

in need, was truly remarkable and for me very inspiring. I was impressed not only by the quality of their work, but certainly by the compassion that they displayed for the family receiving this home.

I wish There's No Place Like Home continued success and hope they are able to inspire other organizations to follow their lead. The founders of this organization, like Paula Young and all of the volunteers, are to be commended for their hard work and their commitment to giving back to the greater good of our Nation.

I am honored to represent such caring, civic-minded citizens in the U.S. House of Representatives.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, of all the urgent matters in the world today, and there are many, none is more poignant than the plight of millions of homeless refugees in countries like Africa, Asia and Latin America, and here in the United States.

There are 8.4 million refugees worldwide. Some were displaced because of natural disasters. Most were forced to flee their homes and their homeland and loved ones to avoid being killed because of persecution, civil war and outright genocide.

They were forced to flee through no fault of their own, and were forced to abandon their belongings and their lives. They fled with the clothes on their back, memories and hopes that one day they would go home again.

Today we meet some of these people. This is World Refugee Day, organized by the United Nations to focus attention on the millions of innocent people who are entitled to live and not merely survive.

□ 2230

Every one of those 8.4 million refugees has a personal story. They hope, as we do, for healthy children, a bright future and peace and security in their lives. They long for a standard of living measured by dignity, not by personal possessions.

And it is within our power to make a difference. I think of it this way: if a million people make one small difference today, the world will wake up tomorrow a much different place.

Almost every day I wear a tie from Save the Children, although I left it off today, because Save the Children does, and lots of Americans help them. There are other noble organizations just like them. Organizations like World Vision in my congressional district respond every day to the needs of people in places like Darfur. The need always outstrips the available resources. But no one gives up. They just dig deeper. They have been there on the ground in

camp next to people who are just like us. Once that happens, you never forget.

I know. I went to the refugee camps in Darfur last year as part of a bipartisan congressional delegation. You don't forget people jammed into a refugee camp who pass you handwritten notes asking you to tell the world that they exist and not to forget them.

There are those who refuse to forget. A megastar like Angelina Jolie willingly trades on her name to focus global attention on poverty and homelessness. Angelina is a U.N. goodwill ambassador whose words speak louder than words and whose words echo through capitols, including this one. Angie is redefining the phrase, "one person can make a difference." She will make a difference again tonight as she goes on CNN to tell the world firsthand about the millions of people around the world who want nothing more than to go home. But they cannot do it alone. Watch, learn, and listen.

In a world united by technology, we remain divided by brutal conflicts with millions of innocent victims homeless and held hostage, and that is where they will remain until the nations of the world intercede.

Nations rally behind leaders, political or otherwise, and nations are beginning to hear the voices of people like Ms. Jolie.

The United Nations tells us that 6 million people have returned to their homelands in recent years. That is dramatic progress, but the world has a long way to go before human liberty is protected in every nation.

All too often, refugees return home to find their towns and villages completely destroyed. And all too often, new conflicts disenfranchise or endanger new people.

From afar it seems almost impossible to believe that one person can make a difference. Then I remember the scraps of paper with personal notes handed to me in Darfur. You recognize the work of organizations like Save the Children representing millions of Americans. You meet people like Bono and get to know people like Angelina, and pretty soon you realize that we are all in this together. You recognize that refugees haven't given up. How can we?

Today is the day to see the faces and hear the voices of those who don't have a home, but do have a heart.

Today is the day to meet the people who are worth fighting for, who believe that hope can triumph over despair and that courage can overcome adversity and that every person on Earth is entitled to a life of dignity.

Do the world a favor. Change the television channel tonight. Watch and learn the news on CNN as they help us face the world in which we live. Listen to humanitarian leaders like Angelina. She will help you understand and change the world that we can all make a difference. There is no one who can't make a difference for a refugee in this world.

1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE KELO DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this Friday is the 1-year anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's decision of *Kelo v. City of New London*. And this decision has wide-ranging constitutional ramifications, most notably the grasping at rights guaranteed by our guiding document, the Constitution. That is the reason that we dedicate this week's Congressional Constitution Caucus to discuss this case.

The fifth amendment clause, the so-called "taking clause," the one cited by the Court here and cited by the city as well to allow them to take homes from various families away from them and give them to other private individuals, that clause, the power of eminent domain, that is not a positive grant of power to the government. Rather, that is an express limitation on the powers of the government. In other words, our Constitution expressly limits the powers the government has to take away your property or mine.

James Madison once said: "As a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have property in his rights."

Our Founding Fathers understood that private ownership of property is vital. It is vital to our freedom and to our prosperity as well. Yet our own, very own U.S. Supreme Court issued a very narrow 5-4 decision in the *Kelo v. City of New London* case, giving local governments broad powers to seize private property from one private party and to give it to another private party, citing nothing more than a subjective claim of sorts, a claim of economic development and something called public benefit.

But once again, the highest court in the land has shown its inability to interpret the Constitution and defend the liberties and freedoms that our forefathers so desperately envisioned when they established this great Nation. Instead, this unelected body just across the street seeks now to make its own law for the land.

For over a generation, our judicial branch in this country has headed down what we call the old proverbial slippery slope of overstepping their bounds, and this decision is judicial activism at its worst.

I bring with me tonight a book that is called "Constitutional Chaos." It was written by actually a constituent of mine, a former judge in the Fifth Congressional District. This is Judge Andrew Napolitano. Members may know that name from seeing it on TV. And I want to cite something he that he says in his book talking about this taking by the courts. He says, we have seen in the past the proper function of eminent domain, the government's

taking of lands for use by the public. And the radical transformation of the taking clause to mean public benefit rather than the public use. And this began, this change, this radical change began in the early 20th century, back from 1936 on in a New York City case.

There the court determined that slum clearance would be a public use, that was a good use, taking away people's homes from one set of circumstances and giving it someplace else. And he says, "This is a quintessential private use. The government took the land from private individuals so that other private individuals could use that land to live on."

Then he goes on to say, the Court blatantly ignored the fact that the Constitution uses the phrase "public use" rather than "public benefit." And the Court concluded "the law of each age is ultimately what the age thinks the law should be."

What a scary thought that is, if the courts really take that view that the law can simply change from age to age, and that there are no firm foundations from one generation to the next.

Our government, both on the State and the Federal level, were intended to be limited with only certain specific powers being delegated by the people to the various branches. And the ability of the government to seize private property from its citizens far exceeds the authority the people have bestowed upon it. And that authority may not be changed from generation to generation to generation.

The Justices in the majority, while they may have been well intentioned and trying to provide what they cited as economic development, had absolutely no constitutional authority to make those decisions. Certainly, not in the liberty-grasping fashion that they did.

So tonight I come here and, again, I call for limitations on the courts' jurisdiction before every one of our liberties and freedoms are clutched from our very possessions as our homes now apparently may be. And in light of this anniversary, I recently introduced a resolution, again emphasizing this body, this House's disapproval of the majority opinion of the Supreme Court and highlighting other positive actions we have taken, such as my amendment recently to, in fact, a year ago to say the Federal Government would not use our dollars to help facilitate these actions.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the United States, the greatest Nation in the world, must always remain a Nation where rights and liberties are celebrated, not a Nation where people live in fear of those rights and liberties being instantaneously taken away by unelected judges covetous of policy-making powers.

POWER SHARING NEEDS BIPARTISAN ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, power sharing and the Voting Rights Act will be on the agenda tomorrow. The United States Voting Rights Act, launched and guided by President Lyndon Johnson, was a front line cutting-edge innovation in constitutional democratic government. The turmoil and conflict of the civil rights struggle was brought to a high level, successful, peaceful conclusion with the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

□ 2240

We could hold up to the world a new refinement in democratic governance. That was in 1967. Today in 2006 we should take note of the fact that the Government of Norway has established a new frontline for democratic inclusiveness. Last January Norway passed a law mandating that 40 percent of the board members of all major corporations, private and public, must be women. This is a far-reaching and bold action; however, it reflects a mushrooming trend toward the goal of a fair and productive inclusiveness of all citizens in vital decision-making processes. Norway is at one extreme, but there is a great deal between Norway and our Voting Rights Act.

As we consider reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, we should look beyond our borders. A serious examination of the struggle for democracy across the globe reveals that our American constitutional democracy is not the final realization of the most perfect governance structure that can be achieved. In fact, it may be that our American democracy is now being eclipsed by more a sophisticated set of mutations of constitutional democracy. Our way, born in 1776, may within a few decades appear to be a crude, outdated approach to the rule of law with justice for all.

As of this date, one-third of the world's democratic governments have some form of mandates or incentives for promoting ethnic minority or gender representation. Norway, with its 40 percent mandate for female board representation on private company boards, may be way out there ahead of other governments; nevertheless, many others recognize the need to move out beyond the slow processes of tradition and the prevailing power arrangements.

Denmark and Germany elect minorities in their respective countries into regional and national Parliaments. In Iran ethnic minorities such as Armenians and Jews have seats allocated for them in Parliament. The Pakistan Government has provided for special representation for minorities and women in Parliament. Burundi guarantees 40 percent of the Parliament and Cabinet positions to the Tutsi minority and half the positions in the army.

Advised by the United Nations, the Kosovo Parliament will be chosen by direct elections with special arrangements for Serb and other minority groups to be represented. Billions of United States dollars have been spent in Kosovo to achieve this outcome.

In Iraq the United States advisers are insisting on an all-inclusive government with the dominant majority Shiites sharing power with the minority groups such as the Sunnis and the Kurds.

Our Voting Rights Act, which we are about to renew and extend, is very much in harmony with an escalating international consensus which emphasizes the fact that power sharing promotes good government and peace. Shortsighted efforts to dilute the provisions of the Voting Rights Act must be defeated. This act goes as far as our Constitution will allow us in order to create opportunities for minority representation. However, beyond the law the time has come for each of the political parties to adopt platforms and positions which further enhance the highly desirable goal of power sharing. Beyond opportunity for minority representation, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party should assume positions and take actions to discourage and remove any roadblocks to the greatest possible amounts of power sharing at all levels of government.

There is bipartisan agreement that Kosovo, Rwanda, and Iraq must have power sharing. At home we can offer no less to our minorities. The Voting Rights Act is our successful weapon of mass construction, mass democratic construction. We must support the renewal of the Voting Rights Act.

PERSONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND THE KELO DECISION

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of my top five movies of all time was the 1968 cult classic, the original Producers. And, of course, as you know, that was the story of a Broadway producer who tried to find the worst play possible to produce a Broadway flop, and unfortunately it turned into a smash hit. And there is this wonderful scene where the producer Max Bialystock looks at the audience in the movie and says, "I chose the wrong play, the wrong director, the wrong actor. Where did I go right?"

Well, to me the Max Bialystock of government, the Supreme Court, sometimes does the same thing, as their best laid plans and correct principles end up in something simply messed up. As my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, spoke a moment ago, this week will be the 1-year anniversary of the Kelo decision. After years of harping and praying and hoping the Supreme Court would actually take the