

So Madam Chair of our caucus, this has racial roots. But those roots have been dug up. They are not there anymore. All that is left is a partisanship that exists here in the Congress but not in the country. I think we are close to bringing the two together, the people with the Congress.

I especially am pleased that the gentlelady from California has never ceased to carry this personally when she worked as Chief of Staff for Congressman Ron Dellums, who has gone on, as she said, to be the mayor of another great city, Oakland, and now is Chair of our caucus, I would like to say one word about the constitutional question which is raised. Well, I can't swear that any bill we passed is constitutional. All I know is we are not the ones who decide that question. We decide questions of right and wrong, of whether or not a bill should be passed or not. But I am not worried about the constitutional issue, not when former Court of Appeals judge Kenneth Starr appeared before us and testified in very scholarly testimony that the bill is constitutional. I am really not worried about it when Professor Viet Dinh who spent some years as the constitutional point man in the Justice Department, Attorney General for Legal Policy it is called, has been one of the prime constitutional advocates for the bill. I'm relying not only on people who usually agree with me on constitutional issues, but on scholars who will concede that any bill as unprecedented as this would raise constitutional issues. But in good faith, after more than 200 years, who are we to continue to deny these rights when the very Constitution they cite has ordained an independent institution to make that final judgment? We will be held accountable for this judgment. And so they say you are not a State, so how can you possibly have the rights of States? There is very scholarly testimony from former Assistant Attorney General Dinh about how in each and every instance, more than half a dozen, where the notion of treating the District as a State has been raised, each and every time the Congress and the Supreme Court had said the same thing, when it comes to the Commerce Clause, the fact that it says commerce among the States does not mean, said the Congress first, and then, of course, the court, does not mean it doesn't apply to the District of Columbia. There is not a case which extracts us from that line of reasoning, both congressional reasoning and, of course, the reasoning of the court.

I have to say to the gentlelady, the one that I think makes me smile most is article 1 section 2 clause 3 which provides that representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States. The court said, go away from here. When it comes to paying your income taxes, D.C., that means you. Don't take these words so literally that they are meaningless. You are not outside the United States. You are different from the States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Since the gentleman from Georgia has come in, I hope that he will have a 5-minute period.

HONORING COLD WAR WARRIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield 5 minutes to my colleague so that he can express his opinion on this important discussion. And then I will reclaim my time, the 55 minutes I have left, after 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is so very gracious of you. I do appreciate it. This is such an important issue. Home rule is a concept that we take for granted, those who live in cities around this great Nation, those who live in counties, those who live in States as we all do. But all of those levels of government afford to their citizens home rule, which is basically the right to have some self-determination of your governmental affairs.

Unfortunately, however, the citizens of Washington, D.C. have not enjoyed that same liberty. And it was only back in I think 1973 that home rule was conferred by this body, the United States Congress, to the citizens of Washington, D.C., and since that time, they have been able to, as a city council, and as a mayor, school system, they have been able to have control over their governmental issues on the local level. And that was certainly something that was prudent for this body to do.

However, the ability of those same citizens to actually vote for President and Vice President of this great Nation still had not been authorized. And it was 1961 when that occurred. So in other words, citizens of D.C. first were given the right to actually vote for President and Vice President, and then they were given the right to govern themselves.

Now, it is important that we logically extend those rights to the citizens of Washington, D.C. to have a Congressman who has a vote in this great body. We have our illustrious delegate, as she is technically called, but I refer to her always as Congresswoman, a very effective voice in this Congress. And she, on behalf of the citizens of the District of Columbia, deserves to have a vote in this great body. And I'm here in support of that.

I will say that with this fundamental liberty that we are talking about, the right to be represented in this great body, that is a very awesome and fundamental right that should not be bogged down by extraneous matters, particularly when those extraneous matters have to do with tying the

hands of this local government that has been granted home rule. It is just totally different. And it is an insult to link a gun control measure to a people's right to have a representative who can vote in this Congress.

So, let's not compound the tragedy and the injustice any further. I'm asking the public to understand that let's not play politics with the people of Washington, D.C.'s ability to be adequately represented. And certainly they are adequately represented. Congresswoman NORTON deserves a right to cast a vote here to have total equality as all of the rest of us have. And so I don't think that is too much to ask.

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 55 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I appreciate the very sincere presentation we have just had about a serious issue. Although my talk tonight will be focused on some other issues, I would like to have a slight commentary.

Those of us who are conservative Republicans share the concern that has been expressed that the American citizens who reside in the District of Columbia have not been permitted to have the voting rights that people who live in other parts of the United States have. That was taken care of in terms of the Presidential elections by specifically permitting the people involved, and right now as we know the people from the District of Columbia participate in Presidential elections and have Presidential electors, et cetera.

I would suggest that people who are listening do understand there is an alternative to what is being presented which I believe is very serious which is not being considered but should be looked at because I believe that the current path that we just heard being advocated has a chance of being declared unconstitutional. Several scholars testified to that in the hearings.

One method that we know would be constitutional would be to permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for Federal representation as part of the State of Maryland. That would not only permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for a representative that would then have every right of every other Representative, but also the right to vote for two United States Senators. They would be the Senators as part of the voting population of Maryland. They would be able to vote for the two Senators that come from Maryland.

This alternative has been somewhat ignored by those people who are pushing for the alternative that you have just heard outlined. But I would suggest as we move forward, I would hope in the spirit of compromise and in the spirit of really trying to get this job done, because I agree with the assessment that there is taxation without representation.

One of my colleagues suggested, well, then let's eliminate Federal taxation

for the people of the District of Columbia. I would support that. But I think it would be better for us to approach a situation where the people of the District of Columbia could vote as part of the voting system in Maryland, the Federal voting system; and thus, they would have a chance to vote for a Member of Congress and two United States Senators. That would be an alternative that I would hope would be looked at and given very serious consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would say that the voting rights bill that Congresswoman NORTON has introduced and which has already been passed by the House in the 110th Congress, that act provides for an expedited judicial review as to the constitutionality of these actions that Congress would take by passing this legislation.

There is also a difference of opinion among constitutional scholars about whether or not the Congress has the authority under the constitution to actually do what this legislation proposes. There are those on both sides of the fence on that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I think it needs to be adjudicated in court. This legislation is conducive to that, provides for that, and the fact that we are doing something that would cause us to have to go to court and defend our powers is no reason to not pass the legislation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, let me just note that I do believe there is an alternative that should be looked at seriously. And whatever happens to this legislation, I would hope that this other alternative which would permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for not only a Representative but also two United States Senators is given some serious thought.

With that, tonight I rise, Mr. Speaker, in remembrance of a champion of freedom who recently passed away, a great man who influenced the world in which we live, but left the world with little notice of his passing. His name was Dr. Fred Schwarz. He died in his native Australia on January 24, 2009, at age 96. Dr. Schwarz was a medical doctor, a brilliant thinker, with the most disciplined thought process and intellectual honesty than any other person I have ever met. And that is saying a lot.

At an early age, Dr. Schwarz was able to identify the philosophy of communism—Marxism and Leninism—as the major threat of that day to the human race. He spent decades of his life exploring and exposing the basic ideas of Marx and Lenin and other communist thinkers. He was sounding the alarm as to the logical consequences of those ideas.

Most anti-communists in the United States at that time never got in great

er depth than that of a cliché. They were opposed to communism. “The dirty rotten commies.” But even though they were using these clichés, they didn’t have an inkling as to what the actual philosophy and tenets of communism were all about.

Dr. Schwarz saw communism as an evil religion that corrupted the human soul to the point that idealistic people all over the world, humane people, were turned into murderers and mass slaughter was taking place. People were executed. And yet, even thoughtful people in our own society whose thought patterns were corrupted by Leninism and Marxism ignored this mass slaughter that was going on in the communist world, and sometimes even excused it. From Lenin to Stalin, from Castro to Pol Pot, it was no freak accident that every regime led by people who believed in communism ended up with mass killing and the debasement of civilized and human values. And yes, ended up with having people who flirted with this Marxism and Leninism, were affected in some way by the philosophy, ignoring that torturous existence that the people who lived under communism had to endure.

Dr. Schwarz took it upon himself to educate as many people as he could, especially opinion makers and future leaders, not only about the evil doings associated with communism, but also with the ideology itself that resulted in these evil consequences. In fact, one of the Dr. Schwarz’s favorite quotes was “ideas have consequences.”

Thus, it was vital in the Cold War years that the basic ideas and concepts of this evil theory that threatened the world and threaten to bring upon the human race death and misery wherever it happened, it was vital that we understood the basis of this philosophy and what was causing these evil things to happen in the world.

In those days, communism could propagandize about creating a more peaceful world and benevolent society, even as they turned whole countries into concentration camps and murdered anyone who resisted their power, and murdered anyone who was related to anyone who resisted.

Dr. Schwarz was an Australian, but when he realized that the Cold War would be won or lost by the strength and conviction of the American people, he moved here and became a major educational force teaching young and old alike about the inherent danger that lurked in Marxist-Leninist philosophy. He was a disciplined intellectual, and had no fear in engaging in direct confrontations and disagreements. He was always seeking the truth. He would never put up with faulty logic or inaccuracy of fact on our side or on their side.

Now somewhat forgotten, perhaps ignored, the fact is he had a major impact. He had a major impact on the American conservative movement, giving substance and depth to anti-com-

munist activists that were such an important part of that movement. He thus equipped the intellectual soldiers who eventually won the Cold War. He equipped them with what they needed to understand in order to understand the Cold War.

I owe so much to Dr. Schwarz. The education he gave me was invaluable. From the time I went to Saigon in 1967 during the height of the Vietnam War in search of young political leaders to enlist in the anti-communist cause, to the time I marched arm in arm with anti-Soviet activists in the streets of Prague in 1968, what he taught me could be very well seen in those locations in that day of the evils of communism. And what he taught me helped me all the way through the time I was a journalist, all of the time I spent in the 1980s writing hard-hitting, anti-communist speeches in the White House for President Ronald Reagan. Of course, over these last 20 years as a Member of Congress, what Dr. Schwarz taught me has served me well and helped equip me to serve my country and to serve the cause of freedom.

Speaking of President Reagan, it is significant that President Ronald Reagan was the master of ceremonies, before he was President, of course, at several rallies conducted by Dr. Fred Schwarz during the 1960s. Dr. Schwarz’s Christian anti-communist crusade drew thousands to rallies and seminars. And I have no doubt that Ronald Reagan’s anti-communist attitude, as well as his understanding, were to a great degree shaped by Dr. Fred Schwarz. Early on as a union leader, Ronald Reagan knew that he was anti-communist. But after Dr. Schwarz, Ronald Reagan knew why he was an anti-communist.

I was not the only Ronald Reagan speech writer who subscribed to Dr. Schwarz. Tony Dolan, Ronald Reagan’s chief speech writer who worked with Ronald Reagan on the Evil Empire speech and other historic utterances, was a devotee of Dr. Schwarz.

Dr. Schwarz gave us the intellectual ammunition to relegate communism to the dust bin of history. All of us who he equipped to do battle remember him and are grateful to him.

He has been laid to rest now in his native Australia, and I pay tribute to him, along with the other Cold War warriors, for the contributions that he made to us as individuals and to the cause to which we were all so dedicated.

And yes, we as a global coalition of free men and women defeated the Soviet Union without an all-out war with Russia because we defeated their ideas and understood their ideas and fought them at that level as well as with weapons. One of the factors that helped us win was that we understood and defeated the ideology behind that communist tyranny.

Thank you, Dr. Schwarz, for helping us learn what we needed to learn and to know what we needed to know and then to do what we needed to do.

I will submit for the RECORD an obituary of Dr. Schwarz to give a small background on Dr. Schwarz.

[From the Christian Today, Australia, Jan. 30, 2009]

FRED SCHWARZ, RIP

(By Bill Muehlenberg)

Jesus once said that a prophet is without honour, except in his own country. One of the greatest Australian prophets of the past century has just passed away, and nothing that I am aware of about his passing can be found in the Australian mainstream media.

While Australia has many heroes—especially sporting figures and movie stars—perhaps the greatest hero to arise from Australia in recent times has been totally overlooked by our secular, leftist media. I refer to Dr. Fred Schwarz, who died earlier this week at age 96.

Schwarz was a successful medical doctor originally from Brisbane. He left a successful medical practice in Sydney, although with a young family, to devote his whole attention to warning people about the dangers of atheistic communism.

Born in 1913, he accepted Christ as his personal saviour in 1934. In the mid 1940s he began his medical work. He combined this with active Christian work, and also became aware of the threat of Communism during this period. He soon was reading everything he could find on the topic, especially the source materials.

Each night he devoured the works of the founders of Communism. Thus his wife Lillian would quip that she often found four men in her bed: Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Fred. He soon was debating leading Australian Communists.

He became aware that most Christians were clueless as to the menace of totalitarian Marxism, and he dedicated his life to educating the public, and the church, about these dangers. He was invited to speak in America in 1950. He was urged to form an organisation dedicated to instructing people about the Communist threat, and how it is the polar opposite of Biblical Christianity.

In 1953 he established the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade (CACC). He closed his Sydney medical practice in 1955 and devoted the rest of his life to this project, moving to America to fully engage in the work. In 1960 his best-selling book was published, *You Can Trust The Communists* (to be Communists).

I picked up a secondhand copy of this book in Madison, Wisconsin in the mid-80s. He said this in the book, "In the battle against Communism, there is no substitute for accurate, specific knowledge. Ignorance is evil and paralytic."

This book and this ministry were profoundly influential. They influenced a generation of Americans who would do battle against the Communist foe. These include such luminaries as Ronald Reagan, William F. Buckley, Jack Kemp, James Jobson and James Kennedy.

Schwarz had countless debates with Communists, gave countless speeches and talks on the subject, and wrote countless articles, booklets and books on the topic. His life was energetic, passionate, and committed to standing up for biblical Christianity, and warning against the Marxist evils.

When asked which was more dangerous, the external or internal threat of Communism, Fred would reply, "If you were on a ship that was sinking, which would be the greatest danger, the water outside or the water inside? I was illustrating that the external and internal forces were manifestations of the same danger."

And the dangers were very real indeed. In one of his first pamphlets Schwarz argued

that Communism is a disease: "Communism has already killed many millions of people and proposes to kill many millions more. Therefore, by definition, it is a disease. It is a threefold disease. It is a disease of the body, because it kills; it is a disease of the mind, because it is associated with systemized delusions not susceptible to rational argument; and it is a disease of the spirit, because it denies God, materializes man, robs him of spirit and soul, and, in the last analysis, even of the mind itself, and reduces him to the level of a beast of the field."

And even though atheistic, Schwarz could clearly see that it was a religion, albeit a false religion, and the main contender against Christianity. He noted that many ex-Communists have spoken of the religious nature of Communism.

When people charged Schwarz with bias, he confessed: "I plead guilty. We are biased in favour of truth, freedom, and life; we are against deceit, slavery, and unnecessary death. We believe that Communism leads to classicide through the liquidation of the bourgeoisie, that it leads to the justification and practice of mass murder."

But, critics will complain, what about the good of Communism? "In rebuttal I explained that a pathologist is a specialist in the characteristics of a disease, not health, and that a mixture of good and evil is often more deadly than an undiluted evil."

The complete and incredible story of this modern prophet is told in his autobiography, *Beating the Unbeatable Foe* (Regnery, 1996). This 600-page story is an inspiring read, and shows us the dedication, zeal and perseverance of this one amazing individual.

It tells of the waves of opposition, not just from the Communists and the Soviet Union, but from leftist, liberal allies and "useful idiots," to use Lenin's phrase. The lies, deceit, slander, and malicious attacks on Dr. Schwarz were relentless and are mind-boggling to read about. Yet despite all this incessant opposition and attack, he remained steadfast to his calling.

The book also speaks about how the Christian churches were especially targeted by the Communists. Internal subversion was an important tactic of the Communists. And many churchmen of course were completely taken in by the Communist propaganda.

One notable thing that struck me as I read this book was that a very similar battle is being waged today, and there is a similar need for accurate information to withstand a vicious enemy. I refer to militant Islam, and the war it is waging against the free West. The parallels between its internal and external attacks are so close to what we found in the Communist offensive.

And in the same way today many Christians are completely ignorant of the threat to the Christian church, or are being duped by various "peace" initiatives and interfaith endeavours. In the same way that many believers were hoodwinked by the Communists last century, many believers today are being deceived by the Islamists and their interfaith supporters.

Dr. Schwarz eventually returned to Sydney where he has now finally received his eternal reward. This man was a modern-day saint, a genuine prophet, and a tireless worker for Christ and his Kingdom. He achieved more in his lifetime than most people ever will.

Yet incredibly I still cannot find any news of his death, or any obituaries or eulogies about this remarkable man. Like Jesus, he was certainly a prophet without honour in his own land. But his life and work deserve to be widely heralded. And if no one else will, I most certainly will. God bless you richly Fred Schwarz.

I would also like now to rise in honor of another heroic champion of freedom,

a distinguished scholar, a Cold War strategist, a man who, yes, like Dr. Schwarz did not get all of the recognition that he deserved, but those of us who were involved in the final days of the Cold War and the implementation of an anti-communist strategy that worked, we remember Constantine Menges.

Constantine Menges passed away in 2004. Again, like Dr. Schwarz, there was not a great deal of attention that was paid to his passing, yet he had been a powerful force in shaping the world in which we live.

He was a profound thinker. Constantine Menges had a Ph.D. He was someone who thought things out in the long run, and had tremendous historical perspectives which he shared with us.

□ 1730

He was the one who put together the strategies and the maneuvers that would end the Cold War with the defeat of the Soviet Union while minimizing the chances of all-out war between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Although it wasn't called it then at the time, the Reagan Doctrine—that strategy of confronting Soviet expansionism without confronting the Soviet Army itself with American troops—this idea flowed from a basic strategy laid forward originally, as far as my first contact with it, from Constantine Menges, who was, at that time, a senior National Intelligence Officer for Latin America at the Central Intelligence Agency under William Casey—of course that was during Ronald Reagan's administration. I remember him showing me that plan.

I also remember that basic plan later when Dr. Jack Wheeler stepped forward and said, "I'm going to go out and meet the various people of these anti-Soviet insurgencies and anti-Soviet movements throughout the world so that we can put a face to that strategy. And then of course we had Oliver North, who was then working in the White House to help that insurgency in Nicaragua that helped turn the tide there."

Constantine Menges was the man who strategized these moves, the man who then, after working in the CIA—and serving CIA Director Bill Casey very well—was brought to the White House. And there in the White House he fought the internal battles that made sure that strategy worked. President Reagan had signed on to that strategy—the Reagan Doctrine—of defeating the Soviet Union by supporting those folks in various parts of the world who themselves were resisting Soviet expansionism. But you would think, well, that just speaks for itself, of course we should have done that. Well, in the 1980s, that was not something that was just taken for granted.

The fact is that there were people within the Reagan administration itself who were constantly trying to undermine that strategy. For example, I just mentioned Oliver North, who was

actually in the National Security Council, along with others—by the way, for only 1 year, with our help to the insurgents who were trying to fight the Sandinista dictatorship in Nicaragua, only for 1 year was that not a legal operation. And the years before we gave hundreds of millions of dollars, and the years after that hundreds of millions of dollars were given to support that resistance movement. But constantly there was this effort by people within the Reagan administration—and also from without, I might add, people here in Congress—who were trying to undermine our support for those who were trying to force democracy and democratic elections on the Sandinista dictatorship.

And what was one of the major issues? It was whether or not we should cease our support for these insurgents before or after the Sandinista permitted free elections. And there were those who were trying to pressure Ronald Reagan, people within the administration—and I might say, I believe that our Secretary of State Schultz supported this position—of actually cutting off our arms to the anti-Sandinista insurgency before the Sandinista dictatorship actually permitted the elections to take place.

With Constantine Menges constantly at Reagan's side reminding him that, no, what would work is only after the elections we will pledge, no matter how the elections come out, that we will withdraw our military support for those people in that insurgency, without that, we would have withdrawn our support and the Sandinistas would never have permitted a democratic election because they were committed to the same type of philosophy that you have in Cuba and in other communist countries; they were Marxist-Leninists. As Dr. Schwarz would say, you can trust the communists to be a communist. And Marxist-Leninists don't believe in democracy. And unless we were forcing them to, they would not have permitted free elections.

And once those elections happened in Nicaragua—which was a tribute not only to the championship and to the courage of those people who fought that insurgency, but also a tribute to the Ollie Norths and the Constantine Mengeses who were fighting the inside fight. If we would not have done that, there would never have been those free elections. And with those elections, the Sandinistas were soundly defeated. By an American standard, that election was a landslide against them.

So what happened? There was a solid move to democracy in that region because what we had done is we had thwarted the Soviet Union's strategy of their own to catch the United States by surprise and undermine our security by supporting those pro-communist elements in Latin America, supporting the guerrilla movements in Latin America. And that base of operations was going to be in Nicaragua. We put the Nicaraguan communists on the de-

fensive, and by doing so, we permitted Central America to have a chance for freedom.

And sure enough, the countries in Central America have been stalwarts for democracy in the years since the end of the Cold War. They have benefited by the Constantine Mengeses, who worked their hearts out inside the White House and outside the White House to make sure that they had the political support and the strategic support they needed to establish democracies there.

Constantine Menges wrote book after book. His last book that I remember dealt with the emerging threat of China, but he was also very focused on Latin America and warned us about potential inroads being made in Venezuela, for example.

So tonight we remember Constantine. And we are grateful to Dr. Fred Schwarz, we're grateful to Ollie North, we're grateful to Dr. Jack Wheeler, we're grateful to Constantine Menges. These are individuals whose names most people don't know. Without them, freedom wouldn't have had a chance during the Cold War. But yet, we won the Cold War without actual warfare between the Soviet Union and the United States and, again, democracy was secured in Central America.

Unfortunately, now in Latin America we see an ominous trend, a very ominous trend, when we see the rise of a left-wing, semi-Marxist Cedillo in Venezuela, this Chavez, this boisterous anti-American, we see him aligning himself with communist Cuba, one of the last communist dictatorships in the world. And again, we see this in Bolivia. But yet, we see ominous trends. For example, in Nicaragua itself, the pro-democratic elements of that society were split, and they ended up with the Sandinista, the thugs from the old Sandinista Marxist regime returning to power even though they only had 40 percent of the vote. The 60 percent of the vote that was anticommunist was split, and that in itself is an ominous trend. And then of course we have the elections that will be coming up this weekend in El Salvador. And from what I understand, it is within a margin of error now, it's neck in neck, who will be elected to be the government of that country.

El Salvador has had a solid and a stable democracy all of these years since the end of the Cold War, since Ronald Reagan determined we would be supporting not right-wing dictators to defeat communism, but instead, we would solidly support democratic elements. Otto Reich, one of the champions during the Reagan years, testified just yesterday that when Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, 90 percent of Latin America was under right-wing military dictators. When Ronald Reagan left, 90 percent of Latin America was under democratic rule and governed by people who had been elected in free elections. What a tremendous, tremendous legacy.

But now that legacy is a threat because the people of these countries have learned to take that democracy for granted and to forget the basic nature of those Marxists and Leninists who tried to implement, tried to impose communist dictatorship on those countries back in the 1980s.

Well, now the FMLN—which was a terrorist organization, basically a Marxist-Leninist military arm back in the 1980s which tried, by force, to become the government of El Salvador—since then they have been operating within the democratic process; but this same group that would have imposed a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship now has a chance of winning the elections in El Salvador.

Free people should be alarmed, especially the people of El Salvador. They have learned to take for granted the stability, the progress, the democratic rights that they have. The FMLN is made up of people who have allied themselves with al Qaeda, Iran, Cuba, and other state sponsors of terrorism. For example, the current vice presidential candidate of the FMLN, that candidate, a few days after 9/11, celebrated the attack on the United States with a demonstration in El Salvador and burned American flags and claimed that America had brought 9/11 upon ourselves. That's the kind of leadership, that's the kind of belligerence represented by the FMLN.

Now, the people of El Salvador have every right to elect whoever they want to head their government, whether it's the FMLN, or anyone else—certainly no one is suggesting otherwise, but obviously there are consequences that need to be considered when choosing who your leader will be.

In this case, all of the cooperation, all of the economic cooperation, all of the stability that we've had, the friendship that we've had could be destroyed if the FMLN, a political party in El Salvador that is hostile to the United States—they hate the United States. And if you elect someone who hates the United States, then the people of El Salvador cannot expect that there will be a good relationship between our countries.

Now, if the people of El Salvador want to have a bad relationship with the United States, they don't want to have the same type of economic policies, fine, they should elect the Marxist FMLN. But if they want to be friends of the United States, they should understand that you can't elect people who celebrate 9/11 and say good things about al Qaeda and ally themselves with Marxist dictatorships and think that they're going to have the same positive relationship with us.

In this case, we have had very positive economic policies for which we bestowed upon the Government of El Salvador because it was democratic and because it was friendly to the United States. Those economic policies will not stand up if the Government of El Salvador is hostile to us or hates us, or

is anti-democratic, or starts—as the tough guy in Nicaragua has done, he has already started to repress his own people and to use a heavy hand in place of a democratic process in that country.

So the people of El Salvador need to think about what relationship do you want to have? What will it cost us if we have an anti-American government? Well, today there are over \$4 billion that come from El Salvadorians who are in the United States in remittances, \$4 billion from these people who are here, who are El Salvadorians, flow into El Salvador. Now, they're called remittances. Well, we do not need to permit those remittances; we do this as a favor to that country and to try to help its economy. But if we have an anti-American government there, that issue will be hotly debated in the United States Congress.

If you have a country that is run by people who burn American flags and congratulate al Qaeda terrorists for flying planes into our buildings and killing thousands of Americans, yes, we will have an honest debate about whether or not we should restrict the billions of dollars that now flow in remittances from the United States to El Salvador. If people want to vote for that there, they have every right, and we respect that. That's democracy. But we, too, will respond. And we, too, will have things that we have to do to protect our interests if we have a country that is allying themselves with the people who slaughtered our American citizens on 9/11. We can't expect to permit the free flow of billions of dollars to continue if that's the case. That shall be solidly debated if the FMLN is brought to power. So we need to make sure that good people who support democracy throughout this hemisphere, who we helped during the wars in the 1980s, that they do not then become complacent and take all of the democracy and progress that has happened there for granted.

There was tremendous chaos in the seventies and eighties in Latin America and Central America. People don't need that anymore. They don't need the hatred and the vitriol that was down there and all of the anti-Americanism—and the outside interference, I might add, that came in when the Soviet Union pumped a billion dollars worth of military equipment into Nicaragua thinking they were going to roll up Latin America. Well, brave people in Latin America stood against Marxism-Leninism then. They should continue to do so because, in the end, all of us, what kind of country we live in is in our hands. We wish the people of El Salvador well; we do, we wish them well. We wish them a successful election. We hope that they will remain friends of the United States.

□ 1745

Unfortunately, I know there is a large number of Members of Congress who signed on to a letter suggesting

whatever happens in the election, it's not going to make any difference in American policy. Well, those Members of Congress, and many of them are my friends, they have a more liberal left outlook in life than I do, and I can say that they're misguided in presenting that to the people of El Salvador. The fact is that what happens in this election will have impact on our relations, and it is not just something that the people can elect an anti-American government and expect everything to stay the same.

So I hope we remain friends. I hope the people of El Salvador vote to be friends. But if they don't, that is their right to do so. I think it would be much more beneficial for the people of El Salvador and other Latin American countries to remain good friends of the United States rather than attaching their future to the likes of Hugo Chavez and other despots and bellicose Cedilloes.

These military strongmen who are in the right wing that dominated Latin America back in the 1960s, that was a tragedy for the people of Latin America, and that was a tragedy that the United States did not oppose that type of authoritarian rule as much as we should have. And it was Ronald Reagan that turned that around, and I am very proud that during Ronald Reagan's administration that we stood for democracy, not just anti-communism; and that with Constantine Menges there to help us strategize, we turned back the tide of communism in Latin America and throughout the world, and we created a better world without having the kind of nuclear exchange or massive military fight with the Soviet army that was predicted so often back in the 1950s and 1960s.

So tonight we look back on the heroes, the heroes of the Cold War who brought about a more peaceful and a more democratic world. And we reach out to those people now in Latin America who are making decisions, making the decisions as to whether or not they're going to take for granted what was accomplished during this pro-democratic revolution that took place under Ronald Reagan and took place at great risk and great hardship for the people in Central America.

Now is not the time to go back to Marxism-Leninism with another face. Let's again go back to Dr. Fred Schwarz. Dr. Schwarz told us that if you really read what the communists and the Leninists believe, you will see that they believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat. You will see they believe in the centralization of power, the arrogant "we know what's best for everyone" notion that results in dictatorship every time but also results in poverty and results in a decline in the standard of living and results in conflict with other peoples. Latin America nor anywhere else in the world needs the conflict, needs the repression that will come with a resurgence of Marxist-Leninists who now put on a democratic

face and say, no, we're actually different now. Well, maybe they aren't using guns, but putting them in power in any way will not make this a better world or a better country. That is for people of each country to decide for themselves. We wish all of those people, whether in El Salvador or elsewhere, free elections, open discussion, open debate.

I hope that my words today will be seen as part of the debate here as to what we should do if indeed a change in policy happens and a change in leadership happens in El Salvador so that we will know what policies will change if indeed the FMLN, which was a Marxist-Leninist terrorist group back in the 1960s and 1970s, whether or not, if that group comes to power, what changes will be brought about.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, I would also put into the RECORD at this point an obituary about Mr. Constantine Menges, dated July 14, 2004.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 2004]

CONSTANTINE MENGES; NATIONAL SECURITY AIDE

(By Joe Holley)

Constantine Menges, 64, a national security aide for Latin America during the Reagan administration who had a central role in planning the U.S. invasion of Grenada in 1983, and who focused on the continuing threat of communism in books and numerous articles, died of cancer July 11 at Sibley Memorial Hospital. He lived in the District.

At the time of his death, Dr. Menges was a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, a public policy think tank. His recent work had focused on the threat to the United States of a growing pro-Castro alliance throughout Latin America; state-sponsored terrorism, including what he considered Iran's subversion of Iraq; and the rise of China as a superpower.

Dr. Menges had just completed the manuscript for a book titled "China, the Gathering Threat: The Strategic Challenge of China and Russia." He also was the author of a memoir, "Inside the National Security Council," several other books, and numerous articles.

Dr. Menges was born in Ankara, Turkey, the son of political refugees from Nazi Germany. The Menges family, fearing that Turkey would enter the war as an ally of the Axis powers, moved from place to place through war-torn Europe. The family arrived in the United States in 1943.

Dr. Menges received a bachelor's degree in physics from Columbia College and a doctorate in political science from Columbia University. He taught political science at the University of Wisconsin before joining the Rand Corp.

He entered government service in the late 1970s, first as assistant director for civil rights, then as deputy assistant secretary for education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

From 1981 to 1983, he was a national intelligence officer for Latin American affairs at the Central Intelligence Agency under Director William Casey. From 1983 to 1986, he worked for the National Security Council as a special assistant to the president, specializing in Latin America.

In "President Reagan: The Role of a Lifetime," author Lou Cannon described Dr. Menges as one of a cadre of National Security Council aides who believed, as did Casey, "that the West should be mobilized to fight Communists with their own methods."

Cannon described Dr. Menges "as one of the most forceful of these polemicists" and "a principled conservative." White House and State Department pragmatists, according to Cannon, dubbed him "Constant Menace," a play on his name, for his ardent support of action, covert and otherwise, against Nicaraguan Sandinistas and Salvadoran rebels.

Deeply involved in White House support for the Nicaraguan contras, Dr. Menges also argued that an American strategy for combating communism in Latin America should include suppression of right-wing death squads and promotion of land reform.

"He believed that the United States should compete with the Soviets in sponsorship of 'national liberation movements' in Third World nations," Cannon wrote.

Dr. Menges contended that the invasion of Grenada helped avert a possible Grenada nuclear deployment crisis and strengthened President Ronald Reagan's hand in deploying intermediate-range missiles in Europe in late 1983.

From 1990 to 2000, Dr. Menges was a professor at George Washington University, where he founded and directed the program on Transitions to Democracy. His work on democratic transitions included the post-communist states, Iraq, Iran and the Americas. He also began a project on U.S. relations with Russia and China and the new Russia-China alignment.

In articles that appeared regularly in *The Washington Post*, *The Washington Times*, the *New York Times*, the *New Republic* and other publications, Dr. Menges continued to warn that the communist threat persisted.

In a *Washington Post* opinion article in 2001, he wrote that "Russia and China are using mostly political and covert means to oppose the United States on security issues and to divide America from its allies."

As a college student, Dr. Menges helped individuals escape communist East Berlin in 1961, and in 1963, he worked in Mississippi as a volunteer for equal voting rights.

Survivors include his wife of 29 years, Nancy Menges, and a son, Christopher, both of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that in this country we have demonstrated to the world something really important, and that is that we have had a shift in power in the United States. And I hope people see that the Republicans and the Democrats stood there and applauded as our new President was sworn in. We wish this country success, and we wish this President success. We may have a difference of opinion on how to achieve success, but we all are rooting for people who fundamentally believe that democratic dialogue like the one I'm talking about and democratic process is the answer to the future.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2009 AT PAGE H3336

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1105. An act making omnibus appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHAFFETZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 19.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 19.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

843. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Canadian Forces Snowbird Air Show, Duluth, MN. [USCG-2008-0359] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

844. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; American Carp Society Northeast Regionals fireworks, Seneca River, Baldwinsville, NY. [USCG-2008-0358] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

845. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Columbia River, All Waters Within a 100-yard Radius Around the M/V MAERSK JEWEL [USCG-2008-0362] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

846. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Gulf of Mexico, FL. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0364] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

847. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; New York Air Show, Atlantic Ocean off of Jones Beach, NY [Docket No. USCG-2008-0371] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

848. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Savannah River, Savannah, GA [USCG-2008-0370] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

849. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Wilmington River, Savannah, GA [USCG-2008-0387] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

850. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Private Birthday Fireworks Display, Gulf of Mexico, Florida. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0402] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

851. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Columbia River, All Waters Within a 100-yard Radius Around the M/V BRUGGE VENTURE [Docket No. USCG-2008-0435] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

852. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA [Docket No. USCG-2008-0430] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

853. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fish Barrier Testing, Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal, Chicago, IL. [USCG-2008-0300] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

854. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fleet Week Sea and Air Parade; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0298] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

855. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Stockton Asparagus Festival; Stockton, California [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0324] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.