

to health care practitioners about putting its findings to use to help cure diseases.

Companies like Prime Cell are continuing the great American tradition of private medical research that is responsible for many medical breakthroughs. For example, Jonas Salk, discoverer of the polio vaccine, did not receive one dollar from the federal government for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that forcing taxpayers to subsidize embryonic stem cell research violates basic constitutional principles. However, S. 2754 also exceeds Congress's constitutional authority and may even retard effective adult stem cell research. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against S. 2754 and vote to uphold President Bush's veto of H.R. 810. Instead, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3444, the Cures Can Be Found Act.

SUPPORT FOR REPRESENTATIVE
MOLLOHAN

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 2006

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is enough blame to go around. The minority leadership of the House has politicized the ethics process for partisan political gain. Likewise, the majority party has tried to take control of the ethics process again for partisan reasons.

I have been encouraged recently that the House Ethics Committee is again taking action in investigative matters. I am disappointed, however, that Representative ALAN MOLLOHAN (D-WV), the former ranking minority member, is being given blame by some for inactivity of the committee over the last 16 months.

If I put myself in Representative MOLLOHAN's position, I am not sure I would have acted any differently. The House Ethics Committee is the only House committee that has an even number of Republicans and Democrats. Due to the nature of the committee and the important work it conducts, all committee activity should be conducted on a bipartisan basis.

As I review the events at the start of the 109th Congress, it leads me to the conclusion that several important actions were conducted by the majority without consulting the minority. These partisan actions were contrary to the nature and spirit of the way business has been, and should be, conducted by the Ethics Committee. If I had been the ranking member of the Ethics Committee and the majority party had arbitrarily and unilaterally changed the rules I would have had an obligation to react, just as Representative MOLLOHAN did. If I had been the ranking member and the majority party unilaterally fired the senior committee staff in contradiction to rules which say both the majority and minority must agree, I would have had to react, just as Representative MOLLOHAN did. If I had been the ranking member and the majority party tried to put a partisan chief of staff in as the staff director for the Ethics Committee in contradiction to the standards of a nonpartisan staff I would have had to react, just as Representative MOLLOHAN did.

In other words, I feel Representative MOLLOHAN did exactly what was expected of him as the ranking minority member when the bi-

partisan nature of the ethics process was unilaterally challenged by the majority. He had the courage to stand up to partisan actions when he should have.

My experience with Representative MOLLOHAN when we served together on the Ethics Committee during the 108th Congress is that he was completely nonpartisan and that he would absolutely take no instructions from his leadership on the conduct of the Ethics Committee. That was my philosophy as well, and should be the stance of all who serve on this important committee.

Representative MOLLOHAN has recently been dealing with some other issues that I know nothing about and won't speak to, but as the committee chairman I couldn't have asked for a more thoughtful and considerate ranking member to work with.

His successor as ranking minority member on the Ethics Committee, Representative HOWARD BERMAN (D-CA), is an excellent choice. I have also worked with Representative BERMAN on the committee and I have the highest respect for him.

In conclusion, it is apparent to me that the leadership of both parties have forgotten the importance of a bipartisan ethics process in the House. The Ethics Committee proved during the 108th Congress that, working in a bipartisan manner, it could handle politically sensitive and difficult cases.

Both parties need to return to a bipartisan Ethics Committee and bipartisan ethics process or the House as a whole will continue to suffer.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TEACHER
CENTER ACT OF 2006

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 2006

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Teacher Center Act of 2006.

First and foremost, I want to thank our teachers for their dedication and commitment to taking on all of the demands of their profession. We ask them to perform miracles every day in our underfunded and overcrowded system. And we owe it to them and to their students to provide more than rhetoric about our commitment to supporting teachers and helping them succeed.

Teacher quality is the number one in-school influence on student achievement. Congress recognized this when we passed the No Child Left Behind law and we've come a long way in making sure that every child is taught by a highly qualified teacher. In NCLB we also took a major step forward in improving professional development opportunities for our Nation's teachers. We moved away from 1-day workshops that were not connected to the curriculum and, instead, provided resources to help States and local school districts develop programs that provide continuous, high-quality professional development. This was—and is—essential to meeting the Nation's goal of high standards of learning for every child.

Now we have a responsibility to go to the next step, building on innovative models of dynamic professional development. Teachers tell us that in order to better meet the learning

needs of students, particularly those with the greatest needs, it is essential that we support teachers in honing their instructional skills and techniques with a full repertoire of research-based, proven strategies. We need to pay heed to their call.

The Teacher Center Act of 2006 builds on NCLB by assisting teachers in helping students meet high academic standards. Teacher Centers align professional development with state standards and district curricula and incorporate research about proven classroom strategies—all while meeting high levels of rigor and expertise in both the design and delivery of services.

Teacher Centers employ a strategy in which professional development is made available "for teachers, of teachers, and by teachers." Teachers' voices drive and design the services, which are delivered by expert, practicing teachers and other experts. Teacher Centers provide teachers with opportunities to take charge of their own professional growth and take a lead in the decision-making and implementation of staff development programs based on their needs.

One of the most exciting elements of Teacher Centers is the focus on data-driven instruction in which test results and other indicators of student need are used to drive classroom instruction and strategies. While Teacher Centers give priority focus to literacy and math, they also highlight other essential areas of the curriculum including science, social studies, art, music, foreign languages, health, and physical education. Interdisciplinary approaches to instruction are another example of the type of innovative approaches to professional development that the Teacher Centers provide.

Teacher Centers also help to bridge the gap between groups of students by promoting the effective use of technology to support instruction. Technology is changing at lightning speed and Teacher Centers are particularly helpful to teachers by helping them learn to use technology effectively in their classrooms.

Finally, as we move forward in efforts to ensure that all students receive a high-quality education, we must pay particular attention to the needs of English language learners, students with disabilities, recently arrived students from foreign countries, and other students with special needs. Teacher Centers provide a great opportunity for teachers of these students who have developed effective strategies for helping these students improve their academic achievement to share what they have learned with their peers.

The Teacher Center Act of 2006 is a positive and important step in strengthening the teaching profession and in strengthening our schools. I look forward to achieving the vision of a better school system for all of our children.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION
AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2006

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, while I oppose federal efforts to redefine marriage as something

other than a union between one man and one woman, I do not believe a constitutional amendment is either a necessary or proper way to defend marriage.

While marriage is licensed and otherwise regulated by the states, government did not create the institution of marriage. In fact, the institution of marriage most likely pre-dates the institution of government! Government regulation of marriage is based on state recognition of the practices and customs formulated by private individuals interacting in civil society. Many people associate their wedding day with completing the rituals and other requirements of their faith, thus being joined in the eyes of their church and their creator, not with receiving their marriage license, thus being joined in the eyes of the state.

If I were in Congress in 1996, I would have voted for the Defense of Marriage Act, which used Congress's constitutional authority to define what official state documents other states have to recognize under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, to ensure that no state would be forced to recognize a "same sex" marriage license issued in another state. This Congress, I am an original cosponsor of the Marriage Protection Act, H.R. 1100, that removes challenges to the Defense of Marriage Act from federal courts' jurisdiction. If I were a member of the Texas legislature, I would do all I could to oppose any attempt by rogue judges to impose a new definition of marriage on the people of my state.

Having studied this issue and consulted with leading legal scholars, including an attorney who helped defend the Boy Scouts against attempts to force the organization to allow gay men to serve as scoutmasters, I am convinced that both the Defense of Marriage Act and the Marriage Protection Act can survive legal challenges and ensure that no state is forced by a federal court's or another state's actions to recognize same sex marriage. Therefore, while I am sympathetic to those who feel only a constitutional amendment will sufficiently address this issue, I respectfully disagree. I also am concerned that the proposed amendment, by telling the individual states how their state constitutions are to be interpreted, is a major usurpation of the states' power. The division of power between the federal government and the states is one of the virtues of the American political system. Altering that balance endangers self-government and individual liberty. However, if federal judges wrongly interfere and attempt to compel a state to recognize the marriage licenses of another state, that would be the proper time for me to consider new legislative or constitutional approaches.

Conservatives in particular should be leery of anything that increases federal power, since centralized government power is traditionally the enemy of conservative values. I agree with the assessment of former Congressman Bob Barr, who authored the Defense of Marriage Act:

"The very fact that the FMA [Federal Marriage Amendment] was introduced said that conservatives believed it was okay to amend the Constitution to take power from the states and give it to Washington. That is hardly a basic principle of conservatism as we used to know it. It is entirely likely the left will boomerang that assertion into a future proposed amendment that would weaken gun rights or mandate income redistribution."

Passing a constitutional amendment is a long, drawn-out process. The fact that the

marriage amendment already failed to gather the necessary two-thirds support in the Senate means that, even if two-thirds of House members support the amendment, it will not be sent to states for ratification this year. Even if the amendment gathers the necessary two-thirds support in both houses of Congress, it still must go through the time-consuming process of state ratification. This process requires three-quarters of the state legislatures to approve the amendment before it can become effective. Those who believe that immediate action to protect the traditional definition of marriage is necessary should consider that the Equal Rights Amendment easily passed both houses of Congress and was quickly ratified by a number of states. Yet, that amendment remains unratified today. Proponents of this marriage amendment should also consider that efforts to amend the Constitution to address flag burning and require the federal government to balance the budget have been ongoing for years, without any success.

Ironically, liberal social engineers who wish to use federal government power to redefine marriage will be able to point to the constitutional marriage amendment as proof that the definition of marriage is indeed a federal matter! I am unwilling either to cede to federal courts the authority to redefine marriage, or to deny a state's ability to preserve the traditional definition of marriage. Instead, I believe it is time for Congress and state legislatures to reassert their authority by refusing to enforce judicial usurpations of power.

In contrast to a constitutional amendment, the Marriage Protection Act requires only a majority vote of both houses of Congress and the President's signature to become law. The bill already has passed the House of Representatives; at least 51 Senators would vote for it; and the President would sign this legislation given his commitment to protecting the traditional definition of marriage. Therefore, those who believe Congress needs to take immediate action to protect marriage this year should focus on passing the Marriage Protection Act.

Because of the dangers to liberty and traditional values posed by the unexpected consequences of amending the Constitution to strip power from the states and the people and further empower Washington, I cannot in good conscience support the marriage amendment to the United States Constitution. Instead, I plan to continue working to enact the Marriage Protection Act and protect each state's right not to be forced to recognize a same-sex marriage.

THE ONGOING BATTLE AGAINST SLAVERY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the traveling exhibition created by the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, a branch organization of the New York Public Library, in conjunction with the UNESCO Slave Route Project to mark the United Nation's General Assembly's resolution proclaiming 2004 as the International Year to Commemorate the Struggle against Slavery

and its Abolition. To reach a wider audience the Schomburg Center has created versions in French, Portuguese, Spanish, as well as in English. The online version of the exhibition is available on the Schomburg Center website. (<http://www.nypl.org/research/sc/sc.html>)

The exhibition, titled *Lest We Forget: The Triumph Over Slavery*, is a celebration of the extraordinary human capacity to overcome oppression and injustice. Its tour through Africa, the Caribbean, Central and South America and Europe, is a reminder of a heritage that binds people of all races and color, across national and religious boundaries.

Lest We Forget shows us the images of downtrodden degraded people who were stripped of their humanity and culture who were forced to live their lives as mindless, agendaless pawns in vicious, all-powerful systems of human degradation. The transatlantic slave trade was brutal, vicious, denigrating and horrific. It is a representation of one of the most consistent assaults on human dignity and self-worth in the history of mankind.

We see a different kind of slavery today. Guest-workers, lured from third world countries with false promises, are forced to work in hazardous work conditions with very little wages in countries where oftentimes they do not even speak the language. They have virtually no rights as foreign workers and are sometimes forbidden by law to form unions. These modern-day slaves have no recourse but to follow the directives of their employers to exploit their helplessness. The United Nations defines an enslaved person as one whose movement and decision-making abilities are curtailed so that he/she does not have the ability to choose his employer. With this in mind, it is doubly important for us to recall the brutal reality of slavery and systematic degradation of human dignity; and take action in order to eliminate this modern-day slavery.

I commend the Schomburg Center for creating this remarkable presentation, and the UNESCO for making it accessible across the globe. Their cooperation and collaboration has made the exhibition a resounding success, and I hope to see this cooperation repeated and expanded in finding the resolution to the problem of slavery in today's world.

TRAVELING WITH A GLOBAL APPEAL

To mark the United Nations International Year to Commemorate the Struggle Against Slavery and its Abolition in 2004. UNESCO commissioned the Schomburg Center to create a traveling version of its exhibition *Lest We Forget: The Triumph Over Slavery*. The exhibition highlighted the extraordinary capacity of human beings to confront and transcend oppression, and to overcome state-sanctioned injustice.

The traveling version of *Lest We Forget* has toured in Africa, the Caribbean, Central and South America, and Europe. Travelling to countries such as Cameroon, South Africa, Cape Verde, Mali, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, Senegal, The Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Brazil, Sweden, France, Finland, and Norway. To help ensure that the exhibition did indeed reach a wider audience the Schomburg created versions in English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish.

Just as *Lest We Forget* tells a portion of the story about people of the African Diaspora, so too does *In Motion: The African-American Migration Experience*, which originally opened at the Schomburg Center in February 2005. *In Motion* traces 13 different migration patterns of African Americans over 500 years. As part of the Schomburg