

always wore a St. Christopher's medal around his neck. When he died, they couldn't find it. But on the day of the funeral, the colonel came up to my aunt and said that they had found the St. Christopher's medal. When his body was thrown back by the blast, the St. Christopher's and his dog tags were in the hole that the bomb was in."

Finally, one of the new mothers asked another mother if the pain of losing a child in war ever goes away. This mother had to say, "No."

Madam Speaker, we owe the Section 60 mothers our deepest respect and gratitude. They remind us that the war isn't something that takes place thousands of miles away. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are happening to our mothers and families right here in our own communities in America every single day.

So let us resolve to go to war only as a very last resort. Every possible alternative to war should always be completely exhausted before we send our great men and women into battle. That is the least we can do for them and the mothers they leave behind.

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.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO HONOR FALLEN HEROES

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. Madam Speaker, in May of this year I introduced H. Res. 1183, a resolution calling for the House to observe a moment of silence on the first legislative day of each month for those killed or wounded in the United States engagements in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am very grateful that last month the Speaker of the House initiated this moment of silence to honor America's fallen heroes. It is my understanding that the Speaker will continue this monthly observance during votes tomorrow.

I again thank Speaker PELOSI for making this tribute a part of the regular order of the House. This moment of silence will serve as a solemn reminder of the more than 4,000 killed and more than 30,000 wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, and a thank-you from a grateful Nation. During the month of June, 56 United States servicemen were killed; 27 in Afghanistan and 29 in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I am sure every American shares my heart, which is heavy for the sacrifice of these fallen heroes. We are grateful to all of our men and women in uniform for their

courage and for their selfless commitment to duty.

Again, I want to thank Speaker PELOSI and her staff for continuing to make this remembrance a reality for those who have sacrificed for our Nation and for their families. We, the House of Representatives, the People's House, should never forget those who have given their life for this great Nation.

May God continue to bless our men and women in uniform, and may God continue to bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And I ask God to continue to bless America.

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

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

□ 1930

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, in about a week, I will introduce legislation to repeal the infamous section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and to rid this country once and for all of the so-called Right To Work statutes in 21 or 22 of our States.

Now, section 14(b) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act allows States to pass the so-called Right To Work laws, which strip unions of the right to charge fees even when they negotiate the contract that the employee works under.

Section 14(b) has been controversial from its inception. It was vetoed by President Truman. It became law only overriding that veto. What we have now is a network of different labor laws in different States that pits the workers in one State against another, that pits businesses in one State against another, that creates an unlevel playing field for businesses in one State as opposed to businesses in another State.

So-called Right to Work is union busting. It is that simple. Right to Work strips unions of their ability to require payment for the contract negotiation that they do. It is designed to encourage free riders and to weaken and destroy unions.

Every worker benefits from the union contract, but under so-called Right to Work laws, some pay absolutely nothing to the union that negotiates that contract. That encourages others to choose to pay nothing, and eventually the union unravels. That is exactly what has happened in the 22 so-called right-to-work States.

Now, Right to Work States have significantly lower unionization rates than do other States. The unionization

rate in my State of California is 18 percent; in New York, 26 percent; in Washington State, 21 percent; in Wisconsin, 16 percent; in New Jersey and Michigan, 21 percent. None of those States have so-called Right to Work statutes. In contrast, such right-to-work States such as Texas, Arkansas, Utah and Georgia, have only 6 percent unionization rates, and North Carolina, with its Right to Work laws, has an only 4 percent unionization rate.

Now, it can be alleged that those who are in right-to-work States don't need unions. They enjoy great pay and great working conditions. Well, let's look at the facts. The average worker in a so-called Right to Work State makes \$5,333 less per year than a worker in a free bargaining State. That is a comparison of \$35,500 on the one hand, with \$30,167 on the other. Some 21 percent more people lack health insurance in Right to Work States as compared with free bargaining States. And as for workplace and safety, workplace deaths are 51 percent higher in States with so-called Right to Work laws.

It is time that we repeal section 14(b). It is time that we let unions organize and time that we allow workers who want to have a union, to enjoy that right.

I serve as the Chair of the subcommittee of Foreign Affairs Committee with jurisdiction over trade issues, including the International Labor Organization. The ILO is the official international organization affiliated with the United Nations that sets labor standards. It is clear that our Right to Work laws violate international labor standards. The National Organization of Manufacturers acknowledged this just a few days ago when they pointed out that while Right to Work laws probably violate the ILO core conventions, we as a country have not ratified those core conventions. So a country that should be in the forefront of the world, in the forefront of human rights, civil rights and labor rights, has in 22 of its States laws that violate the ILO core convention.

It is time for America to stand in the forefront of human rights, civil rights and labor rights. It is time to end so-called Right to Work.

I urge my colleagues to contact me if they are interested in being original cosponsors of this legislation.

SAVE OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, it is easy to be in Washington, DC, making bold predictions and promises and then ignore the realities right in front of our noses. Congress' failure to meet the July 1 deadline to prevent the scheduled fee reductions for Medicare providers is shameful and our failure to act has real consequences.

Seventeen percent of the people I represent are on Medicare, roughly 114,000 people. Many of these citizens live in communities where there are few doctors and few health care options. If the available doctors stop seeing Medicare patients, the health care access for all Kansans will be severely damaged. We must prevent the scheduled physician fee reductions from going into effect, and I encourage the Senate to take up necessary legislation now.

Just this week, I received a letter from a family physician back home. He, of course, expressed his frustration with our current Medicare system. Here are his words:

"It is with mixed emotion that I am writing to inform you of my intent to leave my family medicine practice. I have reached the point where I am no longer willing to expose myself or my family to the risk of having to rely upon an increasingly unreliable and poor source of income, Medicare. As a small business with 12 employees, I don't have the margin to absorb others' incompetence or our government's capricious reimbursement. I am not willing to be a pawn in an ideological chess match in Washington, and therefore as of today I will no longer accept Medicare patients.

"I am considering a position in an economically booming region in another State that is nearly 95 percent private pay. What physician worth their salt will continue in a system that undervalues the work they do for a patient population that is the most complex and the most time demanding?

"Congress and the Medicare system are taking advantage of good-intentioned physicians who are more interested in caring for patients and upholding and honoring the Hippocratic Oath than lining their pockets. Even now, writing this letter to you, I feel a sense of guilt as though I am betraying my Medicare patients. I have realized, however, that it is not I that have betrayed the elderly, rather Congress."

When doctors close their practices, it creates a gap that is almost impossible for us in rural communities to fill. Congress must understand that we have a responsibility in making physicians want to continue to practice medicine, to not give them the reason to walk out their clinic or hospital doors and never look back. Congress needs to look closely at our role in these trends and make sure we are not encouraging this situation by playing politics with people's health care and their lives.

I hope that the Senate will pass legislation this week that can keep our vital health care system in place and protect our most vulnerable citizens.

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.)

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF SENATOR JESSE HELMS

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Senator Jesse Helms. Senator Helms, who passed away this past 4th of July at the age of 86, was renowned for his considerable personal warmth and his commitment to the good of his constituents. So it is no surprise that in the days after his passing, tales from his constituents across the State of North Carolina paid tribute to his decades-long track record of thoughtful constituent service.

But Senator Helms was so much more than a good public servant. He was a man of integrity, and over the course of his 30 years of service in the United States Senate, you could always count on one thing: You knew where Jesse Helms stood on the issue. An outspoken conservative who was never bashful about defending the conservative principles of small government and individual freedom, he was a man who refused to compromise on his principles.

Senator Helms knew a conservative when he saw one. This is why he helped propel Ronald Reagan to the national stage by orchestrating Reagan's North Carolina primary victory in 1976. In so doing, he helped prepare the groundwork for the eventual Reagan Revolution of the 1980s.

As we remember the life of Senator Helms, we know we have lost one of the finest conservative statesmen of a generation. Senator Helms believed that America was the greatest nation in the world, and that belief informed his principles and the policies that he ultimately pursued. For instance, he knew that a strong America would be a signpost of hope for millions during the uncertain times of global communist influence in the seventies and eighties. As a strident anti-communist, he fought to ensure America would be a bulwark against the forces of oppression and tyranny in the communist corners of the globe.

Senator Helms was also an indomitable champion of life. He believed in the dignity of the lives of the unborn and fought with heroic energy to see to it that they might receive the protection they deserve. His pro-life legacy is still with us today. In fact, Senator Helms successfully amended legislation 35 years ago to include what is today known as the "Helms amendment." This amendment, which is still in effect, mandates that no U.S. foreign aid money may be used to pay for or promote abortions.

Yes, Senator Helms fought for the innocent unborn, he condemned wide-

spread corruption in the United Nations before it was popular to do so, and he staked out clear conservative positions without having to consult a pollster. He was a one-of-a-kind leader who passed on conservative principles to many, including me. But his crusades were never just about him. Rather, he fought for his country and the ideas that he knew made America great.

He said it best in his farewell address to the Senate: "Being remembered isn't important. What is important is standing up for what you believe to be right, hoping that you have done everything you can to preserve the moral and spiritual principles that made America great in the first place."

Senator Helms' death last Friday was a profound loss for America and for the State of North Carolina. He served his country well, dispatching his duty to stand up for what is right with unrivaled moral clarity. He will be missed, and today my thoughts and my prayers are with his family and loved ones as they grieve this loss and remember a life well-lived.

DECLARING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to say to the gentlewoman who just spoke that I sure share her admiration for Jesse Helms. I had the honor to work with him on legislation known as the Helms-Burton law, and I want you to know he was a wonderful man, a titan and a real conservative, and the kind of man that everybody in America could be proud to say that he was a Senator in the august body on the other side of the building.

Let me just say briefly today that we just celebrated the 4th of July, known as Independence Day, and we celebrate that because we became an independent Nation after the Revolutionary War by winning that war and becoming not a colony of Great Britain, but a United States of America, an independent country. Our Declaration of Independence.

Now we are faced with another problem. It is called energy dependence. We are dependent on Saudi Arabia, we are dependent on other countries in the Middle East, we are dependent on countries in South America like Venezuela that are not friends of ours, and we ought to be moving toward energy independence.

Any of my colleagues who were out marching in parades during the 4th of July recess ought to know that the people they were talking to on those parade routes were saying, hey, we don't want gasoline at \$4 or \$5 a gallon. We don't need to have gasoline at \$4 or \$5 a gallon, because we can drill right here in the United States and get