

This week, after a long August recess, bipartisan bills were introduced to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission with regard to reorganizing the intelligence operations of our country in order to better protect our people and our country. Earlier this week we met, as I said to the gentleman, with the President, who asked us to send him legislation quickly.

The reason for my question is, the Democratic leader, after requesting participation by your side of the aisle and a determination was made not to participate, introduced legislation drafted to incorporate the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. In addition to that, Mr. MCCAIN and Mr. LIEBERMAN have introduced legislation in the Senate. Mirror legislation has been introduced by a Member on your side and a Member on our side as well.

The President, as you know, changed his position on the budget authority for the National Intelligence Director and apparently now supports that, so there may well be good bipartisan White House-congressional agreement.

Clearly the American public are very concerned about this, we are very concerned about it, and I know the gentleman is very concerned about it. We want to put our intelligence community in the best possible posture, as the 9/11 Commission recommended, to respond to the terrorist threat to this country.

My question is, therefore, sir, can we expect, do you think, to perhaps take the bipartisan bills that have been introduced in both the Senate and the House, mirror images of one another, and work on those bills and pass them prior to the time that we either recess or adjourn prior to the election?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, let me say we were all very impressed in a bipartisan way when the report of the 9/11 Commission came forward. We know that President Bush has already, through executive order, implemented many aspects of the 9/11 Commission report.

The gentleman also is aware of the fact that immediately upon release of that report, the Speaker of the House called on the chairmen and ranking minority members of numerous committees here in the House, over a half dozen committees, called on them to hold hearings. There were 25 hearings held in the House of Representatives during the August district work period, and I believe that some very important information came forward.

One of the goals that the Speaker has set forth is to ensure that we do proceed with legislation. He very much wants to, before we adjourn in October, see the passage of legislation. Exactly what shape that will take is, of course, up to the legislative process that we have here. We are very well aware of the fact that we have seen the introduction of the 9/11 Commission report,

and we know that a lot of people are thinking about that.

I will say that I am particularly honored, as I know the gentleman is, that a Member of this body, the former chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and vice chairman of the House Committee on Rules, has been nominated to be the director of Central Intelligence. He has obviously spent a great deal of time on this, and many of our colleagues have expertise on this.

So we will in the coming weeks I hope be able to fashion legislation so that the goal that the Speaker has set forth of passage of legislation before we adjourn in October will come to fruition.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments. We are hopeful that we can in fact work together in a bipartisan fashion, as seems to be started by the Senate and in this House as well, to accomplish the objective of the early passage of a reorganization to make us better to respond to the terrorist threat to this country. We hope that that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2004

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1900

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). 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.

RESTORING FREEDOM OF SPEECH TO AMERICA'S HOUSES OF WORSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor today, as I was prior to the August break, to talk about freedom of speech in our churches and synagogues and mosques of this country.

Many people do not realize that from the beginning of this great Nation, until 1954, there was never any restriction of what a minister or a priest or a rabbi might say regarding policy issues, political issues, and actually making reference to the teachings in the Bible and the Torah. But what has happened over the last few years is that there is an element in this country, usually it is the Americans for Separation of Church and State, which is a metaphor, that seem to want to monitor what is being said in our churches and synagogues. This year it seems to be worse than ever before.

I want to start my brief remarks about Bishop Smith, a Catholic bishop in New Jersey. On March 27 at St. James Church, Bishop Smith asked why, in our presumably democratic country, Catholic churches fear that the Internal Revenue Service will punish them if they speak out on a politician's positions on issues. I further quote Bishop Smith: "The first amendment protects the free exercise of religion. Separation of church and state does not mean that the church and its members should not voice or advocate for their positions."

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because there is a real problem in this country.

About 2 months ago, Bishop Sheridan, the Catholic bishop of Colorado Springs, sent a pastoral letter to the 120,000 Catholics in his diocese, and it was a pastoral letter. He mentioned in the letter that the Catholic Church stands for protecting the unborn, opposed to euthanasia, opposed to stem cell research, and believes that marriage should be between one man and one woman. In this pastoral letter he said nothing about Mr. KERRY or Mr. Bush, but because he did use the word prolife, Mr. Lynn, Barry Lynn, director of the Americans For Separation of Church and State, wrote a letter and complained to the Internal Revenue Service that the bishop and the church should lose its tax-free status.

Well, let me explain very quickly. I have done 4 years of research on this issue, and this is my fourth year of putting a bill in to return the freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues. What I found out was that in 1934 when the Congress decided that the churches could qualify for the 501(c)(3) status, they had no restriction of speech, absolutely none, zero. But what happened is in 1954, Lyndon Baines Johnson had the H.L. Hunt family opposed to his reelection to the Senate, and the H.L. Hunt family had 2 501(c)3s; not churches, but think tanks. And Senator Johnson put in an amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate in 1954 that was never debated, no hearings, that basically had

unintended consequence for our churches and synagogues. I share that just to give a little bit of the history.

Let me give two more examples before I close. In Kansas, the American Center for Separation of Church and State has a subgroup called the Main Street Coalition based in Johnson County, Kansas. It is sending recruits into area churches to see if IRS guidelines, which come from the Johnson amendment, are being followed. The group, which bills itself as a committee for the separation of church and state, is concerned that local clergymen might be violating their tax-exempt status by endorsing candidates for elected office.

What prompted the campaign was a public meeting where an evangelical minister spoke out against homosexual marriage. They were Protestant churches, by the way. Catholic League president William Donohue is wary of the group's tactics and released the following statement. "To conduct a covert operation in houses of worship for the purpose of monitoring homilies or sermons is not the kind of operation conducted by friends of the first amendment." I am not reading the complete statement, but part of the statement.

Let me go further with one more example, and then I will conclude my remarks.

In the Baptist Church in Arkansas, Pastor Ronnie Floyd did not have a sermon, but actually at the end of church had a little flyer that he handed out, and there was a picture of George Bush and JOHN KERRY, and he just mentioned not who to vote for, but just two issues, one being the marriage between man and woman, the other about partial-birth abortion, and because the photograph was a little bit larger of President Bush, he filed a complaint with the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is about up, and I want to close this way. This Nation's greatness is due to the fact that we have men and women overseas now fighting and dying for freedom for the American people. If this country is going to remain morally strong, then we must, we must return the first amendment right to our houses of worship, both Catholic, Protestant, Muslim and also Jewish.

SMART SECURITY AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, when Vice President CHENEY was talking about terrorism, he told the audience something that I consider to be absolutely appalling. He said, "It is absolutely essential on November 2nd that Americans make the right choice, because if we make the wrong choice, then the danger is that we'll get hit again."

The White House would like the American people to believe that President Bush is the only person capable of confronting terrorism, even though his record has proven otherwise. They employ fear as a campaign tactic, claiming that a vote for JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS is a vote for the terrorists. This misleading connection, besides insulting the intelligence of the American people, raises a very important question: If Presidents are singularly responsible for terrorist attacks that happen on their watch, was President Bush responsible for the attacks on September 11?

While I believe that President Bush was not responsible for the events of 9/11, he is responsible for the failure to truly secure America after 9/11.

Three years ago, after the worst attacks on American soil in our Nation's history, the United States had the support of nearly all other countries in our fight against terrorism. With the anniversary of the September 11 attacks approaching, now is a good time to consider whether we have made progress in the global war on terror over the last 3 years.

Last week in Russia, Chechen terrorists shocked the world when they took 1,200 hostages at a school and killed over 300 of them, most of them children. I ask you, what is humanity becoming? We have to stop this. What a terrible tragedy. Surely there must be a better way. There must be a smarter way.

In Sudan, thousands of Sudanese Africans have been subjected to a horrific campaign of rape, looting, and ethnic cleansing driven by a militia that has the tacit support of the Sudanese Government. More than 30,000 people have needlessly been killed as a result of this campaign of genocide terror. Much more needs to be done, and despite almost unanimous passage of a House resolution calling upon the Secretary of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the U.N. to immediately address this issue, it is still not being completed.

There has to be a better way, a smarter way, a smarter course of action dictated not by what is politically pragmatic, but by what is good and by what is right. And there is such a course of action.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392 to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism.

SMART security fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships than the Bush administration, and it does so without endangering our alliances around the world. It treats war as an absolute last resort.

SMART security controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with aggressive diplomacy, strong regional security arrangements, and vigorous inspection regimes. It invests in the development of impoverished nations to

prevent the kind of terrorism occurring in Sudan and Chechnya from ever taking root in the first place.

President Bush thinks the best way to fight terrorism is to confront it head on by possessing bigger weapons and being stronger than the terrorists. But that only addresses the symptoms of the disease and certainly does not ensure a 100 percent success rate.

In order to truly defeat terrorism, we need to confront its root causes: poverty, despair, and unfair allocation of resources in so many underdeveloped nations around the world. SMART security will protect America and the world by addressing not just acts of terrorism, but also the reasons why terrorism exists. In the end, SMART security is smart, and it will keep America safe.

HONORING MS. MARTHA WYLLIE

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, before I start my remarks, which will be a great pleasure to do, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that just less than 5 minutes ago, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) took the floor, and I would just like to associate myself with his eloquent remarks and just absolutely, totally agree with him, that the first amendment should absolutely take effect in all of our churches around this country. So I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and hope we can do something about it this year.

I rise today for one of those very nice things we get to do, and that is to talk about somebody really special and really nice. I want to recognize the outstanding dedication and the compassion and the achievements on this floor of Ms. Martha Wyllie. Taking an active role in our community while greatly enriching the lives of those who come in contact with her describes how we in Georgia regard Martha Wyllie.

Interestingly enough, Martha was born in Bangor, Maine, and lived in a private orphanage until she was adopted at 9 months of age. Her next home was in Massachusetts where she went through her schooling and college work, graduating from Lesley Teaching College in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Her interests and talents began to show up at the age of 4 when she sat down at the piano and played a song for her mother that she had just heard on the radio. Music lessons then, of course, began at age 5, which were taught by her mother until she advanced to the Conservatory of Music Teachings and traveled to numerous States playing with their symphony orchestras from age 10 to 17.

Throughout these formative years, she was also involved in school sports and a member of the Brownies and the