

Jonathan Stertzbach, an independent Baptist by training. Chaplain Stertzbach was called to perform a memorial service for a fallen soldier. In that division, he had to e-mail his prayer to the divisional chaplain. In the prayer, the divisional chaplain struck through the words "Jesus Christ." He sent back the prayer with the strike-through of "Jesus Christ" to Jonathan Stertzbach. Chaplain Stertzbach went to the company commander, and asked permission not to pray.

The company commander says, Why not?

He says, Because I've been ordered not to close my prayer as I see fit, based on my conscience, and knowing that the deceased soldier had attended his chapel, a Christian chapel.

So the company commander said to Chaplain Stertzbach, You will pray, and you will pray as you see fit.

He did, and he closed his prayer in the name of his Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ. From that, the divisional chaplain removed Chaplain Stertzbach from his chapel.

In 2005, when I heard this story, I wrote a letter to Lieutenant General Stanley Green, the inspector general of the United States Army, and I asked for an investigation into this case involving Chaplain Stertzbach. I am pleased to say, Madam Speaker, that Chaplain Stertzbach was returned to his chapel. The inspector general found that he should never have been removed.

Madam Speaker, very briefly, I just want to read the bill, which is so simple. This is what it says: to ensure that every military chaplain has the prerogative to close a prayer outside of a religious service according to the dictates of the chaplain's own conscience.

Madam Speaker, this is a sad day in America. I would be on this floor for a Jewish rabbi. I would be on this floor for a Muslim who happened to be a chaplain in the military. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will look at this bill, because all it says is that you can close your prayer based on your heart, based on the dictates of your faith outside the church on base, even over the body of a dead soldier.

□ 1945

Madam Speaker, as I close, I want to make it clear, because I see my friend on the floor who is of the Muslim faith, that I would be on this floor tonight for a Muslim chaplain who was told that he, an imam, could not close a prayer based on their faith.

Madam Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in our uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I ask God to give wisdom, strength and courage to the President of the United States. And I

ask three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

FEBRUARY 6, 2005.

Department of the Army,  
*The Inspector General, 1700 Army Pentagon,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR LTG STANLEY GREEN: It has come to my attention that in all branches of the military it is increasingly difficult for chaplains to pray in adherence to their faith. I have read reports, received letters, and seen documentation which verifies that suppression of religious freedom throughout our Armed Forces is a pervasive problem, affecting military chaplains from all denominations and religions. Of particular concern is an incident involving Army Captain Chaplain Jonathon Stertzbach of the 3-6 FA HHB in Iraq. I am writing to request that the Army Inspector General investigate whether Chaplain Stertzbach was illegally removed from his chapel.

This chaplain who is serving our troops in harm's way in Iraq was asked by another unit, whose chaplain had to return home to start chemotherapy after cancer was discovered, to serve the spiritual needs of the unit's soldiers in weekly movement to an undisclosed FOB (Forward Operating Base) as well as his own battalion. During one of the missions, tragically, one of the soldiers was killed in action. The unit's Commanding Officer asked this chaplain to perform the memorial ceremony because he had bravely served the soldiers, and gone to the risk of conveying to the FOB (Forward Operating Base) weekly.

Before the memorial ceremony, the chaplain submitted two prayers and a meditation for the Division Chaplain and his direct supervising chaplain to review and was approved. The Brigade Chaplain, having just arrived from Fort Drum, attempted to remove the chaplain from administering the prayers of the memorial ceremony because he concluded his prayer in the name of Jesus Christ in a public forum. The chaplain, adhering to his conscience and faith tradition, said he would not strike the words Jesus Christ.

The unit's Commanding Officer intervened, explaining that Chaplain Stertzbach volunteered to serve a different unit outside of his assigned unit and placed his life in harm's way to provide for the needs of the unit's soldiers. The Commanding Officer instructed that Chaplain Stertzbach would pray according to his faith tradition and the prayers that he had already submitted. The Brigade Chaplain told him to qualify his prayer at the beginning with "Please pray according to your faith tradition, as I pray according to mine" and then close the prayer with "in thy name we pray, and in Jesus' name I pray." Chaplain Stertzbach delivered the memorial meditation and prayers for the fallen hero, but still followed orders with the 'qualifier' remaining in place.

After the incident, Chaplain Stertzbach's story reached the media. The Chaplain was directly contacted by the Washington Times and referenced in a Washington Times January story. Chaplain Stertzbach's incident was not printed, but he was quoted as saying the following:

"You need to allow people to pray according to their faith group. Many faith groups do not pray in general and generic terms. . . . For Christian groups, the name of Jesus is from where all the power comes."

I believe Chaplain Stertzbach answered questions fairly, accurately, and within his legal rights. Consequently, his answers to the media and the incident surrounding the memorial ceremony resulted in Chaplain Stertzbach's removal from his chapel.

I am concerned that Chaplain Stertzbach was removed without justification. Again, I am requesting that you investigate this incident and provide an explanation.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,  
Member of Congress.

### TRI-CAUCUS WELCOMES ALL INTERNS AND STAFF

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I come here to read a statement that was recently issued by an organization here in our own Congress, our own body, known as the Tri-Caucus. The Tri-Caucus includes members of the Black Caucus, Hispanic Caucus and the Asian Caucus, and is made up of about 87 Members of this body.

The statement says as follows:

"Four of our colleagues, Representatives JOHN SHADEGG of Arizona, PAUL BROWN of Georgia, TRENT FRANKS of Arizona and SUE MYRICK of North Carolina recently requested the House Sergeant at Arms to launch an investigation of the civil rights group CAIR, or Council on American-Islamic Relations, to determine whether it was placing staff and interns in key congressional offices who they fear are acting as 'spies.'

"This proposed investigation coincides with the launch of a book by Dave Gaubatz, an anti-Islamic activist and author of the book 'Muslim Mafia: Inside the Secret Underworld that's Conspiring to Islamize America.' It features an introduction by Representative MYRICK and was written after Gaubatz posed as an intern at CAIR in an effort to 'infiltrate' the group.

"These charges smack of an America 60 years ago where lists of 'un-American' agitators were identified. We should be affirming the importance of diversity and tolerance for all interns and staff who serve in Congress without suspicion of being identified as 'spies.'

"The idea that we should investigate Muslim interns as spies is a blow to the very principle of religious freedom that our Founding Fathers cherished so dearly. If anything, we should be encouraging all Americans to engage in the U.S. political process, to take part in, and to contribute to, the great democratic experiment that is America.

"We all have experienced the sting of discrimination and we know that there will be challenges ahead. But our message should be firm that the America we believe in welcomes people of all backgrounds to the U.S. Congress.

"We ask these charges be disavowed and we issue a hearty welcome to interns and staff of all creeds, color, ethnicities and sexual orientation."

I read this statement and will submit it for the RECORD and again thank the leadership of the Tri-Caucus, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congresswoman

NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ and Congressman MIKE HONDA. I thank all of them.

#### IRAN SANCTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold a long-overdue markup of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. Some of our colleagues are focusing exclusively on Iran's nuclear ambition, as it was the nuclear program in itself that was the catalyst for the concern.

But if Iran were comprised of a responsible, democratic government, would we be as apprehensive about their nuclear activities? Of course not. But we are talking about an Iranian regime which just this year conducted two missile tests and continues to work on the range of its missiles and on enabling them to carry a nuclear payload. We are talking about a regime whose leaders throughout the years have made it abundantly clear that they will stop at nothing to destroy the Jewish State of Israel. We are talking about an Iran which for nearly three decades has been designated by our U.S. Department of State as the world's leading state sponsor of global terrorism. The clerical regime is fomenting bloodshed and promoting chaos in the West Bank and Gaza and Lebanon and the Persian Gulf, as well as in Iraq, where it is actively assisting in the murder of our U.S. soldiers.

On the battlefields of Afghanistan, Iran is also playing a deadly subversive role. As early as 2002, allegations emerged that Iran was supporting insurgent groups in Afghanistan, including its former archenemy, the Taliban. However, the first significant report of Iranian weapons in Afghanistan came in April of 2007. Then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace, announced: "We have intercepted weapons in Afghanistan headed for the Taliban that were made in Iran."

Since 2007, several large shipments have been seized near the Iranian border. U.S. officials say that Iranian-made weapons have been found in Afghanistan and used by Taliban-led insurgents. These weapons have included Tehran's signature roadside bomb, the explosively formed penetrator, EFP, AK-47s, as well as C-4 plastic explosives and mortars.

On August 29 of this year, just a few days before General McChrystal submitted his request to this administration, Afghan and NATO forces uncovered a weapons collection in Herat with EFPs, Iranian-made rockets and dozens of blocks of Iranian C-4 plastic explosives.

In the August 2009 declassified, leaked version of his assessment, General Stanley McChrystal stated that: "Iran plays an ambiguous role in Afghanistan, providing developmental as-

sistance and political support to the Afghan government while the Iranian Qods force is reportedly training fighters for certain Taliban groups and providing other forms of military assistance to insurgents."

We cannot allow Iran to undermine U.S. efforts and kill our soldiers in Afghanistan. We cannot allow Iran to return Afghanistan to the status of a failed state and pave the way for attacks against the West using Afghanistan as its launching pad. We cannot allow Iran to develop nuclear weapons capabilities which threaten the United States and our allies.

If we are to be vigilant in protecting the lives of our men and women—military and civilian—in Afghanistan, we must increase the pressure on the Iranian regime and impose immediate sanctions on Iran. This should be our first option.

We don't have the luxury of time, to wait for an eventual Iranian response to U.S. diplomatic overtures. We cannot wait for the U.N. Security Council to come around. We cannot wait for our European and other allies to decide to do the right thing. The United States must lead by example. It is time to cut off the Iranian regimes' economic lifeline. As such, we should not stop at this week's Foreign Affairs Committee markup.

I urge the majority to bring the strongest possible form of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act to the floor next week for a vote, followed by quick Senate action so that it gets to the President's desk before the end of the year. We must do this now.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I came to Congress with a purpose, a purpose of working to preserve the way of life that we live in Kansas. I was born and raised in Kansas, and my home and family are still in Kansas. I never moved to Washington, D.C. because I love the sense of community and belonging that Kansas communities offer. Access to quality, affordable health care is one of those things that determine whether our communities survive and whether we have a future. This is why the current health care reform debate is so important to me, and I am extremely concerned about the direction that we are going.

During his campaign, President Obama stressed transparency and accountability in the health care debate. He said, I'm going to have all the negotiations around a big table and that the negotiations will be televised on C-SPAN so that people could see who is making the arguments on behalf of their constituents and who is making the arguments on behalf of drug companies or insurance companies.

But now the transparency that the President promised us is nowhere to be found, as several Democrat senators and White House staff hole themselves away to draft the health care reform bill behind closed doors. I understand the Democrats' desire to merge the two Senate committee bills, but this process concerns me because in this closed office, the future of health care for Kansans is being decided.

Does this small group understand the problems that cutting Medicare reimbursement rates will pose for Kansas hospitals, doctors, nurses and other health care providers? Kansas hospitals operate on razor-thin margins because they are already dramatically underpaid by Medicare. If these rates are further reduced, as the current reform bills propose, Kansas hospitals may be forced to close and access to health care for Kansans will be reduced.

Is this small group considering commonsense ideas that have been proposed by Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle that would make quality coverage more affordable and more accessible for more Americans? Some of those ideas that we have talked about include placing as much emphasis on wellness as we do on illness by giving employers and insurers flexibility to reward individuals who improve their health and manage their disease; encouraging medical students to become primary care physicians and nurses and incentivizing them to care for patients in underserved communities; permitting the sale of insurance across State lines, establishing high risk pools and reinsurance pools to address preexisting conditions and providing incentives to low-income families to retain or purchase private health insurance that best meets their needs; reforming our medical liability system to reduce frivolous lawsuits that lead to inflated insurance premiums and the practice of defensive medicine; encouraging health care savings by offering individuals health savings accounts that enable families to take ownership of their health; and upgrading our outdated health records system through the use of new technology to streamline costs and reduce medical errors.

It is my hope that these issues are being addressed as the President and Democrat leaders craft the health care reform bill. I have traveled across my State, and I have heard many Kansans who have worries. They are concerned about their health care and about the future of their State and country. Kansans and all Americans deserve to know what their Representatives are voting on, and they deserve the assurance their business will be conducted in a deliberate and open way.

The President has expressed a desire to explore a wide range of options for health care reform. Kansans want commonsense reforms that enhance our current system and reduce health care costs. What we do not want is the trillions in new deficit spending, reduced