Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Tancredo
Musgrave	Ross	Tanner
Myrick	Rothman	Tauscher
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Taylor
Napolitano	Royce	Terry
Neal (MA)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Oberstar	Salazar	Tiahrt
Obey	Sali	Tiberi
Olver	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tierney
Ortiz	Sanchez, Loretta	Towns
Pallone	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Pascrell	Scalise	Turner
Pastor	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Paul	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Payne	Schmidt	Upton
Pearce	Schwartz	Van Hollen
Pence	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Walberg
Petri	Sessions	Walden (OR)
Pickering	Sestak	Walsh (NY)
Pitts	Shadegg	Walz (MN)
Platts	Shays	Wamp
Poe	Shea-Porter	Wasserman Schultz
Pomeroy	Sherman	Waters
Porter	Shuler	Watson
Price (GA)	Shuster	Watt
Price (NC)	Simpson	Waxman
Pryce (OH)	Sires	Weiner
Putnam	Skelton	Welch (VT)
Radanovich	Slaughter	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Smith (NE)	Weller
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Wexler
Regula	Smith (WA)	Whitfield (KY)
Rehberg	Snyder	Wilson (NM)
Reichert	Solis	Wilson (OH)
Renzi	Souder	Wilson (SC)
Reyes	Space	Wolf
Reynolds	Speier	Woolsey
Richardson	Spratt	Wu
Rodriguez	Stark	Yarmuth
Rogers (AL)	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rogers (KY)	Stupak	Young (FL)
Rogers (MI)	Sullivan	
Rohrabacher	Sutton	
Ros-Lehtinen		

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Boswell	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Cubin	Lucas	Scott (GA)
Cuellar	Marshall	Shimkus
Dicks	Miller, Gary	Wittman (VA)
Gilchrest	Murtha	
Green, Al	Peterson (PA)	

□ 2000

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 508, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 415, TAUNTON RIVER WILD AND SCENIC DESIGNATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 415, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER, THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Nicole Sarabia Rivera, Field Representative/Caseworker, Office of the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2008.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a civil trial subpoena for documents and testimony, issued by the Small Claims Division of the San Francisco Superior Court.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the documentary aspect of the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House, but that compliance with the testimonial aspect of the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

NICOLE SARABIA RIVERA,
Field Representative/Caseworker.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND POLAND ON SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–133)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Agreement Between the United States of America and Poland on Social Security, which consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The agreement was signed in Warsaw on April 2, 2008.

I The Unite States-Poland Agreement is similar in objective to the social Security agreements already in force with Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries. The United States-Poland Agreement contains all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4).

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the principal agreement and the related administrative arrangement. Attached to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, a report on the effect of the Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend to the Congress the United States-Poland Social Security Agreement and related documents.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 16, 2008.*

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–134)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency and related measures dealing with the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor are to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2008.

Today, Liberia continues its peaceful transition to a democratic order under the administration of President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf. The Government of Liberia has implemented reforms that have allowed for the removal of international sanctions on Liberian timber and diamonds, and Liberia is participating in the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme and the Extractive

Industries Transparency Initiative to ensure that its natural resources are used to benefit the people and country of Liberia, rather than to fuel conflict. Charles Taylor is standing trial in The Hague by the Special Court for Sierra Leone. However, stability in Liberia is still fragile.

The regulations implementing Executive Order 13348 clarify that the subject of this national emergency has been and remains limited to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor and specified other persons and not the country, citizens, Government, or Central Bank of Liberia.

The actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons—in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources, their trafficking in illegal arms, and their formation of irregular militia—continue to undermine Liberia's transition to democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions and resources. These actions and policies pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States, and for these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 16, 2008*.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ASSAULT ON THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court Justices decide cases based upon the cold written record of proceedings at the trial court. Eight of our nine Justices have never tried a case before a jury. Only one has in some very limited way. For the most part, they have been isolated from the real world all of their lives. They have dwelt in legal theory and constitutional construction, reconstruction and constitutional destruction during their entire judicial careers. They've not heard a witness testify or a defendant plead his case or have had to empanel a jury or have had to listen to little girls testify about graphic, brutal sexual assault.

The Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights, is not that complicated to most Americans, though we keep seeing the Star Chamber court of five Justices on the Supreme Court rule the opposite of the obvious meaning of the Constitution. The Supreme Court, especially recently, makes the Constitution, which is simple, complicated. They do so to twist and turn the Constitution to mean what they want it to mean.

At least five Justices follow the doctrine of former Chief Justice Charles Evans when he said arrogantly in 1935, ''We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what [we] the judges say it is.''

This is especially true in the case of Patrick Kennedy versus Louisiana. Here are the facts of that case: Patrick Kennedy sexually assaulted his 8-year-old daughter. So brutal was the attack that she nearly bled to death. She has had to have reconstructive surgery, and her life was only saved by the medical personnel who rescued her. Louisiana and a handful of other States have said that the death penalty is warranted when a person like Patrick Kennedy rapes little kids, especially little girls.

The Supreme Court, with Justice Kennedy writing the opinion, says that that just isn't fair to the criminal in this case. He overruled the will of the people of Louisiana, the legislature of Louisiana and the unanimous jury, who all found that Patrick Kennedy should be executed for his crime. Justice Kennedy reasoned that, since the victim lived, the defendant should not get the death penalty. However, there is no logic in that argument.

The victim, certainly, could have died. If medical people hadn't saved her life, she would have bled to death. She required reconstructive surgery that she will live with for the rest of her life. So the defendant gets a break: the right to live because the hand of God and the hand of the medical personnel saved the life of the victim.

What Justice Kennedy misses is that Louisiana punishes the act of the assault—raping little girls. That's why Louisiana has executed or has written the death penalty into its law. Whether the victim lives or dies should not be a requirement to face the death penalty in Louisiana. The act of child rape alone is dastardly enough to deserve the ultimate punishment.

But, in Justice Kennedy's mind, death must result or it is cruel and unusual punishment under the eighth amendment in our Bill of Rights. Kennedy says the trend is away from the death penalty for anything but murder cases. He is wrong. For these six States that have the death penalty for child rape, these statutes are relatively new, and even our Code of Military Justice now allows the death penalty for child rape if anyone in our military rapes someone on a post or on a base.

Justice Kennedy also says it's not civilized to execute Patrick Kennedy. It's a violation of the eighth amendment. It's just not moral. But what is civilized or moral about now sending Patrick Kennedy to prison? How is that justice to Kennedy or to the victim to let him live?

Now he will be in prison at taxpayer expense at $40,000 a year. He will receive free medical, free Internet. He will have no responsibility. He will receive free legal services. He will receive three hot meals a day and a place to stay as long as he shall live. Is that justice? I think not.

We don't promise that to anyone. We certainly don't promise that to crime victims, because they're basically on their own after a crime is committed. Only the worst people among us get that benefit of our society, and those are child rapists.

Justice Kennedy's opinion is his own moral judgment. His opinion is not any more valuable than my opinion or my next-door neighbor's opinion for that matter. The difference is his opinion is the only one that counts under our Constitution. His opinion, as Justice Evans says, is the Constitution whether we like it or not.

Justice Kennedy is wrong. As my friend Alton Richards, a ranch foreman, has said, ''Patrick Kennedy is wasting good air breathing.''

Victims are denied equal protection under the Constitution because Justices like Kennedy prefer to pander to child rapists rather than to give equal protection to little girls. The same Constitution that protects people like Kennedy should protect the rights of child victims.

□ 2015

ON THE UNITED STATES ROLE IN THE WORLD

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to discuss the need for a comprehensive strategy to advance U.S. interests in the world. Last week I delivered two addresses on this topic. In the second speech, I argued that our understanding of the role the U.S. should play in the world is a foundation of our strategy. It will define our vital interests, and it will condition the means we use for advancing those interests.

Today, the United States is the world's dominant economic, political, and military power. There is no peer or near-peer competitor to us, nor does one appear likely to emerge in the near future. Some have characterized the U.S. as a hegemonic power or as the world's policeman, both those who approve and those who disapprove of such a state of affairs. President Clinton, echoing Winston Churchill, eloquently described a vision of the U.S. as ''the indispensable nation,'' not a world hegemon but a consistent and ever-present ally and arbiter acting around the world.

Still others advocate that the U.S. withdraw from a place of central prominence on the world stage to avoid the costs and implicit responsibilities of that role. I believe the U.S. should remain the world's indispensable nation and in a later speech, I will discuss the