

which are necessary for the long-term stability of southeastern Europe. Many of us worked hard to correct this flaw in the immediate post-Dayton years, and continue to encourage democratic forces in Serbia to reckon fully with the Milosevic legacy.

Fortunately, along with the eventual ouster of Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia, we have seen more vigorous and positive action to move ahead in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the past five years. More of the displaced have returned to their original homes than was thought possible when Dayton was negotiated. It hasn't been easy for many who return as members of a minority population, but determination has helped them to prevail. More and more individuals indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, including Milosevic, have been transferred to The Hague, and, at a recent Helsinki Commission briefing, we learned that Bosnia's own War Crimes Chamber has been established and is ready to conduct sensitive trials in accordance with the rule of law. Srebrenica is being acknowledged as the crime that it was. Defense and police reform are underway, helping to pave the way for Bosnia's further Euro-Atlantic and European integration. The region around Brcko, so brutally contested during the conflict that not even Dayton could determine its status, now provides a model of multiethnic cooperation and economic recovery for the rest of the country. There are now discussions of constitutional reforms which, if adopted, will hopefully make the country of Bosnia and Herzegovina a sum of its citizens and not a balance of its ethnicities.

If the Dayton Agreement succeeded in anything, Mr. Speaker, it was because its detailed provisions and improved implementation have provided the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina with both the parameters of a state and enough time to bring their country back from the abyss. I have increasing confidence that they will succeed in moving from what was admittedly a "General Framework for Peace" to a solid basis for unity, freedom, prosperity and integration.

In the meantime, the international community has much it still needs to learn and develop. The conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina gave new purpose to NATO and enabled it to begin operating out of area. Fifty years after the Holocaust, those who commit war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide no longer operate with complete impunity. Still, the international community—whether the United States and its allies, regional bodies or the United Nations—remains slow in responding to human suffering, or in recognizing the implications massive human rights violations can have on international security. It too readily accepts the reality of innocent people being attacked, brutalized and killed. Look at the response during the assault on Srebrenica and then at the response to Darfur today; the similarities are strong.

I therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that Dayton's tenth anniversary is commemorated in a way that includes not only encouragement for Bosnia and Herzegovina to move beyond the agreement's limiting provisions, but encouragement for all policymakers to learn from the lessons of inaction in the face of evil.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 2005

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in opposition to H.R. 3010, the Labor-HHS-Education Conference Report. First and foremost, I am highly disturbed that the report has no earmarks for Member programs. Unfortunately, this conference report invests nearly \$1.5 billion less in critical education, health care and job assistance than last year. In fact, Republicans will spend more on tax cuts this week, \$70 billion, than they will on all education and labor programs over the entire coming year, \$68 billion. The conference report is only the most recent evidence that Republicans are out of touch with the priorities of the American people. Together, America can do better.

With a record 55 million children in public schools and state budgets stretched thin, No Child Left Behind funding is cut by \$784 million. Title I, which is the core of NCLB's efforts to improve reading and math skills, receives the smallest increase for Title I in 8 years—only \$100 million—which means 3.1 million low-income children will be left behind. Further, even as the cost of a 4-year public college education has increased \$3,095, 34 percent, since 2001, the maximum Pell Grant is frozen for the fourth straight year, and no new funding for all other student financial aid and support programs is provided. These cuts are unthinkable, and the American people do not deserve this treatment.

In addition to other horrible cuts, in an age where being tech-savvy is a necessity not a privilege, the digital divide just got bigger as the bill cuts the Education Technology Program by \$221 million or 45 percent. Republicans will actually cut the Federal share of special education costs from 18.6 percent in FY 2005 to 18.0 percent by providing the smallest increase for the Individuals with Disabilities Act in a decade. The bill provides \$4 billion less than Republicans promised for IDEA. It is hard to imagine, but with 7.4 million Americans out of work, Republicans cut the Community College Initiative's efforts to train workers for high skill, high paying jobs by \$125 million and rescind \$125 million from funds provided last year, denying this assistance to 100,000 Americans. Republicans also cut job search assistance through the Employment Service by \$89 million, 11 percent. To further add injury to insult, state Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service offices are cut by \$245 million, 7 percent, eliminating help for 1.9 million people. With consumers expected to pay 52 percent more for electricity this winter, Republicans still failed to increase funding for LIHEAP home heating assistance, which helps keep the heat on for low-income seniors and children.

Only about 10 percent of physicians in America practice in rural areas despite the fact that one-fourth of the U.S. population lives in these areas. There are significant shortages of

health care providers in urban, underserved areas, but training grants for healthcare professionals are cut \$206 million, 69 percent. Further, nearly 46 million Americans are without health insurance yet Republicans provide virtually no funding for new Community Health Centers beyond those approved last year. Republicans also eliminate the Healthy Communities Access Program, \$83 million, and state planning grants to improve health care coverage, \$11 million. Preventive Health Block Grants to state health departments help address critical public health problems. The bill provides less for responding to disease outbreaks, immunizing children, and improving care for people with chronic diseases, when it cuts these grants by \$31 million or 24 percent.

In addition, The International Labor Affairs Bureau will have a hard time protecting American workers from being undercut by child and slave labor abroad after being cut by \$20 million or 21.4 percent.

In closing let me note that I was disappointed that the bill did provide earmarks for Member projects. However, I was pleased to see that this action by the Republicans was the straw that broke the camel's back, and as a result, the Conference Report was voted down. I hope once conferees return to the drawing board; they get it right once and for all.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE RULE OF  
LAW

**HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, when our new Attorney General, Alberto Gonzales, pledged earlier this year that enforcement of our civil rights laws would be one of his priorities, we all wished him well in fulfilling that commitment.

When leaders here in Washington—Democrats and Republicans alike—have expressed support for extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, our hopes for a better and more just society have been encouraged.

When this Nation rose as one and bowed our heads in respect for the life of Ms. Rosa Parks, the "Mother of Civil Rights in America," we also were re-dedicating ourselves to the ideals of equality, opportunity and civility that are the foundation of American society.

I remind the House of these promising, non-partisan expressions of our Nation's shared values, Mr. Speaker, for a very important reason.

Last Sunday, the Washington Post published a news article that outlined some deeply disturbing assertions about the operation of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

The article entitled Civil Rights Focus Shift Roils Staff at Justice, written by Mr. Dan Eggen, reported that nearly 20 percent of the Civil Rights Division's non-political attorneys resigned or retired during fiscal year 2005.

We also learned that significant disagreements exist between career civil rights attorneys within the Department and administration appointees about the priority that should be given to the enforcement of our civil rights laws.

These policy disagreements—at the core of many resignations—have included the Department's decisions to approve redistricting plans in Mississippi and Texas, as well as the controversial decision to approve a new Georgia statute that would require voters to present government-issued photo identification cards at the polls.

In October, Judge Harold Murphy of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia granted an injunction last month to lawyers for Common Cause of Georgia, the ACLU, the NAACP and other groups who have challenged the Georgia photo identification statute under the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Judge Murphy ruled that the petitioners have shown a substantial likelihood that they will ultimately prevail in establishing that it “unduly burdens the right to vote” and “constitutes a poll tax.” Recently, a three-judge appellate panel, made up of one Democratic and two Republican appointees, confirmed this reasoning by upholding the lower court's injunction.

Why, we must ask, does the policy leadership of our Department of Justice not agree?

Consider, also, this revealing fact. The Department of Justice's own statistics confirm that prosecutions for the racial and gender discrimination crimes traditionally handled by the Civil Rights Division have declined by 40 percent over the past 5 years.

The Department has vigorously disputed both the significance of the policy disagreements within its Civil Rights Division and the exodus of so many career attorneys.

However, the facts indicate that Attorney General Gonzales faces some very real obstacles to his promise about renewed civil rights priority.

Mr. Speaker, we know from history that the legitimacy of any government rests upon the fairness of its laws and willingness to vigorously uphold the rule of law.

We cannot overlook patterns of systematic neglect within the agency entrusted to enforce our laws.

These failures threaten our most fundamental legal guarantees.

That is why we must not be hesitant to seek the answers to the hard questions, the questions that the people we represent are asking.

Why have civil rights cases declined so precipitously in recent years?

Why have career attorneys in the Civil Rights Division been reassigned to other duties?

Why are so many career lawyers leaving the Department of Justice?

What must Congress do to better support America's chief law enforcement officer in fulfilling his commitment to make enforcement of our civil rights laws a priority?

Mr. Speaker, let the discord within the Department of Justice serve as a bellwether to all Americans who believe in the principles of civil rights.

A renewed vigor and more certain direction are desperately needed in the enforcement of civil rights.

We must remain vigilant. We must move forward with a sense of urgency.

If America is to serve as the beacon of democracy for the rest of the world, it is the imperative that we enforce justice, equality and the rule of law within our own country.

HONORING PROFESSOR LAWRENCE F. ROBERGE

**HON. JOHN B. LARSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 18, 2005*

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Professor Lawrence F. Roberge for being awarded the 2005 U.S. Professor of the Year for the State of Connecticut by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, CASE.

Professor Roberge earned this award for his work as the associate professor and chair of the Science Department at Goodwin College located in East Hartford, CT in my district. As a dedicated educator for nearly 20 years, Professor Roberge has taught a variety of college science and technology courses. Professor Roberge's expertise and skills aided him in also designing and teaching online educational courses.

During his tenure as chair of the Science Department at Goodwin College, Professor Roberge developed multi-media and computer-based teaching tools to aid in the development and training of the Science Department teaching staff. In addition, Professor Roberge was responsible for designing the science curriculum and labs for the nursing program. Professor Roberge was an inspiration in the classroom while he taught courses in chemistry, anatomy and physiology, and microbiology.

The Council for Advancement and Support of Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching award four university and college professors as national winners and also recognize a State Professor of the Year in 40 States, the District of Columbia and Guam. These professors are recognized for their outstanding commitment to teaching undergraduate students and their influence on fellow colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating Professor Lawrence F. Roberge for receiving this prestigious award. As a former educator, I am honored to recognize Professor Roberge for his exceptional commitment and service to teaching undergraduate students in the State of Connecticut.

#### DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

**HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 17, 2005*

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Republican budget bill.

Unfortunately, this bill is just another example of the disdain that this administration and this Congress has shown for the most vulnerable in our society. While the wealthy are lavished with tax cuts, critical social services are being reduced.

Under the guise of offsetting the costs of Katrina and deficit reduction, House Republicans are severely cutting important programs that millions of Americans rely on for edu-

cation, health care, and poverty alleviation. The \$50 billion in Republican cuts will have a devastating impact on families across America and in my home State of Massachusetts.

At the same time, Republicans are pushing a \$70 billion tax package that will overwhelmingly benefit the most wealthy Americans and actually increases the deficit by \$16 billion.

Now, I support the idea of shared sacrifice but the only sacrifice in this bill is by those that need our government's support the most: \$14.3 billion, cut from student loans; \$11.4 billion, cut from Medicaid; \$4.9 billion, cut from child support; \$844 million, cut from food stamps.

Republicans will cut student loan funding by \$14.3 billion. This represents the largest single cut in the history of the student aid program at a time when the cost of tuition has risen 28 percent at public colleges and 17 percent at private colleges in the last five years.

In my home State of Massachusetts there are 172,640 student loan borrowers. Under the Republican plan, the average student borrower in Massachusetts, with \$17,500 in loans will be forced to pay an additional \$5,800.

The Republican budget bill cuts of \$11.4 billion from Medicaid. This \$11.4 billion cut includes \$6.5 billion in cuts that are borne directly by Medicaid enrollees—who include low-income children and seniors, as well as individuals with disabilities.

Massachusetts ranks 12th in the country for Medicaid enrollment with over 1.2 million enrollees. The cuts would harm millions of low-income people across the U.S. and thousands in Massachusetts who rely on Medicaid for health coverage.

Child support enforcement will be cut by \$4.9 billion. The Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates that this will result in reducing child support collections by \$24.1 billion over the next 10 years.

Experts agree that child support is a cost effective way of reducing poverty. In 2002, 1 million Americans were lifted out of poverty through child support payments. For every \$1 spent on child support enforcement programs, \$4.38 in child support is collected.

Massachusetts would lose \$88 million in Federal support over 5 years, rising to \$282 million over 10 years. The estimated loss in child support collections would be \$140 million over 5 years, rising to \$428 million over 10 years.

Nearly 250,000 Massachusetts children currently receive child support enforcement services. This will have a devastating effect on the Commonwealth's children who live in single-parent families.

Finally, this bill as originally drafted would cut food stamps by \$844 million and will result in over 200,000 people losing assistance.

Where are our priorities when we put tax cuts for the wealthy above the elderly, low income families, students, and children?

Vote “no” on the Republican budget bill.

GJERGJ KASTRIOTI  
“SKENDERBEG”

**HON. DANA ROHRBACHER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 18, 2005*

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD