EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING MINISTER LOUIS FARRAKHAN AND THE NATION OF THE ISLAM ON RE-OPENING OF THE SALAAM RESTAURANT IN THE CITY OF CHICAGO.

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Minister Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam for implementation of a tremendous economic development project in the Auburn-Gresham community of Chicago, Illinois.

After being closed for twelve years, on Sunday July 1, 2012, at 706 W. 79th Street, 17 Ward, where the Honorable Latasha Thomas is Alderman. The Nation of Islam re-opened the beautiful five (5) million dollar renovated Salaam Restaurant. In the Webster Dictionary, Salaam is defined as meaning peace. And peaceful it is.

The Nation is reported to have spent in excess of $5 million dollars to renovate the facility and make it a top of the line, first class community venue.

The Salaam has already attracted family gatherings, dinner parties, ministers meetings, business group meetings and visitors from across the nation.

At one meeting with ministers, Minister Farrakhan is reported to have said to the group ''We built the Salaam restaurant with steel and concrete, that's why we could close it for twelve years and come and find it still here! Because brothers and sisters; for you, there is nothing too good.''

For you, we call this, ''The Palace of the People.'' ''From our bakery, we intend to give out your daily bread, freshly baked bread made of the finest ingredients. The Salaam restaurant also has wonderful vegetarian cuisine. But for those who just must have a tenderloin steak, or lamb, come on here to the Salaam.''

''Up stairs on the second floor is a private banquet hall, along with the Ministers' private dining room and adjacent is a piano room.''

Currently the restaurant employs forty people and is eager to expand. Many people have called this magnificent creation the ''jewel of 79th street'' and is a wonderful place for tourist and visitors when they come to Chicago.''

Once again, my hat is off to Minister Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam for putting their money where their mouth is and adding another level of pride for Alderman Latasha Thomas and the people of the 17th Ward in the City of Chicago.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2012

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the majority claims that there is no war on women, but here is yet another example of their attempt to restrict women's access to reproductive health care. H.R. 3803 is quite simply another attempt by anti-choice Republicans to reverse the freedoms women have gained over the last several decades regarding reproductive choice in health care.

Once again, the majority has sought to restrict women's access to reproductive healthcare by threatening doctors with prison (two years) and other penalties if they perform abortions after 20 weeks. With doctors fearful of yet even more restrictions to their practice, many will simply refuse to treat women who want to obtain a safe and legal abortion, thus achieving the majority's intended goal.

Unbelievably, this bill also allows the woman who obtains the abortion, the father, or the maternal grandparents to press civil charges against the doctor! In addition, there are no exceptions to this ban for rape, incest, fetal anomaly, or a woman's health, and with only a narrow exception for a woman's life. This bill also uses the term ''unborn child'' which is a very slippery slope.

The fact that H.R. 3803 is blatantly unconstitutional has been over-looked by the majority. It clearly violates two Supreme Court decisions regarding pre-viability and exceptions for a woman's life and health.

There can be no doubt about the national implications of a bill with D.C.'s name on it as a cover for attacking the reproductive rights of the Nation's women. The citizen's of the District of Columbia are being unfairly attacked. It is absolutely shameful that the sponsors of this legislation are trying to impose their will on the women of D.C. because they know for a fact they could not pass this policy at the national level.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3803 is just another attempt by the majority to wage a war upon women—unfortunately, this time it is directed at residents of the District of Columbia.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL HEALTH CENTER WEEK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC) for 47 years of service during National Health Center Week.

In Cleveland, the celebration honoring National Health Center Week will take place on Tuesday, August 7th, and be hosted by the members of Cleveland's Federally Qualified Community Health Network which consists of: Care Alliance Health Center, Neighborhood Family Practice, Northeast Ohio Neighborhood Health Services and The Free Medical Clinic of Greater Cleveland.

The theme for this year's event is ''Celebrating America's Health Centers: Powering Healthier Communities.'' The focus will be on the success of Cleveland's FQHCs over the years, as well as how the community will welcome new movements in the health sector.

The event will feature local and state experts to discuss health disparities in the Cleveland area. A representative from the Ohio Department of Health will provide the keynote address.

As of 2011, the Cleveland Community Health Center Network has served more than 66,000 patients; Nationwide FQHC's have served over 20 million people. Community Health Centers all across America are partnering with local healthcare providers, social service agencies, and visionaries to ensure that quality health care is available to all.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Cleveland Community Health Center Network as well as the Federally Qualified Health Centers for their dedication and service to our communities and country.

IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN'S ACCESS TO PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, beginning today, August 1, preventative health care provisions for women under the Affordable Care Act will begin going into effect for new insurance plans.

As an increasing number of health insurance policies come under the reach of the Affordable Care Act, a growing number of women will finally be able to access—with no co-payments or deductibles—important preventative services including breastfeeding support, counseling for domestic violence, screenings for HIV, and well-woman visits.

Also importantly, women with these new insurance policies will have access to all FDA-approved forms of contraception. This is an unprecedented victory for women in every district and for women of all backgrounds.

The use of birth control is nearly universal, with 99 percent of women using contraception at some point in their lives. A June Hart Research poll also found that 80 percent of all American women agree that cost should not be a barrier to using effective birth control.

In addition, a letter released by leading law-and-religion scholar Leslie Griffin, and co-

signed by 170 law professors at top religiously affiliated and non-religiously affiliated law schools clearly explains why the contraceptive-coverage benefit protects the rights of individual employees and in no way violates religious freedom. I ask unanimous consent to include the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the majority of Americans that all women have the right to affordable and effective birth control, and I am proud to have fought for this great achievement.

Even before the Affordable Care Act went into effect, the benefits of publicly-funded family planning services could be seen, as these programs have assisted 7 million women each year and have prevented 2 million unintended pregnancies.

Every dollar spent on family planning services is also estimated to save four dollars on future Medicaid costs for prenatal services, delivery, and one year of the baby's medical care.

Affordable birth control and preventative health care services help women plan the timing and size of their families and protect their health. There is a direct link between increased access to birth control and declines in maternal and infant mortality.

The critical provisions within the Affordable Care Act will therefore allow us to expand on these previous successes and give women the freedom to make their own private health decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues and to acknowledge the hard work and long hours we devoted to ensuring that women have access to health care they deserve and I pledge to continue championing women's access to these important preventative services.

AUGUST 1, 2012.

TO PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA AND THE CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP: We are law professors concerned about the Constitution, religious freedom, individual liberty, and gender equality. Today, the egalitarian notion that every American deserves to enjoy religious freedom is under attack from those who would cede employees' religious-liberty rights to corporate executives and nonprofit directors. In this cramped and one-sided view of religious freedom, supervisors are entitled to decide, based on their religious sentiments, whether their employees will be permitted to enjoy essential health benefits without the slightest concern for their religious beliefs. In particular, advocates claim that the Constitution gives all employers the right to veto their employees' health-insurance coverage of contraception.

This view, which is espoused by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and others, is both wrong as a matter of law and profoundly undemocratic. Nothing in our nation's history or laws permits a boss to impose his or her religious views on non-consenting employees. Indeed, this nation was founded upon the basic principle that every individual—whether company president or assistant janitor—has an equal claim to religious freedom.

Nor does religious freedom provide a constitutional entitlement to limit women's liberty and equality, which are protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. Throughout the 1960s, religious leaders advocated laws banning contraception because they believed contraception was immoral. Nonetheless, in 1965 the Supreme Court held that contraceptive use enjoys constitutional protection in Griswold v. Connecticut. Moreover, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires that women enjoy the same health and reproductive freedom enjoyed by men.

Women's liberty and equality are well-settled constitutional law and must remain so. Just as the Court ruled in 1983 in Bob Jones that the free exercise of religion may not override government policies against racial discrimination, today free exercise must not undermine women's liberty and equality.

The diminishment of women's liberty and equality will be the result if organizations claiming a religious affiliation are granted an exemption from the Obama administration's policy requiring all employers to provide contraceptive insurance to their employees.

The battle against legal contraception has been fought and lost before, not only in the 1960s, but also in the 1990s, when state legislatures and courts repeatedly rejected the argument that religious liberty provides a justification for undermining women's equality and denying them contraceptive insurance.

The same principle must apply today in the battle between the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and their allies and the Obama administration over insurance coverage for contraception. Simply put, religious freedom requires religiously affiliated employers to obey the law rather than to become a law unto themselves.

Even forty-seven years after the Supreme Court recognized a constitutional right to contraceptive use, many American women continue to lack access to effective and affordable contraception. One reason for this has been the disparate insurance coverage for men and women. For that reason, twenty-eight states have passed contraceptive equity acts that help women gain equal access to reproductive health care. Several of those acts, just like the Obama administration's policy, require employer insurance plans that offer prescription-drug coverage to include contraceptive drugs and devices in their coverage. Most of those acts, just like the Obama plan, do not apply to houses of worship but to religiously affiliated employers like Catholic Charities, a large social-services organization that receives more than two-thirds of its funding from taxpayers, as well as to Catholic schools, universities and hospitals that employ both non-Catholics and Catholic women who use contraception.

The bishops and their allies opposed those bills in the legislatures and the state courts, arguing that religious freedom requires a complete exemption for all employers that claim a religious affiliation. As the recent debate demonstrates, that argument has a certain intuitive appeal to religious organizations that believe that free exercise allows religiously affiliated organizations to avail themselves of special rules. Under the leading free exercise case (Employment Division v. Smith), however, religious employers are subject to neutral laws of general applicability. Two state courts, namely the highest courts of New York and California, forcefully rejected the bishops' argument for exemptions from laws requiring the provision of contraception insurance to employees.

The state courts first ruled that providing insurance could not be a matter of internal church governance protected from state interference by the First Amendment. The courts also held that insurance laws applying to all employers were neutral laws of general applicability that could be constitutionally applied to religious employers under Smith. The two holdings reinforce each other. As the New York Court of Appeals explained, ''The employment relationship is a frequent subject of legislation, and when a religious organization chooses to hire nonbelievers it must, at least to some degree, be prepared to accept neutral regulations imposed to protect those employees' legitimate interests in doing what their own beliefs permit.''

The California Supreme Court took a further step, ruling that its women's health act survived strict scrutiny. Under strict scrutiny, a law that substantially burdens a religious practice is upheld only if the law represents the least restrictive means of achieving a compelling interest. The court concluded that the women's health care act was narrowly tailored to the government's compelling interest in eliminating gender discrimination, obviating the need to undertake a substantial-burdens analysis.

The California Supreme Court's strict scrutiny analysis remains relevant to criticisms of President Obama's plan. Opponents of the regulations have argued that they violate the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which subjects federal policies to strict scrutiny if they substantially burden a person's exercise of religion. The opponents are wrong. First, under existing case law, the provision of insurance coverage is arguably not the exercise of religion. Moreover, allowing individuals the choice of contraceptives does not substantially burden any exercise of religion.

Even if the courts found a substantial burden on religion, however, the government's interests in protecting women's health and reproductive freedom, and combating gender discrimination, are compelling. The Institute of Medicine panel's report, and a mountain of evidence from other public health groups, amply demonstrate the government's compelling interest in ensuring widespread access to affordable contraception as a means of promoting health and remedying gender inequality.

The California Supreme Court ruled that a law nearly identical to President Obama's initial plan to provide insurance coverage—including a virtually identical exemption for houses of worship—was narrowly tailored to protect women's equality. Thus President Obama's original regulation could have withstood constitutional scrutiny. The constitutional case is even clearer for the accommodation, which requires insurance companies to bear the burden of providing coverage to employees claiming a religious affiliation. The accommodation is even more narrowly tailored than the initial regulation was to reflect the government's interest in women's equality.

In past Supreme Court decisions, religious employers have been required to pay Social Security and unemployment taxes for their employees and to observe the minimum wage laws. Federal courts of appeals have required religious employers to comply with the child labor laws and to observe the equal pay laws even when the employers believed head-of-household pay was required by the Bible. As the California Supreme Court observed, ''We are unaware of any decision in which this court, or the United States Supreme Court, has exempted a religious objector from the operation of a neutral, generally applicable law despite the recognition that the requested exemption would detrimentally affect the rights of third parties.''

The federal government must continue to protect the rights of women who need insurance laws so that they may make reproductive choices consistent with their individual consciences. Religious freedom must not provide a justification to deprive women of legal rights they should enjoy as employees and citizens. To the contrary, the First Amendment specifically preserves space for their religious liberty, and secures their right to act as individuals who exercise their own

conscience on matters pertaining to their faith, body, and health.

LESLIE GRIFFIN,
Professor of Law,
William S. Boyd School of Law,
University of Nevada Las Vegas.

Signed [Note: Affiliations provided for identification purposes only]:

Paula Abrams, Jeffrey Bain Faculty Scholar and Professor of Law, Lewis & Clark Law School; Libby Adler, Professor of Law, Northeastern University School of Law; Janet Ainsworth, John D. Eshelman Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law; Sara Ainsworth, Lecturer, University of Washington School of Law; Catherine Albiston, Professor of Law and Professor of Sociology; Executive Committee Member, Thelton E. Henderson Center for Social Justice, University of California, Berkeley School of Law; Jose Alvarez, Herbert and Rose Rubin Professor of International Law, New York University School of Law; Mark Anderson, Associate Professor of Law, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Susan Appleton, Lemma Barkeloo and Phoebe Couzins Professor of Law, Washington University School of Law; Margalynne Armstrong, Associate Professor of Law, Santa Clara University School of Law and Marie Ashe, Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School.

Barbara Babcock, Judge John Crown Professor of Law, Emerita, Stanford Law School; Katharine Baker, Professor of Law, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law; Susan Smith Bakhshian, Clinical Professor, Director of Bar Programs & Academic Success, Loyola Law School; Ann Bartow, Professor of Law, Pace Law School; Carrie Basas, Visiting Associate Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University; John Beckerman, Visiting Professor, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden; Valena Beety, Associate Professor of Law, West Virginia University College of Law; Leslie Bender, Professor of Law, Syracuse University College of Law; Mary Berkheiser, Professor of Law, Director of Clinical Programs and Director of Juvenile Justice Clinic, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas; and Adele Bernhard, Associate Professor of Law, Pace Law School.

Anita Bernstein, Anita and Stuart Subotnick Professor of Law, Brooklyn Law School; Caroline Bettinger-Lopez, Associate Professor of Clinical Legal Education and Director, Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; M. Gregg Bloche, M.D., J.D., Professor of Law, Georgetown University; Karen M. Blum, Associate Dean and Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School; Grace Ganz Blumberg, Distinguished Professor of Law Emerita, UCLA School of Law; AmeliaBoss, Trustee Professor of Law, Earle Mack School of Law, Drexel University; Cynthia Bowman, Dorothea S. Clarke Professor of Law, Cornell Law School; Alfred L. Brophy, Judge John J. Parker Distinguished Professor of Law, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Naomi Cahn, John Theodore Fey Research Professor of Law, George Washington University Law School; June Carbone, Edward A. Smith/Missouri Chair of Law, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law.

David Cassuto, Professor of Law and Director, Brazil-American Institute for Law & Environment, Pace Law School; Erwin Chemerinsky, Founding Dean, University of California Irvine School of Law; Nancy Chi Cantalupo, Professor, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Margaret Chon, Donald & Lynda Horowitz Professor for the Pursuit of Justice, Seattle University School of Law; Roger Clark, Board of Governors Professor, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden; David S. Cohen, Associate Professor of Law, Earle Mack School of Law at Drexel University; Clare Coleman, Assistant Teaching Professor and Director of Student Advising, Earle Mack School of Law at Drexel University; Rebecca Cook, Faculty Chair in International Human Rights Faculty of Law and Co-Director of the International Program on Reproductive and Sexual Health Law, University of Toronto; Bridget Crawford, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, Pace Law School; Lynn Daggett, Professor of Law, Gonzaga School of Law.

Anne Dailey, Evangeline Starr Professor of Law, University of Connecticut School of Law; Anne Dalesandro, Director of the Law Library, Rutgers School of Law—Camden; Christine S. Davik, Professor of Law, University of Maine School of Law; Martha Davis, Professor of Law, Northeastern University School of Law; Kate Nance Day, Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School; Bernard Dickens, Emeritus Professor of Health Law and Policy, University of Toronto; Norman Dorsen, Frederick I. and Grace A. Stokes Professor of Law, New York University School of Law; Margaret Drew, Professor of Clinical Law and Director of the Domestic Violence and Civil Protection Order Clinic, University of Alabama School of Law. Jennifer Drobac, Professor of Law, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law; and Linda Edwards, E.L. Cord Foundation Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas.

Maxine Eichner, Reef C. Ivey II Professor of Law, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill School of Law; Kathleen C. Engel, Associate Dean for Intellectual Life and Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School; JoAnne Epps, Dean, Beasley School of Law, Temple University; Deborah Epstein, Professor of Law and Associate Dean, Georgetown Law; Martha Ertman, Carole & Hanan Sibel Research Professor of Law, University of Maryland School of Law; Lisa Faigman, Lecturer in Law, University of California Hastings College of the Law; Bryan Fair, Thomas E. Skinner Professor of Law, University of Alabama School of Law; Mary Fellows, Everett Fraser Professor of Law, Emerita, University of Minnesota Law School; Linda Fentiman, James D. Hopkins Professor of Law, Pace Law School; and Zanita E. Fenton, Professor of Law, University of Miami School of Law.

Victor Flatt, Taft Distinguished Professor of Environmental Law, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill School of Law; Marsha Freeman, Professor of Law, Barry University Dwayne O. Andreas School of Law; Jaqueline Fox, Associate Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law; Katherine Franke, Isidor and Seville Sulzbacher Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Gender and Sexuality Law, Columbia Law School; Theresa Gabaldon, Lyle T. Alverson Professor of Law and Director of Academic Programs and Administration, George Washington University Law School; Ruben Garcia, Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas; Leslie Garfield, Professor of Law, Pace Law School; Marsha Garrison, Suzanne J. and Norman Miles Professor of Law, Brooklyn Law School; Susan Gary, Orlando J. and Marian H. Hollis Professor of Law, School of Law University of Oregon; and Bennett Gershman, Professor of Law, Pace Law School.

Lauren Gilbert, Professor of Law, St. Thomas University School of Law; Theresa Glennon, Professor of Law, James E. Beasley School of Law at Temple University; Sally Goldfarb, Professor of Law, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden; Julie Goldscheid, Professor of Law, CUNY Law School; Leigh Goodmark, Associate Professor, Director, Family Law Clinic and Co-Director of the Center on Applied Feminism, University of Baltimore School of Law; Michele Goodwin, Everett Fraser Professor of Law, University of Minnesota; Cheryl Hanna, Professor of Law, Vermont Law School; Kathy Hessler, Clinical Professor of Law and Animal Law Clinic Director, Lewis & Clark Law School; Steven J. Heyman, Professor of Law, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law; and Tracy Higgins, Professor of Law, Fordham School of Law.

Jessie Hill, Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Cynthia M. Ho, Associate Professor of Law & Vickrey Research Professor; Director, Intellectual Property & Technology Program, Loyola University Chicago School of Law; Sharon Hoffman, Edgar A. Hahn Professor of Law, Professor of Bioethics, Co-Director, Law-Medicine Center, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Joan H. Hollinger, Lecturer-in-Law, Berkeley Law School, University of California; Deena Hurwitz, Associate Professor of Law and Director of the International Human Rights Law Clinic and Human Rights Program, University of Virginia; Melanie Jacobs, Professor of Law, Michigan State University College of Law; Stewart Jay, Pendleton Miller Endowed Chair of Law, University of Washington School of Law; Faye Jones, Director and Professor of Law, Florida State University College of Law; Sital Kalantry, Associate Clinical Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the Avon Global Center for Women and Justice, Cornell University Law School; and Margo Kaplan, Assistant Professor of Law, Rutgers School of Law.

Harriet Katz, Professor of Law, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden; Linda K. Kerber, May Brodbeck Professor in the Liberal Arts Emerita, and Lecturer in Law, University of Iowa College of Law; Jaime King, Associate Professor of Law, University of California Hastings College of the Law; Kristine S. Knaplund, Professor of Law, Pepperdine University School of Law; Ellen Kreitzberg, Professor of Law, Santa Clara University School of Law; Sylvia Law, Elizabeth K. Dollard Professor of Law Medicine and Psychiatry, New York University School of Law; Nancy Leong, Assistant Professor, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law; Nancy Levit, Curators' and Edward D. Ellison Professor of Law, UMKC School of Law; Francine J. Lipman, William S. Boyd Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas; and David Luban, University Professor in Law and Philosophy, Georgetown Law.

Jody Lynee Madeira, Associate Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law; Kevin Noble Maillard, Professor of Law, Syracuse University College of Law; Maya Manian, Associate Professor of Law, University of San Francisco School of Law; Thomas McAffee, William S. Boyd Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas; Joyce E. McConnell, William J. Maier, Jr. Dean, Thomas R. Goodwin Professor of Law, WVU College of Law; Marcia McCormick, Associate Professor, Saint Louis University School of Law; Ann McGinley, William S. Boyd Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas; Michelle McKinley, Associate Professor, Dean's Faculty Fellow, University of Oregon School of Law; Laura McNally, Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; and Carrie Menkel-Meadow, A.B. Chettle, Jr. Professor of Dispute Resolution and Civil Procedure, Georgetown Law.

Cynthia Mertens, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Law, Santa Clara University; Vanessa Merton, Professor

of Law and Faculty Supervisor of the Immigration Justice Clinic, Pace Law School; Sally Merry, Professor of Anthropology, Institute for Law and Society, New York University School of Law; Carlin Meyer, Professor of Law and Director of the Diane Abbey Law Center for Children and Families, New York Law School; Naomi Mezey, Professor of Law, Georgetown Law; Jennifer Moore, Professor of Law, University of New Mexico School of Law; Karen Moran, Associate Professor of Law, General Faculty, University of Virginia; Daniel Morrissey, Former Dean and Professor of Law, Gonzaga University School of Law; Jill Morrison, Adjunct Professor of Law, University of DC David A. Clarke School of Law; and Ann Murphy, Professor of Law, Gonzaga School of Law.

Karen Musalo, Clinical Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Gender and Refugee Studies, University of California, Hastings College of Law; Michael Mushlin, Professor of Law, Pace Law School; Kimberly Mutcherson, Associate Professor of Law, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden; Cynthia Nance, Dean Emeritus & Nathan G. Gordon Professor of Law, University of Arkansas; Michelle Oberman, Professor of Law, Santa Clara University School of Law; Nancy K. Ota, Professor of Law, Albany Law School; Richard L. Ottinger, Dean Emeritus, Pace Law School; Justin Pidot, Assistant Professor, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law; Deana Pollard-Sacks, Professor of Law, Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law; and Andrew S. Pollis, Assistant Professor of Law, Milton A. Kramer Law Clinic Center, Case Western Reserve University School of Law.

Terrill Pollman, Director of the Lawyering Process Program and Professor of Law, Williams S. Boyd School of Law, University of Las Vegas; Lucille M. Ponte, Professor of Law, Florida Coastal School of Law; Sarah Ricks, Clinical Professor of Law, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden Angela R. Riley, Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law, Director, UCLA American Indian Studies Center; Dorothy Roberts, George A. Weiss University Professor of Law & Sociology and Raymond Pace & Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander Professor of Civil Rights, University of Pennsylvania; Rand Rosenblatt, Professor of Law, Rutgers University School of Law—Camden; Susan Deller Ross, Professor of Law and Director, International Women's Human Rights Clinic, Georgetown Law; Margaret Russell, Professor of Law, Santa Clara University School of Law; Carol Sanger, Barbara Aronstein Black Professor of Law, Columbia Law School and Nadia N. Sawicki, Assistant Professor of Law, Beazley Institute for Health Law and Policy, Loyola University Chicago School of Law.

Robert P. Schuwerk, Professor of Law, University of Houston Law Center; Elizabeth Sepper, Associate Professor of Law, Washington University School of Law; Ann Shalleck, Professor of Law, Director of Women and Law Program, Carrington Shields Scholar, American University Washington College of Law; Laurie Shanks, Clinical Professor of Law, Albany Law School; Julie Shapiro, Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law; Jessica Silbey, Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School; Rosalind Simson, Adjunct Professor of Law, Mercer University School of Law and Associate Professor of Philosophy, Mercer University; Jana Singer, Professor of Law, University of Maryland, Francis King Carey School of Law; Abbe Smith, Professor of Law and Director of the Criminal Defense and Prisoner Advocacy Clinic, Georgetown Law and Cynthia Soohoo, Director of the International Women's Human Rights Clinic, CUNY Law School.

Roy G. Spece, Professor of Law, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law; Carrie Sperling, Associate Clinical Professor of Law, Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law; Ralph Stein, Professor of Law, Pace Law School; Lara Stemple, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Health and Human Rights Law Project, UCLA School of Law; Richard Storrow, Professor of Law, CUNY School of Law; John Strait, Associate Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law; Jennifer Templeton Dunn, Executive Director, UCSF/Hastings Consortium on Law and Adjunct Professor, University of California, Hastings College of the Law; Tracy Thomas, Professor of Law, University of Akron School of Law; Stacey Tovino, Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas and Mary Pat Treuthart, Professor of Law, Gonzaga University School of Law.

Ann E. Tweedy, Assistant Professor, Hamline University School of Law; Carole Vance, Associate Clinical Professor of Sociomedical Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University; Valorie K. Vojdik, Professor and Deputy Director, Law Clinic, West Virginia University College of Law; Lois Weithorn, Professor of Law, University of California Hastings College of the Law; Robin West, Frederick J. Haas Professor of Law and Philosophy, Georgetown Law; Lesley Wexler, Thomas M. Mengler Faculty Scholar and Professor of Law, University of Illinois College of Law; Deborah Widiss, Associate Professor of Law, Indiana University Maurer School of Law; Lindsay Wiley, Assistant Professor of Law, American University Washington College of Law; Verna Williams, Professor of Law, University of Cincinnati College of Law; Zipporah Wiseman, Thos. H. Law Centennial Professor, University of Texas at Austin School of Law and Marcia Zug, Assistant Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law.

IN HONOR OF KATHLEEN PEPERA

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kathleen Pepera who is retiring on August 1, 2012 after 34 years of dedicated service with the Social Security Administration.

Kathy began her career with the Social Security Administration (SSA) in the Cleveland West District Office as a summer intern while still a student at Baldwin-Wallace College. Following graduation, she took the Professional and Administrative Career Examination and was subsequently hired in 1979 as a Claims Representative in the Cleveland Southwest Social Security Office.

Throughout her career with SSA, Kathy has held a number of positions with increasing responsibilities. She has served as a supervisor at the Cleveland Teleservice Center and the Cleveland Downtown Field Office. Kathy also worked as the District Manager at the Cleveland Southeast Office and Cleveland Northeast Office. She also fulfilled a temporary role as Deputy Area Director for Northern Ohio. Kathy will be retiring as the District Manager of the Cleveland West District Office, the same office where she started her 34 year career.

Kathy's dedication to the SSA and citizens she helped serve was unquestionable. She was steadfast in fulfilling SSA's mission to "deliver Social Security services that meet the changing needs of the public."

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Kathleen Pepera on the occasion of her retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 537 on suspending the rules and passing S. 679—the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act of 2011—I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 538 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 828—the Federal Employee Tax Accountability Act of 2011—I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 539 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3803—the District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONCURRENT TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION CELEBRATES ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY, TUESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2012

HON. MARK S. CRITZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, 2012, Concurrent Technologies Corporation will celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary. I rise to acknowledge this notable milestone and to pay recognition to the company's history and dedicated employees.

Concurrent Technologies Corporation (CTC) was first known as Metalworking Technology Inc., a subsidiary of the University of Pittsburgh Trust. Metalworking Technology Inc. was formed in 1987 in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, to operate the National Center for Excellence in Metalworking Technology for the U.S. Navy.

In 1992, Metalworking Technology Inc. changed its name to Concurrent Technologies Corporation to more accurately convey the organization's expanded mission: to provide cutting-edge scientific, applied research and development solutions to its clients. Two years later, CTC separated from the University of Pittsburgh Trust to become a fully independent nonprofit corporation.

Daniel R. DeVos was the company's first permanent Chief Executive Officer, and through his leadership the organization quickly expanded its capabilities and gained national recognition. Edward J. Sheehan, Jr., who succeeded Mr. DeVos, is the current President and Chief Executive Officer. Under his guidance, CTC continues to grow and prosper—earning respect and appreciation from its many customers across our nation and globe.