

coach Peter Laviolette, team captain Rod Brind'Amour and all of the team's players, veterans and rookies alike, on their hard-earned success.

The team's 3–1 win in Game 7 of this year's Stanley Cup finals was proof that hard work pays off.

After years of losses and the trials involved in the team's move to North Carolina, the Hurricanes have conquered the world of hockey by winning the most famous trophy in the world of sports.

Despite hockey's short history in our region and sparse crowds in the team's early years on the ice, I have been amazed at how lovingly the people of North Carolina have embraced the former Hartford Whalers once they became the Hurricanes and owner Peter Karmanos moved the team to our state in 1997.

I am amazed that so many people in eastern North Carolina, who, like me, were not familiar with the sport of hockey, have grown to love the sport because of the Hurricanes.

Even in the town where I live, 68 miles East of Raleigh, I see countless cars flying the Hurricanes flag throughout the hockey season.

North Carolina residents, well-known fans of college basketball and NASCAR, have warmly embraced the sport of hockey by catching Hurricanes fever.

These athletes have become an integral part of their communities by actively involving themselves in the communities where they live.

For this, they have gained the respect and admiration of their North Carolina neighbors and fans.

When I go to a game, I am always so impressed by how many families I see cheering together for the Hurricanes, who we have welcomed into our communities and into the North Carolina family.

Their hard work, talent, and teamwork have been an incredible gift to loyal fans across the state.

There is a saying that a successful team beats with one heart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the team's Stanley Cup victory, it is without a doubt that the Carolina Hurricanes beat with one heart—the heart of a champion.

I am proud that the Hurricanes call North Carolina home and I congratulate their hard-earned success.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 883.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

#### BENEDICT ARNOLD PRESS?

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, and now we are being told we are battling the press as well. The United States has rooted out terror on a global scale. They have also gotten unprecedented help from other countries and international banking institutions to seek out accounts used for al Qaeda money laundering, because without a supply of money, the terrorists have no fuse to light.

Now the New York Times has apparently detailed that security program to the entire world, and we find ourselves pondering what to do when the press willingly reveals national security secrets to terrorists.

Prior to World War II, the United States had broken the Japanese military communications codes. A journalist published a book revealing this classified information, so right before the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese changed their codes so the United States was unaware of this invasion.

In 1950, a law was passed making releasing such classified information a crime. If the New York Times has violated this law by becoming the Benedict Arnold press, they need to be held accountable. Not even a journalist from the Times has the right to violate the law just to get a byline.

And that's just the way it is.

#### REAUTHORIZE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOW

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand partly the continued reasoning for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and I encourage my colleagues from Georgia and Texas to recognize that the vestiges of discrimination still require this particular initiative to be authorized and do so immediately.

This is a Supreme Court decision in the League of United Latin American Citizens versus the Governor of Texas. Specifically it says against this background, the Latinos' diminishing electoral support indicates their belief that the person was unresponsive to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group. In essence, the State took away the Latino's opportunity because Latinos were about to exercise it. This bears the mark of intentional discrimination that could give rise to an Equal Protection violation. The Voting Rights Act protects those from

discrimination and protects their right to vote.

Although this opinion gives a reckless aspect to midterm redistricting, which I hope we can correct legislatively, it does reaffirm the value, the importance and the sanctity of the Voting Rights Act in encouraging and protecting all Americans' rights to vote.

I ask my colleagues to read this opinion for a better understanding of why the Voting Rights Act is an effective civil rights initiative that should be reauthorized.

#### 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 Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE 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.)

#### HOUSE RECYCLING CAUCUS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. DEFAZIO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Members of the other body, Mrs. SNOWE of Maine and Mr. CARPER of Delaware, for forming the Senate Recycling Caucus. Their effort complements the prior formation of the House Recycling Caucus, which I was proud to establish with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GILLMOR.

I would suggest that the House and Senate Recycling Caucuses work together on issues facing the recycling industry in the United States. I would also like to urge my colleagues here in the House to join our respective caucuses.

When most of us think of recycling, we think either of the bright blue bins in our offices, or of collecting cans, bottles and newspapers at home. As important as municipal recycling is to our country, however, it represents just the tip of the iceberg of the \$30 billion-plus manufacturing industry that employs over 1.1 million Americans.

Most of us are probably also unaware that recyclables is one of our country's largest export commodities and are

also one of the bright stars in our country's balance of trade.

Many like myself see recycling as an important environmental issue facing our country, but there are a whole host of other issues that face, and possibly inhibit, recycling in the United States, far beyond just getting people to throw cans in the proper receptacle. That is why we created the Recycling Caucus, so we can focus our efforts on this important sector and address not only environmental issues, but also issues of trade, energy and commerce.

Chief among those issues is the very simple statement that should guide any legislative efforts that impact this industry. Recyclables are not just waste and recycling is not just disposal. In fact, recycling is the opposite of both. By thinking of recycling as waste and recycling as a disposal activity like trash or garbage collection, we risk encouraging unintended consequences that can and do inhibit recycling.

We need to avoid inhibiting recycling efforts because the benefits are tremendous. For example, recycling kept over 140 million tons of material out of landfills last year. In addition, manufacturing products from recycled materials save energy. For example, using recycled aluminum can save as much as 95 percent of the energy used when producing products from virgin ore. Recycling also reduces eight major categories of water pollutants and ten major categories of air pollutants, including greenhouse gas emissions, compared with manufacturing from scratch.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my caucus cochair, Mr. GILLMOR of Ohio, and our other colleagues who have already joined us on the House Recycling Caucus. I also want to thank the members and staff of the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries for their assistance over the past 2 years in helping us make the idea of the caucus into a reality.

The Recycling Caucus is a broad-based caucus that will address all facets of recycling, with input from a wide range of associations, industry groups, experts, environmental organizations and other stakeholders.

Again I want to wish Mrs. SNOWE and Mr. CARPER much success in the other body. I look forward to working with them to promote all aspects of recycling in the United States.

#### STRAIGHT FACTS ABOUT IRAQ

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5-minute Special Order out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President likes to say as the Iraqi people stand up, the U.S. will stand down. He has changed the mission from finding weapons of mass destruction to re-

moving a dictator and bringing democracy to Iraq, saying the Iraqi people would decide what is best for their country. The President essentially likes to point to the recent formation of a new Iraq government as vindication of his policies and a turning point in bringing peace to a troubled land.

Last week, Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki announced a 24 point reconciliation to stabilize the country, his government's first major independent initiative. Within hours, we learned the U.S. had been deeply involved in watering down what the administration did not like about the Iraqi reconciliation plan, including two key elements, an offer of amnesty for insurgents and calling for a timetable for U.S. troop withdrawal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. U.S. troops will never be able to leave Iraq as long as we stay the course of allowing the Iraqi government to make decisions only so long as we agree with.

After all the sacrifices made by the American people, after all the American soldiers lost in combat, wounded and psychologically scarred in combat, the President's Iraq strategy is evolving into a corporate subsidy strategy. Influential leaders at home and abroad are beginning to raise questions about the President's intentions.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the record three recent articles from the mainstream influential news media in the Mideast and the U.S. "Sovereignty is just a word on paper until Iraq is allowed to run its own affairs," is the title of an editorial published in the Daily Star, a distinguished newspaper in Lebanon.

On the same day, the Daily Star reprinted a commentary originally published in the Los Angeles Times entitled: An Iraq Amnesty Will Split the Insurgency. The Arab News published a commentary entitled Reconciliation in Iraq: If Only Maliki Had Freedom of Action.

Thoughtful people are raising troubling questions. This is the conclusion of the Daily Star's editorial: "The Iraqis need the space to make hard decisions that will help them restore stability in their country. But they will never find this space so long as the U.S. officials continue to micromanage the Iraqi government according to their own plan. What the Iraqis really need most now is what the Americans promised them long ago, freedom. And that ought to include the freedom to govern their own country in a way that would benefit the Iraqi people."

The President keeps telling Congress and the American people that it is stated policy to let Iraq stand up. If that is the case, then the President cannot instruct the administration to hold the Iraqi government down. Otherwise, we are installing a U.S. government, run by Iraqis, and that is one of the worst fears of the Middle East.

If the President is going to follow his own policy, then Iraqi leaders may

make decisions we don't like. If the President is calling the shots behind the scenes, then the new Iraqi government will have no credibility. Without credibility an Iraqi government is living on borrowed time, and we know it.

This Nation has some history with attempts to install or prop up governments around the world beholden to the United States, and the record is dismal. How many times have we thrown billions at so-called friends, only to see these leaders ousted or ignored because they are seen as puppets of the United States?

The Arab News commentary says, "If left to his own devices Iraq's new Prime Minister Maliki has a good chance of uniting his fractured country and stamping out the violence. But there is just one problem. U.S. internal politics appear to be thwarting his efforts."

Running Iraq from behind the scenes cannot be the President's definition of stay the course, or the U.S. will stay in Iraq indefinitely. The Iraq war has divided this Nation, and the Iraq government's decisions on difficult issues like amnesty for insurgents will divide America even more.

The President said he wanted a free and independent Iraq. Well, perhaps he got what he wanted. Now what is he going to do about it?

□ 2345

Finding a way to end the war can be as difficult as finding a way to start a war. It will be impossible unless the President starts talking straight to the American people and to the Iraqi people. You cannot install a puppet government and think that that is going to fool the Iraqis. They will continue to attack, which will keep our troops there and keep the death going.

We must be honest about what our policy in Iraq really is.

[From the Arab News, June 27, 2006]

RECONCILIATION IN IRAQ: IF ONLY MALIKI HAD FREEDOM OF ACTION

(By Linda Heard)

If left to his own devices Iraq's new Prime Minister Nuri Al-Maliki has a good chance of uniting his fractured country and stamping out the violence. But there is just one problem. U.S. internal politics appear to be thwarting his efforts.

On Sunday, Al-Maliki presented his Parliament with a 24-point national reconciliation plan that was backed by Sunni opposition figures. This included amnesty for insurgents without blood on their hands, further prisoner releases, and a timetable for Iraqis to take over all aspects of their country's security.

Des Browne, Britain's defense secretary, applauded the moves saying, "There is no conflict in the world that has been resolved without dealing with the issue of reconciliation. Reconciliation requires risks, whether it is in South Africa, Northern Ireland or the Balkans . . ."

These are undoubtedly good steps on the road to cementing various factions but earlier press releases suggest Al-Maliki's initial grand design has been considerably watered-down.

According to a report in last Friday's Times newspaper titled "Peace deal offers