

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

ways in which this role should inform the formulation of our comprehensive strategy, but first let me discuss the other options.

Those who would have us significantly reduce our role on the world's stage cannot provide a credible description of who or what would replace the U.S. in the role of world leadership. The U.N. is not up to the task, nor is there any other international organization. As already mentioned, there is no other country in a position to fill the role of world leadership.

To embrace such an approach, we would have to accept that significant portions of the world would simply be left to their own devices. Yet we know that places as remote as the Hindu Kush are home to those who would attack us and our allies. What other corner of the world, then, do we judge to be so distant and so remote as to be beyond our interest? And how would world fault lines, such as the Taiwan Strait, the India-Pakistan Line of Control, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict respond to a world leadership vacuum? The answer is, not well. In short, for the U.S. to abdicate its position of world leadership would be highly detrimental to our national interest.

What then does accepting a role of world leadership entail? And if it is a current necessity, is it an inherent good to be indefinitely maintained? In other words, should the U.S. view our position as world leader as so necessary to our security that we act largely to maintain this position, which is the primary characteristic of a hegemonic power or empire? Again, the answer is no. To do so is to put our national interest in opposition to the national interests of much of the rest of the world. It is inconsistent with the desires of the American people, with the extent of the costs they're willing to bear for world leadership and, I would argue, with our sense of morality and fair play. Our vital interests should be defined as suggested by President Clinton, by our role as the world's indispensable nation: taking a leadership role in advancing and protecting our interests around the world in concert with our friends and allies as part of an open and evolving international system that is fair to all nations. To do so, we must restore the prestige and credibility of the United States, and repair and rebuild the relationship with our major international partners. With this role as our goal, we can define those interests critical to achieving it, and develop and adopt an appropriate strategy.

---

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.)

#### IT IS TIME TO HELP AMERICANS WITH GAS PRICES

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting with the cost of gasoline at the pumps, the rising price at the pumps, a weak economy that we're facing nationally and pending tax increases, a housing crisis that's facing many Americans, the struggles we've had in western North Carolina with bad trade deals.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting, and it is because of rising prices at the pumps. That is the most egregious and powerful punch that this Democrat Congress has laid before the people of America.

There are some in this House that have been advocating for increasing the supply, making sure that new oil refineries are online, new American production of oil and natural gas. Then we have those, mostly liberals in this House, mostly Democrats, that say, No. We don't want any new production. No. We will side with the extreme environmentalists, not with American people who are screaming. They will support the screaming environmentalists rather than the families that are screaming, screaming when they take their kids to school, screaming when they just go out for a Saturday afternoon.

I will tell you the American people need help when it comes to the price of fuel. And this Democrat Congress has abdicated its responsibility in this role. The American people will be furious when they find out that we have American resources that can be tapped into. And so many of us, my colleagues and many in this House, have been advocating more supply. And yet the Speaker of the House will say, No, we don't want new American supply. That won't do anything to the price of gasoline at the pumps.

Well, just this morning, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, testified before the Financial Services Committee. And in answering a question about the cost of price at the pumps, the question was posed to him, "Would increasing supply cut the price of gas at the pumps?" His response—here. I have blown it up large so that my Democrat colleagues can read it. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said, "A 1 percent increase in supply could lower prices by as much as 10 percent." A 1 percent increase in supply could lower prices by as much as 10 percent. This was the testimony, as of this morning, in front of the Financial Services Committee.

This is a very important thing for this Congress to understand, that if we allow for more exploration here that has been prevented by law, it can bring down prices.

Now, I'm not a newcomer to this. I have been advocating things from my first days here in Congress. I think we

need to have an American energy policy that is multi-tiered. First, we need to have new refineries. We also, along with that, have to have new domestic exploration of oil. That can be done off the deep waters of our coast. It can be done in remote areas of Alaska, such as ANWR. It could be done in the Rocky Mountain West with oil shale production. These things can be done if Congress acts. And I think it's high time Congress acts with the price of gasoline over \$4 a gallon in western North Carolina.

But that's not it. We can't just stop there. Certainly it will bring down prices, as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve said, if we increase that production. But we have to go a step further. We have to ask the American people to conserve energy. Conservation is not a means to American energy independence, though it is a sign of personal virtue. But it can help on the margins. And it can help family budgets across western North Carolina.

But beyond that, we have to heavily invest in alternative sources of energy. There will be a day when our economy is powered by alternative sources of energy. Whether it's an electric car or hydrogen-powered automobile, a natural gas-powered automobile, or even perhaps some nuclear-powered device, these things are possible and we have to heavily invest in that. But until that day comes, it is imperative that this Congress act and act now for American energy independence through domestic energy exploration. American oil, American natural gas, that creates American jobs and keeps wealth here in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is time this Congress acts, and it's time that we take the proper steps to help the folks across America who are struggling with high gas prices.

---

#### HONORING TONY SNOW

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to honor the memory of Tony Snow, commentator, news anchor, White House press secretary, a husband and father. The great American. We lost Tony this last weekend, and it's a tremendous loss for his family, for his colleagues and indeed, for the Nation.

It's also a great loss for humanity at large. Since Tony lost his battle with cancer on July 12, many Americans have heard stories about his wit, his humor, and his devotion to his family. I have a story of my own that I would like to share about Tony, a story that shows that Tony was very much a man of his word.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain privileges that come with being a servant here in the people's House. For me, one of those privileges is from time to time being able to go to 1600 Pennsylvania