

movement quickly led to her promotion to office manager. She joined the Office and Professional Employees International Union Local 11 and was an energetic advocate for office secretaries as part of OPEIU's executive committee.

Though she had no experience with the labor movement prior to joining the Northwest Oregon Labor Council, Judy became a tireless activist for union causes. She volunteered for political campaigns, coordinated the council's Speakers in the Schools program, and appeared before the Oregon legislature to testify for improved job safety. She also graduated from Union Counselor course at Labor's Community Service Agency and served as chair of the IBEW and United Worker's Federal Credit Union.

In 1998, Judy was the first woman elected to the position of the Northwest Oregon Labor Council's executive secretary-treasurer, heading the largest central labor council in Oregon. During her tenure as executive secretary-treasurer, she has led over 100 constituent unions in promoting workers' rights through times of economic growth and decline.

Judy will be retiring in September and plans to return to Montana, where she was raised. Oregon will be losing an important voice for workers, but I hope that Judy is able to have some well-earned relaxation. I want to thank her for her service to the labor community here in Oregon and wish her and her family all the best.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 2009

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 594, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

KOREAN WAR VETERANS RECOGNITION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 2009

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 2632 which encourages the display of the American flag on July 27 honoring National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day.

I want to commend Mr. CHARLES RANGEL of New York for introducing this important resolution further promoting the national recognition of the veterans who fought valiantly in the Korean war. I would also like to recognize the cosponsors for their strong support of House Resolution 2632.

From June 25, 1950, to July 27, 1953, American troops were involved in heavy combat on the Korean peninsula against the invading forces of North Korea and the People's Republic of China. For 3 grueling years, our troops battled alone many other nations' troops in defending the peninsula from being enveloped wholly by communism.

Today, there are roughly 2.3 million veterans still alive today. These men have served our

country at its time of greatest need and have protected our Nation's best interests. It is imperative that our Nation recognizes the service of these veterans and we must honor them with the raising of the American flag on July 27.

As a Vietnam war veteran myself, I personally appreciate the service of my fellow servicemen of the United States Armed Forces. I realize that the sponsor and my good friend Mr. CHARLES RANGEL is also a veteran of the Korean war. He courageously led troops behind enemy lines for 3 days instead of surrendering to the enemy. It is necessary that we honor and remember many of those who fought bravely alongside my good friend. It is important that my fellow veterans from the Korean war are given the utmost respect for their valor and courage.

I would like to once again, thank Mr. CHARLES RANGEL and the cosponsors for creating and supporting this piece of legislation honoring the veterans of the Korean war by raising the American flag on July 27. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE AP- PROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 2009

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as a former judge who has had the misfortune of observing the life-shattering effects of crimes of sexual violence on the victims as well as their friends and families, I rise today to highlight the importance of the National Sexual Assault Hotline programs in supporting the victims in their recovery from these terrible crimes. An estimated 1 in 6 women will become a victim of sexual assault or rape in her lifetime; and the FBI ranks rape as the second most violent crime (second only to murder, which is classified as the most violent crime).

According to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), which conducts an annual crime survey of the nation's households, we have made some progress in the fight to end sexual and domestic violence over the last two decades. But statistics also suggest that we still have much work to do: at least 200,000 Americans are sexually assaulted each and every year, and only about 40 percent of rape victims ever come forward and report the attacks against them to the authorities, according to DOJ.

Research suggests that those who receive crisis intervention support and counseling services are more likely to cooperate with law enforcement in pressing charges against their attackers. That is why it is so important that we continue to support programs, such as the National Sexual Assault Hotline programs, which help ensure that rape victims (as well as their friends and family members) can receive the information and support services that are so vitally important in one's full recovery from an assault. The National Sexual Assault Hotline, accessible toll free around the clock at 800-656-HOPE, has helped more than 1.2 million callers since the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN) created the telephone hotline in 1994. RAINN continues to operate this telephone hotline today, in partner-

ship with close to 1,100 affiliated rape crisis centers located in every state and the District of Columbia, as well as thousands of volunteers across the nation.

In 2006, RAINN also launched the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline, accessible at www.RAINN.org, which has helped close to 30,000 people since its inception. It is the first web-based hotline of its kind for rape victims, offering information and support to those who might be reluctant to pick up the telephone and dial for help. The online hotline, which RAINN created and operates with the assistance of staff at its headquarters in Washington, D.C. and volunteers located around the nation, is designed to reach additional populations (particularly teenagers, males, and even people living in rural, sparsely populated areas) who might not otherwise seek out necessary information and support.

Our colleagues in the Senate specifically recommended \$300,000 for RAINN to carry out the National Sexual Assault Hotline programs, which are federally authorized under Section 628 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, in fiscal year 2010. Appropriations leaders in this chamber, however, omitted to include a specific amount of funding for RAINN in the House version of the fiscal year 2010 Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (H.R. 2847).

I will note, however, that the full House Appropriations Committee, during its consideration of H.R. 2847, did approve report language that is directed specifically at RAINN. This language, which is part of House Report 111-149, calls on the U.S. Department of Justice to continue supporting programs, including hotline programs, that facilitate the delivery of confidential recovery services to rape victims. The inclusion of this committee report language is significant, as it signals Congress' intention that victims of sexual violence should continue to be able to access the National Sexual Assault Hotline programs and the other programs that Congress has authorized RAINN to carry out, with the support of the Office of Justice Programs at the U.S. Department of Justice.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the members of the Appropriations Committee for accepting this report language, at the request of myself, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and other members of this chamber. I also want to express my interest in continuing to work with the House and Senate leadership on a final version of the Commerce, Justice Appropriations Act that will ensure that RAINN receives the level of federal support that is necessary to continue operation of the National Sexual Assault Hotline programs in fiscal year 2010.

HONORING MARGARET SANGER

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 2009

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to submit an article highlighting the life and work of Margaret Sanger authored by Dr. Ellen Chesler, distinguished lecturer at Hunter College of the City University of New York and Director of the Eleanor Roosevelt Initiative on Women and Public Policy.

Margaret Sanger, who lived from 1879 to 1966, was a nurse, educator, birth control pioneer, women's health activist, and founder of the American Birth Control League which eventually became Planned Parenthood.

Her commitment to improving the health and lives of women was a testament to her belief that all women are entitled to basic health care and the ability to plan their pregnancies, and ultimately control their own destiny.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to recognize Margaret Sanger for her tireless efforts on behalf of women and for fighting for those unable to fight for themselves.

MARGARET SANGER—SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By Ellen Chesler)

Birth control pioneer Margaret Sanger went to jail in 1917 for distributing simple contraceptives to immigrant women from a makeshift clinic in a tenement storefront in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, New York. When she died nearly fifty years later, the cause for which she defiantly broke the law had achieved international stature, and she was widely eulogized as one of the great emancipators of her time.

A visionary thinker, relentless agitator, and gifted organizer, Sanger lived just long enough to savour the historic 1965 US Supreme Court decision in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which established privacy protections as a framework for legalizing basic reproductive rights. Elderly and frail, she watched Lyndon Johnson finally incorporate family planning into US public welfare and foreign policy programs. She saw the birth control pill developed and marketed by a team of doctors and scientists she had long encouraged and found the money to support. She saw a global family planning movement descend from her own international efforts.

The years since have not been as good to Sanger's reputation, even as they have witnessed measurable progress for women in achieving reproductive freedom. Today, outside of a small minority of countries in sub-Saharan Africa and in parts of the Muslim world that are now high-profile exceptions to the global norm, a typical woman bears no more than two children over the course of several years and spends another 30 to 40 years avoiding pregnancy. More than 60 million women around the world use oral contraception daily, a dramatic increase since organized interventions began. The right of women to plan their families remains at least for the time being enshrined in the US constitution and in international human rights law, where it is widely recognized as a necessary condition to improve women's status, and in turn to sustain democratic institutions, promote social and economic progress, and help sustain fragile environments.

Still, universal standards for women's human rights offer no sure cure for violations that persist with uncanny fortitude and often unimaginable cruelty in so many places around the world. Harsh fundamentalisms are resurgent in many countries, where women's bodies remain an arena of intense political conflict, as a perhaps predictable response to the social dislocations resulting from changing gender roles and to the larger assaults on traditional cultures from the many real and perceived injustices of modernization and globalization. Even back at home in the United States, decades of substantial progress by women have fuelled a fierce backlash.

With an intensity that few would have predicted in 1992 when Bill Clinton was elected as America's first pro-choice president, a powerful conservative minority has eroded

abortion rights along with funding for family planning at home and abroad, while dollars have surged instead for abstinence programs known to be ineffective and often harmful. We have tolerated the impunity of daily campaigns of intimidation and outright violence against courageous providers of contraception and abortion, culminating most recently in the tragic assassination of Dr. George Tiller of Kansas. Planned Parenthood affiliates have been repeatedly targeted, and Sanger herself has become a collateral victim of this frenzy, her reputation savaged by opponents who deliberately misrepresent the history of birth control and circulate scurrilous, false accusations about her on the Internet.

A particularly harsh example of this campaign of distortion and outright misrepresentation came in response to recent Congressional testimony by U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. Secretary Clinton was chastised for her unwavering support of comprehensive sexual and reproductive health rights and services for women and for having accepted with pride the highest honour of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, its Margaret Sanger Award, a prize bestowed in the past on some of this country's most distinguished supporters of reproductive justice, beginning with the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

This statement is offered in response to false accusations about Margaret Sanger made on that occasion. It investigates Sanger's core beliefs and major contributions and reexamines, in the face of so much continued controversy, her unquestioning confidence in the power of medicine and science to shape human conduct and alleviate suffering, a confidence that fuelled her interest in trying to make birth control serve as a tool of both individual liberation and social betterment.

SANGER'S CONTRIBUTION AND LEGACY

Margaret Sanger's fundamental contribution was in claiming every woman's right to experience her sexuality freely and bear only the number of children she desires. Following in the footsteps of a first generation of educated women who had proudly forgone marriage in order to seek fulfilment outside the home, she offered birth control as a necessary condition to the resolution of a broader range of personal and professional satisfactions. The hardest challenge in introducing her to modern audiences, for whom this claim has become routine, is to explain how absolutely destabilizing it seemed in her own time.

Even with so much lingering animus toward changes in women's lives around the world, it is difficult to inhabit an era in our own history when sexuality was considered more an obligation of women than an experience from which to derive contentment, let alone pleasure. It is hard to remember that well into Sanger's own time motherhood was accepted as a woman's principal purpose and primary role. It is even harder to fathom that American women just a century ago, were still largely denied identities or rights of their own, independent of those they enjoyed by virtue of their relationships with men, and that this principle was central to the enduring opposition they encountered in seeking access to full rights of inheritance and property, to suffrage, and most especially to birth control. This unyielding principle of male "coverture" defined women's legal identities even with respect to physical abuse in the family, which the U.S. Supreme Court condoned in 1910, denying damages to a wife injured by violent beatings on the grounds that to do so would undermine the peace of the household.

Re-examining this history in the context of the recent expansion of civil and human

rights to incorporate women's rights underscored Sanger's originality as a feminist theorist who first demanded civil protection of women's claims to reproductive liberty and bodily integrity, in and outside of marriage. As a result of private arrangements and a healthy trade in condoms, douches, and various contraptions sold largely under the subterfuge of feminine hygiene, the country's birth rate began to decline long before she came on the scene. But it was she who invented "birth control" as a comfortable, popular term of speech, and in so doing gave the practice essential public and political currency. It was she who first recognised the far-reaching consequences of bringing sexuality and contraception out in the open and claiming them as fundamental women's rights. She won legal protection for birth control, and by winning scientific validation for specific contraceptive practices, she also helped lift the religious shroud that had long encased reproduction in myth and mystery, thereby securing medical and social science institutions—as much as houses of worship—as arbiters of sexual behaviours and values. And from this accomplishment, which many still consider heretical, a continuing controversy has ensued.

When Sanger opened her clinic and deliberately staged an arrest in 1916, she challenged anachronistic obscenity laws that remained on the books as the legacy of the notorious anti-vice crusader, Anthony Comstock, whose evangelical fervour had captured late 19th century Victorian politics and led to the adoption by the states and federal government of broad criminal sanctions on sexual speech and commerce, including all materials related to contraception and abortion. Her critique, however, was not just of legal constraints on obscenity, but also of legal constraints on women's place. In this respect, she also helped inaugurate a modern women's rights movement that moves beyond traditional civil and political claims of liberty to embrace social and cultural ones. She understood that to advance women's rights it is necessary to address—and the state has an obligation to protect—personal as well as public spheres of conduct. It must establish broad safeguards for women and intervene to eliminate everyday forms of discrimination and abuse.

FROM THE PAST TO THE PRESENT

Observing the contorted politics of sexuality in recent years only reinforces one's sympathy for Margaret Sanger's predicament as a wildly polarizing figure in her own day and clarifies the logic of her decision after World War I to mainstream her movement by identifying reproductive freedom, not just as a woman's right, but also as a necessary foundation for broader improvements in public health and social welfare. Her decision to adopt the socially resonant content of "family planning" over birth control, when the Great Depression encouraged attention to collective needs over individual ones and when the New Deal created a blueprint for bold public endeavours, was particularly inventive, and in no way cynical. Nor as some of her harshest critics have since have charged, did she ever define family planning as right of the privileged, but as a duty or obligation of the poor, any more than we do so today when we call for increased public expenditure on it as a matter of simple justice.

To the contrary, Sanger showed considerable foresight in lobbying for voluntary family planning programs to be included among the benefits of any sound public investment in social security. Had the New Deal included public health and access to contraception in its social welfare package, as most

European countries were then doing, protracted conflicts over welfare and healthcare policy in the years since in the United States might well have been avoided. Where she went wrong was only in failing to anticipate the force of the opposition her proposal would generate from a coalition of religious conservatives of her own day, including urban Catholics and rural fundamentalist Protestants to whom Roosevelt Democrats became captive, much as Republicans have become in recent years.

What is a good deal harder to deconstruct and understand is Sanger's engagement with eugenics during these years, the then still widely respectable and popular intellectual movement that addressed the manner in which biology and heredity affect human intelligence and ability. Like many well-intentioned secularists and social reformers of her day, Sanger took away from Charles Darwin the essentially optimistic lesson that men and women's common descent in the animal kingdom makes us all capable of improvement, if only we apply the right tools. Eugenics, in the view of most prominent progressive thinkers of this era, from university presidents, to physicians and scientists, to public officials, held the promise that merit would replace birthright and social status as the standard for mobility in a democratic society.

In this respect, the most enduring bequest of eugenics is standard IQ testing. Its most damning and unfathomable legacy is a series of state laws upheld by a 9 to 1 progressive majority of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1929, including Justices Oliver Wendell Holmes and Louis Brandeis, who in the landmark decision of *Buck v. Bell* authorized the compulsory sterilization of a poor young white woman with an illegitimate child, on grounds of feeble-mindedness that were never clearly established. This decision, incidentally, was also endorsed by civil libertarians such as Roger Baldwin and civil rights advocates, including W.E.B. DuBois of the NAACP, both of whom Sanger counted among her supporters and friends.

For Sanger eugenics was meant to begin with the voluntary use of birth control, but many conservative eugenicists of the day actually opposed the practice on the grounds that the fit should procreate. Sanger countered by disdaining what she called a 'cradle competition' of class, race or ethnicity. She publicly opposed immigration restrictions which grew out of conservative interpretations of a eugenics that reinforced racial and ethnic stereotypes she opposed. She framed poverty as a matter of differential access to resources, including birth control, not as the immutable consequence of low inherent ability or poor character, a view some conservative eugenicists embraced. She argued for broad government safety nets for social welfare and public health, including access to safe and reliable contraception. And she proudly marshalled clinical data to demonstrate that most women, even among the poorest and least educated populations, embraced and eagerly used birth control voluntarily, when it was provided them.

At the same time, however, Sanger did on occasion engage in shrill rhetoric about the growing burden of large families among individuals of low intelligence and defective heredity. Her language had no intended racial, ethnic, or class content. She argued that all women, no matter where they are situated, should be encouraged to bear fewer, healthier children, but her words have since been lifted out of context and tragically misquoted to provoke exactly the kind of intolerance she opposed. Moreover, in endorsing the Supreme Court's decision about compulsory sterilization, and also on several occasions the payment of pensions or bonuses to

women of low intelligence who would with this inducement agree to the procedure, Sanger quite clearly failed to consider the fundamental rights questions raised by such practices or the validity of the aptitude assessments on which determinations of low intelligence were based. Living in an era indifferent to the firm obligation to respect and protect the rights of individuals whose behaviours do not always conform to prevailing mores, she did not always fulfil it.

The challenge for historians has been to reconcile these apparent contradictions in her views. Sanger was actually an unusually advanced thinker on race for her day, one who condemned discrimination and encouraged reconciliation between blacks and whites. She opened an integrated clinic in Harlem in the early 1930s and then facilitated birth control and maternal health programs for rural black women in the south, when local white health officials denied them access to the New Deal's first federally funded services . . . She worked on this project with the behind the scenes support of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose progressive views on race were well known but whose support for birth control was silenced by her husband's Catholic political handlers, at least until he was safely ensconced in the White House for a third term. Historically specific circumstances of this complexity, however, are hard to untangle and convey, and this in large part explains why Sanger's legacy has been so easily distorted by contemporary abortion opponents who believe they can advance their own ideological and political agendas by undermining her motives and her character.

America's intensely complicated politics of reproduction has long ensnared Margaret Sanger and all others who have tried to discipline it. Birth control has fundamentally altered private and public life over the past century. No other issue has for so long captivated our attention or polarized our thinking. As the psychologist Erik Erikson once provocatively suggested, no idea of modern times, save perhaps for arms control, more directly challenges human destiny, which alone may account for the profound social conflict it tends to inspire.

As many scholars of the subject in recent years have also observed, much of the controversy around birth control proceeds as well from the plain fact that reproduction is by its very nature experienced individually and socially at the same time. In claiming women's fundamental right to control their own bodies, Sanger always remained mindful of the dense fabric of cultural, political, and economic relationships in which those rights are exercised. And almost, if obviously not always, the policies she advocated were intended to facilitate the necessary obligation of public policy to balance individual rights of self-expression with the sometimes contrary social and political obligation to promulgate and enforce common mores, rule, and laws.

That Margaret Sanger failed to get this balance quite right in one important respect is certainly worthy of respectful disagreement and commentary, but it is no reason to poison her reputation or to abandon the noble cause of reproductive freedom to which she so courageously and indefatigably dedicated her life.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 2009

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of the Fiscal Year 2010 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

(1) \$750,000 for the M Street SE Grade Separation Project Requesting Entity: City of Auburn, 25 West Main Street, Auburn, WA 98001

Agency: Federal Highway Administration
Account: Surface Transportation Priorities
Funding Requested by: Rep. DAVE REICHERT

Project Summary: This request will allow the City to complete right of way acquisition. Once completed, the grade separation will provide indirect economic benefits to the regional Ports of Seattle and Tacoma, and the BNSF railroad; it will also allow continued growth and increased economic impact, which will proportionally increase the number of jobs in the region.

FINANCE PLAN:

Funding Source	Tracking (million)	Anticipated (million)	Secured (million)
City of Auburn			2.2
FY08 Appropriations			0.12
City of Auburn—PWFF	\$2.00		
2010 Appropriations	4.60		
FMSIB—State Funds			6.00
City of Auburn		\$1.20	
BNSF		1.10	
Ports		1.50	
TIB	2.00		
Federal STP Grant	1.70		
Total	10.3	3.8	8.3

Funding Need per Phase:

Phase	Dates	Projected cost (million)
Design and Environmental	10/8 to 1/10	\$2.4
Right-of-Way Acquisition	2/10 to 2/11	4.6
Construction	5/11 to 10/12	15.4
Total		22.4 million

(2) \$360,000 for the SE King County Commuter Rail and Transit Centers Feasibility Study

Requesting Entity: City of Covington, 16720 SE 271st St., Suite 100, Covington, WA 98042, and

City of Maple Valley, 22035 SE Wax Road, Maple Valley, WA 98038

Agency: Federal Transit Administration
Account: Alternatives Analysis
Funding Requested by: Rep. DAVE REICHERT

Project Summary: This project is a feasibility study for bringing commuter rail to one of the fastest growing areas in Southeast King County, Washington. A five-city coalition has formed to study the feasibility of utilizing existing infrastructure to handle the expected traffic growth, and to explore whether small commuter trains could run between Maple Valley-Covington-Auburn on the Burlington Northern Stampede Pass Line. Arriving in Auburn, commuters could connect with the Sounder trains and Metro bus service into Kent, Seattle, and Bellevue. The feasibility study will examine the