

recommendations of the Task Force on Clinical Preventive Services.

At that point, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, they are going to have the full weight of law behind them. It is in the bill.

Yes, we look at this, and we see the bureaucrat in the exam room right here. We look at it, and we all know and have loved and have held family members in our arms that have been affected and would have lost their lives had they not had access to early detection. It concerns us.

Do not ration health care. Support the resolution, but let's go further in getting out of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in yielding back our time, I remind our colleagues that the truth is, when enacted into law, H.R. 3962 will result in millions of uninsured Americans receiving their first mammogram and will no longer face being dropped by their insurance company if they are diagnosed with cancer.

I wish to acknowledge and thank the leader of this resolution for her hard work, our colleague, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. DELAURA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, H.R. 971, which helps to clarify much of the unnecessary furor over mammograms we have experienced of late.

The recent breast cancer recommendations by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force effectively said that women ages 40 to 49 should have a conversation with their doctors before deciding to have a screening mammogram. In other words, they were to attempt to put as much information as possible in the hands of women and their doctors, so they can assess their own risk and benefit.

Now, whatever decision women come to on this important matter, they need two things to ensure they have access to mammography should they decide to get screened: One is a quality health coverage so they have a doctor they can go speak to. And the second is coverage for mammograms and other important preventative services. And, of course, some women will need coverage for treatment if a cancer is found.

This is why I support this resolution, which argues that insurers should not deny coverage for mammograms for women ages 40 to 49 who decide to get screened. This is also why I support comprehensive health insurance reform, so that women can afford health care in the first place, and get coverage for that mammograms and any follow-up treatment they might need.

We must redouble our efforts across the board to ensure that Americans are getting the appropriate preventive screenings. Right now, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, only 25.9 percent of women ages 50 to 64 have received all the recommended preventative care for breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer, as well as influenza. Under health reform, women would finally get the preventative care they need.

In the meantime, there is a great need for more information, more research, and more scientific innovation to help women prevent, detect, and fight breast cancer, the second

leading cause of cancer deaths among women. This resolution also urges the National Cancer Institute to continue to invest in research toward more effective screening tools and strategies for improving detection of breast cancer.

For all of these reasons, I strongly urge my colleague to support this resolution. Mammography is not perfect, but right now it is the best method we have to detect this killer in our midst. We need to make sure that as many women as possible have access to this important, life-saving procedure, and that better, safer screening procedures will soon be forthcoming.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 971, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding guidelines for breast cancer screening for women ages 40 to 49. I appreciate the leadership of the bill's author, my Judiciary Committee colleague Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

This resolution was introduced on the heels of new breast cancer screening guidelines issued last month by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (the "Task Force"), an independent panel of medical experts. These new guidelines have created cause for concern by some due to the change from the Task Force's 2002 mammography recommendations concerning mammography screening for women age 40–49.

In light of this concern, this resolution underscores the sense of the House that the Task Force recommendations should not prohibit insurance companies from providing mammography services in addition to those in the Task Force recommendations, and should not be used by insurers to deny women coverage for routine screenings. This resolution also urges the National Cancer Institute to continue to invest and provide leadership regarding research to develop more effective screening tools and strategies for improving detection of breast cancer.

This is not the first time recommendations about the use of mammography and breast self exams have been revisited—by the Task Force or NIH or any number of cancer-related research or advocacy groups. Just as we have seen with prostate cancer screening, immunization schedules, and other preventative care measures, new interpretations often result in a change in what experts tell us works most effectively. As the science of medicine evolves, so too, should the recommendations on the best use of that science.

Evolution and improvement are what the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force set out to achieve in undertaking a review of its 2002 mammography guidelines. The Task Force sought to take a fresh look of what has been learned over the last several years, and based upon that body of work, to provide its best professional judgment on what doctors and their patients should consider when they are making decisions about breast cancer screening. Despite the contention on this issue, I trust that the Task Force's deliberations and conclusions were driven by science and not by cost or insurance coverage.

Notwithstanding the scientific basis for these new guidelines, I share the concern of Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and others such as the Susan G. Komen for the Cure Advocacy Alliance who point out that one-third of all American women do not undergo regular

screening. Many of those who go without screening are African American and younger women. According to the Susan G. Komen for the Cure Advocacy Alliance the failure of age-appropriate women to undergo mammography costs lives and reflects problems with access to care and breast cancer education.

Mr. Speaker, we need to work as rapidly as possible to correct these deficiencies, and continue to fund research and education designed to eliminate health care disparities. We want to eliminate any impediments to regular mammography screening for women age 50 and below. While there may be disagreement about the exact timing of breast cancer assessments, I believe there is unanimous consensus over the importance of guaranteeing access to screening.

New screening approaches and more individualized recommendations for breast cancer screening are urgently needed. I support research initiatives designed to improve screening, and believe that it is imperative that this research move forward rapidly. Furthermore, I encourage African American and other women with unresolved questions about breast cancer screening to engage in discussion with their health care providers.

If the new guidelines have done nothing else, I believe it has at least raised awareness, not only amongst women, but amongst all Americans. As such, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 971.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### DANIEL PEARL FREEDOM OF THE PRESS ACT OF 2009

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3714) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices information about freedom of the press in foreign countries, establish a grant program to promote freedom of the press worldwide, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3714

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009".

**SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATING TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS WORLDWIDE IN ANNUAL COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.**

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) in section 116(d) (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)), as amended by section 333(c) of this division—

(A) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (11)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) wherever applicable—

“(A) a description of the status of freedom of the press, including initiatives in favor of freedom of the press and efforts to improve or preserve, as appropriate, the independence of the media, together with an assessment of progress made as a result of those efforts;

“(B) an identification of countries in which there were violations of freedom of the press, including direct physical attacks, imprisonment, indirect sources of pressure, and censorship by governments, military, intelligence, or police forces, criminal groups, or armed extremist or rebel groups; and

“(C) in countries where there are particularly severe violations of freedom of the press—

“(i) whether government authorities of each such country participate in, facilitate, or condone such violations of the freedom of the press; and

“(ii) what steps the government of each such country has taken to preserve the safety and independence of the media, and to ensure the prosecution of those individuals who attack or murder journalists.”; and

(2) in section 502B (22 U.S.C. 2304), by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) The report required by subsection (b) shall include, wherever applicable—

“(1) a description of the status of freedom of the press, including initiatives in favor of freedom of the press and efforts to improve or preserve, as appropriate, the independence of the media, together with an assessment of progress made as a result of those efforts;

“(2) an identification of countries in which there were violations of freedom of the press, including direct physical attacks, imprisonment, indirect sources of pressure, and censorship by governments, military, intelligence, or police forces, criminal groups, or armed extremist or rebel groups; and

“(3) in countries where there are particularly severe violations of freedom of the press—

“(A) whether government authorities of each such country participate in, facilitate, or condone such violations of the freedom of the press; and

“(B) what steps the government of each such country has taken to preserve the safety and independence of the media, and to ensure the prosecution of those individuals who attack or murder journalists.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 3714 reinforces and broadens our country's commitment to media freedom around the world. Dedicated to the memory of a prominent U.S. journalist who lost his life in the pursuit of truth, the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act will ensure that our embassies and consulates overseas bring word to Washington in a timely and regular fashion about those parts of the world where journalists face obstacles, harassment and physical harm merely for doing their job.

I want to particularly congratulate my colleague and recognize him, ADAM SCHIFF of California, for authoring this legislation which will enshrine in law the practice of including information about media freedom in the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices written by the Department of State.

With passage of this legislation, our embassies and consulates will be required to report every year on the status of press freedom in each country, both the good and the bad. Where media freedom is threatened in a country, our diplomats will report on what steps that government has taken to preserve journalists' safety and independence and to ensure the prosecution of those who commit violence against journalists.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers faced by the media worldwide continue to mount. On World Press Freedom Day this past May, Freedom House reported a seventh straight year of decline in global media freedom, with twice as many losses as gains and with deterioration occurring in every region of the world. Of the 195 countries and territories that Freedom House monitors, 36 percent have a free press while 31 percent are rated partly free and 33 percent not free at all. As the organization noted, “The press is democracy's first defense, and its vulnerability has enormous implications for democracy if journalists are not able to carry out their traditional watchdog role.”

Daniel Pearl was one such watchdog. A long-standing correspondent for The Wall Street Journal and its South Asia bureau chief, he was investigating possible terrorism links in Pakistan in early 2002 when he was kidnapped, held hostage, tortured, and killed. His murder was videotaped and released on the Internet.

Although the circumstances of this horrific crime were meant to send a chilling message to the U.S. government and the world's media, it served instead to strengthen our resolve.

A number of initiatives have been established in his name to promote intercultural understanding and freedom of the press. We should let the legislation

before us today, Mr. SCHIFF's bill, become part of this legacy in the interests of ensuring that those who would seek to extinguish the light of truth around the world will instead be dragged out of the shadows and defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 3714, the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009.

□ 1430

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my good friend, and also my friend from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), our conference Chair, for introducing this important legislation on an issue of growing international concern.

A free press is indispensable to an informed public, to government accountability, and to the efficiency and integrity of public and commercial institutions. Here in the United States we enjoy the benefits of a robust free press, protected by the First Amendment to our Constitution. But in many other parts of the world, telling the truth as a journalist is dangerous and an even deadly calling.

Sadly, this fact was underscored by the life and death of the person for whom this bill is named, the brave and accomplished Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl. In 2002, while reporting in Pakistan, Pearl was kidnapped by violent Islamic extremists who chose to murder him on videotape, after compelling him to recite the fact of his Jewish religion on camera.

Whether the cause is extremism, corruption, political repression, or the dangers of reporting from conflict zones, journalists around the world face a rising tide of threats. So far this year, 68 journalists have been confirmed killed in the line of duty or because of their reporting. Nearly half of those, sadly, at least 30 journalists, were killed in the shocking election-related massacre in the southern Philippines on November 23. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, there has been a 9 percent increase over the 2008 levels in the imprisonment of journalists worldwide. The one-party regime in China continues to imprison the largest number of reporters of any one nation.

But the Iranian regime runs a very close second, and its closure of yet another newspaper last week is another sad reminder of the extent to which it has targeted independent and foreign media in the aftermath of the widespread election-related protests by the Iranian people.

And rounding out the shameful top three, Cuba suffers perhaps the greatest per capita levels of press repression. Even though it has only one-twelfth of the population of China, the Cuban regime imprisons roughly the same number of journalists. Just last month,

state security agents detained and beat Cuban bloggers Yoani Sanchez, Claudia Cadelo, and Omar Luis Pardo Lazo as they were on their way to a peaceful march in Havana. What a sad irony that is.

To help address these and other outrages, the bill before us today would beef up press-related reporting in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. Among other issues, the expanded reports would describe the extent to which foreign governments are complicit in attacks on press freedoms and what steps are being taken to protect the media and to prosecute those who attack and murder journalists. This new reporting will help focus the sunlight of public scrutiny even more powerfully on these violators of basic rights.

I want to thank, again, Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. PENCE for bringing forward this important legislation, which deserves our unanimous support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my friend, colleague, and neighbor.

Mr. SCHIFF. At the outset, let me extend my thanks to my friend and fellow Californian, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who has been such a forceful advocate on the issue of media freedom around the world.

By passing the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act today, the House brings much-needed attention to a critical human rights issue. It is especially auspicious that we do it today, December 15, which is Bill of Rights Day in honor of the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. The First Amendment, which guarantees freedom of speech and freedom of the press, is considered by many historians and legal scholars to be the single most important of our constitutional liberties.

We all remember when Daniel Pearl, a highly respected reporter from *The Wall Street Journal*, was kidnapped and murdered by terrorists in Pakistan just 4 months after 9/11. Although four of the kidnappers were convicted in July of 2002, seven other suspects, including those who allegedly helped murder Daniel, remain at large.

This past year has been particularly deadly for journalists. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, a total of 89 journalists and media workers have been killed this year. More than a third of these victims, 30, were gunned down in one horrific incident in the Philippines when 29 journalists and at least one media support worker were ambushed and brutally slain on November 23 as they traveled with a convoy of people who intended to file gubernatorial candidacy papers for a provincial politician.

Unbelievable stories of physical harassment and acts of violence against

journalists contribute to this grim picture. In Mexico, there has been a dramatic increase in attacks on media workers who try to cover corruption or gang activities. Very few of these attacks result in prosecution. As a result, journalists are driven towards censoring their own reporting out of fear for their personal safety and the lives of their families.

Legal mechanisms are also increasingly being used to restrict the media, both through overt censorship and through the use of repressive legislation. This past April, the Sudanese Parliament began consideration of a bill that grants unprecedented authority to impose strict disciplinary measures against journalists and allows the government to both confiscate printing equipment and determine journalists' suitability for their profession. Sudanese security officers visit newspapers nightly to determine what can be printed and what will be censored.

Freedom of expression cannot exist where journalists and the media are not independent and safe from repression, persecution, and physical attacks. And I believe freedom, accountability, and democracy cannot flourish without a free press. It is the essential check on the power of the state. Sadly, that power has tempted too many governments, drug cartels, arms smugglers, and others to target journalists in an effort to silence them. Sadder still is the indifference of governments worldwide who have failed to recognize that by failing to protect the media, we are endangering fragile, young democracies and buttressing autocratic regimes and criminal syndicates.

To highlight the work of journalists worldwide and to document the dangers they confront, my colleague from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and I introduced the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act to focus the world's attention on those countries in which journalists are killed, imprisoned, kidnapped, threatened, or censored. I couldn't have a better partner in this legislation than Mr. PENCE, and I greatly appreciate his advocacy of the freedom of the press.

The legislation calls upon the Secretary of State to greatly expand its examination of the status of freedom of the press worldwide in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. The Daniel Pearl Act requires the State Department to identify countries in which there were violations of freedom of the press and whether the government authorities in those countries participate in, facilitate, or condone the violations. This report will spotlight those governments which seek to silence media opposition. It is my fervent hope that by spotlighting media repression in the human rights reports, American diplomats, Members of Congress, and journalists will press for greater protections and for the capture and punishment of those who abuse or kill reporters. We cannot and we must not re-

main silent in the face of these purposeful atrocities.

Again, I thank Chairman BERMAN for his leadership on human rights issues and his support for the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act. I also offer my gratitude again to my colleague from Indiana, who has been such a leader on this issue.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the chairman of our Republican Conference, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Mr. PENCE is the primary cosponsor of this measure, and I hope that he takes the time to talk about our next bill, the Iran Sanctions Act, as well.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3714, the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act. I do so with a profound sense of privilege and gratitude to those who have gone before me on the floor today.

To Chairman BERMAN of California, to the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, your partnership on behalf of a free and independent press on the world stage should be an inspiration to every American looking on these proceedings.

I especially want to express my appreciation for the visionary leadership of Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, who brought this legislation and who invited us to partner in his vision for expanding awareness of the people of the United States and the people of the world of the repression of the free press. Congressman SCHIFF and I were elected in the same year. We have undoubtedly followed different paths and usually voted differently on things. We occasionally disagree, but we always agree on freedom and a free and independent press, and I commend the gentleman from California for his singular leadership on this issue and the privilege of working with him.

It is altogether fitting, as the gentleman referred earlier, though, that I should do so not only during this debate but also in anticipation of the debate on the next legislation, a bipartisan measure known as the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, to specifically point out the abuses of the regime in Iran and express my strong support for H.R. 2194 as well in the midst of this debate.

The reason why the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act has broad bipartisan support, and that will be reflected on the floor this day, is, among other reasons, the support for terrorism by Iran, the pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, the deception to the world community again and again. But to the point of this debate, it is also imperative that the people of the

United States of America send a message to Iran that the aggressive repression of a free press in Iran will not be tolerated in the form of normal relations with the United States of America either diplomatically or economically.

At this point, the Committee to Protect Journalists reports there are some 23 journalists in prison in Iran. Last week, we received word that another opposition newspaper was closed in Iran. And, of course, the world watched in horror in the aftermath of the blatantly fraudulent elections of this past June in Iran, as not only did the secret police stream into the streets to silence, oftentimes by billy club and violence, the dissidents, but we also watched in horror as the Internet was silenced, as YouTube videos were cut off, as access to the free flow of information was stymied by the brutality of the regime in Iran. So I endorse the legislation that will be brought up, but I see a nexus here between the two and can't help but reference it.

The legislation that Congressman SCHIFF and I have brought to the floor will serve two purposes:

Number one, it will remember the extraordinary sacrifice and courage of one Daniel Pearl, kidnapped and murdered by terrorists in Karachi, Pakistan just 4 months after the attacks of September the 11th, 2001. He was serving as a South Asia Bureau Chief for The Wall Street Journal that, at the time, was based in Mumbai, India. He went to Pakistan as part of an investigation into the alleged links between Richard Reid, the convicted would-be shoe bomber of American Airlines flight 63, and al Qaeda and Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency. Tragically, Mr. Pearl was brutally executed by his captors. The legislation today is named in his memory, and I hope his family may well be looking on today and know that his memory, his courage, and his example of what it means to advance the practice of journalism on the world stage will never be forgotten in this body.

But the legislation today is not simply a tribute. The Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act also will result in an effort to highlight and promote freedom of the press by including such reports in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices information.

□ 1445

As we consider this legislation, we remember Daniel Pearl's legacy, and we think of the stories of so many others on the front lines of freedom.

Gustavo Azocar is a political talk show host, newspaper correspondent and blogger in Venezuela, and he is a vocal critic of Hugo Chavez. Azocar was jailed in 2009 after posting information about his court case online. Amnesty International's 2009 "Report on Human Rights in Venezuela" noted the physical attacks and imprisonment of journalists by this corrupt and despotic regime.

As a conservative who believes in limited government, I believe the only check on government power in real-time is a free and independent press. I don't believe our Founders put the First Amendment, freedom of the press, in our Bill of Rights because they got good press. I believe it's because they believed in limited government and believed in the need to constrain consolidations of power.

A free and independent press ensures the free flow of information to the public. It serves as a vital check on such abuses during a time when the role of government in our lives and in our enterprises here at home seems to grow every day. Yet taking a stand today for the principle of a free press, not only home but in making the means available to hold the lamp of liberty high and to shine it deep into the crevices of this world to expose abuses of the freedom of the press, is a noble task, indeed. So I rise today in support of this legislation.

I commend Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their bipartisan leadership. I commend the gentleman from California, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, for his visionary leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

More importantly than that, I salute the bravery of reporters like Daniel Pearl and Gustavo Azocar and of press outlets around the world which, day in and day out, stand in the gap, oftentimes risking their liberty and, in the case of Daniel Pearl, in fact, risking his life to do the work of a free and independent press in the world.

I urge those in that service to stand firm, to take heart and to know that those of us in public life, that those of us in public service, also understand that those who serve in the world of journalism are also in the business of public service.

I urge this Congress to stand in solidarity with those on the front lines of the worldwide fight for the freedom of the press, and I urge support for the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act and for the legislation that will follow.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a cosponsor of this measure. I hope that he will address not only this resolution but the one that follows it, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding. I totally support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment to our Constitution is first for a reason. The items stated in the First Amendment—the right of freedom of religion, the right of freedom of speech and of a free press and the right to peaceably assemble—are in the First Amendment because they are the most important. Without those four, the rest of the amendments that follow are meaningless, especially the two which

deal with freedom of speech and with the freedom of press.

You will notice the amendment to our Constitution guarantees a free press. It does not guarantee a fair press, as "fair" is always in the eyes of the beholder; but it guarantees the right that a press may exist and communicate, first, through the written word about what is taking place in a free society, in a democracy, in a republic. Iran is a perfect example of a nation that does not believe in a free press or in a press of any kind. It does not want to have its illegitimate regime exposed to the world in order to let the world know what is taking place in that country.

We have all seen the students who protested last summer and, more recently, in the last week and a half. We have all seen how the regime in Iran blocked Internet access and blocked cell phone usage so that photographs of what took place could not be transmitted somewhere else. We have seen that journalists were hauled off to jail and were tried before the star chamber in secret and that some of them were sentenced to the penitentiary. Speech is silenced in Iran, both that of the oral word and the written word. A free press is the enemy of a dictator.

President Ahmadinejad is in defiance of world peace. He is determined to build nuclear weapons, and he is determined to build missiles that are capable of delivering those nuclear weapons. Of course, he has made those plans of his clear to destroy Israel and to be a constant threat to the West, especially to Europe and to the United States. He oppresses his own people. That is why those people, those young people, including journalists and reform clergy members, are opposing his legitimacy to be ruler over them.

My own opinion is that, in that nation, the more the world hears about what takes place there, the more the world will support the people of Iran and a regime change. I hope that we stand by the people of Iran, who desire to have self-determination and to rule their country in spite of their rogue dictator.

Of course, now before us today is another bill regarding sanctions of Iran. I, personally, am not a big fan of sanctions. Historically, they haven't worked. Some countries have always figured out a way to get around it. To me, sanctions usually mean that we kick the problem on down the road with the intention of maybe dealing with it later. However, preventing refined gasoline from getting to Iran is a good idea, and that is what this sanction that we will talk about later and vote on is all about. It may have the result of helping the people of Iran change their illegitimate government.

Mr. Speaker, dictators hate a free press, but a free press is essential to a free people whether those free people are in the United States or whether those free people are in the nation of Iran.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman. I will be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to add to the comments that my colleagues have made in their segue to the bill that follows the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act, which is the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

I am a strong supporter of this legislation. I commend my colleagues, Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, for their leadership on this issue.

One of the most serious threats facing our country is the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran. This is an oppressive regime, one that has threatened to wipe one of its neighbors off the map. The possession of a nuclear bomb by Iran is enormously dangerous in its own regard, but it is all the more destabilizing in its potential of starting a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

The President has offered carrots and the international community has offered carrots to Iran to step back from its pursuit of nuclear weapons. The Congress today takes an important step to make sure that there are sticks which are offered as well if Iran refuses the very generous offer by the international community to reprocess uranium—to provide it for peaceful energy purposes, to have Iran send its uranium out of the country so that it can be put in a form where it cannot be used for nuclear weapons.

This legislation, which will potentially crack down on Iran's ability to refine its petroleum, will put the most severe pressure on the Iranian regime to back away from a program that time and again we have seen it pursue, as much as it has declared to the contrary. So this legislation, I think more so than any other, will put teeth in a regime of sanctions, will put pressure on Iran to back away from its nuclear bomb-making efforts, and in so doing, will inure to the safety of our own country, to the safety of Israel and to the entire region.

So I thank the chairman for his leadership on this. I urge my colleagues to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time to talk about the problems of media control in Venezuela as ruled by Hugo Chavez.

As we know, there was a new intelligence report that outlined the schemes of Hugo Chavez, who is the supposed President of Venezuela, to control media. It is a sign of further deterioration of the freedom of expression, of democracy and of human rights in Venezuela under the Chavez rule.

He ratcheted up his rhetoric against free speech and against political opponents by shutting down broadcast stations across the country. These are as-

saults on the pillars of a democratic society, and they will continue unabated unless responsible nations stand up to Chavez and send a clear message to him and to others in the region that this behavior will not be tolerated.

There is a list that I would like to read of five journalists who were killed in Venezuela: Orel Sambrano of ABC de la Semana and Radio America, who was killed on January 16, 2009, in Valencia; Jorge Aguirre of Cadena Capriles, who was killed on April 5, 2006, in Caracas; Jorge Ibrain Tortoza Cruz, who was killed on April 11, 2002, in Caracas; Maria Veronica Tessari of Colombian Media, who was killed on January 15, 1993, in Caracas; and Virgilio Fernandez of El Universal, who was killed on November 27, 1992, in La Carlota, Venezuela.

Just a little while ago, the Committee to Protect Journalists gave us the news of a journalist who was critical of the Venezuelan Government. He was arrested on contempt of court charges. Journalist Gustavo Azocar was arrested with trumped-up charges. Azocar is the host of a news and political commentary show on local TV station Televisora del Tachira, and is a correspondent for the national daily El Universal in the western city of San Cristobal.

These are just more examples of the repression and suppression of free press by Hugo Chavez of Venezuela.

Mr. ENGEL. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes, I yield to the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, my good friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as she was mentioning Venezuela, quite wisely, I agreed with everything she said about the lack of freedom of the press and about the shutting down of opposition newspapers. Because the next bill we will be talking about involves sanctions against Iran, as Subcommittee chairman of the Western Hemisphere, I want to raise a concern about Venezuela, which arose at my October hearing, on Iran's role in the Western Hemisphere.

Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez recently agreed to provide 20,000 barrels per day of refined gasoline to Iran. It's anyone's guess as to whether this will be implemented, but the deal may be covered by the bill that we consider now and that we are considering next. While some question whether Venezuela has the ability to provide gasoline to Iran, since it imports some gasoline to meet its own domestic demand, President Chavez is clearly approaching a perilous area. I hope that Chavez reconsiders this unwise step.

I thank the gentlewoman, as always, for pointing out what is going on.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, he makes excellent points also about the tie-in between Chavez and Ahmadinejad as they seek

to suppress any dissidents and any free press.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3714, the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009. This legislation amends the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by expanding the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices to include information about freedom of the press in foreign countries and establishing a grant program to promote freedom of the press worldwide. I support this resolution because I believe that freedom of the press is an important pillar of democracy and should be actively promoted in our foreign policy.

I would like to first thank my colleague, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, for introducing this valuable legislation. Freedom of the press is essential to a functioning democracy. In 1823, Thomas Jefferson said, "The only security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted when permitted freely to be expressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to. It is necessary, to keep the waters pure." Unfortunately, the truth of that statement, which is codified in the United States Constitution, is not universally recognized and the freedom of the press is not universally protected.

In Iran, for example, the government assiduously monitors the press and journalists and media outlets face government repression if protocol is not followed. An Iranian journalist, Fariba Pajooh, has been detained since August of this year without being told of her charge. That is merely the tip of the iceberg: according to Reporters without Borders, since the June Presidential election, the Iranian government has arrested more than 100 reporters and sentenced those reporters to more than 65 years in prison.

Not coincidentally, those governments that refuse to recognize the freedom of the press are the same governments who have the most to fear from democracy. Governments that suppress, intimidate, or oppress journalists do so because their regimes do not have the full legitimacy that marks democratic governments. It is understandable but not forgivable that a government afraid of the destabilizing influence of the truth would restrict the press. The long-term best interest of any country is protected, though, when a country is allowed to know the truth about its government and the world.

H.R. 3714 provides the United States and the world with a powerful tool to advocate for freedom of the press. Under this legislation, the State Department will be required to include freedom of the press in the Annual Country reports on Human Rights Practices. The State Department will describe the positive and negative steps that governments have taken with regards to freedom of the press. Additionally, H.R. 3714 establishes a grant program whereby the U.S. State Department can fund activities by nonprofit and international organizations to strengthen independent journalism, promote laws protecting the freedom of the press, and provide training to professionalize journalists.

This legislation will raise the profile of freedom of the press around the world. By enumerating the abuses committed as well as the positive steps taken towards a free press, the

world will see plainly the status of democracy in every country. Additionally, it will allow the United States to help foster independent journalism in countries in every region that do not have the tradition or the capacity for a professional free press.

In addition to the foreign policy benefits, I support this legislation, because I believe that it is a fitting tribute to a great American, Daniel Pearl. Mr. Pearl was a Wall Street Journal correspondent who was abducted and beheaded in Karachi, Pakistan in early 2002. His life was spent in the pursuit of spreading truth through professional journalism and in his death he has become a symbol of the free press. This bill adds to the legacy he built with his life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3714, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1500

#### IRAN REFINED PETROLEUM SANCTIONS ACT OF 2009

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2194) to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2194

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illicit nuclear activities of the Government of Iran—combined with its development of unconventional weapons and ballistic missiles, and support for international terrorism—represent a serious threat to the security of the United States and U.S. allies in Europe, the Middle East, and around the world.

(2) The United States and other responsible nations have a vital interest in working together to prevent the Government of Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

(3) The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has repeatedly called attention to Iran's unlawful nuclear activities, and, as a result, the United Nations Security Council

has adopted a range of sanctions designed to encourage the Government of Iran to suspend those activities and comply with its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (commonly known as the "Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty").

(4) As a presidential candidate, then-Senator Obama stated that additional sanctions, especially those targeting Iran's dependence on imported refined petroleum, may help to persuade the Government of Iran to abandon its illicit nuclear activities.

(5) On October 7, 2008, then-Senator Obama stated, "Iran right now imports gasoline, even though it's an oil producer, because its oil infrastructure has broken down. If we can prevent them from importing the gasoline that they need and the refined petroleum products, that starts changing their cost-benefit analysis. That starts putting the squeeze on them."

(6) On June 4, 2008, then-Senator Obama stated, "We should work with Europe, Japan, and the Gulf states to find every avenue outside the U.N. to isolate the Iranian regime—from cutting off loan guarantees and expanding financial sanctions, to banning the export of refined petroleum to Iran."

(7) Major European allies, including the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, have advocated that sanctions be significantly toughened should international diplomatic efforts fail to achieve verifiable suspension of Iran's uranium enrichment program and an end to its nuclear weapons program and other illicit nuclear activities.

(8) The serious and urgent nature of the threat from Iran demands that the United States work together with U.S. allies to do everything possible—diplomatically, politically, and economically—to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

(9) The human rights situation in Iran has steadily deteriorated in 2009, as punctuated by the transparent fraud that occurred on June 12, 2009, the brutal repression and murder, arbitrary arrests, and show trials of peaceful dissidents, and ongoing suppression of freedom of expression.

(10) The Iranian regime has been unresponsive to, and at times contemptuous of, the Obama Administration's unprecedented and serious efforts at engagement, revealing that Tehran is not interested in a diplomatic resolution, as made clear, for example, by the following:

(A) Iran's apparent rejection of the Tehran Research Reactor plan, generously offered by the United States and its partners, of potentially great benefit to the Iranian people, and endorsed by Iran's own negotiators in October, 2009.

(B) Iran's ongoing clandestine nuclear weapons program, as evidenced by its work on the secret uranium enrichment facility at Qom, its subsequent refusal to cooperate fully with IAEA inspectors, and its announcement that it would build 10 new uranium enrichment facilities.

(C) Iran's ongoing arms exports and support to terrorists in direct contravention of United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(D) Iran's absurd claims that the West, and specifically the United States, have fomented the waves of anti-regime protests that followed the June 12, 2009, election in Iran.

(E) Iran's July 31, 2009, arrest of three young Americans on spying charges.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) international diplomatic efforts to address Iran's illicit nuclear efforts, unconventional and ballistic missile development programs, and support for international terrorism are more likely to be effective if the President is empowered with the explicit au-

thority to impose additional sanctions on the Government of Iran;

(2) the concerns of the United States regarding Iran are strictly the result of the actions of the Government of Iran;

(3) the revelation in September 2009 that Iran is developing a secret uranium enrichment site on an Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps base near Qom, which appears to have no civilian application, highlights the urgency for Iran to fully disclose the full nature of its nuclear program, including any other secret locations, and provide the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) unfettered access to its facilities pursuant to Iran's legal obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Iran's Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA;

(4) because of its involvement in Iran's nuclear program and other destabilizing activities, the President should impose sanctions, including the full range of sanctions otherwise applicable to Iran, on any individual or entity that is an agent, alias, front, instrumentality, representative, official, or affiliate of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps or is an individual serving as a representative of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, or on any person that has conducted any commercial transaction or financial transaction with such entities;

(5) Government to Government agreements with Iran to provide the regime with refined petroleum products, such as the September 2009 agreement under which the Government of Venezuela committed to provide 20,000 barrels of gasoline per day to Iran, undermine efforts to pressure Iran to suspend its nuclear weapons program and cease all enrichment activities; and

(6) the people of the United States—

(A) have feelings of friendship for the people of Iran; and

(B) hold the people of Iran, their culture, and their ancient and rich history in the highest esteem.

(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to prevent Iran from achieving the capability to make nuclear weapons, including by supporting international diplomatic efforts to halt Iran's uranium enrichment program;

(2) to fully implement and enforce the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 as a means of encouraging foreign governments to—

(A) direct state-owned entities to cease all investment in, and support of, Iran's energy sector and all exports of refined petroleum products to Iran; and

(B) require private entities based in their territories to cease all investment in, and support of, Iran's energy sector and all exports of refined petroleum products to Iran;

(3) to impose sanctions on—

(A) the Central Bank of Iran, and any other financial institution in Iran that is engaged in proliferation activities or support of terrorist groups, and

(B) any other financial institution that conducts financial transactions with the Central Bank of Iran or with another financial institution described in subparagraph (A).

including through the use of Executive Orders 13224, 13382, and 13438 and United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1737, 1747, 1803, and 1835;

(4) to persuade the allies of the United States and other countries to take appropriate measures to deny access to the international financial system by Iranian banks and financial institutions involved in proliferation activities or support of terrorist groups;