

In addition to his career in local government, Mr. Leslie served as editor and publisher of the City of Aubrey's weekly newspaper, The Town Charter. As a founding member of the Aubrey Lions Club, he was also active in the Aubrey Chamber of Commerce and Aubrey Education Foundation. His legacy of public service will long benefit the City of Aubrey.

Mayor Leslie is survived by his wife, Allison, and their three children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor the memory of such a courageous individual. Mayor Tim Leslie was a dedicated public servant, and serves as a role model to all citizens. I extend my sincerest sympathies to his family and friends. He will be deeply missed and his service to his community will always be greatly appreciated.

---

HONORING THE LIFE OF DEARBORN, MICHIGAN MAYOR MICHAEL A. GUIDO

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2006*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of a great friend and wonderful public servant, Dearborn Mayor Michael A. Guido, who passed away December 5, 2006 after losing his battle with cancer.

Mayor Guido was elected the youngest person to ever serve on the Dearborn City Council, and then became the youngest mayor in the City's history in 1986. While Michael's 52 years on this earth were far too short, he did much of which to be proud. He exhibited great passion in a job he considered to be the greatest in the world.

To many, Dearborn is renowned for the great services offered by the City. It is to Michael's credit that these services were provided with great fiscal responsibility. It should be noted that the state of the art \$43-million Ford Community & Performing Arts Center, the largest municipally owned recreation center in North America, was the crowning achievement of an impressive career.

Our Nation will also feel the loss of Mayor Guido's leadership as he was the 64th President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. I am glad that mayors around the nation had the opportunity to witness the passion he had for the people he served, and the competence he exhibited in carrying out his duties. I know he was very proud to be a member, and serve as President, of this fine organization.

It is with great sadness that we say goodbye to our "friendly Mayor." The prosperous years he stood at the helm of Dearborn will remain his enduring legacy, but he will also always be remembered for his sense of humor, vigor for life, passionate leadership and charismatic demeanor. Michael Guido wasn't a man who bragged about the great things he did, he just went out and did them. Dearborn will miss its Mayor and I will miss a friend and a wonderful partner. I ask that all of my colleagues join me in remembering the life of this wonderful man, and extend our condolences to his wife Kari, and sons Michael and Anthony.

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. CLYDE STEPHENS

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege today to honor Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Stephens as they celebrate 50 years of marriage. This is a tremendous milestone that embodies the enduring love and profound commitment they have for one another. For those of us who know the Stephens, their marriage is a celebration of life and an inspiration to us all.

On December 12, 1957, Clyde and Nellie were married in Corinth, MS. Clyde and Nellie were blessed with three wonderful children, Pam Stephens Kelly, David Stephens and Gary Stephens, six grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. Tonight their family and friends are gathering in Middle Tennessee to celebrate this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, a 50th wedding anniversary is truly worth commemorating, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Clyde and Nellie Stephens.

---

TRIBUTE TO HEATHER MONTGOMERY

**HON. KEVIN BRADY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2006*

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Heather Montgomery upon her retirement as District Director for the Eighth Congressional District of Texas.

I've had the privilege of working alongside Heather for many years as co-workers at the South Montgomery County Woodlands Chamber of Commerce, as colleagues while she led the North Houston-Greenspoint Chamber of Commerce, and re-united again in 1998 in service to the constituents of the 8th Congressional District of Texas.

Heather brought to my district offices her wealth of knowledge and experience from leading communities and helping small businesses, as mother of three children, a grandmother, and devoted leader and volunteer of many volunteer efforts in The Woodlands, Montgomery County and north Houston area.

For the past nine years Heather has managed an extensive district staff, day to day operations of three offices, and served as direct extension of myself throughout the community. Heather always manages to find a personal connection with each of our constituents and the challenges they face.

Extremely hard-working, painstakingly fair, exceedingly knowledgeable—these are qualities Heather has not only honed, but also put at the disposal of constituents. She is gracious at all times and simply a class act.

Heather's retirement comes at a time when she and her husband Gary are the proud grandparents of nine grandchildren. I know her family is eager to have more of her time.

In the years I have worked with Heather, I have come to know a civic minded leader and a woman of broad and varied interests which I hope she will pursue in the time afforded by retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I know you join with me in saying "thank you" and "job well done" to Heather Montgomery for her years of loyal service to myself, but most of all, to the people of Southeast Texas whom she has served with distinction. She is one of my closest friends.

---

IN HONOR OF SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE MARK L. LOWERY, U.S. SECRET SERVICE

**HON. PETE SESSIONS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2006*

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional career of Mark L. Lowery, Special Agent in Charge of the United States Secret Service Dallas Field Office.

Special Agent Lowery began his career with the Secret Service in 1983 in the St. Louis Field Office, following a 6 year tenure with the St. Louis County Police Department. With the U.S. Secret Service, he served in the Washington Field Office, the Presidential Protection Division, Special Investigations and Security Division, and the Financial Crimes Division.

Under the leadership of Special Agent Lowery, the Dallas Field Office tackled many complex issues plaguing the Dallas community including identity theft, counterfeiting of currency and cyber crimes. Special Agent Lowery's leadership in these cases was instrumental, leading to the successful arrest and prosecution of many criminals in the Dallas area.

Special Agent Lowery has received numerous awards and commendations during his twenty-three year career, including the highest Secret Service award, the Medal of Valor in 1985. The legacy he leaves will speak loudly of the impact he made on our community and his peers and his devotion to the betterment of our community. His tenure at the U.S. Secret Service Dallas Field Office is marked by his dedication, work ethic and public service.

I am grateful for Special Agent Lowery's service to our nation, and I wish him all the best on the occasion of his retirement.

---

UNBORN CHILD PAIN AWARENESS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

**HON. NITA M. LOWEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 6, 2006*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this inflammatory and misleading piece of legislation.

The bill before us requires that women seeking abortions be given a brochure written by Congress regarding the capability of a developing fetus to feel pain. It requires physicians to provide this script to their patients even if the doctor does not believe it to be accurate or in the patient's best interest.

The text of this brochure was not written by or in consultation with the nation's leading physicians. In fact, the sponsor's attempt to impose his values on every woman seeking an abortion in this country is opposed by many physician organizations, including the

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Academy of Physician Assistants, the American Public Health Association, and the National Association of Nurse Practitioners.

This bill is one last attempt in this Congress to use the emotional, complicated subject of abortion as a cloak for what the sponsors of this bill consistently do: manipulate medical practice and scientific research to conform to their own beliefs and moral agenda.

And when science doesn't support their rhetoric, instead of opening their minds and acting from a place of compassion, they attack physicians who disagree with them, demonize women and families who make the decision about abortion, and deny evidence-based medicine.

It is just this kind of extreme interference in Americans' lives and their medical care that voters around the nation rejected—decisively—on Election Day.

Americans look to us to examine issues thoroughly and with great care, befitting the high honor it is to serve in this body. Passing this bill won't do a single thing to advance the cause we should all share: to create a country, a society and a culture where every pregnancy is intended and every child is wanted, prepared for and cherished.

Congress has no right to legislate how doctors care for their patients, to substitute ideology for scientific evidence, or to penalize physicians for legal and responsible patient care.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and this approach to an issue that's difficult for many of us. There is another way and, I would suggest, a better way to help the families of this country have healthy pregnancies and strong families.

THE INTRODUCTION OF COMPROMISE LEGISLATION TO FULLY IMPLEMENT THE LEGAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA UNDER THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS, POPs, THE ROTTERDAM CONVENTION ON PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT, PIC, AND THE AARHUS POPs PROTOCOL TO THE GENEVA CONVENTION ON LONG RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION, LRTAP

**HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2006*

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join Chairman BARTON and Chairman BOEHLERT in introducing H.R. \_\_\_\_\_, compromise, consensus legislation to fully implement the legal obligations of the United States of America under the Stockholm, or POPs, Convention; the Rotterdam, or PIC, Convention; and the Aarhus POPs Protocol to the Geneva LRTAP Convention. This is solid public policy that I urge my colleagues to support because it reasonably implements the POPs and PIC Conventions and the LRTAP Protocol.

Over the past 4 years, and even as recently as a few months ago, I have heard people ask

many questions about this bill. Why is it necessary for this legislation to become law? If the United States is already attending these meetings, isn't that enough—why do we need to move on this bill? What does being a full partner mean to these agreements and what does it give the United States Government and its people in terms of rights and opportunities that we do not already have? These are all good questions, but persistent repetition of these inquiries shows a fatal misunderstanding of these agreements and exactly why it is in the interest of the United States to become a party with "full" rights under these accords.

At a minimum, the failure of Congress to pass implementing legislation—thus securing Senate ratification of these treaties—leaves the United States Government in the position of defending its interests and sharing its expertise only when other countries welcome it, not when we wish and need, for our own national purposes, to offer it. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has testified before the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials that it has been forced to wait long periods of time to be recognized because the leaders of the treaty-related meetings did not consider our delegation important enough to be recognized sooner. This situation presents a radical departure from the leadership role our country took in building the consensus for these pacts to exist. Our delegations should not be welcomed at the receptions for these international meetings, but barred from being integral players in the technological discussions and final decision-making processes in these treaties. Failure to support this legislation is a clear signal that Congress misunderstands the sophistication of our nation's chemical knowledge base and regulatory experience and instead wishes the United States to cede its traditional leadership role in international toxic chemicals management.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001 the Bush administration pledged the commitment of the United States of America to join the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. That date marked the culmination of 10 years of bipartisan cooperation and leadership concerning global protection of the environment and public health. These efforts included not just POPs, but the Aarhus Protocol on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution, LRTAP, of POPs, and the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent, PIC. These were not the triumphs of Republican or Democrat White Houses, they were the victories premised on the various needs and hopes of all Americans. Sadly, the benefits of these agreements have not been actualized because of the policy and political agendas of the interested stakeholders as they relate to chemical management. It is unacceptable that those private parties that are subsets of the interests in our country, whether they are businesses or non-profits, have as much, if not more, input than our own Government officials at these meetings. We must put these matters behind us and focus solely on making the U.S. a full partner.

Before I go into the specifics of this legislation and address some of its broader themes, I want to briefly further explain why this legislation is being introduced and why it is different from my bill, H.R. 4591, which also would totally implement and make the United States a full partner in these agreements.

First, this bill is being introduced as a consensus position of the majority of stakeholders who have testified before the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials that they want the United States to pass implementing legislation. Second, this legislation is different from H.R. 4591, as introduced, because it represents a good-faith compromise among Members of Congress who actively sought to sit down with me and work out mutually acceptable provisions. I have always been willing to work with any Member of Congress on compromise provisions despite the fact that some Members' delay in getting back to me on whether they wanted to work out a compromise made enactment of this legislation nearly impossible. Finally, this legislation is a collaborative work of elected officials with input from others. Some people think that this kind of legislation needs to be delegated to interest groups to forge. Not only am I dubious about punting our constitutional responsibility to legislate to unelected persons, but history has shown that the same people who have called for a consensus stakeholder process have twice killed the resulting bills.

Regarding the specifics of this bill:

First, this bill is a targeted legislative fix that fills the existing legal gaps and only does what is important for us to become a full partner in these agreements. It does not repeal any part of Federal environmental law, but rather adds a new section to the Toxic Substances Control Act to ban the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce, use, and disposal of agreed upon POPs and LRTAP POPs chemical substances and mixtures. This new section also grants separate, new authority for the United States to enact new regulations for future additions of POPs chemical substances or mixtures to the Stockholm Convention or LRTAP POPs Protocol. Because there has been concern from a number of persons about the difficulty existing TSCA provisions present in the way of regulating existing chemicals, this bill creates a distinct and different process within TSCA that couples similarly rigorous and sound scientific analyses, but with a more deferential regulatory standard and the elimination of procedural hurdles that many argue have hindered EPA from taking action regarding chemical protection. This is not the TSCA overhaul that many critics of the chemical manufacturing world have wanted, but it is a solid middle ground that relies on science rather than emotion to address these very insidious chemicals, while also keeping these treaties out of governing American manufacturing processes and decisions.

In addition, while many political opponents of past POPs legislative efforts have argued that the language in this legislation makes regulation of POPs more difficult and places profits of chemical companies over the protection of human health, a reading of the plain language of this legislation would prove how wrong and intentionally inflammatory they are to insist on this interpretation. Specifically, this legislation sets its regulatory standard at "protecting human health and the environment" and intends that while exercising this legal authority, the EPA Administrator, in choosing the means to provide that protection, is to balance costs and benefits. In other words, costs and benefits are to be taken into consideration in determining how to regulate a substance, not whether to regulate a substance.