

Hillander will allow the brave men and women defending freedom abroad to spend more time in touch with their loved ones. The students at Hillander set a wonderful example of how a small unselfish effort can greatly benefit our military personnel.

I am proud to have compassionate and caring youngsters in my district, and I know our soldiers abroad will greatly appreciate their efforts.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR PRIVATE CALENDAR FOR 109TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the majority and minority leaderships, the Chair announces that the official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 109th Congress are as follows:

For the majority:

Mr. COBLE of North Carolina;
Mr. CHABOT of Ohio; and
Mr. FEENEY of Florida.

For the minority:

Mr. BOUCHER of Virginia;
Mr. SCHIFF of California; and
Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

There was no objection.

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION STRIKES SERIOUS BLOW TO CONCEPT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday handed down a decision that will ultimately be very harmful to our freedom and our prosperity. In a 5-to-4 decision, the Court decided that a city government could take a private home by eminent domain for the benefit of another private party.

This decision was in the case of *Kelo v. City of New London*, Connecticut,

and it strikes a serious blow right at the heart of or the concept of private property, which our Founding Fathers believed in so strongly. If anyone does not realize how important private ownership of property is to both our freedom and our prosperity, they should do a more detailed study of economics and world history. The most prosperous countries in the world, without exception, have been those that gave the greatest protection to private property. Not only is it important to individuals, it is important to government as well.

It sounds great for a politician to create a park; however, now that we have so many Federal, State, and local parks, we cannot take care of them properly. Also, most of them are vastly underused. But more importantly, when property goes from private to public ownership, it goes off the tax rolls. This means that taxes have to continually go up on the property that remains in private hands for the always increasing costs of schools and other public functions.

We can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land, Mr. Speaker. I will repeat that. We can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. They always want more. The Federal Government already owns over 30 percent of the land in this Nation. Another 20 percent is held by State or local governments or quasi-governmental agencies. So today about half the land is in some type of public ownership. But government always wants more and is continuously taking more. In addition, there are more and more restrictions being placed on the land that remains in private ownership, so developers are having to crowd more and more people into apartments, townhouses, or homes on postage-stamp lots, all at a rapidly escalating prices.

Some have said we do not need to worry about this decision because this new power will be used sparingly by local governments. Those who say that either do not really believe very strongly in the right of private property or they do not realize how government at all levels can rationalize or justify almost anything, especially almost any taking of property.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in her dissent against the Court's decision said: "The Court today significantly expands the meaning of public use. It holds that the sovereign may take private property currently put to ordinary private use and give it over for new, ordinary private use so long as the new use is predicted to generate some secondary benefit for the public, such as increased tax revenue . . . But nearly any lawful use of real private property can be said to generate some incidental benefit to the public. Thus," she said, "there really is now no realistic constraint on the taking of private property."

Justice O'Connor went on to say, "For who among us can say she already

makes the most productive or attractive possible use of her property? The specter of condemnation hangs over all property. Nothing is to prevent the State from replacing any Motel 6 with a Ritz Carlton, any home with a shopping mall, or any farm with a factory."

She later added, "Any property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process . . . As for the victims, the government now has license to transfer property from those with fewer resources to those with more. The Founders cannot have intended this perverse result."

In my home region of East Tennessee, government has taken huge amounts of land. Almost all has been taken from poor or lower-income families who would be wealthy today if they still had their beautiful land. Justice Clarence Thomas said in his dissent, "Something has gone seriously awry with this Court's interpretation of the Constitution. Though citizens are safe from the government in their homes, the homes themselves are not." Justice Thomas went on to say, "The consequences of today's decision are not difficult to predict, and promise to be harmful . . . Extending the concept of public purpose to encompass any economically beneficial goal guarantees that these losses will fall disproportionately on the poor."

Mr. Speaker, this decision by the U.S. Supreme Court is a very dangerous one and will end up being especially harmful to the poor and lower-income and working people of this country.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "A government big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take away everything you have."

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR JERALD AUGUST GLAUBITZ

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the men and women of America's greatest generation, the generation that saved freedom and defeated tyranny, pass quietly from this life each day. Too quietly, I believe. For this generation of Americans must never forget that we are the beneficiaries of their selfless acts and their sacrifice. They made America what it is today: free, strong, and vibrant.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and salute the many contributions of one member of that great generation, Jerald August Glaubitz, who passed away on April 26 at the age of 84.

□ 1700

Jerry Glaubitz was a constituent of mine. He was a friend of mine. In some

respects, he was a mentor of mine. I have known him for almost 40 years. More importantly, he was a trusted public servant, a patriot, and a good personal friend.

A native of Murdock, Nebraska, Jerry was just 18 years old when he joined the United States Navy in 1938. He was stationed on the U.S.S. *San Francisco* and was present at Pearl Harbor on that day of infamy in December 1941 when 2,300 sailors and civilians lost their lives.

Jerry Glaubitz survived the treacherous Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor and remained determined to honor the memory of those service men and women who were not as fortunate. Jerry served as the president of the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, and he played a key role during the observation of the 50th anniversary of that attack.

After the war in which Jerry served, he returned home, more than determined than ever to live a life defined by the love of his wife and family, a life marked by his commitment to community and to his Nation. For 43 years, from 1961 to 2004, Jerry Glaubitz served as the mayor of Morningside, Maryland, a town of approximately 1,000 citizens, a small town, a vibrant town, a town where every neighbor knew one another and every neighbor was concerned about one another.

At his retirement, he was the longest-serving mayor in our State, and one of the longest serving mayors in the Nation. Morningside Councilman Jim Ealey said recently, "Jerry took over the town when it was a one-horse town and nourished it and contributed everything he had to that town."

Jerry also was a mainstay on the Morningside Volunteer Fire Department, joining the department in 1947 and serving as president, chief, and chaplain over the next 5 decades. He was a past president of the Maryland State Fire Association and the Prince George's County Volunteer Firemen's Association.

I had the great privilege as chairman of the caucus and as a member of the State Senate of Maryland of working closely with Jerry, both in his capacity as the mayor of Morningside, the president of the state fire association, and the county fire association. I can think of few people, Mr. Speaker, who cared more about their family, their community, and their country than did Jerry Glaubitz.

I want to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife of 62 years, Jean; his daughter, Carol; his son, Larry, and all of his family and friends. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they find comfort in the fact that his was a life well-lived, a life that enriched countless others. A God that is merciful has taken Jerry to be home. He took him from a country that is grateful for his service and a community that is better for his life.

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

tleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND DECEPTIONS IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the common theme to the war in Iraq has been the Bush administration's ability and willingness to mislead the American people. First, they misled about the weapons of mass destruction. Then, nearly 2 years ago, they falsely declared the end of major combat operations. Now, they are openly declaring the success of the mission, and President Bush regularly speaks of an increasingly democratic Iraq.

This assessment suggests the degree to which the President fails to comprehend the disastrous lack of security that has plagued Iraq over the last 2 years. Personally, I am frightened that our own President has such a failed understanding about the reality of the war that he started.

Just as disturbing were recent comments by Vice President DICK CHENEY. In an interview, he said that the Iraqi insurgency was in its "last throes." I am not sure which press reports the Vice President has been reading but, somehow, I do not think his optimistic assessment of Iraq's insurgency is grounded in real fact.

Unfortunately, misleading assessments of the war like these do not magically secure Iraq from the true threats that it faces. And the true threats are an increasingly strengthened Iraq insurgency, bolstered by the continued United States military occupation of Iraq.

On the ground, a violent wave of car bombings and other attacks killed 80 U.S. soldiers and more than 700 Iraqis in the month of May alone. Vice President CHENEY calls this the "last throes"? And by mid-June, almost one-third more troops were killed than during all of the month of May.

At some point, the Bush administration needs to admit what the rest of the American people know, that its current strategy for Iraq is failing.

Recent polls show that 63 percent of Americans want our troops to come home. Now it is time for the President to start listening to the American people, the people he works for.

Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle understand that our Iraq policy is a disaster. When the House recently debated the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, 122 Democrats, five Republicans, and one Independent voted in favor of my amendment simply expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a plan for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and bring his plan to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are less secure, not more secure, as a result of the war in Iraq. This war has created a whole new generation of terrorists whose common bond is their hatred for the United States and our aggressive militarism. We have asked the President to address Iraq's lack of security. We have asked him to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not, so we will. And when we put our plan in place and when the troops come home, we can begin to plan for the future.

Fortunately, there is a plan that would secure America for the future. That plan is the SMART Security resolution which I recently reintroduced with the support of 50 of my House colleagues. SMART is a Sensible Multilateral American Response To Terrorism for the 21st Century, and it will help us address the threats we face as a Nation.

SMART will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the very conditions which allow terrorism to take root: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunities. Instead of rushing off to war under false pretenses, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues. That way we will be able to deal with global crises diplomatically instead of resorting to armed conflict.

Instead of maintaining a long-term military occupation of Iraq, our future efforts to help the Iraqi people must follow the SMART approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies, to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration needs to take a long, hard, and honest look at the effects of our policies in Iraq. Once they do, they will understand that the United States is less safe than we were before we got ourselves into this preemptive war and that we must end this long and destructive war.