

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Last Wednesday, I attended the funeral of one of my constituents, a 25-year veteran of the Philadelphia Police Force. His name was Officer Charles Cassidy.

Officer Cassidy was shot and killed in the line of duty on October 31, 2007. He was 54, and he left behind his wife, Judy, and their three children, Jody, Casey and Cody.

I would ask everyone here tonight in the House of Representatives to join me in a moment of silence for Officer Cassidy and the 62 other officers killed in the line of duty this year in our Nation.

Thank you.

The pain I witnessed at Officer Cassidy's funeral, that of his family, of his fellow officers, and the citizens of the entire region is why I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in condemning the significant and deplorable wave of violence against police officers across this Nation.

In the Philadelphia Police Department alone, in the past 2 months, five other officers have been shot while protecting our city.

They will all survive their wounds and continue to serve the citizens of the city of Philadelphia. They are:

Officer Richard Decoatsworth on September 24, 2007, who was shot in the face with a shotgun while making a traffic stop. He survived his injuries after 5 hours of surgery. I saw him at the funeral last week.

Officer Sandra Van Hinkel on October 28, 2007, was shot in the right leg during a gunfight near a nightclub.

And Officer Marino Santiago on October 30, 2007, was shot in the shoulder while responding to a shooting that left three people hospitalized.

And just last night, the city was once again shocked to learn that two undercover narcotics officers were shot while serving a warrant at a suspect's residence on Oxford Avenue not far from my Philadelphia district office.

And last May, I stood on this floor to remember another fallen police officer, another constituent, Philadelphia Police Officer Gary Skerski.

Unfortunately, Philadelphia is not alone in this battle against violent crime. Cities big and small are coping with the threat and the reality of violent crime. So far this year across the country, 63 officers have died from gunshots.

We cannot tolerate any more of this violence against our citizens or against our police officers. We, the political and civic leadership of this country, must commit our will to tackle the wave of violence and the lack of respect for the rule of law and law enforcement.

This means bringing all the forces we have within law enforcement and also within delinquency, criminal justice, human services, probation and parole, education, employment, mental health and drug addiction services to face the reality of what is happening and to say that this violence is no longer acceptable, that this violence must stop.

It also means that the President and this Congress must respond with action and the resources to enable Federal and local initiatives that will get illegal guns off our streets and put violent criminals behind bars.

Congress should quickly complete our work on the COPS Improvement Act and the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill to help our communities and the officers who face these very real threats every day on the streets of our cities. And they need better technology, improved equipment and training, and they need more police officers on the street.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in the effort to push these bills to finalization and to do all that we can to stop this deplorable violence in our midst.

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

(Mr. HOEKSTRA 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 California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE LIFE OF CATHERINE RORABACK

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Catherine Roraback of Canaan, Connecticut. Ms. Roraback passed away on Wednesday, October 17 in Salisbury, Connecticut, and will be greatly missed by her family, by her community, and by her country.

Ms. Roraback was best known for successfully arguing the landmark case of *Griswold v. Connecticut* in front of the United States Supreme Court in 1965. This groundbreaking case overturned an 1849 Connecticut law that banned the use of contraception. And this historic decision established the right to privacy that exists to this day as the foundation of many of our most revered constitutional freedoms.

Ms. Roraback was the only woman in her graduating class from Yale Law School in 1948, and she quickly established a law practice dedicated to protecting the rights of those that she called the "dissenters and the dispossessed." Her groundbreaking work in the *Griswold* case was simply an extension of her life's work, which included the founding of the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union and serving on innumerable boards and commissions to serve her community and her State.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine Roraback was a national figure. But where she shined the brightest was at her desk in her law office in northwestern Connecticut, where she worked out of for almost her entire career. She was always a caring and fiercely intelligent adviser and advocate to her neighbors and her clients, and she was a mentor to generations of community leaders and advocates, including my friend and her cousin, State Senator Andrew Roraback, with whom I had the pleasure of serving in the State Senate for 4 years.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Ms. Roraback just a little in the last few years, and though we only got to spend a brief few moments together, I feel so blessed to have had the fleeting chance to get to know one of Connecticut's true heroes. She was an incredible woman with an incredible drive and a never erring sense of right and wrong. I was deeply honored to be her representative for the last 10 months, and I will strive every day to live according to her example.

In these very trying days, I think it's incredibly important to remember the lessons that Catherine Roraback leaves with us, the motivation that underlies her entire work as a lawyer and an advocate, because Catherine Roraback taught us that the basic rights that we enjoy every day to live and to speak freely cannot be dependent on one's lot in life. She also taught us that these rights, these precious civil liberties that we enjoy, cannot and should not be taken for granted. We must fight for them, now more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers go out to Catherine Roraback's family, her friends, and her beloved community.

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

(Ms. FALLIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we saw a varying level of discourse and debate over an enormously important and I might say singularly important issue that is facing the American public, and that is the question of the war in Iraq.

No matter how you touch the hearts and minds of Americans, whether or

not they suggest that this Congress and this President is not paying enough attention to the domestic concerns, woven into the crisis of where we stand today is the conflict in Iraq.

I think Americans understand Afghanistan more than we might think they do. They know that this Nation was attacked on September 11, 2001. They know that when the Nation is attacked, the Commander in Chief, leaders of this government have the responsibility of defending the honor and the security of America. They see Afghanistan as defending that honor and that security. They know that the Taliban, Osama bin Laden, those who collaborated were the basis of the attack against the World Trade towers and other sites in this country. They know that our lives have changed because of the horrific tragedy of 9/11. And they are willing to accept that. They faced up against new laws that seem to undermine their liberties, and within reason they are willing to acknowledge that things must change. I am grateful, however, that there are those of us who understand that the greatest success of a terrorist is to cause you to terrorize yourself. So many of us have asked to modify and assess the PATRIOT Act. We are looking to redo the FISA law that deals with electronic surveillance. But mostly in debating this question, Americans understand that their lives have changed.

But the Iraq War continues to be a questioning action by this administration. All of us have tried to give respect to the basis and the reason of this direction that this government took in the fall of 2002. I, for one, was very hesitant to speak about a war for oil. I recognize that there might have been many deliberations that have occurred that might have caused this administration to make this unfortunate leap of preemptive attack.

I have come full circle now, however, and I am enormously disappointed in the thought process and the respect not given to the American people. For the American people, over 56 percent, want this war to end, want these troops to come home, want to see a troop reduction.

So this debate today was not a frivolous debate. And the leadership of the Democratic Caucus, the leadership of this Congress took great pains to try to address this in a fair and dignified manner. They worked very hard to bring a concise document that spoke to the safety and security of the troops, the respect of the troops, the acknowledgment of their hard work; but yet to insist that a plan be laid out by this administration to reduce the number of troops in Iraq while at the same time ensuring that if there are outstanding conflicts, firefights, terrorists to be fought, that we'd have the troops on the ground.

I believe that this has been the most misdirected war that history will record. I believe that it beats out the Civil War, the War of 1812, World War I,

World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Persian Gulf. For any of those who opposed those wars, and I was not there for all of them, if there was any opposition for reasons that I don't know, this has to be the single most dangerous and devastating action that this Nation could have ever taken. There is no sense for it. There is no basis for it. But if there was a case that you could make, you could make the case that the military has done every single thing that it was asked to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I was moved to write the Military Success Act of 2007. It indicates that Congress recognizes that the military, in the invasion of Iraq, as authorized by a resolution given to the President in 2002, going into Baghdad was probably one of the best executed military operations in modern history, alongside of the Persian Gulf. The armed services successfully toppled the regime of Saddam Hussein.

And as I close, it lists a whole series of successes. And then it indicates that every single aspect of the 2002 resolution has been complied with. And, therefore, that means that the task of the 2002 resolution has ended. And it calls then for the troops to come home, for them to be acknowledged, for them to be given free, with no attachment, \$5,000 for each returning troop from Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this was a difficult debate, but I think and know that we made the right decision. But we could do even more. We can affirm that these troops need to come home, and we can celebrate them for the heroes that they are.

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.)

THE 30 SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for one-half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

We are here tonight with part of the 30 Something Working Group, and we are going to talk about what this House has been doing this week. We are here, it's late into the evening, and we have been working throughout the day on a variety of issues, and we are going to be at work tomorrow. I wanted to talk with my colleagues tonight. And we are going to have a full house. We are going to be joined by Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut, Mr. MEEK from Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from

Florida, and Mr. RYAN from Ohio. We are going to have a discussion about some of the things that this House has been doing.

We took several significant votes this week, including the vote that was just discussed on Iraq. And we are going to discuss the policy in Iraq and the vote that we took today.

I wanted to start by talking about the President's veto earlier in the week of the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. Now, the President has found his veto pen, something that on appropriations bills he had not used until this Congress. And I think it's instructive to begin this debate by reminding my colleagues, as if they needed reminding, that we are talking about an administration that took office after 4 consecutive years of record surpluses, 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses, that were forecast to continue as far as the eye can see. In fact, the 10-year projection for budget surplus beginning in 2001 was more than \$5 trillion of surplus over that 10-year period.

□ 2245

Well, what have we seen instead of that? We've seen seven consecutive budget deficits in the 7 years of this administration, deficits that are forecast to continue as far as the eye can see. And instead of that \$5 trillion in surplus, we've seen more than \$3 trillion in deficits in just 7 years.

So, this administration that's now lecturing us on fiscal responsibility and vetoing our appropriations bills, criticizing us for spending, this administration saw more than \$8 trillion flip from a projected \$5 trillion surplus to \$3 trillion in deficit and counting. So, that's the context of what we're talking about.

So, we sent to the President the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, which includes programs like low-income energy assistance, home heating, the LIHEAP program. Now, I don't think there's anyone in this country that has not been affected by the price of oil. And home heating is something in the Northeast where I'm from in Pennsylvania, and in Connecticut where Mr. MURPHY is from, and in Ohio where Mr. RYAN is from, the price of home heating has continued to skyrocket. And we're going to get into some of the numbers, but that's one of the things that's in this bill. Well, I don't think that's excessive spending, to help people who would otherwise have their heat turned off.

We're talking about funding for community health centers. We're talking about funding for Head Start, a program for early childhood education. Is there anything more important in this country than early childhood education, making sure our children get off to a good start and begin their educational careers in a way that we're able to ensure that they get off and they're positioned to have the best start possible.

Now, what about medical research, the National Institutes of Health?