

and refugees. However, the President and Secretary of State have indicated that it does not undermine the fundamental requirement that all issues be mutually agreed upon in final status negotiations.

The problem right now is that Israel has no reliable Palestinian partner capable of negotiating a final status agreement. Israel's disengagement plan responds to the void left by the failure of the current Palestinian leadership to lead. I would also suggest that the Israeli disengagement initiative is in the interests of Israelis and Palestinians alike. It will help Palestinians to take concrete moves to establish a democratic state, and it will help preserve both the Jewish and democratic character of Israel over the long term while contributing to its security.

It is also important to remember that policy articulated in the President's letter is consistent with the peace negotiations initiated by President Clinton at Camp David. Those negotiations took into account the fact that the Palestinian claim to an open-ended right of return would be demographically untenable for Israel's future as a Jewish state. The Clinton negotiations also operated on the premise that the final settlement negotiated in accordance with UN Resolutions 242 and 338 would involve mutually agreed-upon adjustments to the 1949 armistice lines to provide Israel with secure, recognized, and defensible borders that reflect demographic realities and to provide the Palestinians with territory for their own state.

By passing this resolution today and expressing its support for the April 14 letter and the disengagement plan, I believe Congress can help show its support for an enduring and sustainable peace settlement in the Middle East.

Months of cooperation and shuttle diplomacy between Washington and Jerusalem led to a White House meeting on April 14th, 2004 and an historic agreement between President Bush and Prime Minister Sharon on some of the most important issues in the conflict. That agreement was included in a letter the President sent to Prime Minister Sharon, enunciating a number of principles that are specifically referenced in the resolution before this House today, among them: The need for Israel to have defensible borders that reflect demographic realities; the need for Palestinian refugees to understand that they will not be returning to Israel; the need for Palestinians to end their campaign of terror and for Israel to have the ability to defend itself against that terror.

H. Con. Res. 460 strongly endorses the principles articulated in the April 14th letter and sends a strong, bipartisan show of support for that agreement.

These principles are clearly framed as subject to future negotiations between the parties. They lay out basic parameters that reflect the reality of the Middle East today and, as such, could play a useful role in helping promote realistic peace negotiations.

The resolution also expresses support for "efforts to continue working with others in the international community to build the capacity and will of the Palestinian institutions to fight terrorism, dismantle terrorist organizations, and prevent the areas from which Israel has withdrawn from posing a threat to the security of Israel."

Such efforts are desperately needed, as it will not be possible to reach a comprehensive

solution to the conflict in the Middle East until the Palestinians renounce the use of terror and return to the negotiating table. Today, for example, we know that Palestinian terrorists are continuing to smuggle guns and explosives from Egypt into Gaza. Recent press reports indicated that the terrorists are now using an elaborate network of tunnels to carry out such smuggling. For example, a May 16, 2004 article that appeared in the Jerusalem Post reported that:

A short list of items smuggled via the tunnels to terrorists in the Gaza Strip includes Katyusha rockets, mortars, shoulder-mounted anti-aircraft missiles, antitank grenades, large amounts of explosives, ammunition, and rifles. The arms come from Egypt, Iraq, Sudan, and Libya. The underground smuggling is necessary because the navy has successfully blocked attempts by Palestinians to smuggle weapons into Gaza via the sea.

The army frequently conducts operations along the Philadelphi Route and in the outskirts of Rafah in an attempt to uncover and destroy the tunnels. One of the painstaking tasks is similar to that in which the five soldiers died on Wednesday evening: boring holes meters under the ground, placing explosives to blow up tunnels.

The IDF has uncovered and destroyed 11 tunnels this year—and close to 100 during the past three and a half years.

As Israel proceeds to withdraw from Gaza, the Bush Administration needs to put pressure on the Egyptian government to shut down these terrorist smuggling tunnels. Egypt is a substantial recipient of U.S. economic aid and an ally of the U.S., and it has a responsibility to ensure that its borders are not being used by terrorist organizations seeking to smuggle weapons into Gaza for use in terrorist attacks against Israel. The President and Secretary of State Colin Powell need to take forceful action now to convince Egypt to shut down all of these smuggling tunnels at once.

In closing, I believe that this resolution reflects the strong bipartisan support which exists in the Congress for Israel's security, and for the conclusion of a Middle East Peace agreement that is consistent with the protection of Israel's security and self determination for the Palestinian people, including a Palestinian state.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. LANOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 460.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. 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.

HONORING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF PASSAGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 676) recognizing and honoring the 40th anniversary of congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 676

Whereas 2004 marks the 40th anniversary of congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352);

Whereas the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the result of decades of struggle and sacrifice of many Americans who fought for equality and justice;

Whereas generations of Americans of every background supported Federal legislation to eliminate discrimination against African Americans;

Whereas a civil rights movement developed to achieve the goal of equal rights for all Americans;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy on June 11, 1963, in a nationally televised address proposed that Congress pass a civil rights act to address the problem of invidious discrimination;

Whereas a broad coalition of civil rights, labor, and religious organizations, culminating in the 1963 march on Washington, created national support for civil rights legislation;

Whereas during consideration of the bill a historic prohibition against discrimination based on sex was added;

Whereas the Congress of the United States passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and President Lyndon Johnson signed the bill into law on July 2, 1964;

Whereas the Civil Rights Act of 1964, among other things, prohibited the use of Federal funds in a discriminatory fashion, barred unequal application of voter registration requirements, encouraged the desegregation of public schools and authorized the United States Attorney General to file suits to force desegregation, banned discrimination in hotels, motels, restaurants, theaters, and all other places of public accommodations engaged in interstate commerce, and established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

Whereas title VII of the Act not only prohibited discrimination by employers on the basis of race, color, national origin, and religion but sex as well, thereby recognizing the national problem of sex discrimination in the workplace;

Whereas the Congress of the United States has amended the Civil Rights Act of 1964 from time to time, with major changes that strengthened the Act;

Whereas the 1972 amendments, among other things, gave the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission litigation authority, thereby giving the EEOC the right to sue nongovernment respondents, made State and local governments subject to title VII of the Act, made educational institutions subject to title VII of the Act, and made the Federal Government subject to title VII, thereby prohibiting Federal executive agencies from discriminating on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, and national origin;

Whereas the 1991 amendments to the Civil Rights Act overruled several Supreme Court decisions rendered in the late 1980s and allowed for the recovery of fees and costs in lawsuits where plaintiff prevailed, for jury trials, and for the recovery of compensatory

and punitive damages in intentional employment discrimination cases, and also expanded title VII protections to include congressional and high level political appointees;

Whereas the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in our Nation's history; and

Whereas we applaud all those whose support and efforts lead to passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and honors the 40th anniversary of congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and

(2) encourages all Americans to recognize and celebrate the important historical milestone of the congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 676, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 676, which recognizes the 40th anniversary of Congress' passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and calls on all Americans to recognize and celebrate the historical milestone that it represents.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been a cornerstone in the effort to end discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, and sex. It has been used successfully by Federal prosecutors to desegregate hotels, motels, restaurants, theaters, and other places of public accommodation engaged in interstate commerce. Together with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Fair Housing Act of 1968, and the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has done much to remedy the sad legacy of discrimination in America.

As I noted in my comments on the resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of *Brown* on the House floor last month, the quest for civil rights has been, and must continue to be, a bipartisan effort. This was particularly true in the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Recognizing that segregationists in the Democratic Party could forestall the passage of any civil rights legislation, the Kennedy administration actively sought to build a bipartisan consensus in favor of the bill from the moment of its introduction. In that spirit,

Republican ranking member William M. McCulloch joined with Democratic chairman Emanuel Celler to guide the bill through the House Committee on the Judiciary. Their efforts ultimately led 138 Republicans to join 152, mostly Northern Democrats to overwhelmingly pass a compromise measure in the full House on February 10, 1964.

In the Senate, bipartisanship was even more important for passage of the act. Due to the rules of that body, a minority of Senators, mostly Southern Democrats, were able to prevent a vote on the act for 52 days. Against this backdrop, Republican Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen succeeded in drafting an alternative clean bill with Majority Leader Mike Mansfield that kept most of the substantive provisions of the House bill, while tweaking it sufficiently to gain the support of a few swing Republican Senators. The Dirksen-Mansfield substitute worked. After an impassioned floor speech by Senator Dirksen, the Senate voted 71 to 29 to invoke cloture on June 10, 1964. After a few more days of procedural wrangling, 28 Republicans joined with 45 Democrats to pass the Civil Rights Act by a 73 to 27 margin.

When the Senate-passed measure returned to the House for final action, a bipartisan coalition succeeded in ensuring that the bill would go to the floor without an amendment. On July 2, 1964, the House passed the Civil Rights Act with yet another bipartisan vote of 289 to 126. The bill went to the White House where President Johnson signed it into law before a live television audience the same day.

The legislative history of the Civil Rights Act demonstrates what can happen when Republicans and Democrats work together. Neither side got everything it wanted, but they succeeded in passing landmark legislation that, while imperfect, did a great deal to remedy discrimination and promote equality of all Americans, regardless of color, creed, or sex.

Passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was one of the highlights of the history of Congress, and I hope that all Members will join me in recognizing its importance.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution which honors the 40th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the many civil rights advances since its enactment.

I want to first commend our colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, for introducing the resolution. I also want the record to reflect her long efforts to make real the promise of our civil rights laws as Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, working with the New York Human Rights Commission as a legal scholar, and a distinguished Member of this House.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of the Civil Rights Act. It is a monumental achievement, reflecting the best values of this Nation: equality, fairness, and respect for the dignity of all people. No one should forget how difficult it was to get this legislation through, how hard the forces of bigotry fought its passage, how strong the resistance was, and still is, to its enforcement.

Reflecting on these past achievements should be an occasion, most of all, for us to learn from the past and to remember that our society has changed for the better. We can be more inclusive. We can fight Big Industry. We can continue our progress as a Nation toward the promise that all people are created equal and that our Nation will treat every person in that spirit.

The resolution notes that the struggle did not end with this watershed legislation. Rather, it marks an important milestone in the fight against discrimination.

□ 1345

Today, as our Nation continues that fight, we should draw inspiration from this achievement to move forward and tackle the remaining threats to equality. This anniversary gives us the opportunity to reflect and remember that true progress is possible, even against tremendous odds. That experience proves that we have no right to resign ourselves to the remaining injustices because we know what is possible.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I commend the gentlewoman from Washington, DC, for introducing it.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, DC, (Ms. NORTON), the sponsor of the legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time, and I appreciate his work in managing this bill and bringing it forward on our side, and his own work for civil rights in his own State of Virginia. I want to thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for his support and cosponsorship of this important resolution. I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), for his work on the resolution as well as for his steadfast effort of four decades in establishing and preserving civil and human rights in the Congress and in our country.

Not surprisingly, but nevertheless with gratification, I note that this resolution is also cosponsored by all the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

As a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I was pleased to introduce this resolution and to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) to perfect its wording.

The 1964, Civil Rights Act was enacted during the most fruitful period for civil rights legislation in our history since the Civil War. President Kennedy called on Congress to pass a civil rights bill, and the great march on Washington of 1963 was perhaps the seminal event leading to passage. After much debate, on July 2, 1964, Congress passed the Act. President Lyndon Johnson, whose political skills and dedication to civil rights were vital to passage, signed the bill into law.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act is the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in the Nation's history. The Act, among other things, prohibits the use of Federal funds in a discriminatory fashion, bars unequal application of voter registration requirements, encouraged the desegregation of public schools, and authorized the United States Attorney General to file suits to compel desegregation. And very importantly in this period of many demonstrations, it banned discrimination in hotels, motels, restaurants, theaters, and all other places of public accommodation engaged in interstate commerce.

The Act contained a historic prohibition against discrimination based on sex. That was inserted at the very end, but has since changed the workplace and our country profoundly.

Perhaps the most important provision of this very important Act was the creation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which was established to administer the Nation's first Federal antidiscrimination employment law that had been a major goal of African Americans throughout the 20th Century.

Mr. Speaker, the 1964 Act is one of the great milestones of the United States Congress. We see the fruits of the Act virtually everywhere in our country. Forty years later, may the act inspire us to continue to do what is necessary to arm the EEOC and the Justice Department, and to arm ourselves to carry its work to completion.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a stalwart in the Civil Rights movement.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 676, recognizing the 40th anniversary of the congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I want to thank my good friend of many years, a colleague in the student nonviolent coordinating committee during the early 1960s, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), for bringing forth this resolution.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank her for all of her hard work for many years for civil rights and social justice, and for having the courage during and after law school at Yale University to come south and work in Mississippi during one of the most difficult

periods in the history of our country and in the history of our struggle for civil rights. And for helping to organize the march on Washington 41 years ago, I thank her, thank her for keeping the faith, thank her for keeping her eyes on the prize.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 just did not happen. It just did not happen. It took many years, many months of struggle on the part of a disciplined and organized movement that created a climate, created an environment for action on the part of the President of the United States and the Members of the Congress.

One must understand that in the American south during the 1950s and 1960s, there were signs that said, "white men, colored men; white women, colored women; white waiting, colored waiting." Segregation and discrimination were the order of the day. As a child growing up in the American south, and as a participant in the civil rights movement, I saw those signs. There were separate water fountains in department stores, in public buildings. A sign in front of the fountain marked "white" and a spigot marked "colored" for people to get water to drink.

Black people could not go into a store, buy a pair of shoes. And sometimes they were not even allowed to try on those shoes. They would go into a store and they were not even allowed to try on a suit, and women were not allowed to try on a dress. They were welcome to go into a drugstore to get a prescription filled, but they were not allowed to sit down at the lunch counter and have a soda or something to eat. They had to take it out on the streets and stand up to drink or eat. There were separate waiting rooms in bus stations and train stations. People could not stay in the same hotel. People could not ride in the same taxi cabs.

When I look back on it, Mr. Speaker, the drama of the movement, the sit-ins, the freedom rides, the stand-ins at the theaters, the marches, all were the action of an ordinary people using the philosophy and the discipline of non-violence. People had been beaten, people had been arrested and jailed, some had been shot and even killed. Medgar Evers was shot and killed in May of 1963 at his home in Jackson, Mississippi. Police Commissioner Bull Connor in Birmingham, Alabama, used fire hoses and dogs on nonviolent protestors. Four little girls were killed while attending Sunday school on Sunday morning September 15, 1963, when their church was bombed. Because of what happened in Birmingham, Alabama, and other parts of the American south, there was a sense of righteous indignation.

All across America, by the hundreds and thousands, people started demanding that the Federal Government act. People sent letters, telegrams, and petitions to Members of Congress and to the White House. And President Kennedy responded on June 11 in a nation-

ally televised address to the Nation and he urged the Congress to pass a Civil Rights Act.

The Congress debated the proposed Act for many days, long nights, and it was finally passed on July 2, 1964. Forty years ago, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law that Act. I think it is fitting and appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for us to pause and celebrate the distance we have come and the progress we have made. Because of the actions of hundreds of our citizens, and because of the response of the United States Congress, President John F. Kennedy, and President Lyndon Johnson we have witnessed what I like to call a nonviolent revolution in America, a revolution of values, a revolution of ideas.

Today, because of the actions of 1964, we are a better Nation, we are a better people, better in the process of laying down the burdens of race. The signs that I saw back then, the young people today will never see. The only place they will see those signs will be in a museum, in a book, or a video. Those signs are gone, and they will never, ever return to America.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Today, we celebrate the anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was the subject of debate in this very body 40 years ago and which was enacted into law almost on this very day, on July 2. This anniversary is important because guaranteeing the equal treatment, the equal recognition of every American before the law has been a work in progress for the entirety of the existence of this Nation and it remains a work in progress still.

It is important also because with this enactment, the United States finally established in permanent, positive law the fulfillment of the vision of the grand words of our founders; that our Nation would not treat its citizens differently any more than they are treated differently in the eyes of God, their creator. The Act said that we will not tolerate discrimination against women or against men of any race or background or belief, even when the offense is not committed by a State government or by the Federal Government.

When the Congress finished this momentous work in 1964, our Nation had already made significant progress in advancing the rights of women and minorities. In 1964, Senator Margaret Chase Smith became the first woman to be considered by a major party for nomination to the Presidency of the United States. She finished second in the balloting to Barry Goldwater. But in that same year, reflecting how far we still had to go, and may have to go, a former Klu Klux Klansman filibustered the Civil Rights Act on the floor of the other body for 14 hours.

History will record that one of the great leaders in the passage of the 1964

Civil Rights Act was Senator Everett Dirksen, who indeed led the fight to protect the rights of all Americans here in the United States and, ultimately, to extend that vision around the world. Today, we can look back at the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in even greater appreciation, if not awe, of its significance.

Remember that this legislation had been enacted in prototypical form, in the 19th century by this Congress, but it had been stricken down by the Supreme Court. In 1964, the Congress acted and we made it stick. This legislation finally said to the world that if you are an American, our government will protect your freedom not only from outside aggressors, but from those in your own country who would deny employment benefits to you or deny you access to a public place because of your race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

This Act created a law enforcement organization, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and it enhanced the power of the U.S. Department of Justice, which had been created initially to prevent discrimination against American citizens. Now the Department of Justice was given more tools to combat public and private discrimination. There were major steps in continuing a national tradition of expanding protection for individuals that dates back to the establishment of our Nation.

From the statement of equality in the first line of the Declaration of Independence to the founding of the Republican Party for the purpose of opposing slavery in 1854, to the first attempts to enact effective civil rights legislation in the years after the war, to the establishment of voting rights for women, to the defeat of fascism and Soviet communism, our Nation has moved deliberately, if not promptly, to become the Nation in which freedom for individuals is paramount.

□ 1400

As a legal act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 required courage, persistence, and dedication to enact. Countless lives were taken and sacrificed in attacks against the ideas it embodies. There were battles for this rule of law that made it possible. America had its very own domestic terrorist organization, the Ku Klux Klan, organized to murder opponents and to destroy the principle of freedom that we fight to protect today from terrorists around the world. As we memorialized President Reagan a few weeks ago, we were reminded of our national mission to protect freedom, and we once again heard the final line of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic." That simple line speaks to us even now as our soldiers are deployed around the world: "Let us die to make men free."

Forty years ago, this and the other body approved the Civil Rights Act with overwhelming bipartisan support. What we do here today while our sol-

diers still give their lives to make others free is remind the world once again that our Nation stands for freedom and equality. To us, these are priceless. I commend the authors of this resolution for so doing and urge its adoption.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my first thought was to come to this podium with a prepared text to be able to salute the 40th anniversary of the congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But I thought it would be more appropriate to speak from the heart and recollection of the pain that was experienced by many in this country without the passage of this act.

Might I first give my accolades and appreciation to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her fight on the battlefield for civil rights; to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), our own special icon and warrior for peace; to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and others, chairman and ranking member, for allowing us this small moment of acknowledgment in the backdrop of the death of Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney, three young men of different backgrounds and religious faiths who came together in destiny down in Mississippi just to be able to stand up for the opportunity and freedom for a people who had been disenfranchised from the time that they came to this Nation.

Is it not interesting that the 1964 act prohibited discrimination, if you will, in voter registration and public schools. Some would say, did we not have *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954? And yet 10 years later we needed the Civil Rights Act to encourage desegregation in our schools. There are reasons that many of us support specific political philosophies because Lyndon Baines Johnson, a President from Texas, helped to be part of the movement of this bill and we had to organize, yes, some Southerners and Northerners and moderates, to come together to push for the support and legislation of this bill.

But most of all I believe that this day allows us to remember that we are on a journey of freedom and that journey is not yet complete, for now we suffer with unequal educational systems in our public schools, inner cities that are crumbling; and, yes, we suffer from an election system that is yet not fair.

So I stand before you to acknowledge the fact that we are grand and greater because of the 1964 Civil Rights Act; but what I would simply say to America, our journey is yet not finished and we would join together in working in our Congress to be able to have a fair and equitable system of health care, of an educational system, and of an economic system that treats all of us fairly.

I hope, finally, that we will address the question of an unequal criminal justice system because the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is that. It is the planting of the seed to ensure that all America joins in civil rights, not just African Americans, not just Hispanics, but immigrants, Anglos, Asians and all will join together and recognize that this Nation is a better place if you acknowledge first that race is a factor in this country and if you acknowledge first that we have not yet finished the journey for civil rights in America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 676, a bill recognizing and honoring the 40th anniversary of Congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is imperative that we take a step back to recognize the years of bondage and enslavement; needless lynching and bloodshed; and the years of discrimination and hatred that Civil Rights Act of 1964 sought to curtail.

The legal protection of U.S. citizens, regardless of race, color, sex, religion and national origin against the vice of discrimination in the workplace and places of public accommodation; the prohibition of unequal application of voter registration requirements; the encouragement of continued desegregation of public schools; and the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission highlight the basic tenets set forth in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I speak out today to commemorate the progress we have made in casting out the demons of prejudice and discrimination. I speak out today to recognize the steps we have taken as a nation to get closer to the American Creed. However, I must speak out today to call attention to the progress we have yet to make in order to fulfill the tenets of Civil Rights Act of 1964. I speak out today to challenge this nation to uphold our founding principles of equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, sex, religion and national origin.

Despite the 40 year life span of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in 2004, we still attempt to take the life out of this act by violating its principles. Although the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed *Prairie View A&M University* student voter rights in 1979 when it was challenged in Waller County, Texas, attempts to disenfranchise *Prairie View A&M University* students continue today.

On November 5, 2003, the Waller County, Texas District Attorney requested that the county Elections Administration bar the students at *Historically Black College Prairie View A&M University* from voting locally by virtue of his unilateral interpretation of "domicile" for voting purposes. Texas voter registration law only requires a person to be a resident of the county at least 30 days prior to the elections. African-American students represent the majority of *Prairie View A&M's* student body of 7,000 members, and these students, constitute a major voting bloc in Waller County. The District Attorney's request sought to effectively disenfranchise African-American college students in this area; as such, this request suggested a form of voter intimidation and likely had the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color. Despite a prolonged dialogue with Texas officials regarding this matter, relief from the pressures and intimidation experienced by the students when attempting to exercise their

rights was never provided. This example does not stand alone among the long list of discriminatory acts that continue to plague our nation.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues: Have we truly upheld the Civil Rights Act of 1964? If your answer is no, you are one step closer in helping us to realize our U.S. commitment to equality. You must now join the front lines in the battle against discrimination and injustice. If your answer is yes, I ask that you call your attention to all of the overt and covert discriminatory acts that occur across our nation, such as the attempted disenfranchisement of the Prairie View A&M University students in Waller County, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 676 because of the significant and far-reaching impact the Civil Rights Act of 1964 continues to have on our nation. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of the essential, yet fragile threads that keep our nation civil. In fact, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, helped to mend our nation's worn fabric, tattered by hostility and hatred, into a nation that strives for the liberties and rights of all.

The fight to achieve equality is by far not over, but honoring and reflecting upon legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will bring this nation one step closer to upholding unity and justice for all. I implore all of my colleagues to keep the spirit of equality and equal opportunity, the spirit of the Civil Rights Act alive, when governing this nation. As an original cosponsor of this bill, I find this resolution not only pertinent, but a necessary reminder to encourage us to move in the right nation, which is a nation for all.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the great State of Virginia for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, there are three of us who are African American who were not even born when this act was passed: the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), and me. I should begin by saying that those of us who were born in the late 1960s, we are not only the legatees of what was done here 40 years ago; we are very much the hope of what was done here 40 years ago. It was somehow imagined by the people who sat in this Chamber 40 years ago close to this very day that if they made this change in our laws that they would somehow open up the talent base in this country, that they would somehow build an America that had never been; and the fact that we commend this day shows us the continuing power of law.

It is sometimes fashionable to say that you cannot legislate morality in this country, and all of us have said that on our favorite issue or another; but this is the reality: law can be used to shape our moral character; law can be used to set the boundaries of what we will tolerate and what we will not accept and that is exactly what we did 40 years ago. We used the power of law to shape the American dream and to talk about its outer aspirations.

It is ironic as I stand here, one of the reasons that more Members are not in this Chamber right now is because at this very moment an African American Secretary of State is briefing the Congress. Another reason more Members are not here is because at this very moment a young, dynamic black Democrat named Barak Obama is in this building receiving members of the Congressional Black Caucus. A black Secretary of State; a black U.S. Senator about-to-be, born in Illinois; a black national security adviser. Whatever we disagree on, that is an America that no one would have contemplated 40 years ago.

I end just on this note. By thinking about frankly a lot of people who never had the chance to serve in this Chamber, all of the brilliant African Americans who were born too early to be in Congress, who were born too early to shape this country's agenda, they could have been here if America had been a little bit fairer and if our dream had been a little bit more secure in this country.

They are really the people we ought to be thinking about today in some sense because when that Congress passed the civil rights law and Lyndon Johnson signed it into law, this is what it did: it created an America where talent is the outer limit of what you can be. And yes, as my friend from Texas said, we routinely fall short of that goal, but at least we have it as a value, at least we have it as a goal; and it somehow defines what we can be and what we can still dream.

So as one young African American Member of this institution, I simply say this. We are so much freer than we used to be as a country. We are also so much more American.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague from Virginia, and let me thank everyone who has taken the time to commemorate this very, very historic law. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 certainly has changed the history of America. It certainly has affected my life and the lives of many others who were similarly situated, having grown up in the segregated South in Mobile, Alabama; having attended segregated schools; having attended segregated public accommodations.

I was just struck as I reflect every day on how different life is today in 2004 from the way that it was in 1964, the year that I graduated from high school. I am grateful that this Nation passed through the Congress the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I am grateful that I had an opportunity as a young attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund as an Earl Warren Fellow to help in the implementation and the interpretation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, particularly as it related to employment discrimination and the

other aspects of it in terms of my early days as a civil rights attorney.

It was very meaningful to me. Certainly the interpretations have meant worlds for the changes that have been implemented in this country and the model that this has set for other nations around the world, particularly in South Africa. I, therefore, would like to just register my heartfelt thanks to all those who had a hand in passing this law and for all those who have paid the price and worked so hard to see that it is implemented in the way that Congress intended.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I again want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her leadership. I urge Members to not only remember the need for the Civil Rights Act but also to commit to support its principles.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to my friends from the other side of the aisle talk in support of this very important and meritorious resolution, they seem to have forgotten that the advances of civil rights that were passed in Congress in the 1960s were only made possible due to the fact that civil rights was a bipartisan project. Republicans and Democrats joined together to pass not only the civil rights bill of 1964 but the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

When we talk about civil rights in the 21st century, it seems to me that we ought to hearken back on repeating what worked in the 20th century. I did not hear very much praise for the Republican efforts to get the civil rights acts passed. I would remind my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that we are just as much for civil rights as you are; and when we work on this on a bipartisan basis, we can accomplish a lot more while each side maybe strikes a few fewer political points.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today in support of House Resolution 676 and to celebrate the 40th anniversary of congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This landmark piece of legislation has been a cornerstone of our democracy for the past 40 years. The leaders who championed these important protections were visionaries armed with a truly moral cause. Congress sent the Civil Rights Act to President Johnson who signed the measure into law on July 2, 1964. That date will forever serve as the date our country embraced the fundamental right to equality. No longer would Americans tolerate injustice and discrimination.

As the Representative of a racially, ethnically, and spiritually diverse constituency, I have witnessed the blending of cultures and the strong and vital community that has resulted from those forces. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the pivotal moment in American

history that ensured the vitality of Northwest Indiana, and all of our communities. Though this legislation required decades of struggle and sacrifice in order to be realized, the gains we have been able to achieve as its result have been unparalleled.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed in the 88th Congress to enforce the constitutional right to vote, tackling discriminatory tests and obstacles placed in the path of many who sought to have a voice in their representation. It banned discrimination in federally assisted programs and outlawed segregation in businesses such as theaters, restaurants, and hotels. Title VII of the Act took the fundamentally important step of prohibiting discrimination by employers on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion or sex. It provided crucial enforcement mechanisms, by enlisting the district courts, the Attorney General, the Commission on Civil Rights, and the newly established Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. Each provides vigorous and proactive protection of constitutional rights and takes action against those who continue to discriminate. This piece of legislation was a critical step in our Nation's efforts to address the issues of fundamental rights and institutionalized discrimination.

This legislation was, above all "essentially moral in character," as Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen stated. Passing the legislation was the right thing to do at the time, and vigorously enforcing it is the right thing to do in our time.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the result of many years of struggle and sacrifice by Americans who fought for equality and justice, to whom we owe a great debt of gratitude. I applaud all those whose support and efforts led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in our Nation's history. It is with great honor and pride that I commemorate the 40th anniversary of this landmark legislation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 676, a resolution recognizing and honoring the 40th anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, brought to the floor by ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON from the District of Columbia and spearheaded by the venerable House Judiciary Committee ranking member, Representative JOHN CONYERS. I thank you both for your unwavering leadership.

Mr. Speaker, July 2, 2004 marks the 40th anniversary of President Lyndon B. Johnson's signing into law of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This landmark legislation ended the disenfranchisement of millions of Americans and struck a final blow to the Jim Crow laws that existed in many parts of our country.

As many of us know, the Civil Rights bill ended de jure segregation and discrimination in public accommodations, publicly owned or operated facilities and schools, employment and union membership, and voter registration. Just imagine what this country would be like without the enactment of these laws—a country where some people are treated like second-class citizens solely because of the color of their skin? How atrocious a thought? Where people are denied employment because of their color, national origin, religion or sex? The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its progeny se-

cured equal rights under the law for all Americans—the importance of passage of this bill cannot be overstated.

In the early 1960s, millions of Americans continued to suffer under the oppressive hand of Jim Crow laws. The Freedom Rides of the 1960s, led by religious leaders, civil rights activists, students and many others, empowered African Americans to organize and attempt to vote throughout the Deep South. Many Freedom Riders, such as Chaney, Schwerner and Goodman gave their lives for the cause of equal rights for all. Their names are indelibly inked in our collective consciousness, but there were many equally brave and courageous individuals whose names will not be recorded in the history books. However, none are forgotten. Due to their courage, we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I believe that commemorating passage of the Act reflects our commitment to bring this Nation closer to the ideals and values that each of us holds dear—equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, while I have come here to commemorate these great laws, I must also recognize that while the Act brought our Nation closer to fulfilling the promises guaranteed in the Constitution, de facto discrimination continues to pervade many of our institutions. Though we are a country on the brink of embodying a truly democratic Nation, we are also a Nation grappling with ensuring that the goals of the Act are achieved. We only need look to the 2000 Presidential Election in which many African Americans reported being turned away from voting polls. Our election process was marred by the disenfranchisement of thousands in Florida and on a smaller scale in other states polling places. These incidents of disenfranchisement show that though we are close, we are not there yet.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor the enactment of this momentous law, it is imperative that we also acknowledge that many of our Nation's communities have not progressed much since 1964 and still suffer the ravages of discrimination. Though the Civil Rights Act of 1964 brought us closer to dismantling the legacy of slavery, many American men, women and children still feel its impact. Many of our schools remain segregated (de facto) and underfunded. In fact, the No Child Left Behind Act, which authorizes funding and establishes accountability for our public schools, will be underfunded by at least \$8 billion in the FY 05 budget. Many African Americans remain in the lowest economic brackets, where unemployment often reaches double digits in some communities, including my own. Women still earn \$0.76 on the dollar to men for the same work and the same hours.

On that note, as my time to speak is short, I leave with two quotes from Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whose name is synonymous with the peaceful advancement of the civil rights movement. The first is one of my favorites and is taken from writings during his time spent imprisoned for standing up to the ugly face of discrimination and segregation—"injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." (Letter from a Birmingham Jail, April 16, 1963). Until we promote economic and educational policies that level the playing field for those that have been left behind—left behind many times in fact—then the injustice of second class citizenship will persist.

The last is a quote by Dr. King that is not as often quoted but is equally remarkable in

its insight—"[A]ll progress is precarious, and the solution of one problem brings us face to face with another problem." (Martin Luther King, Jr., "Strength to love," 1963). I find these words encouraging because they are wrought with optimism for the future. We are progressing steadily in our fight toward equality, and although we have many more problems to overcome and to confront, united, I am confident we will win this fight.

We must sustain the legacy of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by continuing to enact legislation that represents what it stands for—our country's highest ideals of equality and opportunity for all citizens.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in honoring the 40th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by voting in favor of passage of this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 676, which recognizes and honors the 40th anniversary of congressional passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

On July 2nd, we will mark the passage of this historic act, which finally guaranteed equal rights for minorities in America. It is hard to believe that it was only 40 years ago when, facing prejudice and stubborn odds, President Lyndon Johnson guided the Civil Rights Act through the House and Senate and signed into law legislation that guaranteed rights that so many of our fellow citizens had been denied.

The Act made racial discrimination in public placed illegal and established standards to thwart the rigged voting system in the South. It also required employers to provide equal employment opportunities no matter a person's race. Projects involving federal funds could be halted if there was evidence of discrimination based on color, race or national origin. These are things inherent in our society today, but for much of the 20th century, these protections only existed for white Americans—not blacks.

Mr. Speaker, were it not for the unshakable faith and fierce determination of members of the civil rights movement—many who literally sacrificed their lives—the Civil Rights Act may have taken many more years to arrive.

Our own colleague, and my good friend, Senior Chief Deputy Whip JOHN LEWIS, was one of the leaders of that civil rights movement. He was just out of his teens when he was beaten because of his participation in the Freedom Rides. Yet he was not deterred. At the age of 23, he joined Dr. King on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial for the March on Washington, and in the years that followed, he continued the fight for freedom and human rights, despite more than 40 arrests, physical attacks and serious injuries.

In the years that followed its passage, the Civil Rights Act opened doors and created opportunities for black and minority Americans that were long overdue. With federal protections, blacks could attend any school or university, be hired for any job, and finally enjoy the Constitutional freedoms so many of us take for granted.

However, Mr. Speaker, despite much progress, minority Americans still struggle for equal access and advancement. Right now we face a struggling economy that is not producing enough jobs, and it has imposed even greater hardships on minorities. Since March 2000, black unemployment has soared to nearly 11 percent, almost double that of

whites. And there is still a glaring wage gap confronting minorities in the workforce. Black men earned 73.9 percent of what white men earned in 2002, measured by median full-time wages and salaries. That's barely up from 73.4 percent a decade ago.

In our health system, minorities still repeatedly receive inferior care. Last year's Institute of Medicine report found that health care delivery is very unequal depending on the race or ethnicity of the patient. That inequality is thought to be a major reason that African-Americans frequently have worse health outcomes than whites. The black infant mortality rate in fact remains twice as high as the white rate, and 20 percent of black Americans lack regular access to health care compared with less than 16 percent of whites.

Without early and advanced education, individuals face a great handicap in this world. Yet in our school system today separate and unequal is still the reality in far too many places. Even in higher education, there exists a large gap between the percentage of whites with a college degree and the percentage of blacks.

So Mr. Speaker, today let us acknowledge that the Civil Rights Acts we passed in Congress was a crucial step forward for our Nation. Our laws require vigilance so that every citizen has an equal shot at the American dream. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said, "Human progress is neither automatic nor inevitable . . . Every step toward the goal of justice requires sacrifice, suffering, and struggle; the tireless exertions and passionate concern of dedicated individuals."

Today, we must redouble our commitment to the Civil Rights Act and the America envisioned by JOHN LEWIS and every citizen who fought for equal rights four decades ago, and continue the effort for justice and equality. We have not yet reached the Promised Land, but it is up to us to ensure that America achieves the full measure of its promise.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my objection to H. Res. 676. I certainly join my colleagues in urging Americans to celebrate the progress this country has made in race relations. However, contrary to the claims of the supporters of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the sponsors of H. Res. 676, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did not improve race relations or enhance freedom. Instead, the forced integration dictated by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 increased racial tensions while diminishing individual liberty.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 gave the federal government unprecedented power over the hiring, employee relations, and customer service practices of every business in the country. The result was a massive violation of the rights of private property and contract, which are the bedrocks of free society. The federal government has no legitimate authority to infringe on the rights of private property owners to use their property as they please and to form (or not form) contracts with terms mutually agreeable to all parties. The rights of all private property owners, even those whose actions decent people find abhorrent, must be respected if we are to maintain a free society.

This expansion of federal power was based on an erroneous interpretation of the congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. The framers of the Constitution intended the interstate commerce clause to create a free trade zone among the states, not to give the

federal government regulatory power over every business that has any connection with interstate commerce.

The Civil Rights act of 1964 not only violated the Constitution and reduced individual liberty; it also failed to achieve its stated goals of promoting racial harmony and a color-blind society. Federal bureaucrats and judge's cannot read minds to see if actions are motivated by racism. Therefore, the only way the federal government could ensure an employer was not violating the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was to ensure that the racial composition of a business's workforce matched the racial composition of a bureaucrat or judges defined body of potential employees. Thus, bureaucrats began forcing employers to hire by racial quota. Racial quotas have not contributed to racial harmony or advanced the goal of a color-blind society. Instead, these quotas encouraged racial balkanization, and fostered racial strife.

Of course, America has made great strides in race relations over the past forty years. However, this progress is due to changes in public attitudes and private efforts. Relations between the races have improved despite, not because of, the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while I join in sponsors of H. Res. 676 in promoting racial harmony and individual liberty, the fact is the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did not accomplish these goals. Instead, this law unconstitutionally expanded federal power, thus reducing liberty. Furthermore, by prompting race-based quotas, this law undermined efforts to achieve a color-blind society and increased racial strife. Therefore, I must oppose H. Res. 676.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 676.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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.

IDENTITY THEFT PENALTY ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1731) to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1731

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 "Identity Theft Penalty Enhancement Act".

SEC. 2. AGGRAVATED IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1028, the following:

"§ 1028A. Aggravated identity theft

"(a) OFFENSES.—

"(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in subsection (c), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person shall, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 2 years.

"(2) *TERRORISM OFFENSE.*—Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in section 2332b(g)(5)(B), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person or a false identification document shall, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 5 years.

"(b) *CONSECUTIVE SENTENCE.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) a court shall not place on probation any person convicted of a violation of this section;

"(2) except as provided in paragraph (4), no term of imprisonment imposed on a person under this section shall run concurrently with any other term of imprisonment imposed on the person under any other provision of law, including any term of imprisonment imposed for the felony during which the means of identification was transferred, possessed, or used;

"(3) in determining any term of imprisonment to be imposed for the felony during which the means of identification was transferred, possessed, or used, a court shall not in any way reduce the term to be imposed for such crime so as to compensate for, or otherwise take into account, any separate term of imprisonment imposed or to be imposed for a violation of this section; and

"(4) a term of imprisonment imposed on a person for a violation of this section may, in the discretion of the court, run concurrently, in whole or in part, only with another term of imprisonment that is imposed by the court at the same time on that person for an additional violation of this section, provided that such discretion shall be exercised in accordance with any applicable guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994 of title 28.

"(c) *DEFINITION.*—For purposes of this section, the term 'felony violation enumerated in subsection (c)' means any offense that is a felony violation of—

"(1) section 641 (relating to theft of public money, property, or rewards), section 656 (relating to theft, embezzlement, or misapplication by bank officer or employee), or section 664 (relating to theft from employee benefit plans);

"(2) section 911 (relating to false personation of citizenship);

"(3) section 922(a)(6) (relating to false statements in connection with the acquisition of a firearm);

"(4) any provision contained in this chapter (relating to fraud and false statements), other than this section or section 1028(a)(7);

"(5) any provision contained in chapter 63 (relating to mail, bank, and wire fraud);

"(6) any provision contained in chapter 69 (relating to nationality and citizenship);

"(7) any provision contained in chapter 75 (relating to passports and visas);

"(8) section 523 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6823) (relating to obtaining customer information by false pretenses);

"(9) section 243 or 266 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253 and 1306) (relating to willfully failing to leave the United States after deportation and creating a counterfeit alien registration card);

"(10) any provision contained in chapter 8 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act