

gives manufacturers, competitors, retailers and shareholders a right to hold violators accountable. The bill prohibits Federal Government agencies from buying goods made with prison or sweatshop labor.

We cannot afford to continue to turn a blind eye to these abuses. Sweatshop imports are a moral crime. They violate the values of our families, of our faith and of the history of this country. They are a moral crime against the working men and women, and, I am afraid, working children of the developing nations.

Sweatshop imports are economic suicide for our country. As we import sweatshop goods, we export American jobs, we weaken the bargaining position of U.S. workers fighting for wages with which they can actually support their families.

The heart of America's economy has always been a vigorous middle-income consumer class. Henry Ford knew that. That is why he paid his workers a wage that would allow them to buy the cars that they made, to share the wealth they create, to buy the cars that they made.

By driving U.S. wages down, we weaken the American consumer market, we undercut our greatest economic power, and we lose jobs in so many of our communities. And when we lose jobs in places like Marion, Ohio, and Zanesville, Ohio, we hurt our communities, we hurt our families, we lay off police officers, we cut back on the fire department, our classrooms get larger as teachers get laid off. It hurts our communities, and it is wrong for our country.

I ask my fellow Members of the House to please support the legislation that I mentioned tonight, the Decent Working Conditions and Fair Competition Act.

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

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AGREEING TO TALK TO IRAN UNCONDITIONALLY

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim my 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by recent news that the administration has offered to put an end to our 26-year-old policy of refusing to speak with the Iranians. While this is a positive move, I am still concerned about the preconditions set by the administration before it will agree to begin talks.

Unfortunately, the main U.S. precondition is that the Iranians abandon

their uranium enrichment program. But this is exactly what the negotiations are meant to discuss. How can a meaningful dialogue take place when one side demands that the other side abandon its position before the talks begin?

Is this offer designed to fail so as to clear the way for military action while being able to claim that diplomacy was attempted? If the administration wishes to avoid this perception, it would be wiser to abandon preconditions and simply agree to talk to Iran.

By demanding that Iran give up its uranium enrichment program, the United States is unilaterally changing the terms of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. We must remember that Iran has never been found in violation of the Nonproliferation Treaty. U.N. inspectors have been in Iran for years, and International Atomic Energy Agency Director ElBaradei has repeatedly reported that he can find no indication of diversion of source or special nuclear material to a military purpose.

As a signatory of the Nonproliferation Treaty, Iran has, according to the treaty, the "inalienable right to the development, research and production of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination."

□ 1845

Yet, the United States is demanding that Iran give up that right even though, after years of monitoring, Iran has never been found to have diverted nuclear material from peaceful to military use.

As my colleagues are well aware, I am strongly opposed to the United Nations and our participation in that organization. Every Congress I introduce a bill to get us out of the U.N., but I also recognize problems with our demanding to have it both ways. On one hand, we pretend to abide by the U.N. and international laws, such as when Congress cited the U.N. on numerous occasions in its resolution authorizing the President to initiate war against Iraq. On the other hand, we feel free to completely ignore the terms of treaties, and even unilaterally demand a change in the terms of the treaties without hesitation. This leads to an increasing perception around the world that we are no longer an honest broker, that we are not to be trusted. Is this the message we want to send at this critical time?

So some may argue that it does not matter whether the U.S. operates under double standards. We are the lone superpower, and we can do as we wish, they argue. But this is a problem of the rule of law. Are we a Nation that respects the rule of law? What example does it set for the rest of the world, including rising powers like China and Russia, when we change the rules of the game whenever we see it? Won't this come back to haunt us?

We need to remember that decision-making power under Iran's Government is not entirely concentrated in

the President. We are all familiar with the inflammatory rhetoric of President Ahmadinejad, but there are others, government bodies in Iran, that are more moderate and eager for dialogue. We have already spent hundreds of billions of dollars on a war in the Middle East. We cannot afford to continue on the path of conflict over dialogue and peaceful resolution. Unnecessarily threatening Iran is not in the interest of the United States and is not in the interest of world peace.

I am worried about pre-conditions that may well be designed to ensure that the talks fail before they start. Let us remember how high the stakes are and urge the administration to choose dialogue over military conflict.

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

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ AND THE PATH TO WAR

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, stop the presses; we found Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Or at least that is what some Members of Congress would have the American public believe. They stake this claim on an unclassified portion of an intelligence report that addressed the finding of 500 weapons shells of old, inert chemical agents from the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s. The shells had been buried deep within the ground near the Iranian border and forgotten by Iraqi soldiers.

Yesterday, intelligence officials made clear that these deactivated shells were not the so-called weapons of mass destruction that the Bush administration used as the basis for going to war in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, a few weapons shells from a two-decade-old war does not a weapons of mass destruction program make.

No matter how you slice it, no matter how you package the story, Saddam Hussein simply didn't have a weapons of mass destruction program in Iraq; yet, there are those who would stop at nothing to prove they existed. It is as if finding the weapons of mass destruction would somehow validate an unjust and unnecessary war that has been mismanaged from the day it was first shamefully conceived.

Mr. Speaker, do a few weapons shells from a two-decade-old war justify the 2,511 American soldiers who have been killed in Iraq? Do they justify the more than 18,000 soldiers who have been wounded forever? How about the countless others who have been traumatized

by psychological and physical injuries or the tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians who have been killed?

Speaking of U.S. troops killed in Iraq, the President's new press secretary recently called the 2,500th American casualty "just a number."

But the American people know that this soldier and the other 2,510 soldiers who have been killed aren't just numbers; they are sons, they are daughters, they are husbands and wives, they are fathers, they are mothers; and each of them was willing to lay down their own life for what they believed to be their duty as part of the U.S. military.

These brave men and women deserve a foreign policy worthy of their sacrifice. Unfortunately, their civilian superiors at the Pentagon and at the White House have let them down in many ways, but particularly by referring to any troop, dead or alive, as just a number.

Instead of trying to justify a tremendously wrong-headed war by pointing to decades-old shells buried in the ground, the Bush administration ought to start engaging in a little something called diplomacy. By going on a diplomatic offensive, the United States will shift its role from that of Iraq's military occupier to its reconstruction partner. We need to engage the United Nations to oversee Iraq's economic and humanitarian needs. At the same time, we must publicly renounce any desire to control Iraqi oil and ensure that the United States does not maintain lasting military bases.

Engaging in diplomacy will give Iraq back to the Iraqi people, helping them rebuild their economic and physical infrastructure, creating Iraqi jobs, and ending the humiliation that corresponds with another country maintaining 130,000 plus occupying troops on their soil.

A strategy emphasizing the diplomacy is in line with an approach I call SMART security. SMART stands for Sensible, Multi-Lateral, American Response to Terrorism. Instead of throwing our military weight around the world, SMART security utilizes multi-lateral partnerships, regional security arrangements, and robust inspection programs to address the threats of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, to be able to address the true threats we face as a Nation, we need to retract ourselves from the very conflict that is damaging our national security on a daily basis, and there is one and only one, important way to begin this process. For the sake of our soldiers, for the sake of their families, for the sake of our very own national security, it is time to stop sacrificing lives and limbs. It is time to stop spending billions of dollars on this war, and it is time to bring our troops home.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PROPERTY RIGHTS IN AMERICA (ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE KELO DECISION)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the first anniversary of *Kelo v. New London*, the Supreme Court's misguided interpretation of the fifth amendment's restrictions on the taking of private property rights.

Both the Old Testament and Greek literature contain references to the government's ability to take private lands. However, in modern times, the exercise of eminent domain has been very limited and only used in public projects such as roads or the provision of electricity and telephone services.

Yet, nearly a year ago this week, the Supreme Court struck a devastating blow to this Nation's homeowners and small businesses when it ruled that government may seize private property and transfer it to another private owner under the guise of promoting community improvement for so-called economic development. As Justice Sandra Day O'Connor said, "The specter of condemnation now hangs over all property."

The *Kelo* ruling inspired citizens and legislators in more than 30 States, including Florida, to enact laws to limit the scope of eminent domain. Their outrage was echoed in the words and actions of many of us here in Congress, and last November the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H.R. 4128, the Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2005.

Yet, as quickly as our voices were raised in defense of our fundamental rights, they now seem to have fallen silent. H.R. 4128 lingers in legislative limbo.

In Riviera Beach, Florida, a poor, predominantly African American coastal community, city officials plan to use eminent domain to seize 400 acres of land to build a \$1 billion waterfront yachting and housing complex, displacing about 6,000 local residents. Surely this is not what the Founding Fathers meant by public use.

Are we to tell the American people that private property is no longer guaranteed under the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, the battle of individual rights and liberties cannot be a part-time engagement. The expropriation of private property for private transfer in the name of economic development is not an act that speaks to the tradition of Robin Hood; it is one that betrays our fundamental constitutional rights.

As James Madison eloquently wrote in the *Federalist Papers*, private property rights lie at the foundation of our Constitution. "Government is insti-

tuted no less for the protection of property than of the persons of individuals."

The *Kelo* case illustrates only one front in a broader battle to preserve the individual rights granted to all citizens under the Constitution. We must apply equal vigilance to protecting intellectual property rights. Safeguarding property such as artistic, musical, and literary works, as well as the commercial branding tools, promotes entrepreneurship and creativity, and incentivizes honest innovation. Moreover, protection for intellectual property plays an ever increasingly prominent role in today's global economy, promoting trade and influencing foreign direct investment. American explorers rely on intellectual property protection.

Mr. Speaker, property rights are basic principles of individual freedom, whether it is real property or intellectual property of which we speak. Today, I rise to marshal my colleagues in defense of this fundamental right of property ownership for every individual in every district that we are honored to represent from homeowners to entrepreneurs.

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

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE DEBT AND THE DEFICIT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we granted a tax break of nearly \$800 billion over the next 10 years to the wealthiest among us, and it made me think about a quote from children's literature, which I think is a good place sometimes to learn what we really ought to know.

We all know about the morality tale called the "Lord of the Rings"; and one of them is called "The Return of the King," and the main character is Gandalf, the magician. The children asked Gandalf what they are supposed to do, and he says, "It is not our part to master all the tides of the world, but to do what is in us for the succor of those years wherein we are set, uprooting the evil in the fields that we know, so that those who live after may have clear earth to till. What weather they shall have is not ours to rule."

Now, we stand out here on this floor very frequently and talk about our children and what kind of a world we are leaving to our children, and we are leaving a world of debt to our children. The June 11 issue of the *New York*