

Highway Division in 1995 to an active involvement in the group's Young Constructors Forum for students coming into the profession. He served from 1999–2001 as co-chairman of the National Quality Initiative, established by the Federal Highway Administration to ensure that the construction and maintenance of our interstates and national highways meets the highest possible standards. He has been an active member of the Transportation Information Program and Transportation California, groups that strive to ensure adequate resources are available for our state and federal highway systems.

Jim Waltze has served for the past two years as vice president and senior vice president for Associated General Contractors of America, and he will be installed on March 12 as the chairman of the national group. The contractors of California are proud to be represented by one of their own this year.

Mr. Speaker, the general contractors of America build our highways and airports, ports and dams, our military installations, government buildings and skyscrapers. Their dedication to excellence has helped our nation be the world's leader in quality construction, indeed in our quality of life. Visionary leaders like Jim Waltze continue to push the drive for excellence and innovation that will keep America the world leader into the future. Please join me in congratulating him and wishing him well as he takes the reins of the Associated General Contractors of America.

EMPLOYER SUPPORT OF THE  
GUARD AND RESERVE

**HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER**

OF IDAHO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, March 10, 2004*

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the enormous contribution to America's continuing freedom that is provided by employers who support our "citizen soldiers" in the Guard and Reserve.

In today's perilous world, each of us knows that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. The men and women of America's Guard and Reserve are the vanguard of that vigilance. They are clerks and cashiers, merchants and mechanics, doctors and lawyers. Most importantly, they are our friends and neighbors, our sons, daughters, fathers and mothers.

They represent the best among us. Along with the full-time members of our armed services, those volunteers help ensure that we all have the fullest opportunity to exercise the liberties for which generations of American heroes have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months we all have seen National Guard and Reserve units from our own states and districts called to active duty for the war on terrorism. We all have heard the public declarations of support for those activated troops and the families they leave behind. But the true measure of that support lies not in words but in actions. And there is no greater comfort for our Guard and Reserve personnel than the certainty that they will be able to return to their civilian jobs when they come home, and that their loved ones will continue receiving the benefits of that employment while they are gone.

The employers who provide those assurances, who guarantee the jobs and benefits of

America's Guard and Reserve personnel, should be counted among the heroes of the war on terrorism. They are shouldering an important part of the burden of defending our homeland from those who envy and despise us for the freedom to choose liberty, tolerance and diversity. America is blessed with employers who have the foresight to understand the great value of having a force of trained and qualified personnel ready to answer their nation's call to arms with the sure knowledge that they are appreciated and financially protected.

So I encourage my colleagues to join me, Mr. Speaker, in recognizing and applauding the essential role played by employer support of the Guard and Reserve, and the invaluable service they provide to the men and women who bear the weight of battle. The Three Star program launched by Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve committees across the country is one way to acknowledge the understanding and support of those employers who are enabling a new generation of American heroes to go into harm's way unencumbered by concerns for their families' financial well-being. They deserve our patronage, and our thanks.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ANNE HEPP

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, March 10, 2004*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay tribute today to Anne Hepp, a woman from my district who supplies an invaluable service as the Spanish language interpreter for the Montrose and Delta County Colorado courts. The honesty and integrity Anne brings to her job is matched only by the commitment and skill she brings to making sure that accurate and complete communications flow between the court and Spanish-speaking defendants. It is my pleasure to take this opportunity and thank Anne for the significant contributions she makes to her community and state.

The daughter of a French high school teacher, Anne's interest in linguistics began at an early age. Having many friends who spoke Spanish, Anne studied the language in middle and high school, even participating as a foreign exchange student in Mexico. With the large number of Spanish-speaking citizens in her community, Anne knew she could use her language skills to become an interpreter. Her great skills and dedication to the judicial system has earned high praise from judges, attorneys, and most especially the defendants she assists.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear Anne provides a vital service to her community and the judicial system, and I would like to recognize her contributions before this body of Congress and this nation today. I thank Anne for her continuing efforts and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

REGARDING A CONSTITUTIONAL  
AMENDMENT ON GAY MARRIAGE

**HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO**

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, March 10, 2004*

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, as Congress moves to consider a constitutional amendment banning gay marriage, I would like to take this opportunity to submit for the RECORD the following letter from a constituent of mine, whose words and sentiments are echoed by millions of Americans throughout the country. Though this letter was addressed to the members of the Massachusetts State Legislature, I believe the passion and conviction this mother has for the rights and privileges of her children, and her gay son in particular, is extremely relevant to the debate that we may soon have in the U.S. House of Representatives.

FEBRUARY 21, 2004.  
Members of the Massachusetts Legislature,  
*State House, Boston, MA.*

DEAR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES: I am the mother of four children. Our family values are evidenced by the concern they have for each other's well being. They are so alike in thought and deed that it continues to amaze me. They are outstanding, productive members of society and I am equally proud of all of them. However, passage of this discriminatory constitutional amendment will forbid my gay son from enjoying the same rights and privileges as his brother and sisters.

I implore you to vote no.  
Sincerely,

ELSIE FRANK.

Thank you Mr. Speaker and I urge all of my colleagues to heed the words of Mrs. Frank.

AN INDECENT ATTACK ON THE  
FIRST AMENDMENT

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, March 10, 2004*

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we will soon debate the "Broadcast Indecency Act of 2004" on the House floor. This atrocious piece of legislation should be defeated. It cannot improve the moral behavior of U.S. citizens, but it can do irreparable harm to our cherished right to freedom of speech.

This attempt at regulating and punishing indecent and sexually provocative language suggests a comparison to the Wahhabi religious police of Saudi Arabia, who control the "Commission for the Promotion of Virtue and Prevention of Vice." Though both may be motivated by the good intentions of improving moral behavior, using government force to do so is fraught with great danger and has no chance of success.

Regulating speech is a dangerous notion, and not compatible with the principles of a free society. The Founders recognized this, and thus explicitly prohibited Congress from making any laws that might abridge freedom of speech or of the press.

But we have in recent decades seen a steady erosion of this protection of free speech.

This process started years ago when an arbitrary distinction was made by the political left

between commercial and non-commercial speech, thus permitting government to regulate and censor commercial speech. Since only a few participated in commercial speech, few cared—and besides, the government was there to protect us from unethical advertisements. Supports of this policy failed to understand that anti-fraud laws and state laws could adequately deal with this common problem found in all societies.

Disheartening as it may be, the political left, which was supposed to care more about the first amendment than the right, has ventured in recent years to curtail so-called “hate speech” by championing political correctness. In the last few decades we’ve seen the political-correctness crowd, in the name of improving personal behavior and language, cause individuals to lose their jobs, cause careers to be ruined, cause athletes to be trashed, and cause public speeches on liberal campuses to be disrupted and even banned. These tragedies have been caused by the so-called champions of free speech. Over the years, tolerance for the views of those with whom campus liberals disagree has nearly evaporated. The systematic and steady erosion of freedom of speech continues.

Just one year ago we saw a coalition of both left and right push through the radical Campaign Finance Reform Act, which strictly curtails the rights of all Americans to speak out against particular candidates at the time of elections.

Amazingly, this usurpation by Congress was upheld by the Supreme Court, which showed no concern for the restrictions on political speech during political campaigns. Instead of admitting that money and corruption in government is not a consequence of too much freedom of expression, but rather a result of government acting outside the bounds of the Constitution, this new law addressed a symptom rather than the cause of special interest control of our legislative process.

And now comes the right’s attack on the first amendment, with its effort to stamp out “indecent” language on the airways. And it will be assumed that if one is not with them in this effort, then one must support the trash seen and heard in the movie theaters and on our televisions and radios. For social rather than constitutional reasons, some on the left express opposition to this proposal.

But this current proposal is dangerous. Since most Americans—I hope—are still for freedom of expression of political ideas and religious beliefs, no one claims that anyone who endorses freedom of speech therefore endorses the nutty philosophy and religious views that are expressed. We should all know that the first amendment was not written to protect non-controversial mainstream speech, but rather the ideas and beliefs of what the majority see as controversial or fringe.

The temptation has always been great to legislatively restrict rudeness, prejudice, and minority views, and it’s easiest to start by attacking the clearly obnoxious expressions that most deem offensive. The real harm comes later. But “later” is now approaching.

The failure to understand that radio, TV, and movies more often than not reflect the peoples’ attitudes prompts this effort. It was never law that prohibited moral degradation in earlier times. It was the moral standards of the people who rejected the smut that is now routine entertainment. Merely writing laws and threat-

ening huge fines will not improve the moral standards of the people. Laws like the proposed “Broadcast Indecency Act of 2004” merely address the symptom of a decaying society, while posing a greater threat to freedom of expression. Laws may attempt to silence the bigoted and the profane, but the hearts and minds of those individuals will not be changed. Societal standards will not be improved. Government has no control over these standards, and can only undermine liberty in its efforts to make individuals more moral or the economy fairer.

Proponents of using government authority to censor certain undesirable images and comments on the airwaves resort to the claim that the airways belong to all the people, and therefore it’s the government’s responsibility to protect them. The mistake of never having privatized the radio and TV airwaves does not justify ignoring the first amendment mandate that “Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech.” When everyone owns something, in reality nobody owns it. Control then occurs merely by the whims of the politicians in power. From the very start, licensing of radio and TV frequencies invited government censorship that is no less threatening than that found in totalitarian societies.

We should not ignore the smut and trash that has invaded our society, but laws like this will not achieve the goals that many seek. If a moral society could be created by law, we would have had one a long time ago. The religious fundamentalists in control of other countries would have led the way. Instead, authoritarian violence reigns in those countries.

If it is not recognized that this is the wrong approach to improve the quality of the airways, a heavy price will be paid. The solution to decaying moral standards has to be voluntary, through setting examples in our families, churches, and communities—never by government coercion. It just doesn’t work.

But the argument is always that the people are in great danger if government does not act by: (a) Restricting free expression in advertising; (b) claiming insensitive language hurts people, and political correctness guidelines are needed to protect the weak; (c) arguing that campaign finance reform is needed to hold down government corruption by the special interests; (d) banning indecency on the airways that some believe encourages immoral behavior.

If we accept the principle that these dangers must be prevented through coercive government restrictions on expression, it must logically follow that all dangers must be stamped out, especially those that are even more dangerous than those already dealt with. This principle is adhered to in all totalitarian societies. That means total control of freedom of expression of all political and religious views. This certainly was the case with the Soviets, the Nazis, the Cambodians, and the Chinese communists. And yet these governments literally caused the deaths of hundreds of millions of people throughout the 20th Century. This is the real danger, and if we’re in the business of protecting the people from all danger, this will be the logical next step.

It could easily be argued that this must be done, since political ideas and fanatical religious beliefs are by far the most dangerous ideas known to man. Sadly, we’re moving in that direction, and no matter how well intended the promoters of these limits on the

first amendment are, both on the left and the right, they nevertheless endorse the principle of suppressing any expressions of dissent if one chooses to criticize the government.

When the direct attack on political and religious views comes, initially it will be on targets that most will ignore, since they will be seen as outside the mainstream and therefore unworthy of defending—like the Branch Davidians or Lyndon LaRouche.

Rush Limbaugh has it right (at least on this one), and correctly fears the speech police. He states: “I’m in the free speech business,” as he defends Howard Stern and criticizes any government effort to curtail speech on the airways, while recognizing the media companies’ authority and responsibility to self regulate.

Congress has been a poor steward of the first amendment. This newest attack should alert us all to the dangers of government regulating freedom of speech—of any kind.

---

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ELLEN  
ROBERTS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 10, 2004*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor Ellen Roberts for her selfless dedication to the community of Durango, Colorado, and congratulate her on being recognized by the Durango Chamber of Commerce as their 2003 Athena Award Winner. The Athena Award is presented to a woman each year who has shown a commitment to helping other women realize their business goals. Ellen could not be a more worthy recipient. It is a privilege to pay tribute to Ellen for her well-deserved award, and her ongoing efforts to better her community today.

Ellen’s interest in community service can be traced back to her college days where she created her own major at Cornell University in environmental policy. Since Ellen moved to Durango, in 1981, she has been actively involved in the community. Her involvement includes serving as Chairman of the Mercy Medical Center Board of Directors; and on the board for the First National Bank of Durango; and sitting on the Citizens Health Advisory Council; and sitting on the Citizens Steering Committee for a New Library.

It is my privilege to recognize Ellen before this body of Congress and this nation for the recognition she received by the Durango Chamber of Commerce as the Athena Award Winner. She has done much to improve the lives of her community and I wish her continuing success in all her endeavors.

---

FRED DOWNS, JIM MAYER NAMED  
DAILY POINTS OF LIGHT AWARD  
WINNERS

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 10, 2004*

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, the Points of Light Foundation singled out two career employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for recognition as a Daily Point of