

and has held writing and art contests at high schools both in West Virginia and Virginia.

Through the foundation, Shelley Marshall will continue to touch the lives of people in need in West Virginia and around the country. I thank Donn Marshall and the couple's children, Drake and Chandler, for their commitment to helping others and for the worthwhile way they have preserved Shelley's memory.

The Washington Post wrote an article on January 22, 2004, about the Marshall Foundation, which I include for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 2004]

9/11 MONEY FUNDS A DREAM

MAN PLANS TRIBUTE TO WIFE LOST IN PENTAGON

(By Jacqueline L. Salmon)

SHEPHERDSTOWN, W. VA.—In the tiny townhouse he rents behind an office park, Donn Marshall unfurls an armful of papers on the living room couch. They are plans for a house to be built on land he has purchased nearby.

Modeled on an 18th-century Irish country house, it will have bedrooms for Marshall's two children, Drake and Chandler, and room for as many as six guests—everything that Marshall and his wife, Shelley, ever dreamed of.

But it will go ahead without her. Shelly Marshall, a Defense Intelligence Agency budget analyst, was among the 184 people who died Sept. 11, 2001, when terrorists flew an airplane into the Pentagon.

"I think it should be almost like a monument," Marshall said, as he smoothed wrinkles from the house plans. "In a sense, it's Shelley's money."

The Marshall family expects to receive about \$2 million from the federal fund created to compensate the injured and the families of the 2,976 people killed that day at the Pentagon and the World Trade Center in New York. Although the money will not take away the grief that has diminished only slightly in 2½ years, Marshall said it will free him to work full time on the charitable foundation he established in his wife's name—his way of fighting back.

The fund, established by Congress to protect the airlines from billion-dollar lawsuits, has reached the family of almost every victim. Fund administrator Kenneth R. Feinberg, a Washington lawyer, said that by last month's final deadline, 2,924 families—98 percent—had surrendered their right to sue the airlines in return for an average award of just under \$2 million.

But many who took the settlement wrestled with "survivor's guilt," said Larry Shaw, director of Northern Virginia Family Service, whose counselors are working with many families of Pentagon victims. "They felt that they were benefiting from the loss of someone they loved."

Shaw said family service counselors tell families that the settlement is part of their recovery process. "And part of the recovery is being able to fulfill some dreams that you had in your life," he said.

Shelley Marshall was a woman of passionate and varied interests. She put together family scrapbooks and hosted Victorian-style tea parties with her mother-in-law, Phyllis Marshall. She loved to spot hawks while out walking. Shortly before her death, she had begun to collect kickknacks decorated with dragonflies.

On Sept. 11, Shelly and Donn had commuted in separate cars to the Pentagon from

their then-home in Charles County, with Donn carrying the children. Together, they said goodbye to Drake and Chandler at the Pentagon day-care center. Then Shelley headed to her office in the southwest wing of the Pentagon, and Donn drove to his Crystal City office, where he also worked for the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Moments after the plane buried itself in the Pentagon, Donn drove back to the blazing structure to search frantically for his family. The children were unharmed. He couldn't find Shelley.

Three days later, he got the news that she was dead.

The words of a grief counselor who visited him resonated. "Give your sorrow meaning," he urged Marshall. "It was like he flipped a switch," Marshall recalled.

With his wife's retirement savings, he set up the Shelley A. Marshall Foundation. He has used the proceeds to organize dozens of intergenerational tea parties for elderly nursing home residents and high school students across the Washington area, where Shelley grew up, and in West Virginia, where his parents live.

He has also funded story hours at libraries in both places, set up writing contests at high schools and arranged high school art workshops to reflect the interests of his late wife. In all, the foundation has spent about \$60,000 on such events and plans to expand nationwide as well as overseas, where tea enthusiasts in Britain and Moscow are planning offshoots.

"I didn't want [Osama] bin Laden to have the last word on her life," Marshall, 39, said. "She died far too young, and I wanted her to be able to touch people."

All together, he figures, more than 5,000 people have participated in the foundation's activities.

"We can leave September 11 as a black day in history," Donn Marshall told guests at a fundraising tea party at the Pentagon City Ritz-Carlton in November, on what would have been Shelley's 40th birthday. "Or we can look at it as a day when something incredible started—and that's what we're trying to do."

The foundation work has drawn in family and friends. Shelley's mother, Nancy Farr, makes hundreds of cucumber sandwiches and shortbread for the nursing home parties. The work, Farr said, "is a blessing. Shelley will always be with us in our hearts, but other people know her because of the foundation."

Sometimes the work fends off Marshall's loneliness. Sometimes it doesn't. He believes that Shelley is still near. The signs are everywhere. The way the heat in his home clicks on when he asks her for a signal that she's present. A door that blows shut to remind him to take the children's coats to their school on a cold day. A dragonfly balloon from his son's birthday party that drifts into the bedroom and stops by his bed.

The signs comfort him—a little. "I know she's okay and that's huge," he said. "Now I just have to deal with not seeing her for a long time."

Shelley used to make a pot of tea each night for Donn, and he has taught himself to make tea the way she did. She had collected dozens of different kinds from her favorite tea shops—fragrant Oolongs, delicate "white" teas and black teas such as light-bodied Darjeeling and full-flavored Assams—and could recite their characteristics.

Last January, Marshall quit his job and moved his family to West Virginia to be closer to his parents in Martinsburg and Shelley's in Herndon. He said the compensation fund should support his family and put the children through college while he works full time on the foundation.

His next step is having their house built on 18 acres of woods and meadow that he bought

just outside Shepherdstown, a cozy town of 1,500.

"I'm going to get people to come up for the weekend," he said. "We'll have two to three different people at the dinner table, hopefully, on the weekends—my artist friends, politicians. I want a lot of people coming in and interesting the kids with their ideas—I think they should have an extraordinary life after what happened to them."

When Marshall came out to see the land for the first time, he heard a scream above him and looked up to see a hawk. It circled over his head.

"I said, 'Okay, this is the place.'"

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

VOTING RIGHTS FOR CITIZENS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the denial of voting rights to people in the District of Columbia who pay their

taxes every day and are fighting in Iraq, Afghanistan, and all around the world is finally sparking national attention, and even more important, it is sparking bills in the Congress. And bills not only from me and my side of the aisle, but I am pleased to note from my Republican friends.

Several Members are considering or have already put in bills to give voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia, and all of these are Republican bills and worth noting on this floor. On behalf of the people of the District of Columbia, I want to express my appreciation for these Members who have come forward with their own bills.

The first national interest comes, of course, from our "First in the Nation" primary. It was nonbinding, but that did not much matter. People came out in double the numbers they came out in the 2000 Presidential primary. And they came out because the primary was in part to cast a personal protest vote against paying taxes without representation here in the House, no representation in the Senate whatsoever, and yet serving as we have in our Armed Forces since our Nation was established, all without representation. Today, we are once again disproportionately represented in our Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The bills, however, are not about protest. They are about a remedy. I am still gathering signatures, and am grateful to Members who have signed on to my No Taxation Without Representation Act, and I will continue to do so. Indeed, this bill got out of committee in the Senate a couple of years ago, and I certainly have not given up on it. But I do want to come to the floor this afternoon to say I welcome bills, especially the bills by my Republican friends, and I am very encouraged and will continue to work with them until we get a bill that everybody can agree upon.

My own bill, of course, would give representation in the House and the Senate for the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), Chair of the Committee on Government Reform, which has oversight for the District of Columbia, is considering a bill that would have a House-only seat.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has long favored and often in the past put in bills for voting rights. His is a retrocession bill. D.C. would return to the State of Maryland, that is to say, if Maryland agreed, with Congress maintaining control over the Federal enclave.

And now the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has come forward with a bill that treats the District, for purposes of voting rights only, as Maryland citizens. District residents could vote in Maryland, could run for the Maryland Senate seats. We would remain an independent jurisdiction and there would be no retrocession.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has represented that he is considering a statehood bill. The problem with that, and I appreciate his interest, is that we had a vote on statehood in 1993, but the District had a grave financial problem and had to give back State costs, so we do not presently qualify to become a State.

We are asking for voting representation because every citizen qualifies for representation in her legislature. As long as the Federal Government takes the money of the people I represent every April 15, as long as we have men and women fighting and dying abroad, and today especially in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is simply intolerable for there to be unequal representation.

For my constituents, this is a pure and simple question of disparate treatment, inequality of treatment and discrimination. At a time when we are insisting on democracy not only in Iraq but everywhere we see, everywhere we go in the world, at some point people are going to point their fingers right at us and say, "Why do you not give the same democracy to the people who live closest to you, the people of your own Nation's capital?" To that, our only answer can be, "Duh?"

We do not have any answer. The fact that I have colleagues on the other side of the aisle, three of them, who have come forward with their own bills says to me that there is a gathering consensus that we can, in fact, move forward with a bill.

I am not going to abandon my bill at the moment. Ultimately all of these bills will come together, and I have no doubt that together we can find the solution to the last remaining and most intolerable scar on our democracy.

My thanks, finally and once again, to my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in a mood to lament what is going on in this House. The American people, I think, sometimes do not understand what it means to have one-party government. The United States right now is in the hands of one party from the Presidency through the Senate, right on through the House of Representatives. One party makes all of the decisions. That has a very strong effect on what happens around here. Issues that might raise questions if they are in the hands of the majority party are clearly not raised. If they are an issue of the minority party, who cares because the majority is running the place and there is really very little that the majority cannot do, from the way it has handled the Committee on Rules to the way it handles bills all up and down the line.

If it was just the processes of the House that I was depressed or upset about, that would be one thing. But there are huge issues that I think affect the American body politic. When people think about the Congress, there is often a saying, that people like their Congressperson, but they do not like Congress in general because of the things that they see happen here.

The first issue that brought this to my mind was the issue of the outing of a CIA agent by someone in the White House. I am not someone who is enamored of the CIA, but still someone who knows the importance of the CIA; and I believe that the protection of CIA agents is absolutely paramount. We cannot have an intelligence agency that is being exposed on every hand by anybody for any political purpose. The issue comes up, there is no outrage in this body.

We will give them \$40 billion more for the budget for that agency, but we will for political purposes out an agent anytime we feel it is politically, or some people will, anytime they think it is politically expedient. It obviously came from the White House, and we are several months down the road, and there is nothing happening. They have moved it now to a special prosecutor in Chicago. Why there, I do not know. Finally, the Attorney General felt he could not handle it; it was too hot to deal with in the Justice Department, so it is gone.

There are other things that happen here. We have intelligence leaks in the other body. There is no outrage anywhere. No one demands an inquiry because the man who did it apparently, we do not know, and it is not clear who did it, but it is clear there should be an investigation of an intelligence leak. It does not happen. Where is the outrage in this place? Is it only Democrats in the minority that feel outrage? Are there no Republicans who care about the intelligence agencies in this country that allow leaks, allow outing of agents?

The other thing that we do in this House is we deal with public policy,