

example that Rush Limbaugh has been to me, both as an entrepreneur and as an American. The truth is, he has been an inspiration to many millions of Americans. After Ronald Reagan left the national stage in 1988 and many of us conservatives were searching for a voice and for over 20 million Americans, that voice was and is Rush Limbaugh.

Now, I know something as a former radio professional about the formatics and my colleague (Mr. LEWIS) in the Chamber knows that in radio we learned pacing and how to hook the audience. We know the techniques, and no one is better in that than Rush Limbaugh, in my judgment. But it was not the formatics that drew the audience to Rush Limbaugh; it was not the gimmicks. It was information, verifiable fact and an undaunting willingness to speak the truth boldly.

Rush Limbaugh was not one of those in the media who, in effect, cowered behind that image of objectivity, hiding the fact that he had opinions, biases, beliefs, convictions; but, rather, he never feared being discovered to be an American of strong opinions. In fact, Rush Limbaugh never feared anything. I trust as he faces one of the great challenges of his life in a debilitating impact on his hearing, that that same courage, that same determination is being applied by Rush Limbaugh in the same way that his family is bathing his circumstances in prayer.

I close today, Mr. Speaker, simply by saying that Rush Limbaugh has made a difference in my life, and I say without apology that I believe he has made a difference in the life of the Nation. He has given us an example of a life that is about ideas larger than personal advancement, a life that tries to bring the reality of God's grace in each of our lives and in the history of this Nation before the citizenry every day.

My word to Rush is stay the course, encourage, tear down the strongholds, only be strong and courageous, do not be discouraged, for the Lord your God will go with you wherever you go.

TRIBUTE TO BEA GADDY: A POINT OF LIGHT, A BEACON OF HOPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American, Baltimore City Councilwoman Bea Gaddy, who a few days ago succumbed to breast cancer at the age of 68. For decades, Bea Gaddy fed and sheltered the poor and homeless in our city of Baltimore. In 1992, then President George Bush included her among Americans he honored as "Points of Light."

Upon learning of Bea Gaddy's death, Maryland Governor Parris Glendening observed that she "was a beacon of hope for those who felt hopeless." She had a unique ability to reach out and

help people. She effectively articulated that strong communities are created when we recognize that every member of the community is important.

Mr. Speaker, as the testaments of these national leaders witnessed, Bea Gaddy's vision for America transcended the divisions of race, class, and party that all too often limit our potential as a people. Her legacy was directed to those of us who have the ability to give, as well as to the thousands whom she helped to survive poverty. Every year, hundreds of volunteers and I joined Mrs. Gaddy for the Thanksgiving dinner she prepared for those who were homeless. As I watched her tireless and forever smiling generosity towards others, I realized that God had sent us an angel, that God was reminding us through her that every person has value.

Mrs. Gaddy used her own trials in life as a passport for helping others. Her love for other people, and especially for those in the greatest need, became a force for compassion and change throughout Baltimore and the rest of America. Our hearts go out to Mrs. Gaddy's family as we join them in mourning the loss of a truly remarkable human being.

Bea Gaddy challenged those who came to her caught in the grip of poverty to take control of their own destinies. She helped them to learn the skills of perseverance that would uplift their lives. Bea Gaddy also called upon those of us to whom life has been generous, asking that we share our fortunes and our lives with those who are less fortunate. Poor and rich alike, the people of Baltimore responded to her vision because of the conviction that she had gained from the trials in her life. As I stated at her funeral a few days ago, she fully understood that we are all the walking wounded, and that at some point in our lives, every single one of us will stand like the blind man on the corner of a busy highway waiting for someone to lead us across.

We knew that she herself had been born into poverty during the Great Depression. This remarkable woman had once been forced by her own childhood of poverty to scavenge for food from the garbage bins of restaurants and grocery stores. We, who knew and worked with Bea Gaddy, realized that her life had been filled with poverty and pain. We also knew, however, that she had transformed her life, completing high school, earning a college degree, and marrying a wonderful man named Mr. Lacy Gaddy, who died in 1995.

Bea Gaddy became known and beloved throughout Maryland for those wonderful annual Thanksgiving dinners that she provided to as many as 20,000 needy people. She was admired for her efforts to provide toys to the poor children at Christmastime, for distributing donated shoes and clothing in the winter months, and for the summer camp she helped to sustain. It is less well known, however, that many

of the people whom Bea Gaddy fed and encouraged there at her North Collington Avenue row home in Baltimore later returned to volunteer after they had become self-reliant members of the community. Mrs. Gaddy's life teaches us that a saint does more than minister to our needs; a saint also inspires by the witness of her life.

In 1999, Bea Gaddy took her mission on behalf of those whom America had left behind to the Baltimore City Council. During the last 2 years of her life, she continued to work in the community while advocating for housing, employment, and health care programs in the halls of Baltimore local government. We will hold her family in our prayers.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, 600,000 Americans will struggle to find shelter because they have no home to call their own. Nearly one-half of them will have work at jobs this week, but not have earned enough money to afford a home. By the legacy of the life of Bea Gaddy, she offered America a clear vision of compassion and commitment that can address this national tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, a great American is gone from our midst, but we have been empowered to carry on her work.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY SEEKS TO THREATEN MILITARY ACCESS TO RADIO FREQUENCIES AND THREATEN NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, even as I speak today, the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in combat operations to ensure the security of our people. However, the continued viability of some of the very weapons systems being used now is threatened by a concerted effort to reallocate portions of the radio frequency spectrum from the military to the commercial sector.

This effort is being led by the telecommunications industry, which is seeking access to additional frequencies to support development of advanced wireless services. They have vigorously argued that unless the Federal Government provides access to the 1755 through 1850 megahertz frequency band, the United States will forfeit its leadership of the worldwide telecommunications market.

Now, I do not pretend to know whether this claim is true or not, but I do know that forcing the military to give up this particular part of the frequency spectrum will have a significant negative effect on national security and will put our service members at greater risk.

The importance of this frequency band to the military cannot be understated. The DOD systems that operate on these frequencies are the very core

of our war-fighting capability. They include battlefield communications, precision weapons guidance, satellite control of over 120 military satellites, air combat training, and many other vital functions. The simple truth is that military access to the 1755 through 1850 megahertz frequency band is a matter of life and death.

Now, some have argued that the military should just move to another part of the frequency spectrum to carry on its functions. But let me be clear about this. The military did not just randomly decide to use these frequencies. The military uses this part of the frequency spectrum because the physical properties of these frequencies meet their unique operational requirements which cannot be compromised for any reason, but certainly not for something as trivial as advanced cell phones.

So, it is not just a simple matter of moving to another part of the frequency spectrum. We have to find frequencies that have comparable characteristics, which is something we have thus far failed to do.

But even if alternative frequencies are identified, the cost of modifying or replacing more than \$100 billion in equipment, not to mention the cost of retaining developing new tactics, is beyond comprehension. I therefore applaud the Secretary of Commerce's decision last week to no longer consider the majority of the 1755 through 1850 megahertz bands for reallocation. This was the right decision, but it could have gone further by permanently removing from consideration the entire 1755 through 1850 megahertz band. I remain very concerned that when we move beyond the current crisis the military will once again come under assault to relinquish these and other vital frequencies to the commercial sector.

So let the word go out to all concerned that we cannot and will not tolerate any attempt to restrict the military's access to the frequencies they need to carry on their missions. We have a solemn obligation to protect the people of the United States, and no argument from any special interest group will change that. So do not even think about asking for access to military frequencies. The answer is no and will stay no. Some of these huge giants should realize that.

MAINTAIN CONDITIONS OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO AZERBAIJAN IN CURRENT FORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to urge this Congress to maintain section 907 of the Freedom Support Act in its current form and oppose efforts to repeal this important provision of law.

Section 907 places reasonable conditions of U.S. assistance to the Govern-

ment of Azerbaijan until Azerbaijan has shown that it has taken demonstrable steps to cease all blockades and other offensive uses of force against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the administration is using the tragedies of September 11 and our Nation's war against terrorism as a way to convince Members of Congress of the need to waive these sanctions. Yesterday, members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations in both the House and the Senate received a letter from Secretary of State Colin Powell requesting "assistance in passing legislation that would provide a national security interest waiver from the restrictions of section 907." Secretary Powell continued by stating, "Removal of these restrictions will allow the United States to provide necessary military assistance that will enable Azerbaijan to counter terrorist organizations and elements operating within its borders. This type of assistance is a critical element of the United States fight against global terrorism."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this letter is unfortunate; and although I am not surprised, because the State Department has always opposed section 907, but it is particularly troubling to think that Secretary Powell would want to provide military assistance to Azerbaijan, a nation which has a history of aggression and blockades against Armenia and which continues to this day to make threats of renewed aggression against Nagorno Karabagh under the cover of the international war on terrorism.

Let me give some recent examples of these threats. Azerbaijani Defense Minister, Colonel General Abiev, was cited recently by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Caucasus Report as an advocate of renewed aggression against Nagorno Karabagh.

Radio Free Europe has also reported that Azerbaijani Foreign Minister Quliev has said that if Azerbaijan decides to liberate Karabagh from terrorists, then the international community would have no right to condemn that move as aggression.

Azerbaijani Parliamentarian Igbal-Agazadeh said that the time has come to start hostilities on the liberation of Azeri territories occupied by Armenia, a direct reference to a new war against Nagorno Karabagh.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, Azerbaijan does not share our understanding of this war on terrorism. The senior Azerbaijani leaders are telling us very plainly that they intend to use all of the means at their disposal, including apparently any and all military aid that we provide them in their antiterrorist war against the Armenian people.

□ 2015

Taking any steps to weaken, waive, or repeal Section 907 will give Azerbaijan the green light and the means to renew its aggression against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh.

In his letter, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Powell says Section 907 must be repealed so the Azerbaijani government can fight terrorist organizations in its own country. What the Secretary does not say is that there are credible reports that the Azerbaijani government invited bin Laden and his network into its country.

Given this information, the United States Government should carefully review its relationship with Azerbaijan and not reward it with repeal of Section 907. At a minimum, I believe U.S. interests are best served by insisting Azerbaijan arrest and turn over those involved in the al-Qaeda cells operating there with the government's approval since the early to mid-1990s. These cells threaten all of us in the United States, but Armenia in particular is on the front line of this battle.

To date Azerbaijan has done nothing to warrant repeal of Section 907, including continuing its war rhetoric, rejecting U.S.-European calls for cooperation with Armenia, rejecting specific proposals by Armenia for economic and regional cooperation, and backing away from the commitments made by Azerbaijani President Geidar Aliyev during peace negotiations this year in Paris and in Key West earlier in year.

Given the ongoing sensitive peace negotiations, efforts to weaken or repeal Section 907 only serve to legitimize Azerbaijan's immoral blockade and would make its position at the negotiating table even more intransigent.

Moreover, repeal of Section 907 is no way to reward Armenia's solidarity with America's campaign against international terrorism. Armenia's early response to the World Trade Center attack was to first assist American staff at our U.S. Embassy in Armenia's capital to ensure the Embassy's security.

Armenia's President, speaking on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty of the post-Soviet Commonwealth of Independent States, called for joint action against international terrorism. Armenia currently holds the rotating presidency in this six-member defense grouping. Armenia has also offered and the U.S. has already used Armenia's airspace. In addition, Armenia has offered intelligence-sharing and other unspecified offers of support.

There is no reason to repeal Section 907, and it would be a big mistake at this time, Mr. Speaker. Now more than ever the Congress has to uphold the fundamental and enduring U.S. principles of justice, democracy, and human rights.

THE RHODE ISLAND VICTIMS OF THE WORLD TRADE CENTER DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.