

presence only serves as a recruiting tool for new terrorists. How can anyone think to put our troops in harm's way merely to serve a political legacy?

Both the American and Iraqi people have consistently sent the clear message: Bring the troops home. Not in 2009 or whenever a new President comes along. The time is now, and we must not delay.

This will require bold actions, but our troops deserve nothing less than to be brought safely home to their families.

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.)

#### RECLAIMING DR. BERNARD SIEGAN'S REPUTATION

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to correct the record concerning a great economist and a friend, the late Bernard Siegan, a distinguished professor of law at the University of San Diego. It will be remembered that in 1988 Dr. Siegan was nominated by President Ronald Reagan to the U.S. Court of Appeals. He promptly came under attack, one of the worst from Professor Lawrence Tribe of Harvard University.

Tribe wrote in a public letter on May 28, 1987, to Senator BIDEN attacking the academic views of Dr. Siegan as being outside the mainstream of American jurisprudence.

In a widely quoted section of his letter, Professor Tribe assailed Dr. Siegan's assertion that the Brown v. Board of Education ruling was "a component of the right to travel, a right long secured by the Federal courts."

At this time Professor Tribe claimed that this legal view was "tortured" and part of "Mr. Siegan's radical revisionism . . . so bizarre and strained . . . as to bring into question both Mr. Siegan's competence as a constitutional lawyer and his sincerity as a scholar." This type of assault was typical of the attacks that preceded the defeat of Dr. Siegan's nomination.

That was 1987, and much has changed since then.

Dr. Bernard Siegan died in March 2006. His many books, speeches and articles made him one of the most prolific and respected legal and constitutional scholars on the political right.

Recently, in sorting through the files of her last husband, Mrs. Shelley Siegan came upon a series of written exchanges between her husband and Professor Lawrence Tribe. Tribe wrote on September 6, 1991, "I have reconsid-

ered my description of your analysis of Brown v. Board of Education. I agree with your general approach that Brown can be justified by arguing from the 'liberty' component of the 14th amendment."

Tribe further wrote Dr. Siegan, "although I do not reach the same conclusions you do, the issues you raise are important enough to be worthy of scholarly discussion."

Unfortunately for Dr. Siegan's reputation, Professor Tribe's reevaluation was never publicly documented. However, in a letter to Mrs. Siegan on September 21, 2006, he wrote, "Please permit me to apologize to you here for the unnecessary and ad hominem character of what I wrote to Senator Biden in May 1987.

"I am sorry to have caused him, or you, any distress, and I am grateful for the opportunity your letter affords me to set the letter straight as best I could do at this late date."

All this tells us much about the ugly period of personal attack this country experienced during the judicial nominations of the 1980s.

I hope this review of the above-cited letters makes it clear that Professor Bernard Siegan was a distinguished and respected scholar, a champion of personal liberty and private property. And contrary to the assertions made during his nomination hearings in 1987, Professor Bernard Siegan would have been made an excellent addition to the 9th District Circuit Court of Appeals.

And now the record is set straight.

#### RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD AND HEALTHY FAMILIES ACT OF 2007

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is broad agreement that fathers matter in the upbringing of children. Studies show that children raised in the absence of a father are more likely to live in poverty. Children whose fathers interact with them on a regular basis on such daily activities as helping with homework, enjoying recreational opportunities and sharing meals have higher self-esteem and are better learners.

Children raised in the absence of a father are more likely to engage in risky behaviors such as early sexual activities, as well as drug and alcohol use. Statistics demonstrate that boys raised in fatherless homes are more likely to become violent.

No one argues that there is any one model of family structure, but the elimination of government barriers to healthy relationships and healthy marriages, the promotion of cooperative parenting skills, and the fostering of economic stability and the provision of incentives to noncustodial parents to fulfill financial and emotional support responsibilities are clearly in the best interest of millions of children.

What we have learned is that even effective fatherhood programs cannot by themselves address the growing crisis arising out of the trend toward a single-parent home. What is required is a national social infrastructure which supports effective fatherhood. Therefore, on Friday of this week, I, with Representative ARTUR DAVIS, JULIA CARSON, BOBBY RUSH and others shall introduce the Responsible Healthy Fatherhood Act.

The Responsible Fatherhood and Healthy Families Act of 2007 restores cuts in Federal child support and requires States to pass through 100 percent of collected child support payments. It prohibits unfair and unequal treatment of two-parent families receiving TANF. It provides grants to help reduce barriers to healthy family relationships and obstacles to sustainable employment.

The Responsible Fatherhood and Healthy Families Act of 2007 ensures equal funding for programs such as mediation and conflict resolution. It provides funding for partnership between domestic violence prevention organizations and fatherhood or marriage programs to train staff in domestic violence and domestic violence prevention.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to promote healthy family living; and I encourage all of my colleagues to take a hard look at it and support it.

□ 2245

#### A LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM JENIFER ALLBAUGH

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a mother of a Marine who was killed on July 5 of this year. She asked that I make this letter known to the Members of the House, and that is what I will do at this time. I will read directly from her letter.

"Let me first tell you about myself. My name is Jenifer Allbaugh, my husband is Jon Allbaugh and we have three children together. My son, 2nd Lt. Army Jason Allbaugh (24), my daughter Alicia Allbaugh, college sophomore (19) and Cpl. Jeremy Allbaugh, USMC (21). Jeremy was killed in Iraq on July 5, 2007 while on a mission in a Humvee that was hit by an IED.

"Jeremy enlisted in the Marine Corps before he graduated from high school in 2004. We were at war but he very much wanted to serve his country. He believed very much in what he was doing and what his country was trying to accomplish in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"While we as a family are struggling greatly with the loss of our hero, I feel a great need to express my concerns in regards to our military.

"I do not understand why our government has to be pushed to equip our

military with the best equipment technology has to offer. We are one of the greatest Nations on this earth, but yet it took parents and other individuals to get our military up-armored Humvees and better body armor. Now we need Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles and the debate is on again.

"First of all, these vehicles were available for years before this war began, but yet we are just now realizing the need for them. This is shameful, and there is no excuse for it. I would like one person to look me and other mothers in the eye and explain why our sons were not in the these vehicles. According to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, approximately 700 American heroes would be alive today if they had been in an MRAP, my son included.

"I'm not smartest or most educated woman in the world, but it doesn't take a genius to figure out that there should be no debate over supplying our military with these vehicles.

"IEDs seem to be one of the most effective weapons terrorists have against our troops. Money should not be an issue. This country has been selfish long enough. It shouldn't matter how much it costs. If you are going to ask our military to put their lives on the line for our freedoms, then again, money should not matter. We as a country can go without perfectly paved roads and other such luxuries we seem to think we need for awhile. We gripe about the cost of gas, milk and cup of coffee. If Americans would quit being selfish, maybe funding this war wouldn't be so hard.

"Our Congress and Senate need to stop the finger pointing, back biting, back stabbing and name calling and do their jobs. Work together. As hard as that sounds, the rest of us in the 'real world' have to do it every day.

"It is also time for what I believe is a silent majority to stand up and be heard. Since the death of our son, we have heard from people all over the country who appreciate what he did for his country. They also appreciate what our military is doing in Iraq and Afghanistan. But we as a country only hear from the ones who complain the most. The rich and famous, who don't know what they're talking about, get to tell their opinions, but not those of us who support our sons and daughters who have volunteered to serve this country.

"I had long conversations with my son while he was in Iraq. I was one of the lucky Moms who got to talk to her son quite frequently. He told me of the good things they were doing, for example opening schools, hospitals, clinics and helping recruit men into the Iraqi Army. The vast majority of the Iraqi people in the area Jeremy was in, loved and appreciated the Marines. They understood why we are there. He told me how the locals were voluntarily giving info on the terrorists and their activities and that neighborhood watch programs had been started.

"Do we hear of this? No. Because it isn't sensational enough and it doesn't get votes.

"This war has had a lot of mistakes made, but to me it's neither here or there. We are there and there are good things being done. I want no more excuses and explanations. Write the check with no attachments and give our men what they need. MRAP's should have been there from the beginning and should be there now. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates is asking for more money for MRAP's. This is a no brainer and there should no excuse for thousands to be built. I as a Mother do not care what the obstacles are. We built ships faster than this during World War II. It can be done if we want to. Don't attach pork and other stupid stuff to it either. Just do it. Until we finish our job in Iraq and Afghanistan these vehicles shouldn't be under debate and should be top priority in the manufacturing industry. If you had done this in the first place, my son and many others would be alive today. He was in a Humvee every day he was in Iraq as are thousands of others.

"Jeremy was a bigger man at 21 than any of the men and women that are running this country. He went to war without hesitation or reservation. He did his job well and was sorely overworked and underpaid. I ask that you all start earning your paycheck and do what is right. As my son said, 'We are doing good things here and we need to finish.'

Please honor our military and give them the equipment and time in Iraq and Afghanistan that they need. Please save another Soldier or Marine in a Humvee by putting them in MRAP's.

"The Iraqi people where my son was appreciated him and his fellow Marines. Too bad our own politicians don't. Quit using words of support and do it with deeds."

I realize my time is expired, and I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SUTTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PASSAGE OF THE DEEPWATER BILL

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives resoundingly supported efforts to strengthen the management of the Coast Guard's \$24 billion, 25-year Deepwater procurement effort by passing the Integrated Deepwater Program Reform Act, H.R. 2722, which I authored, and they voted by a sum of 426-0 for that bill.

I want to again thank Congressman JAMES OBERSTAR, the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for his leadership on this legislation. I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Congressman MICA, and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Congressman LATOURETTE, for their work on this bill.

And certainly I thank the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, BENNIE THOMPSON, for his wise counsel and his efforts to get the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that the enactment of H.R. 2722 will help restore the trust of the American people in the ability of the United States Coast Guard to manage taxpayers' resources and to hold contractors accountable for the quality of the assets that they produce.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in the House and with my colleagues in the Senate, particularly Senator MARIA CANTWELL, the chair of the Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries and Coast Guard Subcommittee, to take the steps necessary to put legislation forward to strengthen the Coast Guard's management of Deepwater on the President's desk.

The Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, which it is my honor to chair, continues to work diligently to oversee not only the Deepwater project but, indeed, all of the operations of the United States Coast Guard.

Yesterday, the subcommittee held a hearing to examine the Coast Guard's administrative law system, which weighs allegations of misconduct or negligence to determine whether a mariner's credentials should be suspended or even revoked.

The subcommittee received testimony from two former administrative law judges suggesting that during their tenure they worked in an atmosphere that did not support their exercise of judicial independence in the consideration of their cases.

Additionally, serious allegations were raised that, if true, would imply that improper actions may have been committed to direct an ALJ to decide matters in the Coast Guard's favor.

Such testimony is obviously deeply disturbing, and again, I emphasize, if true, we suggest that the scales of the Coast Guard's justice and administrative law system are not evenly balanced.

While we continue investigating the allegations raised, I do know that any administrative law system must not only ensure that there is no impropriety in the conduct of administrative proceedings but that there is not even the appearance of unfairness in the system.

I now believe that the administrative law system reviewing cases against mariners should be separated from the