could not be overcome by litigation, this Congress—led by President Lyndon Johnson, from my own home state of Texas—took the steps necessary to stop it. It is instructive to recall the words of President Johnson when he proposed the Voting Rights Act to the Congress in 1965:

"Rarely are we met with a challenge . . . to the values and the purposes and the meaning of our beloved Nation. The issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such as an issue . . . the command of the Constitution is plain. It is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country."

It was wrong to deny African-Americans and other citizens their right to vote. It was wrong then and it is wrong now. Nothing has done more to right those wrongs than the Voting Rights. Without exaggeration, it has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress.

In 1964, there were only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever. The act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

Mr. Chairman, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is no ordinary piece of legislation. For millions of Americans, and many of us in Congress, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

Mr. Chairman, I hail from the great State of Texas, the Lone Star State. A state that, sadly, had one of the most egregious records of voting discrimination against racial and language minorities. Texas is one of the Voting Rights Act's "covered jurisdictions." In all of its history, I am only one of three African-American woman from Texas to serve in the Congress of the United States, and one of only two to sit on this famed Committee. I hold the seat once held by the late Barbara Jordan, who won her seat thanks to the Voting Rights Act. From her perch on this committee, Barbara Jordan once said:

I believe hyperbole would not be fictional and would not overstate the solemnness that I feel right now. My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total.

I stand today an heir of the Civil Rights Movement, a beneficiary of the Voting Rights Act. I would be breaking faith with those who risked all and gave all to secure for my generation the right to vote if I did not do all I can to strengthen the Voting Rights Act so that it will forever keep open doors that shut out so many for so long. And the first and most important thing to do today is to vote in favor of H.R. 9 and against all weakening amendments.

#### II. RENEWAL OF SECTION 5 AND SECTION 203

Congress needs to reauthorize Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, which requires election law changes proposed by covered jurisdictions to be pre-cleared by the Department of Justice. The reason is simple. Equal opportunity in voting still does not exist in many places. Discrimination on the basis of race still denies many Americans their basic democratic rights. Although such discrimination today is more subtle than it used to be, it must still be remedied to ensure the healthy functioning of our democracy. It is the obligation of the federal government to see that the constitutionally protected right to vote is guaranteed. This is what the Voting Rights Act is designed to do.

#### Section 5: Preclearance

Section 5 applies to 16 states in whole or in part, including my home state of Texas. Under section 5, a covered jurisdiction must submit proposed changes to any voting law or procedure to the Department of Justice or the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. for pre-approval, hence the term preclearance. The submitting jurisdiction has the burden of proof to show that the proposed change(s) are not retrogressive, i.e. that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

The formula used to designate these covered jurisdictions was first adopted in 1965 and then subsequently amended in 1970 and 1975. Section 5 applies to any state or county where a discriminatory test or device was used as of November 1, 1964, and where less than 50 percent of the voting age residents of the jurisdiction were registered to vote, or actually voted, in the presidential election of 1964, 1968, or 1972. Although the formula used by Congress focused on registration rates, Congress was principally focused on voter turnout rates. Rather, Congress understood and found that there was an exceptionally strong correlation between low registration rates in the covered jurisdiction and active, purposeful discriminatory conduct intended to keep African-Americans from voting.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to emphasize that preclearance does not punish states for the wrongdoings of the past. Nor does it stifle their ability to move forward and progress. That is because covered jurisdictions are able to remove themselves from the restrictions of preclearance through a process known as bailout which sets forth clear and demonstrable standards. Among other things, the jurisdiction must show that:

(1) It has not used a test or device with a discriminatory purpose or effect with respect to voting;

(2) No state or federal court has issued a final judgment against the state or political subdivision for voting discrimination;

(3) The jurisdiction has submitted all voting changes for preclearance in compliance with Section 5;

(4) The Attorney General has not objected to a proposed voting change, and no declaratory judgment under section 5 has been denied by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and;

(5) The Justice Department has not assigned federal examiners to carry out voter registration or otherwise protect voting rights in the jurisdiction.

Currently eleven local jurisdictions in Virginia have taken advantage of the bailout provisions thus far.

Mr. Chairman, preclearance acts as an essential deterrent because it puts modest safeguards in place to prevent backsliding. As a bipartisan report by the U.S. Senate in 1982 said, without Section 5, many of the advances of the past decade could be wiped out overnight with new schemes and devices, such as the mid-decade redistricting conducted in Texas, which the U.S. Supreme Court struck down in part in *LULAC v. Perry*, 546 U.S.—No. 05–254 (June 28, 2006) and the Georgia voter identification scheme, which just this week was struck down for a second time.

Mr. Chairman, many scholars and voting rights experts agree that without the deterrent effect of Section 5, there will be little to prevent covered jurisdictions from imposing new barriers to minority participation.

As much as I and many other may like to see it, Section 5 should not be made permanent. Making it permanent would render it vulnerable to a constitutional challenge. Because Section 5 is race conscious, it must be able to withstand strict scrutiny by the courts. What this means, in part, is that the provision must be narrowly tailored to address the harms it is designed to cure. Many legal experts question whether the Court would find a permanent Section 5 to be narrowly tailored, such as to survive a constitutional attack.

Similarly, Section 5 should not be changed to apply nationwide. Although this might sound attractive, a nationwide Section 5 would also be vulnerable to constitutional attack as not narrowly tailored or congruent and proportional to address the harms it is designed to cure, as required by the Supreme Court's recent precedents. Section 5 is directed at jurisdictions with a history of discriminating against minority voters. In addition, nationwide application of Section 5 would be extremely difficult to administer, given the volume of voting changes that would have to be reviewed. This expansion of coverage would dilute the Department of Justice's ability to appropriately focus their work on those jurisdictions where there is a history of voting discrimination.

#### SECTION 203 (LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE)

Mr. Chairman, it is crucial that everyone in our democracy have the right to vote. Yet, having that right legally is meaningless if certain groups of people (such as the disabled or those with limited English proficiency) are unable to accurately cast their ballot at the polls. Voters may be well informed about the issues and candidates, but to make sure their vote is accurately cast, language assistance is necessary in certain jurisdictions with concentrated populations of limited English proficient voters.

Section 203 was added to the Voting Rights Act in 1975 and requires certain jurisdictions to make language assistance available at polling locations for citizens with limited English

proficiency. These provisions apply to four language groups: Americans Indians, Asian Americans, Alaskan Natives, and those of Spanish heritage. A community with one of these language groups will qualify for language assistance if (1) more than 50 percent of the voting-age citizens in a jurisdiction belong to a single language minority community and have limited English proficiency (LEP); OR (2) more than 10,000 voting-age citizens in a jurisdiction belong to a single language minority community and are LEP; AND (3) the illiteracy rate of the citizens in the language minority is higher than the national illiteracy rate.

Section 203 requires that registration and voting materials for all elections must be provided in the minority language as well as in English. Oral translation during all phases of the voting process, from voter registration clerks to poll workers, also is required. Jurisdictions are permitted to target their language assistance to specific voting precincts or areas.

There are currently a total of 466 local jurisdictions across 31 states that are required to provide language assistance nationwide. Of this total: 102 must assist Native Americans or Alaskan Natives across 18 states; 17 local jurisdictions in seven states must assist Asian language speakers and; 382 local jurisdictions in 20 states must assist speakers of Spanish. The total of these figures exceeds 466 because 57 of these Section 203 jurisdictions across 13 states must offer assistance in multiple languages.

There is a great misconception that section 203 is not needed because voters must be citizens, who are required to speak English. While this is true, such citizens still may not be sufficiently fluent to participate fully in the voting process without this much-needed assistance. In addition, there are many other citizens, the majority of whom are Latinos and Native Americans, who were born in the United States but have had little or no education and/or are limited English proficient. The failure of certain jurisdictions to provide adequate education to non-English speaking minorities is well documented in legal decisions and in quantitative studies of educational achievement for Latinos and Native Americans. Before the language assistance provisions were added to the Voting Rights Act in 1975, many Spanish-speaking United States citizens did not register to vote because they could not read the election material and could not communicate with poll workers. Language assistance has encouraged these and other citizens of different language minority groups to register and vote and participate more fully in the political process which is healthy for our democracy.

Mr. Chairman, it should be stressed that language assistance is not costly. According to two separate Government Accounting Office studies, as well as independent research conducted by academic scholars, when implemented properly language assistance accounts only for a small fraction of total election costs. The most recent studies show that compliance with Section 203 accounts for approximately 5 percent of total election costs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, language assistance works. To cite one example, in 2003 in Harris County, Texas, officials did not provide language assistance for Vietnamese citizens. This prompted the Department of Justice to in-

tervene and, as a result, voter turnout doubled and a local Vietnamese citizen was elected to a local legislative position. Another example: implementation of language assistance in New York City had enabled more than 100,000 Asian-Americans not fluent in English to vote. In 2001, John Liu was elected to the New York City Council, becoming the first Asian-American elected to a major legislative position in the city with the nation's largest Asian-American population.

#### CONCLUSION

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, represents our country and this Congress at its best because it matches our words to deeds, our actions to our values. And, as is usually the case, when America acts consistent with its highest values, success follows. I urge my colleague to vote for the bill and reject all amendments.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO CORAL CHILDS

#### HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Coral Childs for her tireless efforts to enhance technology in the classroom.

Coral Childs has worked tirelessly to further her vision of providing every student in America with access to computers in their schools. Through the Computers for Learning program, CFL, Coral and her team are turning her vision into a reality, matching these "needy" schools with a donor, either a government agency or a member of the private sector, and giving young students access to the tools they need to prepare themselves to compete in the new economy. The CFL program helped bring to life an executive order that encouraged government agencies to donate computers and equipment to schools.

The General Services Administration took ownership of CFL in late 1999. It was at this time that Coral began her work with the program. Under her leadership over the next 5 years, CFL helped transfer more than 118,000 computers and related equipment to over 12,000 needy schools. Coral played a significant role in both the marketing and outreach for the program, but her active involvement with the CFL's website cannot go unmentioned. Due to her remarkable compassion for the public and her dedication to the cause, the website is a place where agencies can instantly access pertinent information about needy schools. A key innovation to the program that Coral brought to CFL was to expand potential donors from government agencies to donors from the private sector including corporations and individuals.

Coral's achievements with CFL helped propel her to a new position within the General Services Administration. She no longer plays a daily role in the Computers for Learning program, but its success would not exist without the key part she played in the program's initiatives and implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Coral Childs. Her dedication to distributing computers and related equipment to needy schools has greatly enhanced the educational experience of countless children. I applaud her

efforts and wish her the best in her future endeavors.

#### HONORING THE CITY OF ARLINGTON, TX, ON ITS 130TH BIRTHDAY

#### HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1876, the United States was still celebrating its centennial as Engine No. 20 rolled down the freshly laid tracks of the Texas and Pacific Railroad built to extend rail service west from Dallas. The railroad had hired frontier surveyor and Presbyterian minister Andrew Hayter to locate and lay out a 1-square-mile township as a wood and water stop midway between Dallas and Fort Worth. Entrepreneur James Ditto immediately established a general store in the center of the new town, which had quickly become a shipping point for local cotton farmers and merchants. Hayter and Ditto named the town Arlington in honor of General Robert E. Lee's home in Virginia, and Ditto became the town's first postmaster.

Today, Arlington is the 49th largest city in the United States with a population of more than 360,000 people. It is home to a major General Motors assembly plant, a National Semiconductor wafer plant, a number of Fortune 500 facilities, the fastest growing university in Texas—the University of Texas at Arlington—and an entertainment complex that is one of the top tourist destinations in the country. The original Six Flags amusement park, Hurricane Harbor water park, and the Texas Rangers Baseball Club are located there. And in 2009, when the new stadium is completed, it will become the new home of the Dallas Cowboys football team.

Arlington is and has always been one of the best places in Texas to live, work, and play, to get a quality education and to start a new business. Recent surveys tell us that Arlington is also one of the fittest cities of its size in the Nation, as well as one of the best educated.

As the representative to Congress from Arlington, TX, I want to join the citizens of this great city in celebrating its 130th birthday, recognize the city for its outstanding achievements over the past 130 years, and pray God's blessings on its people for the next 130 years.

#### A TRIBUTE TO DEAN DONALD E. WILSON

#### HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Donald E. Wilson, M.D., MACP, who is retiring as dean of the University of Maryland School of Medicine and vice president of Medical Affairs for the University of Maryland.

Dean Donald E. Wilson has transformed the landscape of American medicine and medical education at the University of Maryland. In 1991, when Dr. Wilson was appointed dean of the University of Maryland School of Medicine,

he was the first African-American dean of a primarily non-minority medical school, as well as the first African-American dean at the University of Maryland School of Medicine.

Since 1991, Dean Wilson has increased grant and contract awards from \$77 million to \$350 million. Philanthropic support for the school of medicine has risen from \$1.7 million to \$37 million. Dean Wilson has created one of the most diverse student bodies and faculties in the country, with the School of Medicine doubling the number of full-time African-American faculty. Now ranked among the top medical schools in the country, the University of Maryland School of Medicine has benefited from Dean Wilson's leadership that has promoted the values of cultural and gender diversity and created an all-inclusive atmosphere at the medical school.

Dean Wilson's commitment to the education of minority students in the field of medicine led him to found the Association of Academic Minority Physicians. He continues to serve as editor of the association's journal. For his devotion, Dr. Wilson became the first recipient of the Association of American Medical Colleges' Herbert W. Nickens, MD Award for Diversity.

Dr. Wilson has been a good and trusted adviser to me on health care policy. He has spoken out about the need to expand research into diseases that are more prevalent in the African-American community and among women. His service on the Maryland Health Care Commission has helped to guarantee access to emergency health care for all Marylanders while ensuring that hospitals are able to provide those services.

I hope you will join me in congratulating and thanking Dean Donald E. Wilson for his outstanding contributions to medical education and his commitment to racial and cultural inclusion.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Norwood Amendment to H.R. 9, the "Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006." The Westmoreland Amendment requires the Attorney General to annually determine whether each State and political subdivision subject to the preclearance requirements of section 5 meets the requirements for bailout. The amendment further requires the Attorney General to then inform the public and each state and political subdivision that they are eligible to bail out. Last, the amendment would direct the Attorney General to consent to the bailout in federal court.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be soundly defeated. I agree with Mr. SENSENBRENNER that of all the weakening amendments offered, this one is the worst by far.

The Westmoreland Amendment turns Section 5 on its head because instead of enforcing the Voting Rights Act and stopping voting discrimination, the Department of Justice will be forced to spend nearly all of its time conducting investigations to determine where discrimination no longer exists. In the meantime, voting discrimination and constitutional violations will not be addressed.

Further, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cripple the Voting Section of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, making enforcement of the Act nearly impossible. There are nearly 900 jurisdictions covered nationwide by Section 5. Under the proposed amendment, determinations of whether a jurisdiction has a clean bill of health will require the Attorney General to dedicate considerable resources to making these determinations, and little else. This amendment has the effect of requiring coverage determinations be made by the Attorney General each year.

The Westmoreland Amendment removes the longstanding requirement that covered jurisdictions bear the burden of establishing that they are free from discrimination and places that burden on the Attorney General. Jurisdictions are uniquely positioned with the evidence showing whether or not voting discrimination is still present.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the current bailout provision in Section 4(a) of the Act provides a reasonable and cost-effective opportunity for qualifying jurisdictions to bailout any time after they meet the criteria, as eleven local jurisdictions in Virginia have already done successfully. The cost for bailout actions has averaged only \$5,000.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

WELCOMING THE NAACP TO WASHINGTON, DC ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 97TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

**HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to Washington, DC for its 97th Annual Convention. The NAACP has been dedicated to promoting and preserving civil rights since its founding in 1909. This year's theme, "Voting our Values, Valuing our Votes," reflects well the organization's commitment to the causes of equality and full participation in society for each and every American.

I wish to extend a special welcome to NAACP President and CEO Bruce Gordon who is completing his first year at the organization's helm, and to Chairman Julian Bond, who has provided steadfast direction and counsel over the years.

As a native of Baltimore, the NAACP's home, and as a life member of the organization, I am filled with pride to see such a large turnout this week in our nation's capital. I also want to welcome the delegates from Region 7, including my constituents from Maryland, who

are participating in the week's events. Many of the other delegates flew for the first time into the Baltimore-Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport, which was renamed last year in honor of Justice Marshall, a son of Baltimore who served as the NAACP's Chief Counsel prior to his historic tenure on the United States Supreme Court.

The 97th annual convention occurs as the House of Representatives has just overwhelmingly passed—without amendments—a 25-year reauthorization of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and we look forward to its passage this week by the Senate. I want to express my gratitude to Mr. Gordon and Mr. Bond for their vigorous efforts in support of this crucial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting the NAACP for its extraordinary legacy of commitment and courage and for its outstanding presence at this 97th annual convention. I look forward to working with them to promote and protect civil rights in the years to come.

ON ILLICIT ARMS TRAFFICKING

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of illegal trafficking of small arms and light weapons which is responsible for the death of approximately 1,000 people every day worldwide. As U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan reminded us in the U.N. conference on curtailing small arms and light weapons, "these weapons may be small, but they cause mass destruction."

The United States objects to any international regulation on arms trade and is opposed to a blanket ban on governments selling arms to 'non-state actors,' i.e. rebel groups, on the grounds that the oppressed have the right to defend themselves against tyrannical and genocidal governments. Unfortunately our policy also leaves the door open for terrorists groups to get their hands on weaponry. The U.S. government is loathe to sacrifice the liberty of the oppressed people worldwide in exchange for a possible security risk (terrorist threat) to the United States, but has no qualms in forfeiting the privacy and civil liberties of American citizens in return for security.

Furthermore, the United States is the leading producer of arms in the world, meaning we, more than any other country engage in arms trade with other governments, as well as 'nonstate actors.' We, as the superpower of the global system, must take the leading role in eliminating illicit arms trafficking which supplies armaments to brutal civil wars and organized crime networks and thereby causing massive casualties worldwide, everyday.

The United Nations has adopted a non-binding agreement program of action in its conference on "Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons In All Its Aspects," held in July 9–20, 2001. It encourages nations to ensure manufacturers use markings on small arms and light weapons make tracing illegal arms easier. It also encourages implementation of procedures to monitor legal sales, transfer and stockpiling of small arms and light weapons

and urges governments to make illegal manufacture, trade and possession a criminal offense.

The U.S. policy should be to support the U.N.'s Program of Action and try to make the resolution of the conference binding to the member states. We already have strict regulatory policies in arms trade within our borders. We need to expand those policies internationally with the assistance of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the RECORD, the article by Warren Hoge, titled With caveats. U.S. Backs Session at U.N. on curtailment of Illegal Arms, published in the June 28, 2006 edition of the New York Times, reporting on the U.N. Small Arms & Light Weapons Review Conference 2006.

[From the New York Times, June 28, 2006]  
WITH CAVEATS, U.S. BACKS SESSION AT U.N.  
ON CURTAILING ILLEGAL ARMS  
(By WARREN HOGE)

United Nations, June 27.—The Bush administration gave its backing on Tuesday to a United Nations conference on curtailment of the international flow of illegal arms, but warned delegates against adopting measures that would restrict individual possession of weapons.

"The U.S. Constitution guarantees the rights of our citizens to keep and bear arms, and there will be no infringement of those rights," Robert G. Joseph, under secretary of state for arms control and international security affairs, told the *General Assembly*. "Many millions of American citizens enjoy hunting and the full range of firearms sports, and our work will not affect their rights," he said.

He also said Washington would object to any steps to establish international regulation of ammunition or to ban governments from selling arms to rebel groups, known in diplomatic jargon as "nonstate actors."

"While we will of course continue to oppose the acquisition of arms by terrorist groups," he said, "we recognize the rights of the oppressed to defend themselves against tyrannical and genocidal regimes and oppose a blanket ban on nonstate actors."

The two-week conference, which began Monday, is intended to improve ways of curbing the \$1 billion black market in the manufacture and distribution of small arms and light weapons that supply brutal civil wars and organized crime networks and end up killing an estimated 1,000 people every day worldwide.

Secretary General *Kofi Annan* reminded the gathering that "these weapons may be small, but they cause mass destruction." He urged member countries to toughen existing laws governing arms deals.

Steps that Mr. Joseph said the United States would support included the marking and tracing of weapons, controls on transfers, certification of the ultimate recipients, effective management of national stockpiles and destruction of illicit and government-declared surplus weapons.

Mr. Annan said the conference was not contemplating a global ban on gun ownership. "Nor do we wish to deny law-abiding citizens their right to bear arms in accordance with their national laws," he said.

He seemed to be referring to a campaign by the National Rifle Association, which has charged in mass mailings that the United Nations is plotting to take away Americans' guns through a treaty banning ownership.

John R. Bolton, the United States ambassador to the United Nations, confirmed that he had received hundreds of the form letters. Asked why all three citizen delegates from

the United States to the conference were prominent members of the gun lobby group, he said he made it a practice not to comment on the activities of nongovernmental organizations.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA  
PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT  
KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS  
ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding. I rise in strong opposition to the King Amendment to H.R. 9, the "Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006." The King Amendment strikes, inter alia, section 203 of the bill. Section 203 is the part of the Voting Rights Act that provides language assistance to American citizen voters for whom English is not their first language.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be soundly defeated. I agree with the Mr. SENBRENNER that of all the weakening amendments offered, this is one of the worst and ugliest.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important things proponents of the King Amendment fail to understand is that Section 203 removes barriers to voting faced by TAX PAYING AMERICAN CITIZENS, citizens who do not speak English well enough to participate in the election process. Tax-paying citizens should not be penalized for needing assistance to exercise their fundamental right to vote.

Language minority citizens are required to pay taxes and serve in the military without regard to their level of English proficiency. If they can shoulder those burdens of citizenship, they should be able to share in the benefits of voting with appropriate assistance to exercise the vote.

Section 203 mandates language assistance based on a trigger formula for language minorities from four language groups: Native Americans, Native Alaskans, Asian Americans, and persons of Spanish heritage. Section 203 protects citizens, not illegal immigrants. Regardless of one's position on the ongoing debate over immigration reform, the debate over immigration policy is simply irrelevant to the debate on ensuring that the fundamental right to vote is exercised equally by English and non-English proficient citizens. According to the 2000 census, more than three-quarters (77 percent) of those protected by Section 203 are native-born citizens. For example, 100 percent of Native Americans and Native Alaskans were born in the United States; 98.6 percent of Puerto Ricans protected by Section 4(e) were born in the United States; and 84.2 percent of Latinos were born in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, section 203 was enacted to remedy the history of educational disparities, which have led to high illiteracy rates and low voter turnout. These disparities continue to

exist. As of 2000, three fourths of the 3 to 3.5 million students who are native-born were considered to be English Language Learners (ELLs), meaning the students don't speak English well enough to understand the basic English curriculum. ELL students lag significantly behind native-English speakers and are twice as likely to fail graduation tests. California has over 1,500,000 ELLs; Texas has 570,000 ELLs; Florida has 25,000 ELLs; and New York has over 230,000.

Since 1975, there have been more than 24 education discrimination cases filed on behalf of ELLs in 15 States. Fourteen of the States in which education discrimination lawsuits have been brought are covered by language assistance provisions. Since 1992, 10 cases have been filed. Litigation and consent decrees are currently pending in Texas, Alaska, Arizona, and Florida. Discrimination cases that have been brought address issues such as inadequate funding for ELLs, inadequate curriculum to assist ELLs become proficient in English, and lack of teachers and classrooms. These disparities increase the likelihood that ELLs will achieve lower test scores and drop out of school, ultimately, leading to lower voter registration and turnout.

Also, adults who want to learn English must endure long waiting periods to enroll in English Second Language (ESL) literacy centers. The lack of funding to expand the number of ESL centers around the country leaves minority citizens unable to enroll in classes for several years. For example, in large cities such as Boston, citizens must wait for several years to enroll. In New Mexico, citizens must wait up to a year. In the State of New York, the waiting lists were so long, the State eliminated them and instituted a lottery system. Once enrolled, learning English takes citizens several years to even obtain a fundamental understanding of the English language—not enough to understand complex ballots. Citizens should not be barred from exercising their right to vote while trying to become English proficient.

Most jurisdictions covered by Section 203 support its continued existence. According to a 2005 survey, an overwhelming majority of jurisdictions covered by Section 203 think that federal language assistance provisions should remain in effect for public elections. In fact, in a poll of registered voters, 57 percent believe it is difficult to navigate ballots and instructions and that assistance should be provided.

Mr. Chairman, it is instructive to review just a few contemporary examples which demonstrate the continuing need for the language assistance provisions of Section 203:

In 2003 in Harris County, Texas, officials did not provide language assistance for Vietnamese citizens. This prompted the Department of Justice to intervene and, as a result, voter turnout doubled and a local Vietnamese citizen was elected to a local legislative position.

The implementation of language assistance in New York City had enabled more than 100,000 Asian-Americans not fluent in English to vote. In 2001, John Liu was elected to the New York City Council, becoming the first Asian-American elected to a major legislative position in the city with the nation's largest Asian-American population.

In July 2005, the U.S. Dept. of Justice filed a lawsuit against the City of Boston for violations of the federal Voting Rights Act, specifically the language assistance provisions (Section 203) for Spanish language assistance

and racial discrimination (Section 2) against Asian American voters. The complaint alleges that Boston abridged the rights of language minority groups by:

Treating limited English proficient Hispanic and Asian American voters disrespectfully;

Refusing to permit limited English proficient Hispanic and Asian American voters to be assisted by an assistant of their choice;

Improperly influencing, coercing, or ignoring the ballot choices of limited English proficient Hispanic and Asian American voters;

Failing to make available bilingual personnel to provide effectively assistance and information needed by minority language voters; and

Refusing or failing to provide provisional ballots to limited English proficient Hispanic and Asian American voters.

In San Diego County, California, voter registration among Hispanics and Filipinos rose by over 20 percent after the Department of Justice brought suit against the county to enforce the language minority provisions of Section 203. During that same period, Vietnamese registrations increased by 40 percent.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, represents our country and this Congress at its best because it matches our words to deeds, our actions to our values. And, as is usually the case, when America acts consistent with its highest values, success follows. By eliminating language assistance to American voters, the King Amendment will make it more difficult for American citizens to participate in the political process simply because English is not their primary language. The King Amendment is thus inconsistent with American values and the spirit of the Voting Rights Act. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

MEDICARE HOME INFUSION THERAPY CONSOLIDATED COVERAGE ACT OF 2006

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues KAY GRANGER, TAMMY BALDWIN, and RANDY KUHL in introducing the Medicare Home Infusion Therapy Consolidated Coverage Act of 2006. This bill would correct long-standing gaps in Medicare coverage for home infusion therapy, and will enable thousands of beneficiaries to obtain these often life-saving therapies in the most convenient and cost-effective setting—their homes.

Under current Medicare coverage rules, beneficiaries who have severe infections, cancer, or congestive heart disease and many other diagnoses, are needlessly admitted into hospitals or nursing homes to receive the care they need. This is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because in many cases, infusion therapy administered in the patient's home is clearly the preferred alternative. Commercial health plans have long recognized the clinical value and cost-effectiveness of home infusion therapy, and full and proper coverage of home infusion therapy is commonplace among these payers. Medicare stands virtually alone in its antiquated coverage policies that discourage the use of a therapy that in actuality should be promoted for its cost savings, safety, clinical effectiveness, and convenience. At a time when there is a growing awareness of the

need to prevent or limit inpatient hospital stays for our Nation's elderly, we believe this legislation is extremely timely.

Our bill is very simple in its approach. Currently, whatever coverage exists for home infusion therapy is divided between part B and part D. Part B coverage is based on the durable medical equipment benefit, because an item of DME—the infusion pump—is sometimes needed to administer home infusion therapy. That coverage, however, is limited to about 23 drugs. Part D, the outpatient prescription drug benefit, covers more infusion drugs than part B, but does not cover the services, supplies and equipment necessary to safely and appropriately administer these therapies in the home. As a result, both part B and part D coverage of home infusion are very limited. Under part B, Medicare beneficiaries do not have access to many of the most common infusion drugs covered by commercial health plans. Under part D, many beneficiaries have to pay for the infusion services, supplies, and equipment with out-of-pocket funds. The clear result is that access to home infusion therapy, despite its potential for cost savings and good clinical outcomes, is needlessly limited.

Our bill would consolidate coverage for home infusion therapy under part B, so that coverage would be centered in one benefit and coverage would be designed to appropriately and accurately reflect what is involved in the safe and effective provision of home infusion therapy. The Secretary of HHS would apply quality standards that are consistent with prevailing community standard of care commonly utilized by commercial health plans. Both beneficiaries and the Medicare program itself would reap the benefits of broader access to these important medical treatments in the home.

I introduced a similar bill in 2001 that would have established a home infusion therapy benefit under part B. Since then Congress enacted the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 which created the part D prescription drug benefit. While I appreciate the efforts to broaden coverage of the drug portion of home infusion therapy, the problems I have described still persist because CMS believes it does not have the authority to cover anything beyond the drugs. Thus, effective coverage of home infusion therapy has remained elusive. We can fix this now.

Along with my colleagues, I urge early consideration of this long-overdue bill.

THANK YOU, HECTOR BARRETO,  
FOR A JOB WELL DONE

**HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, last Monday was the last day in office for Hector Barreto, the second-longest serving SBA Administrator in its 53-year history. Last week, there was a reception in honor of former Administrator Barreto with a broad spectrum of the small business community in Washington in attendance. This reflected well upon Mr. Barreto and his leadership style to bring people together of diverse interests and backgrounds.

I don't know how Mr. Barreto put up with being in Washington for these past 5 years.

I'm proud to be associated with Mr. Barreto and where he has taken the SBA to serve more small businesses than ever before in the history of the agency. I'm also proud to say that Mr. Barreto and I have similar backgrounds, growing up in the family restaurant business in the Midwest.

It's amazing to see what has happened during the tenure of Mr. Barreto as Administrator of the SBA. Mr. Barreto was confirmed by the Senate and then sworn into office on July 25, 2001. Several weeks later, our Nation was hit by the awful terrorist attacks on September 11. More Americans were killed in 9/11 than at Pearl Harbor. Mr. Barreto was just getting used to his new job responsibilities and this terrible tragedy struck America. Administrator Barreto rose up to the challenge by extending Economic Injury Disaster loans to small businesses all across America regardless of their proximity to the locations of the actual terrorist attacks. The terrorists sought to devastate our economy by tearing down the World Trade Center and disrupting air travel but they did not count on the resiliency of the small business sector and the American people. More than 10,000 small businesses across the Nation employing 166,000 workers were helped with over \$1 billion in 9/11 SBA disaster loans.

If that wasn't enough, Mr. Barreto achieved great results in other programs of the SBA. Between 2000 and 2005, the SBA more than doubled the number of loans made through its main business loan guarantee programs. The dollar volume also dramatically increased—in 7(a) by nearly 40 percent and in the 504 program by threefold. And after a series of programmatic shut-downs and curtailments, I joined with Mr. Barreto in making the historic decision in late 2004 to finally get the 7(a) program off the rollercoaster of the appropriations process and have it funded entirely through user fees just like the 504 and the SBIC program. Now, the 7(a) program is going like gangbusters, serving record numbers of small businesses throughout all demographic groups, as compared to when it was receiving a loan subsidy.

There has also been a steady increase in the number of individuals receiving technical assistance, education, and counseling through the SBA and its resource partners. Also, as a result of active engagement between the SBA and Federal agencies, Federal procurement dollars going to small businesses are at an all-time high. All this was accomplished while transforming the SBA into an agency to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Change is hard but Mr. Barreto made the courageous decision to have the SBA operate more like the private sector than a bureaucracy. Doing more with less should be praised, not condemned, particularly in this tough budget environment.

Then, Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma violently struck the gulf coast last year. It was as if a swath of complete devastation 100 miles wide ripped through our country from Boston to Chicago. Again, Administrator Barreto and his team in the Office of Disaster Assistance came through despite enormous obstacles placed in their path, including not being able to really get to the areas of deepest destruction until well after a month after Hurricane Katrina ravaged New Orleans. The SBA and Administrator Barreto in particular took many below-the-belt political potshots

along the way. I know when a person's integrity has been unfairly questioned, and I had to stand up to defend a decent and honorable man. I was proud to stand with Mr. Barreto last December in the press conference to put some context and additional facts into a very complicated situation.

Just as a side note, it is very interesting to me that the media is not reporting that the SBA thus far has approved a record amount of over \$10 billion in disaster loans to more than 152,000 Gulf States residents, representing an accomplishment 2½ times greater than the Nation's previous largest disaster—and all done at a faster pace. That is something to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this brief opportunity to once again thank Mr. Barreto for his leadership; for his friendship; and for his service to our country. Our Nation's small business community is better for Mr. Barreto's tenure as the second longest serving SBA Administrator in history. The new SBA Administrator, Steve Preston, has some fairly big shoes to fill.

Freda and I wish Hector Barreto and his family all the best in his new endeavor as the new national chairman of the Latino Coalition. I am confident that Mr. Barreto will never forget his small business roots.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA  
PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT  
KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS  
ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, speaking of the Emancipation Proclamation, Martin Luther King declared that: "This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of captivity." I say to you today that the Voting Rights Act, like the Emancipation Proclamation that preceded it a century before, was also a momentous decree which came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Americans who for decades had been subjected to the withering injustice of racial discrimination and electoral disenfranchisement.

The Gohmert amendment seeks to diminish the light of continued hope offered by the VRA. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is no ordinary piece of legislation. For millions of Americans and myself, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary yet heroic Americans who showed the world it was possible to transform their society by having the courage to defy entrenched and systematic racial discrimination and disenfranchisement.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, which we MUST vote to reauthorize today was enacted to remedy a history of systemic and

widespread discrimination in certain areas of the country. Presented with a record of systematic defiance by certain States and jurisdictions that could not be overcome by litigation, this Congress—led by President Lyndon Johnson, from my own home state of Texas—took the steps necessary to stop it. It is instructive to recall the words of President Johnson when he proposed the Voting Rights Act to the Congress in 1965:

Rarely are we met with a challenge . . . to the values and the purposes and the meaning of our beloved Nation. The issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such as an issue . . . the command of the Constitution is plain. It is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 represents our country and this Congress at its best because it matches our words to our deeds, our actions to our values. Martin Luther King said that, "When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. . . . It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. . . . But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt."

Fortunately, this country has come a long way in the past four decades since the assassination of Dr. King. However, as the massive voting irregularities that occurred in 2000 and 2004 clearly illustrate, we have not come far enough. That is why we must defeat the Gohmert Amendment which seeks to reduce the reauthorization period for the VRA from 25 years to 10 years.

The considerable evidence presented in 10 hearings in the Judiciary Committee demonstrate clearly that the level and patterns of discrimination and electoral disenfranchisement present today are extremely unlikely to be eradicated in 10 years. Moreover, if covered jurisdictions want to bail out of provisions of the VRA, they can.

In the past, when Congress reauthorized the VRA for short periods of time, it created an incentive for covered jurisdictions to wait out their obligations rather than comply, thus contributing to the widespread non-compliance with the statute that occurred throughout the 1970s. A 10 year renewal of the VRA would be inadequate. In order for Congress to assess whether a pattern of discriminatory conduct remains, it must be able to review voting changes through multiple redistricting cycles. The three years following the decennial Census are a time of the highest volume of voting changes and the greatest opportunity for discrimination. Accordingly, we must maintain the 25 year renewal period.

Furthermore, if we observe Congressional history, our own experience with the renewal of the VRA demonstrates a pattern of lengthening the period of coverage due to the level of entrenchment and intractability of voting discrimination. Given the extensive investment of Congressional resources expended by the Judiciary Committee in compiling and considering the detailed record necessary for reauthorization, reenacting the VRA for only 10 years is inefficient and unacceptable.

Without exaggeration, the Voting Rights Act has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress. In 1964, there were

only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever. The act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

I hail from the great State of Texas, the Lone Star State. A state that, sadly, had one of the most egregious records of voting discrimination against racial and language minorities. Texas is one of the Voting Rights Act's "covered jurisdictions." In all of its history, I am only one of three African-American woman from Texas to serve in the Congress of the United States, and one of only two to sit on this famed Committee. I hold the seat once held by the late Barbara Jordan, who won her seat thanks to the Voting Rights Act. From her perch on this committee, Barbara Jordan once said:

I believe hyperbole would not be fictional and would not overstate the solemnness that I feel right now. My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total.

I sit here today an heir of the Civil Rights Movement, a beneficiary of the Voting Rights Act. My faith in the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act too is whole, it is complete, it is total. I would be breaking faith with those who risked all and gave all to secure for my generation the right to vote if I did not do all I can to strengthen the Voting Rights Act so that it will forever keep open doors that shut out so many for so long.

Consequently, we must honor the legacies of those who sacrificed their lives so that we may be able to exercise our constitutionally protected right to vote by renewing the Voting Rights Act for 25 more years.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO KATHY  
AUGUSTINE

**HON. JON C. PORTER**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Kathy Augustine, a dedicated Nevada leader, who passed away on Tuesday, July 11, 2006.

Kathy was a devoted and passionate public servant, having served in the Nevada State Assembly from 1993 to 1995, and also in the State Senate from 1995 to 1999, where she chaired the Legislative Affairs and Operations Committee and was Vice Chairman of Taxation and the Human Resources and Facilities Committees. In 1999, Kathy became the first woman to be elected as Nevada State Controller. To add to her impressive résumé, Kathy was also a Trustee for the Center for Governmental Financial Management, and the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers' representative on the Electronic Benefits and Services Council, where she served as Chair of the Strategic

Expansion and Advanced Technology Committee.

Kathy's work on behalf of her constituents earned her a number of honors throughout her years of public service. She was a recipient of the American Legion Achievement Medallion, the Community Partners Family Resource Center 1998 Community Service Award of Excellence, the 1998 National Republican Legislators Association, Legislator of the Year, Nevada Opera Theatre's International Friendship Award (2003), and the Augustus Society's Italian American of the Year (2003).

In addition to her vast public service career, Kathy also had an impressive array of academic achievements. She earned a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science from Occidental College in Los Angeles, and a Master's in Public Administration from California State University, Long Beach. She served as a Delegate to Russia and the Ukraine with the American Council of Young Political Leaders (ACYPL) in 1993 and was selected as an Executive Committee Member to the Biennial Assembly of the Atlantic Association of Young Political Leaders (AAAYPL) in Paris, France in 1995. She participated in the Council of State Governments Henry Toll Fellowship Program and was also selected for the Flemming Fellows Leadership Institute's Class of 1996. In 1999, she attended the Governors Center at Duke University Strategic Leadership for State Executives and, in 2000, graduated from the Greater Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce Leadership program. In 2001, she completed the Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Senior Executives in State and Local Government Program.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the unexpected and sudden loss of such a young and ambitious woman. Kathy will be remembered for her dedication to the State of Nevada, to her family, and to her friends. She will be deeply missed.

SUPPORTING INTELLIGENCE AND  
LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS  
TO TRACK TERRORISTS AND  
TERRORIST FINANCES

SPEECH OF

**HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2006*

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 895. I strongly support efforts to track and pursue suspected foreign terrorists by monitoring their financial transactions. This Republican resolution, however, shamefully distorts the facts and turns the critical issue of national security into a venue for Republican political gain.

There is no doubt that our country must effectively and responsibly monitor the financial transactions of terrorists. It is for that reason I have cosponsored H.R. 900, the Democratic alternative resolution. This resolution reaffirms Democrats' commitment to protecting our national security by tracking suspected terrorists. It also reaffirms that, when confidential information is leaked, bipartisan Congressional review and oversight are critical—regardless of who may be responsible for that leak. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has denied the Members of this House the opportunity to

debate and vote on this Democratic alternative.

As a result, we are forced only to consider this flawed and misleading Republican resolution.

This resolution claims that the Terrorist Financial Tracking Program is legal, that it protects individual civil liberties, and that Congress has been appropriately informed about its activities.

The fact is that we do not know if the Terrorist Financial Tracking Program is legal or if it protects our civil liberties because no court has ruled on these critical issues. In essence, this resolution asks Members of Congress and the American people to simply accept their word on the legality and civil protections of this program.

The resolution's claim that Congress has been appropriately informed about the Terrorist Financial Tracking Program is simply not true. In fact, few Members knew about this program. Only after its existence was exposed to the public by the press did the Bush Administration offer to brief the appropriate members of Congress. As a result, this questionable program failed to receive critical Congressional oversight.

The Republican philosophy of selective oversight is also exemplified by the fact that this resolution fails to even mention one of the most egregious leaks in recent history—the 2003 identity leak of a CIA agent by a member of the Bush Administration.

This Republican resolution instead attempts to shield the administration and Republican leadership from public scrutiny by shifting the blame for the leaks to the press and diverting attention from the fact that the majority party has had no hearings, no briefings, and certainly no resolutions highlighting this serious issue.

The lack of Congressional oversight on cases of leaked confidential information is another example of the Republican pattern of negligence.

If the Republican leadership were truly sincere about addressing national security issues through this resolution, they would not have brought it to the floor without review by the appropriate Congressional Committees and with a rule that blocks any consideration of a Democratic alternative.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican resolution is deceitful, politically motivated, and an insult to the very American democracy that Republicans claim they want to protect.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 895 and to cosponsor the Democratic alternative, H.R. 900.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA  
PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT  
KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS  
ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Norwood Amendment to H.R. 9, the "Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006." The Norwood Amendment replaces the existing Section 5 coverage formula with one keyed to whether a jurisdiction has a test or device or voter turnout of less than 50 percent in any of the three most recent presidential elections. The proponents of the amendment claim it is needed to prevent the Supreme Court from striking down the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Chairman, there are several compelling reasons for rejecting this amendment, which I will discuss. But let me respond, Mr. Chairman, to the claim that Georgia has suffered enough and should be let out of the "penalty box." I response is simple: the record amply demonstrates that Georgia earned its way into whatever "penalty box" it is in and it must earn its way out, as eleven local jurisdictions in Virginia already have.

REASONS FOR REJECTING THE NORWOOD AMENDMENT:

Mr. Chairman, the claim that the Voting Rights Act faces constitutional jeopardy from the Supreme Court if section 5 is not gutted is a red herring and is not to be taken seriously. First, the Supreme Court has never ruled the Voting Rights Acts or any of its provisions unconstitutional and there is no reason to suspect it will do so now. The claim that the intent of the Norwood Amendment is to save and protect the Voting Rights Act is disingenuous. It is akin to destroying the village in order to save it!

Second, the Norwood Amendment would eviscerate the effectiveness of Section 5 by extending its reach nationwide. It accomplishes this by basing the pre-clearance "trigger" on election turnout in the three most recent presidential elections. Extending the reach of Section 5 nationwide will weaken it, not strengthen it in at least three ways. A "nationwide" Section 5 would also be vulnerable to constitutional attack as not "narrowly tailored" or "congruent and proportional" to address the harms it is designed to cure, as required by the Supreme Court's recent precedents. Section 5 is directed at jurisdictions with a history of discriminating against minority voters. Nationwide application of Section 5 would be extremely difficult to administer, given the volume of voting changes that would have to be reviewed. This expansion of coverage would dilute the Department of Justice's ability to appropriately focus their work on those jurisdictions where there is a history of voting discrimination.

The lack of understanding of the true purpose and significance of the Voting Rights Act on the part of the supporters of the Norwood Amendment is most revealed by the desire to extend the reach of Section 5 nationwide. The proponents of the Norwood Amendment characterize the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5 as the "penalty box," reserved for those jurisdictions that have "broken the rules."

The right to vote is not a game; it is serious business, and for those who led the fight to secure that right for African-Americans, it was deadly serious. Section 5 is not punitive; it prohibits discriminatory changes affecting the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act has no provisions that name particular states or areas. Section 5 is aimed at a type of problem, not a state or region. It is designed to

prevent backsliding by states whose discriminatory literacy tests were outlawed by the original act in 1965. Section 4 banned literacy tests in states where they were used to discriminate, but experience showed that when one method of voting discrimination was blocked—either through court action or a new law—another method would suddenly appear as a replacement. Congress therefore included the Section 5 preclearance provision to prevent the implementation of new discriminatory laws. The objections made since 1965 showed the covered jurisdictions have attempted to use gerrymandering and other forms of discrimination to abridge the right to vote. Section 5 has focused on these efforts.

Mr. Chairman, utilizing recent presidential election turnout data to determine who should be covered by Section 5 preclearance confuses the symptom with the disease. In 1965, Congress used registration and turnout data to select which states should be subject to federal pre-approval of voting changes because that was the most efficient way to identify those places with the longest and worst history of voter disfranchisement and entrenched discrimination and blatant racism by recalcitrant jurisdictions. Congress understood that while a multitude of formulas could be conjured to identify which governmental units would be subject to preclearance, there was and could be only one way for a covered jurisdiction to overcome the need to preclear its election laws, and that is by satisfying an independent federal judiciary that it had renounced its discriminatory past and could be trusted not to employ any artifice that would result in a return to those days of shame.

Mr. Chairman, the coverage formula does not need to be changed to bring it up to date. The current formula correctly identifies jurisdictions that have the longest and worst history of voter disenfranchisement and entrenched discrimination. Jurisdictions free of discrimination for ten years can come out from under coverage. Those with continuing problems remain covered. And those where a court finds new constitutional violations can become covered. If the existing coverage formula were to be replaced with a formula that relies on 1996, 2000, and 2004 presidential election data, it would amount to a repeal of Section 5, even though we know that voting discrimination continues in the currently covered jurisdictions.

Last, the Norwood Amendment undermines the constitutionality of a renewed Section 5. The current coverage formula targets jurisdictions where Congress found a record of pervasive discrimination in voting on the basis of race. There is no evidence that the new triggers relied upon in the Norwood Amendment will target such jurisdictions, and only those jurisdictions, with a history of racial discrimination when it comes to its citizens' exercise of the franchise:

The Norwood Amendment is not likely to pass constitutional muster because it is not narrowly tailored to achieve the Congressional objective of subjecting only those jurisdictions with a history of voter discrimination and electoral racism to the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5.

CONCLUSION

The jurisdictions covered by section 5 of the Voting Rights Act earned their way in; they can earn their way out through the bailout provisions of the Act. What they have not earned

is for this Congress to end preclearance requirements for where there is a continuing need for such oversight, as the Texas mid-decade redistricting case and the Georgia voter identification case make clear.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 18, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 19

9 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
To hold hearings to examine the science and risk assessment behind the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed revisions to the particulate matter air quality standards.  
SD-628

9:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine antitrust concerns relating to credit card interchange rates.  
SD-226

10 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Frederic S. Mishkin, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Linda Mysliwy Conlin, of New Jersey, to be First Vice President, James Lambright, of Missouri, to be President, and J. Joseph Grandmaison, of New Hampshire, to be a Member of the Board of Directors, all of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, Geoffrey S. Bacino, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board, Edmund C. Moy, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Mint, Department of the Treasury; to be followed by a hearing to examine the semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress.  
SD-106

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark V. Rosenker, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, R. Hunter Biden, of Delaware, and Donna R. McLean, of the District of Columbia,

each to be a Member of the Reform Board (Amtrak), John H. Hill, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Andrew B. Steinberg, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, routine lists in the Coast Guard and NOAA, and other pending calendar business.

SR-253  
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions  
Business meeting to consider proposed Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, S. 843, to amend the Public Health Service Act to combat autism through research, screening, intervention and education, and the nominations of Elizabeth Dougherty, of the District of Columbia, Peter W. Tredick, of California, and Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, each to be a Member of the National Mediation Board.

SD-430  
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine Department of Homeland Security purchase cards.

SD-342  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee  
To hold an oversight hearing on the implementation of Public Law 108-148 The Healthy Forests Restoration Act.  
SD-366

11 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine high performance computing.  
SR-253

2 p.m.  
Judiciary  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.  
SD-226

2:15 p.m.  
Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine judicial nominations.  
SD-226

2:30 p.m.  
Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings to examine Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and related exchanges of letters, signed at Washington on March 31, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-23).  
SD-419

Intelligence  
To receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters.  
SH-219

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.  
Armed Services  
To receive a closed briefing regarding overhead imagery systems.  
S-407, Capitol

Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. policy options regarding North Korea.  
SD-419

Judiciary  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.  
SD-226

10 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To hold hearings to examine USDA dairy programs.  
SR-328A

Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Ray Correll, of Indiana,

- to be Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, and Mark Myers, of Alaska, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey, both of the Department of the Interior, and Drue Pearce, of Alaska, to be Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. SD-366
- Small Business and Entrepreneurship  
Business meeting to mark up an original bill to reauthorize the Small Business Administration. SR-428A
- Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine "VA Data Privacy Breach: Twenty-Six Million People Deserve Assurance of Future Security". SR-418
- Aging  
To hold hearings to examine the generic drug maze relating to access to affordable, life saving drugs. SD-106
- 11 a.m.  
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security Subcommittee  
To receive a closed briefing regarding Iran. S-407, Capitol
- 1:30 p.m.  
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine Iran's nuclear impasse, focusing on the status of Iran's nuclear weapons capabilities, European negotiations and the UN Security Council, and the feasibility of further negotiations, democracy promotion, sanctions, and/or military operations. SD-342
- 2 p.m.  
Appropriations  
Business meeting to mark up H.R. 5631, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, proposed legislation making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, H.R. 5385, making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and H.R. 5576, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of
- Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007. SD-106
- 2:30 p.m.  
Intelligence  
To receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters. SH-219
- JULY 25
- 9:30 a.m.  
Armed Services  
Airland Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the F-22A multiyear procurement proposal in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2007. SR-222
- JULY 27
- 10 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Patrick W. Dunne, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Policy and Planning, and Thomas E. Harvey, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Congressional Affairs. SR-418