

country for their efforts to make sure these soldiers are not forgotten.

“Leave no soldier behind,” is the mantra of many armies. In a nation as small as Israel, where military service is mandatory, the commitment to rescue POWs and MIAs is a national imperative. It is our responsibility as a fellow democracy and steadfast ally to do all we can to help win their freedom.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the House’s attention to a very sad anniversary. One year ago today, Hezbollah terrorists crossed into Israel to attack Israeli troops patrolling the Israeli side of the border with Lebanon. They killed three Israeli soldiers, wounded two others and kidnapped Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev. Only a few days earlier, on June 25, 2006, Hamas terrorists likewise crossed into Israel and attacked an IDF position, killing two soldiers, wounding a third and kidnapping Gilad Shalit.

Both of these vicious terrorist organizations, which constantly proclaim their adherence to religion and morality, have denied these three Israeli soldiers contact with the Red Cross or Red Crescent, or direct contact with their families. Despite the recent release of an audio tape, it is not in fact known if these three men are currently alive, if they are injured or if they are well. Not content merely to hold these men as hostages, Hamas and Hezbollah insist on torturing their families with the agony of not knowing about the true condition of their loved ones.

This is true measure of the faith and morality of these terrorists. In the name of religion they inflict agony. In the name of the sacred they perpetrate barbarism. In the name of their faith they degrade other human beings.

Thus they show the true content of their beliefs. Thus they show the world what their vainglorious proclamations amount to: cynical cruelty and cold calculation.

These terrorist groups have sought to transform Gilad, Ehud and Eldad into something they are not: bargaining chips or pawns, a kind of political chattel. Things that can be swapped for favors or sacrificed on a whim. These three men are not things. They are human beings. They have names and they have families. They have rights as captured soldiers and they have rights as human beings.

The House has expressed itself clearly on this matter on March 13th, when it passed H. Res. 107, the bipartisan resolution I introduced demanding the release of these three captives and condemning both the terrorists and their Syrian and Iranian sponsors for their criminal and indecent behavior.

We can not compel Hamas and Hezbollah to release Gilad, Ehud and Eldad any more than we can force them to understand the difference between right and wrong. You can not disgrace someone incapable of shame. But we can stand by our ally, the State of Israel. We can express our sympathy and our concern for the captives and for their families.

We can let the perpetrators of this barbarism know that we have not forgotten what they have done, and what they are continuing to do. We can bear witness. And we can add our voices to all those saying “Enough. Enough. Let these men go home.”

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the unconditional release of Israeli soldiers still held hostage by terrorists. Exactly one year ago today, Hezbollah terrorists entered territory

that unambiguously belongs to Israel under international law, launching an assault into Israel’s north that killed three soldiers on patrol, wounded two, and took two others hostage.

The two hostages, Ehud “Udi” Goldwasser and Eldad Regev, were injured in the attack, and yet Hezbollah refuses to allow representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit them, a flagrant breach of international law and practice. They have also refused to give the hostages’ families any indication that their loved ones are alive. This is particularly worrisome, because reports have surfaced suggesting Goldwasser and Regev could have been critically injured in the attack in which they were taken captive.

Only seventeen days earlier, fundamentalist thugs launched a similar raid out of the Gaza Strip to take hostage another young Israeli soldier on patrol in Israel’s south, Corporal Gilad Shalit. He has now been held hostage in Gaza for more than a year. Just two weeks ago a recording of him pleading for help was released on a Hamas website. In this recording, Shalit says that his health is deteriorating and he is in pressing need of long-term hospitalization. It should come as no surprise that his terrorist captors have failed to allow him adequate medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, Hezbollah and Hamas are clearly to blame for the outbreak of violence in the Middle East last summer. They committed acts of war by kidnapping Israeli soldiers who were conducting regular patrol missions on their own side of the border.

And while last summer’s war has receded somewhat into the past, the initial causes for the violence have not yet been addressed. Chief among these is the fact that these three Israeli hostages remain in captivity and that Hezbollah and Hamas remain committed to Israel’s violent destruction. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701, which imposed a ceasefire on Israel’s Lebanon front, emphasized, and I quote, “the need to address the causes that have given rise to the current crisis, including the unconditional release of the abducted Israeli soldiers.” Unfortunately, that condition remains totally unfulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, this House has not been silent on the plight of these victims of terrorism. Shortly after Udi Goldwasser’s young wife visited Congress at the start of this year and pleaded for our help, we swiftly passed H. Res. 107, which was sponsored by my good friend Congressman GARY ACKERMAN, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia. This bill called for the unconditional release of the three kidnapped soldiers and condemned the culpable terrorist groups for their despicable actions. The Senate passed a similar bill, which was introduced by Senator HILLARY CLINTON.

Speaker PELOSI has played a particularly admirable role in the global effort to free these three men. When she met with Syrian President Assad in Damascus just this past April, she presented him with a replica of the three hostages’ “dog tags” as a means of urging him to secure their release from these terrorist groups that Damascus has long hosted and supported. She also made crystal-clear to President Assad that under no circumstances could bilateral relations with the United States improve until Damascus showed its willingness to cease sponsoring terror.

To commemorate the one year anniversary of the kidnapping of Goldwasser and Regev by Hezbollah, the United Jewish Communities recently organized a campaign to send copies of these dog tags to every member of Congress. I commend them for their admirable and thoughtful activism drawing attention to the ongoing plight of the three captives.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is a steadfast ally of the United States, and it is on the frontline of the war against terrorism. Israeli soldiers face such threats every day, much like our own inspiring and steadfast soldiers who are currently serving in harm’s way in places like Afghanistan and Iraq. It is incumbent upon us to give our ally in this fight our steadfast support in the face of such terrorist predations.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have been active in efforts over the years to convince our friends in the EU to designate Hezbollah as a terrorist group. A very few EU states do so on a national basis, but the EU collectively continues to view Hezbollah strictly as a political party. This is an absurd anomaly, and I urge our EU friends and allies to reconsider this policy on this sad one-year anniversary. I know of no other “political party” in the world that kidnaps and holds hostages—a fairly remarkable innovation in democratic politics. (In contrast to its policy regarding Hezbollah, the EU does designate Hamas as a terrorist group. I am pleased by that, but the distinction between Hamas killers and Hezbollah killers is frankly lost on me.)

Mr. Speaker, I have the following message for the terrorists who are holding the three Israeli soldiers: Release these innocent hostages, and do so without delay. Should you not, the civilized world—and certainly this body—will not remain silent.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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.)

DR. BERNARD SIEGAN: RECLAIMING A REPUTATION

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to correct the record concerning a great economist and friend, the late Dr. Bernard Siegan, a distinguished professor of law at the University of San Diego. In 1988 Dr. Siegan was nominated by President Ronald Reagan to the U.S. Court of Appeals. He promptly came under personal attack, most notably from Professor Lawrence Tribe of Harvard University.

Tribe wrote a public letter on May 28, 1987, to Senator Joseph Biden belittling Dr. Siegan as being outside the mainstream of American jurisprudence. Tribe further asserted that Dr. Siegan “reveals himself to be not a judicial conservative but an ideologue of the right, one who would deploy the Constitution in service of a conservative economic philosophy.”

In a widely quoted section of his letter, Professor Tribe assailed Dr. Siegan's support of the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling as "a component of the right to travel, a right long secured by the Federal courts," which was, of course, Dr. Siegan's reason for supporting *Brown v. Board of Education*.

At the time Professor Tribe claimed that this legal view was "tortured" and part of "Mr. Siegan's radical revisionism." At the conclusion of the letter, Professor Tribe wrote, "The notion that it is a black child's freedom to 'travel' onto the school grounds that segregation laws infringed is so bizarre and strained . . . as to bring into question both Mr. Siegan's competence as a constitutional lawyer and his sincerity as a scholar." This type of assault was typical of the attacks which preceded the defeat of Dr. Siegan's nomination. That was back in 1987. And much has changed since then.

By the time that Dr. Siegan died in March of 2006, he had many books and speeches and articles that made him one of the most prolific and respected legal and constitutional scholars on the political right. He is today credited with being a father of the recurrent rejuvenation of property rights theory in law.

In response to Dr. Siegan's defense of his views regarding *Brown v. Board of Education*, Tribe replied in a letter to Dr. Siegan's wife, and this was September 6, 1991: "I have reconsidered my description of your analysis of *Brown v. Board of Education* in footnote 10 on page 1379 of the second edition of *American Constitutional Law*. I agree with your general approach that *Brown* can be justified by arguing from the 'liberty' component of the 14th amendment . . ."

Now, that was a letter sent to Siegan years later by Dr. Tribe and when Dr. Tribe and Dr. Siegan were corresponding. These letters were found by his wife, Shelley. Tribe in that same letter writes: "Although I do not reach the same conclusions you do, the issues you raise are important enough to be worthy of scholarly discussion. I am now in the process of drafting a rather substantial supplement to my treatise summarizing recent developments in constitutional law. In my discussion of the equal protection clause, I will include a citation to your book that I am sure will please you more than the citation did in the last book."

□ 2245

Unfortunately for the public reputation of Dr. Siegan, Professor Tribe never did complete the supplement to his treatise, and Dr. Siegan, of course, passed away after that exchange of letters.

Mrs. Siegan wrote to Professor Tribe after discovering these letters and asked Dr. Tribe for information on the planned, but not completed, supplement. She also asked the following question: "In the 19 years since you penned your letter to JOE BIDEN, I won-

der if you have reconsidered your comment regarding Bernie's competence as a constitutional lawyer and a serious scholar?" Tribe replied to Mrs. Siegan on September 21, 2006. "Please permit me," he wrote, "to apologize to you here for the unnecessarily ad hominem character of what I wrote to Senator BIDEN in May of 1987. To help correct the record, if only posthumously, I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator BIDEN. Despite the differences in our perspectives," he said, "I came to think of Bernie, just as you write that he thought of me, as a colleague in the profession we both truly love and consider to be one of the noblest."

I would submit the rest of this statement for the RECORD and note that Lawrence Tribe has set the Record straight, and now the Record is straight on the great person and great scholar that Dr. Bernard Siegan was.

I am sorry to have caused him, or you, any distress, and am grateful for the opportunity your letter afforded me to set the record straight as best I could at this late date.

Mr. Speaker, the correspondence between Professors Bernard Siegan and Lawrence Tribe and the subsequent correspondence between Shelly Siegan and Professor Tribe tell us much about the ugly period of personal attack this country experienced during the judicial nomination hearings of the 1980s.

A review of the above cited letters makes it clear that Professor Bernard Siegan was a distinguished and respected scholar and champion of personal liberty and private property. Contrary to assertions made during his nomination hearings in 1987, Professor Bernard Siegan would have made an excellent addition to the Ninth District Circuit Court of Appeals. And now the record is set straight.

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

(Ms. DELLAURO 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

U.S. TRADE POLICY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the United States has just announced the

second highest monthly trade deficit for this year, \$60 billion. That is just in the month of May. Our Nation continues to import more goods and services than we export at alarming rates, with a record \$192 billion more coming into this country in the earlier part of this year than going out.

This particular chart shows the top category of concern, imported petroleum, which has continued to rise, including in this Presidential administration, despite President Bush's statement at the beginning of his administration that we have a serious problem. America is addicted to oil, which is being imported from some of the most unstable parts of the world. He said that, and yet he continued to allow the import of more petroleum.

Americans are watching as our government does nothing to curb these growing trade deficits, with their accompanying job losses, deteriorating labor conditions and community washouts that U.S. trade policy leaves in its wake.

A bill I have sponsored, H.R. 169, the Balancing Trade Act of 2007, requires the President, if over 3 consecutive calendar years the United States has a trade deficit with another country that totals over \$10 billion, to take the necessary steps to create a trading relationship that would eliminate or substantially reduce that trade deficit by entering into better agreements with that country. In other words, if the United States runs a substantial deficit with any one country, the President must report back to Congress on his plans for correcting that imbalance. This is a very constructive first step to correct the path of U.S. trade policy which is yielding this red ink.

Our bill calls attention to those countries who are taking advantage of our willingness to import goods from them while they block our access to their markets. Our two largest deficits in 2006, for example, were first with China. This is a country we have amassed a \$232.5 billion deficit. That is an enormous amount, comprising about a quarter of what we have amassed with all countries in the world. And the deficit with China has just grown at alarming proportions.

The next largest deficit is with Japan. That has been a lingering deficit that has been growing over the years. It now totals about one-third of what we accumulate with China; it's about \$88.4 billion. And every billion in deficit equals a loss of between 10,000 and 20,000 jobs in this country. That is a displacement in production in this country, putting it someplace else.

Now, these deficits have persisted for years, which makes them particularly troublesome. This chart illustrates our deficit with China pre and post what is called "normal trade relations" with China. We had a very bad deficit already back in the late 1990s, but with the adoption of permanent trade relations with China, that deficit has more than doubled.