

funds will be provided directly to States and municipalities with the greatest number of people out of work to restore critical services like teachers, police and fire. Our bill is about getting America back to work and making investments for the long term and the prosperity of our country.

Throughout the recession, local governments have been one of the hardest hit as cities have had to reduce budgets as their revenues have declined. Local governments across the country lost over 140,000 jobs in 2008 and 2009, and the number just keeps on growing. In 2009, 62 percent of all cities dealt with their budget deficits by delaying or canceling construction projects. Now when a city says, we're not going to build that ramp, that parking ramp; we're not going to fix that road; we're not going to build that community center, that means that the contractors they were going to hire don't get that job. So what that means is that the people who work in the private sector on the construction site, they're not working on that job. They're not bringing food back home based on the money they earned at that construction job.

The bill funds teachers, firefighters, child care workers and other critical services:

\$23 billion to help States support 250,000 teachers who are scheduled to be laid off very soon; \$1.18 billion to support 5,500 law enforcement officers on the beat; \$500 million to hire and train firefighters; \$75 billion to save or create 750,000 jobs to help the local community fill those jobs where they need it; 50,000 on-the-job training slots to help private businesses expand employment.

The goal is to have family wage jobs and help people get back to work, promote our good services for our cities, which is safety, which is education, and then also help the private sector by moving forward on needed construction projects and making sure public workers have their paychecks to make sure there's adequate consumer demand.

The Local Jobs for America Act will target funding to community based organizations serving communities with poverty rates 12 percent, or unemployment rates that are 2 percent or more higher than the national average. Now it's not State by State. It's community by community. So even if your State has an unemployment rate lower than the national average, if your community has one that is higher, then you would be eligible.

Local Jobs for America will help ensure that local communities can still operate essential services; and the Local Jobs for America Act will include on-the-job training for thousands of workers, and this bill would target communities hardest hit by the recession.

□ 1840

Now, that's just one good idea that I think we need to use.

I just want to take you back and say, you know, I'm from Minneapolis, and in my town we boast the finest series of lakes and trails and bike paths in the country. In fact, even though we're a cold weather State, we commute by bicycle more than any other city, including Portland, Oregon. Now, I know those people from Portland are coming after us on this great honor, but we're determined to keep Minneapolis in the first place on bike trails.

My point is simply this: I was riding my bike along the bike trail the other day, and I stopped to rest and sip a little water, and I saw a picnic table that really looked like it had been around for a while. What I saw on that picnic table was interesting. It was a plaque. It said, "WPA 1934." That picnic table had been around since 1934, and the Roosevelt-era program that put Americans of that generation back to work had caused that picnic table to be built.

Some of you young people are like, What is WPA? Go ask your grandparents. WPA is the Works Progress Authority. This was something that put valuable people to work doing valuable work that needed to be done—making trails, making picnic tables, doing things that last to this very moment. And Americans all across America are benefiting from them right now. This is what the WPA is.

And what I'm saying about the Local Jobs for America Act is that if that generation had a heart for its people and would respond to their needs and the needs of the unemployed by putting them back to work, I don't think this generation should do less. I think this generation should do at least as much as prior generations have done. Let it not be said that Americans have grown more stingy over time. Let it be said that Americans still care about other Americans whether they're working or not. Very, very important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to begin to wrap up my remarks right now because it is getting late in the hour. But I just think it's important to just point out that from the Progressive Caucus' point of view, what we need is we need a stronger, more robust economy that has more people working at livable wages; that when people don't have enough, don't have a job, that they can get unemployment benefits until they can find that next job.

We don't think of our people as lazy and who don't want to work. We think of our people as active who do want to work. And when they get a job, we know that they're proud to have that job. But right now in America, we just don't have enough jobs. And we don't need the Republican Caucus standing in the way of jobs.

There are many people of faith in the Democratic Caucus, but we live our values. We don't pontificate about our values like some Members of the Republican Caucus are wont to do. The fact is you have to live caring, you have to live charity, you have to live

commitment to other people, you have to live empathy. And just lecturing to others about your religion is not a valuable exercise in a country dedicated to religious tolerance.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say it's always a pleasure coming before you and the people on the House floor. It's important to get back to real policies that work for real people. I'm so proud that the Democratic Caucus responded to the American people's needs for health care reform, responded to the American people's needs for financial Wall Street reform, as the President signed the bill yesterday. I am so proud that the Democratic Caucus was able to pass unemployment insurance benefits despite very little help from the Republican Caucus.

I look forward to being back soon to talk about the Progressive Caucus and progressive values in the United States Congress.

THIS ADMINISTRATION MUST FIND ITS VOICE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. WOLF. This administration must find its voice on human rights.

On April 21 the New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof authored a piece that closed with the following words: "If President Obama is ever going to find his voice on Sudan, it had better be soon."

Two weeks after the article ran, I wrote the President, and I submit a copy of the letter for the RECORD, putting forth a number of recommendations in the hopes in salvaging the administration's languishing Sudan policy. My concerns echoed those voiced by six respected NGOs who the week prior had run an ad in the Washington Post and Politico calling for Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice to exercise "personal and sustained leadership on Sudan" in the face of a "stalemated policy" and waning U.S. credibility as a mediator.

Sadly, Kristof's assessment can be applied elsewhere around the world. It seems that President Obama and the administration as a whole have struggled to find its voice when it comes to the promotion and protection of basic human rights and religious freedom. These most cherished ideals, which are at the very heart of the American experiment, have time and again been sidelined by this administration's foreign policy. This is a grievous mistake which has dire implications for the world's dissidents and democrats who yearn for freedom and look to America to be their advocate.

Looking back to Sudan, a nation I first visited in 1989, and most recently in 2004 when Senator SAM BROWNBACK and I were the first congressional delegation to go to Darfur where there is genocide, I remain deeply concerned

that the country is headed for a resumption of a civil war if the U.S. fails to exert its necessary leadership. While there were certainly times that I was critical of the Bush administration's policy, it is indisputable that President Bush and former Special Envoy John Danforth were instrumental in securing, after 2½ years of negotiations, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the CPA, which brought about an end to the brutal 20-year civil war in which more than 2 million perished, most of whom were civilians.

A recent New York Times column by author David Eggers and Sudan activist John Prendergast titled, "In Sudan, War is Around the Corner," spoke to this reality. The pair wrote, "Shortly after George W. Bush entered the White House, he decided he would put the full diplomatic leverage of the United States to work in ending this war, one of the bloodiest conflicts of the 20th century. He succeeded."

Eggers and Prendergast rightly noted that when the South is given the opportunity to vote for independence in January, as guaranteed by the CPA, the conventional wisdom is that they will waste no time in severing ties with Khartoum. This shouldn't come as a surprise considering that President Bashir remains at the helm of Khartoum. Long an indicted war criminal, he was earlier this month also officially charged by the International Criminal Court with orchestrating genocide in Darfur. Bashir's murderous aims in Darfur are not without precedent.

With just 6 months to go, Khartoum persists in dragging its feet, undermining installing the process at every turn. Furthermore, the deeply flawed April elections do not bode well for the fate of a free and fair and timely referendum process. Failure to deliver on the long-awaited promise of a respectable referendum could have grave implications.

While some of the administration's rhetoric has improved of late, notably during Vice President BIDEN's trip to Africa, we have yet to see the administration apply real consequences to Khartoum. In fact, most Sudan watchers would agree that we have seen little to no evidence since the administration's release of their Sudan policy that they have any intention of utilizing sticks. Rather, they appear to be relying exclusively on carrots.

A July 14 Associated Press article entitled "Promises, Promises: U.S. Fails to Punish Sudan" described the administration's track record on Sudan this way: "The words of the Obama administration were unequivocal: Sudan must do more to fight terror and improve human rights. If it did, it would be rewarded. If not, it would be punished. Nine months later, problems with Sudan have grown worse. Yet the administration has not clamped down. If anything, it has made small conciliatory gestures."

Eggers and Prendergast, in their New York Times piece, close with a chilling

warning as it relates to the months ahead in Sudan: "This is President Obama's Rwanda moment, and it is unfolding now, in slow motion. It is not too late to prevent the coming war in Sudan, and protect the peace we helped build 5 years ago."

□ 1850

President Obama and his advisers need not rely on the warnings of those in the advocacy community and on Capitol Hill when it comes to the high stakes in Sudan in the days ahead. Rather, they can simply look to the Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. intelligence community, which recently predicted that over the next 5 years, listen to this, "a new mass killing or genocide is most likely to occur in southern Sudan," more than any other country.

A welcomed step toward preserving the tenuous peace would be to provide Southern Sudan the air defense system that the Government of Southern Sudan requested and President Bush reportedly approved in 2008. This defensive capability would help neutralize Khartoum's major tactical advantage, a virtual necessity in light of the scorched earth tactics and Antanov bombers that have marked their genocidal campaigns of the past and would make peace and stability more likely following the referendum vote.

During the campaign for the Presidency, then-Candidate Obama said, "Washington must respond to the ongoing genocide and the ongoing failure to implement the CPA with consistency and strong consequences." These words still ring true today, and yet, apart from a recent National Security Council statement expressing support for "international efforts to bring those responsible for genocide and war crimes in Darfur to justice," we have seen an administration and a President struggling to find its voice on this most pressing human rights issue. Special Envoy Gration, at a recent event on Capitol Hill, reportedly went so far as to say that the genocide charges against Bashir will make his job harder.

What about the people who died as a result of this genocide in Sudan? Sudan is not an anomaly. Consider China, a country where human rights, religious freedom, and civil society continue to be under fierce attack by the country's ruling Communist Party.

From the outset, this administration chose to marginalize human rights in the context of U.S.-China bilateral relations. On the first trip to Asia, Secretary of State Clinton was downright dismissive of human rights concerns saying that "those issues can't interfere" with economic, security, or environmental concerns.

A firestorm of criticism ensued. Human rights organizations were rightly dismayed. How had impassioned advocacy for the dignity of every person been relegated to a position of mere interference? And this in

spite of Obama campaign promises to be "frank with the Chinese" and "press them to respect human rights."

In China, we again see an administration which seems unable to find its voice on human rights. A glance at the news from the last several weeks alone makes it painfully clear that that voice, the voice which speaks out on behalf of those enduring tremendous persecution and oppression at the hands of their own government, has never been more necessary.

A July 5 Associated Press story reported that Yu Jue, "A best-selling author and fierce critic of the Communist Party was taken into custody by the police on Monday for reasons that were unclear."

The AP reported on July 15 that "dozens of blogs by some of China's most outspoken users have been abruptly shut down while popular Twitter services appear to be the newest target in government efforts to control social networking."

Veteran dissident Liu Xianbin, an original signatory of Charter 08, a historic pro-democracy manifesto, was arrested by Chinese authorities on June 27 on suspicion of "inciting subversion of state power."

July also marks the 1-year anniversary of the deadly suppression of Uighur protestors last summer in the northwest of China. China's beleaguered Uighur Muslim community continues to face severe repression in the aftermath of the violence. According to multiple independent news sources, authorities installed 40,000 security cameras throughout the city in anticipation of the 1-year anniversary.

Carl Gershman, president of the National Endowment for Democracy, authored a piece in the Washington Post on the occasion of the anniversary. He highlighted a report by the Uighur Human Rights Project aptly titled, "Can Anyone Hear Us?" which documents "the firing on protesters that led to hundreds of deaths, as well as mass beatings, the arbitrary detention of thousands, and a 10-month communication shutdown that cut off the region from the outside world."

Gershman closes his piece with the following charge: "The United States and the international community should also support the Uighurs' 3-month-old call for an independent international investigation into the events of last July and the opening of a meaningful dialogue with Chinese authorities. Uighur voices have been crying in the wilderness. It's time to listen."

It is indeed time to listen. It is also time to add America's voice to the chorus of voices within China pressing for greater freedoms and basic human rights.

Just last week, I had the honor of meeting with two courageous Chinese human rights lawyers visiting the U.S. for legal training and to brief policymakers on the situation facing those defending rule of law in China. These

lawyers often choose to represent, at their own peril, those human rights activists, house church leaders, bloggers, et cetera, who face persecution in the form of trumped-up charges and the absence of due process. The lawyers said quite pointedly that their lives improve, and those of their cohorts in prison or facing other pressures by the Chinese Government, when the West speaks out for their plight and raises their cases by name. Why does not the Obama administration speak out for the plight and raise their cases by name?

This sentiment is nothing new. I remarked that they are China's Sakharovs and Solzhenitsyns. Similarly, these giants in the cause of freedom time and again recounted how their lives in the gulags improved when the West and President Reagan championed their cause and challenged the lies that were at the foundation of the Soviet system.

It seems this administration, the Obama administration, has forgotten the lessons of history to the detriment of China's young democrats.

In their annual Freedom in the World Report, the NGO Freedom House documented a litany of abuses perpetrated by the Chinese Government and then made the following observation: "While these acts of repression are disturbing, so is the absence of protest from the democratic world. When the Soviet Union arrested a dissident or suppressed religious expression, it drew widespread condemnation by figures ranging from heads of state to trade union leaders, as well as by human rights organizations and prominent humanitarians. China's current actions, by contrast, elicit little more than boilerplate criticism, and just as often they provoke no response whatsoever."

Elsewhere in Asia we see an administration seeming to align itself with the oppressor over the oppressed. Look at Vietnam. On July 19, AFP reported that Kurt Campbell, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs, said, "As I look at all the friends in Southeast Asia, I think we have the greatest prospects in the future with Vietnam."

This is a strange affinity and statement to have with a government that our own State Department said "increased its suppression of dissent, arresting and convicting several political activists" during the reporting period of the 2009 Country Report on Human Rights Practices.

□ 1900

The State Department report continues: "Several editors and reporters from prominent newspapers were fired for reporting on official corruption and outside blogging on political topics. Bloggers were detained and arrested under vague national security provisions for criticizing the government and were prohibited from posting material the government saw as sensitive or critical. The government also mon-

itored email and regulated or suppressed Internet content. The government utilized or tolerated the use of force to resolve disputes with a Buddhist order in Lam Dong and Catholic groups with unresolved property claims."

Today, Secretary Clinton is in Vietnam for the ASEAN meetings. Initial news reports indicate that she raised human rights concerns in a meeting with the foreign minister and afterwards with journalists, and I appreciate that. However, a new New York Times story today pointed out that the timing of her comments on the sensitive issues "suggested that she wanted to make her point and move on." If the administration is truly concerned about human rights and religious freedom in Vietnam, they would take the concrete step of placing Vietnam back on the Countries of Particular Concern, the CPC list, as has been recommended by the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Leonard Leo, chairman of the commission, rightly points out that Vietnam's human rights record has only improved when its "feet were held to the fire." Leo continued: "But once Vietnam, with U.S. help, joined the World Trade Organization in 2007, religious freedom and human rights advocates have experienced waves of arrest," Leo said. Waves of arrests from our "friend" in Southeast Asia? Are the Vietnamese, who are persecuting the Catholic Church, the Montagnards, the bishops, and killing people our friends?

Or consider North Korea. Without question, this country is one of the darkest places on the globe. More than 200,000 North Koreans, including children, are being held in political prison camps. It is estimated that between 400,000 and 1 million people, 400,000 and 1 million people, have died in these camps, having been worked to death or starved to death. Is anyone in this administration going to speak out or say anything or do anything about that?

Last summer an op ed in *The Wall Street Journal* featured a quote from a North Korean refugee woman who said: "If I had a chance to meet with President Obama, I would first like to tell him how North Korean women are being sold like livestock in China and, second, to know that North Korean labor camps are hell on Earth." Let me just repeat what she said again. She said: "If I had a chance to meet with President Obama, I would first like to tell him how North Korean women are being sold like livestock in China and, second, to know that North Korean labor camps are hell on Earth."

However, because North Korea possesses nuclear weapons and threatens not only to use them against neighboring countries, but also to share nuclear weapon technology with such rogue states as Burma and Syria, the international community, the U.S. included, has tended to downplay or out-

right ignore the horrendous human rights abuses in North Korea in the interest of trying to negotiate, through the so-called six-party talks, an end to its nuclear program. When North Korea falls and freedom comes, a lot of people in the West, and this administration, I think, will really feel guilty for not having spoken out and advocated for these people.

But nothing has been achieved by these negotiations, and the recent sinking of the South Korean ship has stalled efforts to revive the six-nation talks. Even in the face of North Korea's nuclear ambitions, it is inexcusable that its abhorrent human rights record is relegated to the back burner and that the North Korea Freedom Act, passed by Congress, has not even been fully implemented. Why has the Obama administration had so little to say about those trapped in "hell on Earth"?

Now, looking to the Middle East, we again see an administration whose advocacy on behalf of persecuted peoples has been sorely lacking. A February 6 ABC news story opened with the following observations: "Across the Middle East, where Christianity was born and its followers once made up a sizeable portion of the population, Christians are now tiny minorities."

This is perhaps no more true than in Iraq. With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities, regions and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country. Abraham came from Iraq.

Tragically, Iraq's ancient Christian community is facing extinction. The U.N. High Commission for Refugees estimated that some 250,000 to 500,000 Christians have left the country since 2003 and about half the Christian population and a large number also have been killed.

While I have appreciated and am very grateful for Ambassador Chris Hill's commitment to this issue during his time as U.S. Ambassador, and while I believe that Michael Corbin, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State who is in charge with working on Iraqi minority issues, cares deeply about the issue, and both are good men, I see a continued unwillingness, unwillingness, at the highest levels of the State Department to acknowledge and ultimately address the challenges facing these ancient-faith communities.

A 2009 column in *The Wall Street Journal*, Daniel Henninger summed it up this way: "Candidate Obama last fall sent a letter to Condoleezza Rice expressing 'my concern about the safety and well-being of Iraq's Christian and other non-Muslim religious minorities.' He asked what steps the U.S. was taking to protect 'these communities of religious freedom.' Candidate Obama said he wanted these groups represented in Iraq's governing institutions. Does President Obama believe these things?"

I long advocated, both during the previous administration and in the current administration, for the U.S. to

adopt a comprehensive policy to address the unique situation of these defenseless minorities. I have also pressed for a high-level human rights representative at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Such a U.S. presence is critical with a U.S. presence in Iraq drawing down and our bilateral relations now governed by the Strategic Framework Agreement.

Among other things, we must be actively engaging the Government of Iraq to press for adequate security at places of worship and ensure minority representation in local police units. These are just some of the steps that could be taken to assist in the preservation of these ancient-faith communities. We have a moral obligation to do so. The Obama administration has a moral obligation to do so.

I was reminded of this again last week while meeting with a visiting high-level delegation of Iraqi bishops. Their impassioned pleas must not be ignored. We do not want to see the eradication and the elimination of the Christian community, the Assyrian, Chaldean Catholic community, in Iraq. We need to protect them.

Turning now to Egypt. Eli Lake pointed out in a July 18, Washington Times piece: "The Obama administration ended support for a small fund operated by the U.S. Embassy in Cairo that supported groups promoting Egyptian democracy and that bypassed any clearance from the Egyptian Government." They ended it.

Ellen Bork, director of democracy and human rights at the Foreign Policy Initiative, summarized the situation well in a recent Weekly Standard piece. She said: "Doing something for democracy in Egypt would require a policy reversal in Washington. Since the end of the Bush administration and the beginning of the Obama administration, there has been a retreat," and let me say I was critical during the Bush administration. More should have been done then, but equally now under the Obama administration. "There has been a retreat, including a cut in funding for democracy programs and acquiescence to an Egyptian veto over which groups may receive U.S. funds." They are going to let the Egyptian Government that is doing the persecution decide which group gets the funds.

Ironically, U.S. support for democracy promotion in Egypt is dwindling at a time when the people of Egypt are increasingly dissatisfied with the current regime. A Washington Post story yesterday reported that "a protest in Alexandria last month was attended by 4,000 people, a high number in Egypt, where many people are afraid to join demonstrations."

Lorne Craner, president of the International Republican Institute, who has a history of caring deeply about human rights and religious freedom, echoed these sentiments about the administration's human rights and democracy promotion policy in Egypt and elsewhere around the world, in recent tes-

timony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1910

He said, "A lack of strong, consistent leadership from the top of the administration has become apparent to the bureaucracy. One result is the cutting or slowing of funding for democracy programs in countries like Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Iran, North Korea, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe. Another consequence is that our embassies abroad"—and this is painful to hear—"are providing less diplomatic support on human rights and democracy. Asked about the U.S. position on democracy in Egypt, our Ambassador to Cairo praises the country's press freedoms." The American Embassy in Cairo should be an island of freedom. The American embassy in every country should be an island of freedom.

Those yearning for greater freedoms in Egypt are not alone in facing the ire of their government. So, too, Egypt's Coptic Christian community faces increasing hardship. USCIRF, the commission, in its recently released report, described a deteriorating situation for this community. USCIRF found that "the reporting period marked a significant upsurge in violence targeting Coptic Orthodox Christians. The Egyptian Government has not taken sufficient steps to halt repression of and discrimination against Christians and other religious believers, or in many cases to punish those responsible for violence or other severe violations of religious freedom. This increase in violence and the failure to prosecute those responsible forces a growing climate of impunity. And even though our own State Department has concluded that the last 3 years have been marked by a decline of religious freedom conditions in Egypt, there has not been a significant change in U.S. policy.

Elsewhere in the region, Morocco is actually an example where American citizens, many of whom are people of faith, are receiving hostile treatment by the Moroccan Government. Over the last 4 months, dozens of American citizens and scores of other foreign nationals have been deported and denied reentry into the Kingdom of Morocco for allegedly proselytizing. Authorities have refused to turn over any evidence or offer any explanation of the charges. Among the individuals who were deported or denied reentry were businessmen, educators, humanitarians, and social workers, many of whom had resided in Morocco for over a decade in full compliance with the law. Additionally, those deported were forced to leave the country within 2 hours of being questioned by the authorities, having to leave everything behind.

Over the past several weeks I have met with and heard from scores of Moroccan Christians. Many feel their voices have long been silenced, and these events highlight some of these pressures they experience. On March 19, I wrote to the U.S. Ambassador to

Morocco, Sam Kaplan, sharing my intent to meet the Moroccan Ambassador to the U.S. and urging Ambassador Kaplan to "convey to the Government of Morocco that Members of Congress are watching these events closely and the outcome could negatively affect our bilateral relations."

I've also spoken with Ambassador Kaplan on several occasions and shared with him my deep disappointment that the U.S. Embassy and the State Department have not been more publicly outspoken on behalf of these American citizens. It is the primary responsibility of the United States Embassy to defend and advocate for U.S. citizens and interests abroad. Unfortunately, the Moroccan Government has been utterly unwilling to compromise. Perhaps they think they don't need to, given the number of high-powered lobbyists, including several former Members of Congress, that the Moroccan Government has on retainer. I don't know how a former Member of Congress could ever go out and represent the Moroccan Government knowing what they're doing to American citizens and feel very, very comfortable. And do the American people know about this?

And the American people should understand not only are they expelling Americans from Morocco, but they should also know that I have urged the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the MCC, to suspend the 5-year compact with Morocco, which is worth \$697.5 million. That's right, you, the American taxpayer, are giving the Moroccan Government \$697 million. They're expelling Christians from Morocco—although they've hired a couple of former Congressmen that, unfortunately, used to serve in this body. I mean, can you believe it? They're expelling Americans, and yet the Moroccan Government expects that we will give them \$697.5 million?

I will offer an amendment on this floor when the foreign operations bill comes up to suspend or cut this program, and I urge any Member who wants to vote the other way to go home to wherever you're from, whether it be the north, south, east or west, and tell your constituents, that's right, I understand; I voted to continue to send all this money to Morocco, \$697 million. Yes, I understand we have a deficit. Yes, I understand we have great debt. Yes, I understand they're expelling Christians, Americans from the country, but I'm still going to give them that money.

The MCC awards compacts on the basis of 17 key indicators of eligibility, six of which fall under the category of "ruling justly." However, recent events raise serious questions regarding the Moroccan Government's willingness to abide by the principles outlined in the MCC indicators. And—and I am very appreciative of this—a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed rightly pointed out that during a time of economic hardship, the unemployment rate at 9.5

percent, “U.S. taxpayers won’t tolerate financing governments that mistreat Americans solely because of their religion.” I appreciate the Wall Street Journal doing that editorial.

Can the administration not find its voice when it comes to the rights of U.S. citizens being trampled abroad? I’ve been assured that the State Department is raising the matter privately with the Moroccan Government. Frankly, this is insufficient. The manner and the means by which we raise concerns of this nature with foreign governments communicate a whole host of unspoken messages. I hope the lobbyists for Morocco—particularly those who have been former Members of Congress—are not influencing the State Department and are not influencing the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Do we simply have a private meeting with the ambassador and ask him to look into the matter, or does the Department’s press secretary issue a statement expressing deep concern? Or better yet, does President Obama call the King of Morocco and make it clear that treating American citizens this way will not be tolerated? The President should pick up the phone and say to the head of the Moroccan Government, we will not give you \$697 million in the Millennium Challenge grant as you’re expelling Americans from your country. Each approach has distinct undertones which highlight the level of priority and seriousness that the U.S. Government places on a particular issue. Privately raising the issue with Moroccan Government officials is a far cry from what we used to see by doing it publicly.

Even as the administration is struggling to find its voice on human rights, changes within the State Department threatens to institutionalize the marginalization of these core issues. The State Department’s International Religious Freedom Office, IRF, has been without ambassadorial leadership, as is required by law, for more than 18 months. After increasing pressure from Congress and religious advocacy groups, Obama named Suzan Johnson Cook to this post in June. She has not been confirmed. Eighteen months, nobody’s there.

□ 1920

With a void in senior leadership at the IRF office, I have been increasingly alarmed by reports that the office is being subsumed into the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor.

Tom Farr, the first Director of the U.S. State Department Office of International Religious Freedom, described what is happening this way in a Washington Post online column: “The ambassador will not report directly to the Secretary of State as do other ambassadors at large, all of whom are experts in their fields. The staffers who reported to predecessors will not report to Johnson Cook should she be confirmed. The position will be emas-

culated, in direct contravention of the legislation that created it.”

In a May 25 letter to Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Michael Posner, I raised these concerns in detail.

I submit a copy of the letter for the RECORD.

If the changes described by Farr move forward, this could potentially violate U.S. law and break with 10 years of established practice under previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican. The Ambassador-at-Large position was established under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, of which I was the primary author, to promote religious freedom abroad. The legislation specifically states, “There is established within the Department of State an Office on International Religious Freedom that shall be headed by the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom.”

Considering the importance of religious freedom to U.S. foreign policy and human rights promotion, I am alarmed by the possibility that DRL could be removing supervisory control from the Ambassador-at-Large over the Office of International Religious Freedom.

These reported changes, combined with the long ambassadorial vacancy, do not bode well for the Baha’i leader imprisoned in Iran’s notorious prisons or for the Ahmadi Muslim in Pakistan, subject to officially sanctioned discrimination and persecution. Who will be their advocates? Who will advocate for the Baha’is? Who will advocate for the Ahmadi Muslims in Pakistan? Who will be their advocates?

The IRF office is but one example of internal changes at the State Department. Not many people know this, but the congressionally mandated Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, headed by a special envoy, only has a single dedicated staff person. During the Bush administration, there were three to five employees at various points. An April 2010 CNN story featured the findings of a study released on the eve of the Holocaust Remembrance Day, which found that the number of anti-Semitic incidents more than doubled from 2008 to 2009. At a time when anti-Semitism is on the rise globally, the special envoy is relying almost exclusively on the already stretched thin IRF office for her staffing needs, therefore making it more difficult for the IRF office to fulfill its congressional mandate.

If the old adage “personnel is policy” is true, then you could surmise that the absence of necessary personnel is itself a shift in policy priorities.

There are staff vacancies also at the State Department that are deeply troubling. On June 24, I wrote Secretary of State Clinton about the Office of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues.

I submit the letter for the RECORD.

I was prompted to write the letter, in part, because it had come to my atten-

tion that there was only one person working in the office. Have you seen how China has plundered Tibet, and there is one person working in the office?

Congress codified the position of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues as part of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002. Not long after the establishment of the office, Congress approved language directing that the office “consist of three professional, full-time staff members and additional support staff, as needed, in addition to the special coordinator.” Their current inadequate staffing levels, at that point 17 months into the administration, were troubling and at odds with congressional intent.

Further, the congressionally mandated Report on Tibet Negotiations, which is due to Congress by March 31 of each year—and we are in July—has not yet been submitted. These developments, or lack thereof, send a message about the priority this administration is placing on Tibet. Does this administration care about the plundering and the persecution in Tibet?

I have visited Tibet. I have been there. I have seen what has taken place in Draphchi prison. I have seen and talked to Buddhist monks who have told me about their times. I have seen the cameras on all of the buildings. I have seen the areas that they have bulldozed and large areas of loss. They have taken away the Tibetan culture. I have seen that. So does not this administration care about that?

That message is not inconsistent with the message the White House sent last fall in declining to meet with the Dalai Lama when he was visiting Washington—the first time since 1991 that the Nobel Prize recipient and spiritual leader was not afforded a meeting with the President of the United States.

In closing, the complexities of foreign policy do not escape me. I am well aware that there are multiple dimensions to our bilateral relations with countries around the globe, but if the United States of America cannot be relied upon to speak out on behalf of those whose voices have been silenced, then it is, indeed, a dark day for millions around the world who are yearning to breathe the sweet air of freedom.

Where the administration fails to find its voice, Congress must stand in the gap. For decades, human rights enjoyed bipartisan support in this body. Now I fear these issues have fallen victim to bipartisan apathy. Too often, we underestimate the power of our words or, worse yet, the power of our silence.

The late Robert Kennedy, speaking in 1966 Cape Town, South Africa, to a gathering of students committed to challenging the injustice of apartheid, famously said, “Each time a man stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a

current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.”

America must stand up for the ideals upon which our own experiment in self-governance was founded. America must strike out against injustice, whatever form it takes. America must believe that even the mightiest walls of oppression can tumble and work toward that end.

The hour is late and the stakes are high. Will the administration accept this charge? Will the Obama administration accept this charge? Can President Obama find his voice? Will the “ripples of hope,” of which Bobby Kennedy spoke, once again infuse America’s foreign policy? We’ll see.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MAY 5, 2010.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
*President, The White House,
Washington DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: “If President Obama is ever going to find his voice on Sudan, it had better be soon.” These were the closing words of New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof two weeks ago. I could not agree more with his assessment of Sudan today. Time is running short. Lives hang in the balance. Real leadership is needed.

Having first travelled to Sudan in 1989, my interest and involvement in this country has spanned the better part of 20 years. I’ve been there five times, most recently in July 2004 when Senator Sam Brownback and I were the first congressional delegation to go to Darfur.

Tragically, Darfur is hardly an anomaly. We saw the same scorched earth tactics from Khartoum in the brutal 20-year civil war with the South where more than 2 million perished, most of whom were civilians. In September 2001, President Bush appointed former Senator John Danforth as special envoy and his leadership was in fact instrumental in securing, after two and a half years of negotiations, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), thereby bringing about an end to the war. I was at the 2005 signing of this historic accord in Kenya, as was then Secretary of State Colin Powell and Congressman Donald Payne, among others. Hopes were high for a new Sudan. Sadly, what remains of that peace is in jeopardy today. What remains of that hope is quickly fading.

I was part of a bipartisan group in Congress who urged you to appoint a special envoy shortly after you came into office, in the hope of elevating the issue of Sudan. But what was once a successful model for Sudan policy is not having the desired effect today. I am not alone in this belief.

Just last week, six respected NGOs ran compelling ads in The Washington Post and Politico calling for Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice to exercise “personal and sustained leadership on Sudan” in the face of a “stalemated policy” and waning U.S. credibility as a mediator.

In that same vein, today I join that growing chorus of voices in urging you to empower Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice to take control of the languishing Sudan policy. They should oversee quarterly deputies’ meetings to ensure options for consequences are on the table.

There is a pressing and immediate need for renewed, principled leadership at the highest levels—leadership which, while recognizing the reality of the challenges facing Sudan, is clear-eyed about the history and the record of the internationally indicted war criminal

at the helm in Khartoum. We must not forget who we are dealing with in Bashir and his National Congress Party (NCP). In addition to the massive human rights abuses perpetrated by the Sudanese government against its own people, Sudan remains on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is well known that the same people currently in control in Khartoum gave safe haven to Osama bin Laden in the early 1990s.

I believe that this administration’s engagement with Sudan to date, under the leadership of General Gration, and with your apparent blessing, has failed to recognize the true nature of Bashir and the NCP. Any long-time Sudan follower will tell you that Bashir never keeps his promises.

The Washington Post editorial page echoed this sentiment this past weekend saying of Bashir: “He has frequently told Western governments what they wanted to hear, only to reverse himself when their attention drifted or it was time to deliver . . . the United States should refrain from prematurely recognizing Mr. Bashir’s new claim to legitimacy. And it should be ready to respond when he breaks his word.” Note that the word was “when” not “if” he breaks his word. While the hour is late, the administration can still chart a new course.

In addition to recommending that Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice take the helm in implementing your administration’s Sudan policy, I propose the following policy recommendations:

Move forward with the administration’s stated aim of strengthening the capacity of the security sector in the South. A good starting point would be to provide the air defense system that the Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS) requested and President Bush approved in 2008. This defensive capability would help neutralize Khartoum’s major tactical advantage and make peace and stability more likely following the referendum vote.

Do not recognize the outcome of the recent presidential elections. While the elections were a necessary part of the implementation of the CPA and an important step before the referendum, they were inherently flawed and Bashir is attempting to use them to lend an air of legitimacy to his genocidal rule.

Clearly and unequivocally state at the highest levels that the United States will honor the outcome of the referendum and will ensure its implementation.

Begin assisting the South in building support for the outcome of the referendum.

Appoint an ambassador or senior political appointee with the necessary experience in conflict and post-conflict settings to the U.S. consulate in Juba.

Prioritize the need for a cessation of attacks in Darfur, complete restoration of humanitarian aid including “non-essential services,” unfettered access for aid organizations to all vulnerable populations and increased diplomatic attention to a comprehensive peace process including a viable plan for the safe return of millions of internally displaced persons (IDPs).

When the administration released its Sudan policy last fall, Secretary Clinton indicated that benchmarks would be applied to Sudan and that progress would be assessed “based on verifiable changes in conditions on the ground. Backsliding by any party will be met with credible pressure in the form of disincentives leveraged by our government and our international partners.” But in the face of national elections that were neither free nor fair, in the face of continued violations of the U.N. arms embargo, in the face of Bashir’s failure to cooperate in any way with the International Criminal Court, we’ve seen no “disincentives” or “sticks” applied. This

is a worst case scenario and guaranteed, if history is to be our guide, to fail.

Many in the NGO community and in Congress cautiously expressed support for the new policy when it was released, at the same time stressing that a policy on paper is only as effective as its implementation on the ground. More than six months have passed since the release of the strategy and implementation has been insufficient at best and altogether absent at worst.

During the campaign for the presidency, you said, regarding Sudan, “Washington must respond to the ongoing genocide and the ongoing failure to implement the CPA with consistency and strong consequences.” These words ring true still today. Accountability is imperative. But the burden for action, the weight of leadership, now rests with you and with this administration alone. With the referendum in the South quickly approaching, the stakes could not be higher.

The marginalized people of Sudan yearn for your administration to find its voice on Sudan—and to find it now.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MAY 25, 2010.

Hon. MICHAEL POSNER,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR ASSISTANT SECRETARY POSNER: I write regarding a matter of great concern—namely the reported plans by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) to reorganize the Office of International Religious Freedom. It has come to my attention that structural changes may be implemented that could result in the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom losing direct supervisory control over the staff of the Office of International Religious Freedom. Such changes could potentially violate U.S. law and break with 10 years of established practice under previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

As you know, the Ambassador-at-Large position was established under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA), of which I was the primary author, to promote religious freedom abroad. The ambassador is charged with making policy recommendations for the U.S. Government toward “governments that violate freedom of religion or that fail to ensure the individual’s right to religious belief and practice . . .” The ambassador also serves as the “principal adviser to the President and the Secretary of State regarding matters affecting religious freedom abroad . . .” IRFA created the Office of International Religious Freedom to support the Ambassador-at-Large in his or her work. Section 101(a) under Title I of IRFA specifically states that “there is established within the Department of State an Office on International Religious Freedom that shall be headed by the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom.” [Emphasis added]

Considering the importance of religious freedom to U.S. foreign policy and human rights promotion, I am alarmed by the possibility that DRL could be removing supervisory control from the Ambassador-at-Large over the Office of International Religious Freedom. Given my intimate involvement in IRFA’s passage, I can say with assurance that such a decision would directly contradict the intent of the act and undermine the critical role of the position. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom shares this concern, and in its 2010 annual report urged the administration to ensure the ambassador’s direct oversight of the office.

I have been concerned for some time at the priority, or lack thereof, that this administration places on religious freedom. For 16 months now, the president has failed to appoint an Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom. This persistent vacancy, and these reported changes within the State Department are alarming and do not bode well for the Tibetan Buddhist monk forbidden from having a picture of the Dalai Lama or for the Iraqi Christian who has helplessly watched their ancient community be decimated by violence.

In light of these concerns, I urge you to ensure that the Ambassador-at-Large maintain direct oversight of the Office of International Religious Freedom, and only those DRL officials reporting directly to the Ambassador-at-Large be given managerial authority over the office staff. IRFA was clear in creating direct lines of authority from the office staff to the ambassador. It is critical that the Ambassador-at-Large continue to head the office, consistent with IRFA.

As these concerns directly relate to the inner-workings of DRL and the IRF office, I respectfully request that any reply to my letter come from you rather than the assistant secretary for Legislative Affairs. Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,
Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JUNE 24, 2010.

Hon. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY CLINTON: I am writing about some areas of concern related to the Office of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues that I believe merit attention. Specifically, I am concerned that the Office of the Special Coordinator is understaffed. It has come to my attention that there is only one person currently working in the office, and that another position has been unfilled since January 2009. It is my understanding that a third position has never been filled.

After years of congressional advocacy for the creation of a special office in the Department of State on Tibet, the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues was established by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in 1997 and charged with protecting the human rights of Tibetans, preserving their religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage, and promoting substantive dialogue between the Chinese government and the Dalai Lama or his representatives.

As you know, Congress codified the position of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues as part of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002. Both you and I were cosponsors of the original stand-alone bills in the House and the Senate respectively. The legislation detailed the duties and responsibilities of the special coordinator which included coordinating "United States Government policies, programs, and projects concerning Tibet" and maintaining "close contact with religious, cultural, and political leaders of the Tibetan people, including regular travel to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and to Tibetan refugee settlements in India and Nepal."

Not long after the establishment of the office, Congress identified that the special coordinator needed additional resources in order to effectively carry out its mission. In fiscal year 2006, the House and Senate Appropriations committees approved language directing \$1 million for the Office of the Special Coordinator to carry out its statutory responsibilities. The committees also di-

rected that the office "consist of three professional full-time staff members and additional support staff, as needed, in addition to the special coordinator." Congress's interest in these funding and staffing levels has been reaffirmed in subsequent appropriations bills. Given this history, the current inadequate staffing levels, 17 months into the administration, are troubling and are at odds with congressional intent.

Further, I have also learned that the one staffer in the special coordinator's Office was pulled back from a previously scheduled visit to Dharamsala, India, in early May 2010. I understand that one of the goals of this staffer's trip was to participate in a selection process for students under the Tibetan Fulbright program, and that the meeting was cancelled. I expect that she was also scheduled to meet with officials of the Central Tibetan Administration as part of routine oversight of the U.S. government programs that benefit the Tibetan refugee communities in India. Staff members from the special coordinator's Office have been travelling to Dharamsala ever since the creation of the office. Such trips, which include engagement with the leaders of the Tibetan exile community, are essential for the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the office and are explicitly authorized by the Tibetan Policy Act. The oversight provided by these trips is vital to ensuring that taxpayer investments in these communities and programs are sound.

Additionally, I understand that the Report on Tibet Negotiations, which is required by section 613(b) of the Tibetan Policy Act and is due to Congress by March 31 of each year, has not yet been submitted. These developments or lack thereof send a troubling message about the priority this administration is placing on Tibet.

A recently released report by the International Campaign for Tibet makes clear that the need for this office is as pressing as it has ever been. The report titled, "A 'Raging Storm': The Crackdown on Tibetan Writers and Artists after Tibet's Spring 2008 Protests," found that over 50 Tibetans, including 13 writers, have "disappeared" or have faced torture or harassment as a result of expressing their views. The Chinese government's deplorable human rights record, specifically in Tibet, necessitates the department's immediate and unwavering attention.

Given these concerns, I respectfully request that you provide my office with the following information:

A report on the department's efforts to fill expeditiously the two vacant positions in the Office of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs;

An explanation for the cancellation of the scheduled May trip to Dharamsala by the staffer from the special coordinator's Office; and

The status of the Tibet Negotiations report and any explanation for why it has not been submitted to Congress by the required date.

Best wishes,
Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

□ 1930

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Virginia, truly a conscience in this body, for those profound words of challenge, bringing us back to the roots from which this great Nation has grown.

And I realize the time grows late, and it is the last hour that we will be in session this week. And if the gen-

tleman would indulge me, I know that we have a President who has said we're not a Christian Nation, and I will not debate that.

But it is so critical to look at our roots. And so I would like to direct, Mr. Speaker, back to the words of Roger Williams when he said: "That forced worship stinks in God's nostrils, that it denies Christ Jesus yet to come; that in these flames about religion, there is no other prudent, Christian way of preserving peace in the world, but by permission of different consciences."

These are the words of our Founders that set this Nation in motion, that pointed us in the direction of religious tolerance.

1701, William Penn drafted the Charter of Privileges and said: "First because no people can truly be happy, though under the greatest enjoyment of civil liberties, if abridged of the freedom of their consciences, as to their religious profession and worship: And Almighty God being the only Lord of Conscience, Father of Lights and Spirits, and the Author as well as Object of all divine knowledge, faith and worship, who only can enlighten the mind, and persuade and convince the understandings of people, I do hereby grant and declare that no person or persons inhabiting this province or territories, shall confess and acknowledge one Almighty God, the Creator, upholder and ruler of the world; and profess him or themselves obliged to live quietly under the civil government, shall be in any case molested or prejudiced in his or their person or estate, because of his or their conscientious persuasion or practice."

Going back to our heritage, that this country was based on these principles, taught in the Bible, discussed by our Founders, and made the basis of our beliefs in religious freedom, Thomas Jefferson said: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are a gift of God? That they are not to be violated, but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever."

And it ought to cause every American to tremble when they think of the injustice we're allowing to be perpetuated on our citizens around the world. It ought to break the hearts and minds and consciences of everyone.

A United States President said these words, referred to a Mr. Levi, a Galveston, Texas lawyer and a president of the National B'nai Brith, drafted President Theodore Roosevelt a telegram denouncing a Russian pogrom in 1903. The Czar of Russia was so stung by Roosevelt's message that he formally refused to accept it. Some Americans complained that Roosevelt had gone too far. He replied that there were crimes so monstrous that the American conscience had to assert itself. And there still are.

“No one is a better witness to the transience of tyranny than the children of Abraham. Forty centuries ago, the Jewish people were entrusted with a truth more enduring than any power of man. In the words of the prophet Isaiah, ‘This shall be my covenant with them, said the Lord: My spirit which is upon you, and the words which I have placed in your mouth, shall not be absent from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your children, nor from the mouth of your children’s children, said the Lord from now for all time.’”

“It is not an accident that freedom of religion is one of the central freedoms in our Bill of Rights. It is the first freedom of the human soul: the right to speak the words that God places in our mouths. We must stand for that freedom in our country. We must speak for that freedom in the world.”

Could the current administration and President dare to do any less than this President that is so reviled in this administration, President George W. Bush?

I would like to just finish with one other thought, and that was what was related to have happened in Iraq after United States troops liberated Iraq, not for any purpose other than to liberate and to free the people there, and to assure us that they would not be a threat to their neighbors or the rest of the world.

President Bush appointed a retired general named Jay Garner. I had heard the story relayed before and I called him this evening to ask if I could retell it here.

He was in charge of looking about, talking to people all around Iraq, and seeing what kind of government would be best suited for Iraq so that we could help the Iraqi people establish a nation of strength and a representative, hopefully, a representative government. And he talked to people around the country. And over and over, people kept referring him to this huge man, a Shia, a cleric, who wore the black turban, the black robes, and was a descendant, apparently, of Mohammed. And everyone kept telling him he had to talk to this man because everyone looked to him for insight, for words of wisdom.

And so eventually General Garner went, made an appointment, visited with him. He had a number of people with him, including a reporter. He was often a freelance report, but at this point a reporter for Time magazine.

And apparently this cleric spoke very good English, but he said he’d like to tell in his own language what should be done. And he talked for quite some time in his language. Everything was recorded.

And then he said, let me tell you in a nutshell what I’ve said. We need a constitutional process, perhaps like yours in the United States, where we create a constitution. But it must be written by Iraqis. The government must be of Iraqis. And it must be based on the lessons of Jesus Christ and bring all the nation together.

General Garner said when he left that interview with the people in the entourage, he asked the others, did everybody hear what I just think I heard? And they said, yes. Could you believe he said you needed a constitution based on the teachings of Jesus Christ?

And he asked the reporter from Time, are you going to put that in the story? He said, no one would believe that.

But when you think about the wisdom of this great Shia cleric, apparently, Shari’ah law does not allow for freedom of religion and worship when it’s considered in context too often. That’s the way it’s interpreted. It’s only the teachings of Jesus that allow for a constitution that allow for freedom of worship. Whether you’re Muslim, whether you’re following the teachings of Mohammed or Jesus or Moses, it’s only those teachings that give us the kind of Constitution we have.

But since we have that Constitution, and we have been given the foresight by our Founders of what is required to do justice, to love mercy, we can do nothing less than what my friend from Virginia has indicated. We must stand for those who seek to worship as the directives of their heart lead them.

And I thank my friend so much for the very touching time he has spent here on the floor. And I hope and pray that this administration will take those words to heart. I thank my friend.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 1:45 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

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. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-neous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-neous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, July 29.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, July 26, 27, 28, and 29.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 29.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 29.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PUTNAM, for 5 minutes, July 27 and 28.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1376. An act to restore immunization and sibling age exemptions for children adopted by United States citizens under the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption to allow their admission into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 4213. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 26, 2010, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

8489. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System’s “Major” final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1384] received July 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8490. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System’s final rule — Truth in Savings [Regulation DD; Docket No. R-1315] received July 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8491. A letter from the OTS Paperwork Clearance Officer, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office’s “Major” final rule — Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices; Amendment [Docket ID: OTS-2010-0009] (RIN: 1550-AC38) received July 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8492. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s “Major” final rule — Political Contributions by Certain Investment Advisers (RIN: 3235-AK39) received July 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8493. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of General