

women for this sacrifices they have made in this war and rebuked the defeatists who would set an arbitrary date for surrender.

Therefore, I respectfully submit the text of Mr. Wham's speech for the RECORD in the hopes that others will stand with him in support of our troops and the mission for which they fight.

[From the Sentinel, May 8, 2007]

2007 TRIBUTE TO THE TROOPS

(By Jim Wham)

I want to commend the 15th Street Church of God for this event at the Bandshell. This evening of prayer and song forms the perfect occasion to recognize the men and women serving this country in the Armed Forces of the United States. Each one of them and their families are making a sacrifice unlike any other.

Every American when called to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States performs the duty assigned to him or her by the Commander-in-Chief and not by Congressmen and Senators.

I thought of each life of these men and women and all others who served their country. The course and destiny of their lives are set by chance assignment of that duty. Some come back unscathed, others marked by grievous wounds and others never come back.

The month of May is the month we pay honor to the men and women on Armed Services Day a couple of weeks from now, and then a week later, Memorial Day—a day when everyone in this land of liberty must stop, look to the story of the soldiers, sailors and marines who fell on battlefields—went down in sinking ships—in crashing planes—in the deserts—in the jungles—in the towns—all over this world during the entire lifetime of this nation.

The unknown soldiers and the unsung heroes—there are thousands and thousands of them. These gallant men and women most likely will never be known by the people for what they did. They served and they did not ask for glory. Their deeds of valor on battlefields and oceans and in the air never had a chance to be forgotten because they remained unspoken and unknown.

The American people never forget these known and unknown living and dead Americans—this ever expanding LEGION OF HONOR has never let their country down and no one in this country should ever let them down.

Jesus tells us “Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.” The peacemakers—they are the men and women in the American Armed Forces—the peacemakers who in defending freedom do so to bring peace to the world—God's world and to the children of God.

The tyrants foment conflict and war. The armed forces of the U.S. are always against the tyrant—never in support of the tyrant, and these American men and women we honor today—honor them for opposing a tyranny of a new dark age, a tyranny of worldwide terrorism—a dark age spawned from the dens of terrorists throughout the world even in this country and in our allies Britain and Israel as well as in countless other nations.

These insane religious fanatics misuse their religion to cultivate and persuade thousands of suicide bombers to destroy multi-thousands of innocent people who are unlucky enough to be at the wrong place at the wrong time when the suicide bomber explodes himself in their midst.

This war in Iraq is no civil war—it is a war against gangs of vicious mad dog criminals who want to kill off any democratic government that can be formed—a government that people yearn for and deserve. These crimi-

nals know that they cannot succeed as long as American troops are in Iraq helping good people form a democracy.

These criminals hide in the casbahs and mountains while promoting their lackeys to kill themselves and others, hoping that such killings will aid the second-guessers in America to oppose the Commander-in-Chief by insisting on a day of surrender—a day to leave the Middle East—a day to quit any resistance against the terrorists.

These second-guessers proclaim to the world that the war is lost; their words bring smiles to the evil faces of those marauders. These quitters are like a quarterback shouting to the other team. “We’re not going to pass, we’re runnin’ around the left end.”

We are running away from you—the terrorists—is the message of the quitter.

If they want to win a war they say is lost, they, the second guessers not the President, must change their tune because quitters never win.

The Scripture proclaims “If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle.” There are far too many uncertain trumpets being sounded in Washington today and in the national news media. These uncertain trumpets inspire nothing but joy in the haunts of the terrorists who love to hear those mournful tunes in the USA.

When these friends from Hell see the leader of the Senate on television proclaim the war is lost, the terrorists around the world applaud and promote more suicide bombers to hasten the day of American surrender.

And when they see and hear the Senate leader condemn the Vice President, they applaud again and try to kill him in Pakistan.

Don't these second guessing quitters know that the United States has a vital interest to contest the terrorist in the Middle East—in that caldron of hatred and insanity which is the launching pad for terrorists against this country and its allies?

Don't be second-guessers give any thought at all to the downside of an American surrender by pulling out of that part of the world?

Every concerned American who stops, looks, and listens to the present day happenings knows the disastrous downside of an American pull-out from Iraq.

It would proclaim to the world an American confession that terrorism has won a victory over the United States.

World power of the United States would evaporate.

No longer would the United States lead in the battle for peace and freedom which is so necessary to the salvation of our own way of life.

Do the quitters ever envision their day at the Baghdad airport—when a thousand transport planes land and take off with the American army to the dismay of every decent person who knows that there goes the last best chance for peace and freedom?

Why can't these quitters envision that into the vacuum left behind, the criminal gangs of the Taliban, al Qaeda, the death squads of both Sunnis and Shiites will seize the opportunity in a common cause against their own people and against America and her allies by joining together these legions of evil against the decent people of the Middle East.

Doesn't it occur to the quitter that a coalition of Iran, Iraq and Syria under despotic leaders will bring pressure and threat of conquest against Saudi Arabia and Kuwait as Saddam Hussein attempted to do in the 1990's Desert Storm?

Can't the quitters envision the utter chaos that will come when the nuclear bomb is developed in Iran or acquired from North Korea and those reckless fanatics threaten their surrounding countries to join the crowd?

If America is gone from Iraq, will that insane fanatic from Iran, Ahmadinejad press the button that will lead to a premature Armageddon in Israel?

A hundred years ago, when Teddy Roosevelt was President, he spoke these words about this nation's destiny: “We have no choice as to whether or not we shall play a great part in the world. That is already the case. “All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or play it ill.”

Thus far, we have played it well but we are now at the crossroads of the decision that will affect all mankind. The question is, will we stay and fight for freedom and for peace or will we forfeit the field to those vicious criminals who in no way respect the God-given miracle of life.

Rudyard Kipling—the great British patriot and poet of the 19th and 20th Centuries put to verse the lesson of perseverance in long lasting battles. Here's the way he wrote it:

“How do we know, when the long fight rages,
On the old, stale front that we cannot shake,
And it looks as though we were locked for ages.

How do we know they are going to break?

There is no lull in the level firing,
Nothing has shifted except the sun.

Yet we can feel they are tiring, tiring—

Yet we can tell they are ripe to run.

Something wavers, and, while we wonder,

Their centre-trenches are emptying out,

And, before their useless flanks go under,

Our guns have pounded retreat to rout.”

In other words, we win by hanging on.

My friends, American forces are going to win this war against terrorism. The war is not lost and no one should listen to the quitters because they are the losers of the present and the future.

If we but stand fast with the troops and our Commander-in-Chief, the fiends of Hell will lose. And the sacrifice of these gallant men and women we honor today will not have been in vain. They must not be let down by quitting and surrender.

THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I hereby submit, for the RECORD, the text of my report to you on the activities of the U.S. Delegation to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, held in early July in Kyiv, Ukraine.

I had the honor to chair the U.S. Delegation, which included Senator BEN CARDIN as the deputy head of delegation, as well as our Majority Leader, Mr. STENY HOYER. Other participants on the U.S. Delegation were Representatives CHRIS SMITH, MARCY KAPTUR, LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER, MICHAEL McNULTY, ROBERT ADERHOLT, MIKE MCINTYRE, HILDA L. SOLIS, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, DORIS MATSUI and GWEN S. MOORE.

As the report details, the delegation was active at the Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, which is an inter-parliamentary body consisting of 56 participating States from North America, Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, as well as numerous partner states from the Middle East, North Africa and Asia. Like the OSCE as a whole, its mandate embraces the comprehensive definition of international security to include not only the traditional military political-military issues

but also human rights, economic cooperation and environmental protection.

In submitting this report, I want to stress the value of American engagement in world affairs, particularly by Members of Congress. In Kyiv, we engaged in a dialogue on issues of concern not only to us, but to our counterparts from other countries. Having served as the President of the OSCE PA, I remain active as President Emeritus as well as a Special Representative on Mediterranean Affairs. Senator CARDIN serves as a Vice President. In Kyiv, our colleague HILDA SOLIS was elected Vice Chair of the "Third" Committee on Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. Members of the U.S. delegation introduced resolutions, suggested amendments and participated in the voting which led to the adoption of a declaration. The text of the declaration can be found on the Assembly's Website, www.oscepa.org.

Our activity was not confined to the meeting halls. We also met President Yushchenko and other Ukrainian officials, in recognition of the importance of Ukraine. We laid wreaths at Babyn Yar and at the Ukrainian Famine memorial. We traveled to Chernobyl, the site of the nuclear accident in 1986.

These activities, I would argue, advance our country's national interest. The U.S. Delegation represented the wonderful diversity of the United States population. It also highlighted a diversity of opinion on numerous issues. It nevertheless revealed a common hope to make the world a better place, not just for Americans but for all humanity. The delegation helped to counter the negative image many have about our country.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I write to thank you for designating me to head the U.S. Delegation to the Sixteenth Annual Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE PA), and to report to you on the work of our bipartisan delegation. The delegation participated fully in the activity of the Standing Committee and the plenary sessions as well as in the Assembly's three committees.

Joining me as Delegation leaders were Commission Co-Chairman Senator Benjamin L. Cardin and Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer. Other Helsinki Commissioners who also participated include the Ranking Member, Rep. Christopher H. Smith, and Representatives Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Robert B. Aderholt, Mike McIntyre, Hilda L. Solis and G.K. Butterfield. They were joined by Representatives Marcy Kaptur, Michael R. McNulty, Doris Matsui and Gwen S. Moore.

This year's Assembly, hosted by the Verkhovna Rada, Ukraine's Parliament, in Kyiv, July 5-9, brought together 234 parliamentarians from 50 OSCE States, representatives from several Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation, as well as delegates representing Afghanistan, a Partner for Cooperation. Five delegations were headed by parliamentary leaders. The U.S. delegation, with 13 Members, was the largest in Kyiv. The designated theme for this year's Annual Session was "Implementation of OSCE Commitments."

Assembly President Göran Lennmarker (Sweden) opened the Inaugural Plenary Session which included an address by Ukrainian

President Viktor Yushchenko, who took the opportunity to discuss Ukraine's commitment to democratic development and challenges. President Yushchenko urged delegates to recognize, in their respective parliaments, the genocidal nature of the Ukraine Famine, the Holodomor. OSCE Chairman-in-Office Miguel Angel Moratinos, the Foreign Minister of Spain, also addressed the plenary before taking questions from the parliamentarians.

At the Standing Committee, the leadership body of the Assembly composed of the Heads of Delegations representing the 56 OSCE participating States, I presented a summary of my activities as Special Representative on Mediterranean Affairs, including my visits in June to Israel and Jordan. During the Kyiv meeting, I convened a special meeting on the Mediterranean Dimension of the OSCE, attended by approximately 100 parliamentarians from Algeria, Egypt, Israel, and Jordan as well as many of the OSCE participating States.

The Standing Committee also heard reports from other Assembly Special Representatives. The OSCE PA Treasurer, Senator Jerry Grafstein (Canada), reported that the Assembly was operating well within its overall budget guidelines and that KPMG, the Assembly's external auditors, again had delivered a positive assessment of the Assembly's financial management. The Standing Committee unanimously approved the Treasurer's proposed budget for fiscal year 2007/2008, including an increase of 4.18% over last year's expenditures. OSCE PA Secretary General R. Spencer Oliver reported on the International Secretariat's activities.

Members of the U.S. Delegation actively participated in the work of the Assembly's three General Committees: Political Affairs and Security; Economic Affairs, Science, Technology and Environment; and Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Questions. Each committee considered its own resolution as well as nine of the 10 supplementary items registered before the session. One supplementary item was debated in plenary. Senator Cardin introduced a supplemental item on "Combating Anti-Semitism, Racism, Xenophobia and other forms of Intolerance against Muslims and Roma," and seven other U.S. delegates introduced a total of 25 amendments to either a committee resolution or to a supplementary item. All were adopted.

The U.S. Delegation also was instrumental in garnering necessary support for supplementary items and amendments proposed by our friends and allies among the participating States. The supplementary items considered and debated in Kyiv, other than Senator Cardin's, included "The Role and the Status of the Parliamentary Assembly within the OSCE"; "The Illicit Air Transport of Small Arms and Light Weapons and their Ammunition"; "Environmental Security Strategy"; "Conflict Settlement in the OSCE area"; Strengthening OSCE Engagement with Human Rights Defenders and National Human Rights Institutions"; "The Ban on Cluster Bombs"; "Liberalization of Trans-Atlantic Trade"; "Women in Peace and Security"; and, "Strengthening of Counteraction of Trafficking Persons in the OSCE Member States."

Attached is a copy of the Kyiv Declaration adopted by participants at the Assembly's closing plenary, which includes the input of the U.S. Delegation.

Following her appearance before the Helsinki Commission in Washington on June 21 during our hearing on "Guantánamo: Implications for U.S. Human Rights Leadership," Belgian Senate President Anne-Marie Lizin, the OSCE PA Special Representative on Guantánamo, presented her third report on

the status of the camp to a general Plenary Session of the Assembly. This report followed her second visit to the detention facility at Guantánamo on June 20, 2007 and gave the Assembly a balanced presentation which concluded that the facility should be closed.

The OSCE PA Special Representative on Gender Issues, Tone Tingstgård (Sweden), hosted an informal working breakfast to discuss gender issues where she presented her plan for future actions addressing gender issues within the OSCE PA. Members of the U.S. Delegation participated in the discussion at this meeting.

During the course of the Kyiv meeting members of the U.S. Delegation held a series of formal as well as informal bilateral meetings, including talks with parliamentarians from the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, parliamentary delegations from the Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation, including Israel, and Afghanistan. The U.S. Delegation hosted a reception for parliamentary delegations from Canada and the United Kingdom.

On the final day of the Kyiv meeting, the Assembly re-elected Göran Lennmarker (Sweden) as President. Mr. Hans Raidel (Germany) was elected Treasurer. Four Vice Presidents were elected in Kyiv: Anne-Marie Lizin (Belgium), Jerry Grafstein (Canada), Kimmo Kiljunen (Finland), and Panos Kammenos (Greece).

Rep. Hilda Solis was elected Vice Chair of the General Committee on Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Questions, which is responsible for addressing humanitarian and human rights-related threats to security and serves as a forum for examining the potential for cooperation within these areas. She joins Senator Cardin, whose term as Vice President extends until 2009, and me as OSCE PA President Emeritus, in ensuring active U.S. engagement in the Assembly's proceedings for the coming year.

While the Delegation's work focused heavily on OSCE PA matters, the venue presented an opportunity to advance U.S. relations with our Ukrainian hosts. While in Kyiv, the U.S. Delegation met with Ukrainian President Yushchenko for lengthy talks on bilateral issues, his country's aspirations for further Euro-Atlantic integration, energy security, international support for Chernobyl containment, and challenges to Ukraine's sovereignty and democratic development. The President discussed the political situation in Ukraine and the development of the May 27 agreement that provides for pre-term parliamentary elections scheduled for September 30, 2007.

The Delegation also visited and held wreath-laying ceremonies at two significant sites in the Ukrainian capital: the Babyn Yar Memorial, commemorating the more than 100,000 Ukrainians killed there during World War II—including 33,000 Jews from Kyiv that were shot in a two-day period in September 1941; and the Famine Genocide Memorial (1932-33) dedicated to the memory of the millions of Ukrainians starved to death by Stalin's Soviet regime in the largest man-made famine of the 20th century.

The delegation traveled to the Chernobyl exclusion zone and visited the site where on April 26, 1986, the fourth reactor of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant exploded, resulting in the world's worst nuclear accident. While in the zone, the delegation visited the abandoned city of Prypiat, the once bustling residence of 50,000 located a short distance from the nuclear plant. Members toured the Chernobyl facilities and discussed ongoing economic and environmental challenges with local experts and international efforts to find a durable solution to the containment of large quantities of radioactive materials still located at the plant.

I hope this summary of the Delegation's activity is useful to you, and let me again thank you for making this trip possible. The Seventeenth Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly will be held early next July in Astana, Kazakhstan, and I hope we can count on your support once again in ensuring that U.S. interests abroad are advanced through active participation in the OSCE PA.

Sincerely,

ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
Chairman.

BRINGING DIVERSITY TO THE FOREFRONT OF CURRENT ISSUES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I stand today to call attention to the issues of diversity this country is facing at the moment. I would also like to enter into the RECORD an opinion editorial by Lee Bollinger, president of Columbia University, from this week's edition of the New York Amsterdam News, entitled, "What's next for diversity?"

Diversity has been, and continues to be, an issue faced by America's institutions of higher education. Brown v. Board of Education was a monumental step forward in achieving diversity for the students in these institutions, but Supreme Court decisions like Grutter v. Bollinger, have caused many to wonder if we have forgotten what those involved in Brown v. Board of Education sought to do. Instead of seeing the Supreme Court continuously striving to achieve diversity, Americans see the decisions of the Supreme Court slowly chipping away at the precedents set forth in Brown v. Board of Education. The question, "What's next for diversity?" is one at the forefront of current issues and it calls all those who support diversity to support all that promotes it and denounce all that contradicts it.

I believe that programs meant to achieve diversity like affirmative action are necessary, and those who oppose such programs should be questioned for their motives. I hope that the questions brought forth by worried Americans will be answered in a timely fashion. Diversity has not been achieved, therefore I do not agree with those who believe diversity aimed programs should be phased out. I support affirmative action, as well as other programs aimed at achieving diversity, and call for the support of all others who feel the same.

WHAT'S NEXT FOR DIVERSITY?

(By Lee C. Bollinger)

For those of us who worked over so many years to reach the Supreme Court and affirm the constitutionality of affirmative action in higher education, which occurred in 2003 in Grutter v. Bollinger, this is the moment we have been dreading. The recent 5-4 decision limiting voluntary desegregation programs in our nation's public schools represents an inversion of the historic Brown v. Board of Education decision's clarion call for racial equality in education. And it is all too easy

to understand how societal efforts to achieve racial integration, including through affirmative action in higher education, are now in serious jeopardy.

To be sure, Justice Kennedy in his concurring opinion stopped the majority short of slamming the door on race-based diversity in our schools; and even the Chief Justice tried to explain why the use of race in law school admissions is different. Specifically, the Court said it was tolerable to consider race as one of several factors in Grutter because individual applicants were evaluated in a "holistic" way and because "the expansive freedoms of speech and thought associated with the university environment"—and fostered by diversity—"occupy a special niche in our constitutional tradition."

Yet anyone reading between the lines of the majority opinion could feel the Chief Justice straining to explain Grutter's constitutionality before making the point he really wanted to make: Grutter is a weak precedent with "expressly articulated key limitations" and that "the lower courts" have "largely disregarded" this "in extending Grutter" beyond "the unique context of higher education."

It is important that we read the narrowness of this interpretation of Grutter alongside the sweeping rhetoric that Chief Justice Roberts really wants this holding to signify: "The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race." This is the language anti-affirmative action advocates and a host of others will seize on. In this way, the methodical process Thurgood Marshall and others followed to achieve the Brown revolution will be used by the Roberts Court to undo it.

The difference is that the Brown decision brought the law down to earth, where it could finally see that separate school facilities were, as a matter of fact and experience, "inherently unequal." The Seattle and Louisville decision removes the law to its formalistic and disconnected position of a century ago, where, as empty rhetoric, it imagines an America that never was—and because of it, may never be.

In doing so, it obscures the larger debate about race in this country. Stripped bare, however, these school decisions are not about precedent, they are about broad philosophical differences about the role of public institutions in dealing with issues of race in America. Undergirding them is the feeling that Justice Scalia has made explicit, that society is tired of mending centuries of slavery and Jim Crow segregation, and that it is now up to those who have been discriminated against to "make it" on their own, as other groups have. For them, to consider race even for the noble end of integration does more harm than good by inflaming racial tensions.

These arguments make many Americans uncomfortable, and so they avoid them. I say let them be put on the table and debated, not hidden beneath phony "interpretations" of Brown. How should we respond to the fact that cities are more segregated today than they were a half century ago, or that the unemployment rates among African Americans in our inner cities is a multiple of the national number?

The problem for the Chief Justice is that wishing Brown stood only for the simpler proposition of "stopping discrimination" does not make it so. From the very beginning, Brown impelled us to take affirmative steps to achieve racial justice. And it is absurd to think the Court that decided Brown would have struck down these local school districts' efforts to carry out this mission.

Yet this is precisely the result the Roberts Court wants us to take at face value. It is up to us to confront them on this and insist, that if they are going to take this new turn in our basic law, they must state their real reasons for it. Otherwise the Court will continue pretending that its rulings are consistent with the Brown line of cases—and thus devoted to "conservative" principles—until there is nothing left of Brown. If that is not the epitome of "judicial activism," what is?

I often wonder what the unanimous Brown Court would think of a country fifty-three years later that has proven itself too impatient to achieve racial justice after centuries of being too slow to recognize it. Perhaps, knowing painfully the legacy of invidious discrimination they were seeking to overturn, they actually would not be surprised by this most recent turn of events. After all, every half century or so, the nation seems to back away from solving the problems of racial injustice, only to recommit itself to the cause when the pot is about to boil over. From the beginning of the Constitution to Dred Scott; from the Civil War and emancipation to Plessy; from Brown to today—we always seem to be better at articulating our ideals than delivering on them.

But it doesn't have to be this way. One of the things I learned in leading the litigation in the affirmative action cases was that dealing with issues of race is not something that people in the mainstream of American life want to talk about, but with the proper leadership, they will.

For example, while we were eventually praised for enlisting the support of forty of the Fortune 500 largest US corporations and from leaders in the military, it was exceedingly difficult to get those advocates to sign on to the cause of affirmative action in higher education. Like many of our political leaders, they were convinced that a majority of Americans would oppose them, and pointed to Prop 209 in California for proof. It was only after the Late President Gerald Ford agreed to stand with us that things began to change. "I don't want future college students to suffer the cultural and social impoverishment that afflicted my generation," he wrote in the New York Times. That is what inspired General Motors to sign on—only then were we "in business."

I fear this latest Court decision represents the first act and scene of a national tragedy of withdrawal from Brown and Grutter's promise of a more inclusive America—a perilous shift in the direction of constitutional law from the last half century. But the scenes that follow are still ours to write—if only we have the courage and will to take up the pen. As President Ford said, "If history has taught us anything . . . it is the notion of America as a work in progress."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2007

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington, DC, yesterday because my flight from Seattle was cancelled. As a result I missed several recorded votes. Were I able, I would have voted in support of H.R. 2750, H. Res. 580, and H. Res. 579.