

BACHUS for his perception, his perspective, and his judgment with regard to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time except for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve 5 minutes of my time, and I yield back the balance of my time, also.

□ 2115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 269, further proceedings on the bill will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1132, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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.)

GRASSROOTS LOBBYING AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as part of the Constitutional Caucus, we try every week to raise issues that are of concern to us, because dealing with the Constitution, observing the Constitution and honoring the Constitution is very, very important to us. It is the basis of everything that we do here in the Congress and should be the basis of every lawmaking body in our country. So tonight I want to talk a little bit about the first amendment and a concern that I have about an assault that has been made on the first amendment by a previous Congress.

The first amendment clearly states that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech." Our Founding Fathers understood the vital role that free speech played in the health and functioning of our democracy. They lived under the restrictions

of colonial England, and were very intent on creating a new system of government that respected the right to speech and political expression.

One of the strongest proponents of the Constitution's Bill of Rights, Patrick Henry, said: "Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel."

Today, as Mr. Henry advised 200 years ago, I look with suspicion at some of the legislation that has emerged from this body. I am suspicious that we have at times not given adequate attention to the "public liberty" that Patrick Henry so strongly urged us to guard.

Congress must take great care when attempting to control political expression. But, unfortunately, this has not always been the case. In the past, Congress has created laws which restrict organizations' rights to participate in the electoral process.

The First Amendment Restoration Act, H.R. 71, would restore America's first amendment rights by repealing the "electioneering communication" provision in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, known as BCRA.

This provision stifles the speech rights of corporations, nonprofits and labor unions. They are prohibited from sponsoring no-PAC funded radio and TV advertisements that include any references to Federal candidates during the 30 days before primary elections and 60 days before general elections. This is a severe infringement on these organizations' constitutional rights to free speech. It communicates to them that they have no right to voice their views during elections.

It is a clear violation of the first amendment to restrict the speech of organizations and limit what people can say about a candidate and when they may say it. The Supreme Court, unfortunately, upheld the constitutionality of these restrictions on groups in the days leading up to an election. But the Supreme Court has erred in the past.

This bill offers a much-needed correction to the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. The 30/60 day BCRA provision was an attack on the primary purpose of the first amendment's free speech clause, which is the protection of political speech. This bill fully restores those rights which were hampered by BCRA.

We must be vigilant and heed the words of America's founders. They knew firsthand the democracy-choking effect of restrictions placed on political speech. But the minute we begin to craft laws that hamper expression, we demonstrate we have forgotten the priceless lessons of liberty that have been fought for by the patriots who have gone before us.

I urge my colleagues to support the First Amendment Restoration Act, H.R. 71.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORKER MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a former social worker serving in the United States Congress, and I rise to honor the work of professional social workers across the country and throughout the world.

I would like to join my colleagues in the National Association of Social Workers in recognizing March as National Professional Social Work Month and today as World Social Work Day. Today we have the opportunity to acknowledge the important contributions that social workers make in our community and throughout this country.

Today the House overwhelmingly passed H. Res. 266 to recognize the goals and ideals of National Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day. This legislation offered the Congress a valuable occasion to support professionals who have helped individuals, families, and communities resolve complicated issues and make significant choices.

My experience as a social worker had a profound influence on my decision to enter public life. I could see that many of the challenges facing my clients and those that I worked with had stemmed from the decisions being made at the public policy level. Serving in Congress allows me to be able to continue to help my clients in a broader capacity.

Social work as a profession is a commitment to not only addressing the individual needs of clients, but also in creating a just system. As a Member of Congress, I work every day to create a just system for the American people.

This year, the theme of National Professional Social Work Month is "Hope and Health." This theme allows us to highlight the considerable involvement of social workers in the health profession.

Social workers often work cooperatively with doctors, nurses and other medical professionals to ensure that their clients receive the highest quality care. Care and attention provided by social workers begins when the client enters the health care profession and does not end until he or she has recovered.

When dealing with health care, social workers will most often act as counselors and therapists. In that capacity, they must help the client and his or her family understand the diagnosis, the illnesses, and the emotions involved. In addition, social workers provide much-needed advice and support

regarding the difficult health care decisions that clients must make.

In fact, professional social workers provide more mental health care than psychologists, psychiatrists and psychiatric nurses combined, making them the largest provider of mental health services in this country.

These services are also extended to our Nation's veterans. Professional social workers provide counseling, substance abuse treatment, crisis intervention and other services to veterans and their families.

At a time when our Nation is involved in wars both in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is important that our returning soldiers have access to the compassionate care that social workers provide. The Department of Veterans Affairs employs over 4,400 social workers to assist American veterans, including those returning from combat in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for joining me in support of H. Res. 266 yesterday and for honoring and paying their respect to our country's professional social workers and the services they provide.

I want to take this opportunity also to indicate that as a former social worker, I had the opportunity not only to teach 11 years in the School of Social Work, but also serve as a caseworker for heroin addicts for about 3 years, where I had the opportunity to serve directly with individuals that also had substance abuse, including adolescent substance abuse. I also had the privilege of working in the community mental health area, where I had an enjoyable practice and enjoyed working with individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the social workers throughout this country for the services they provide.

A STRANGE REWARD FOR HEROIC ACTION

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor as I have so many times in the past to address an issue dealing with our extradition policy.

Mr. Speaker, a gentleman by the name of Duane Chapman, a bounty hunter that goes by the name of "Dog," faces the strangest of rewards for heroic action.

In 2003, Mr. Chapman received a tip regarding the whereabouts of a millionaire by the name of Andrew Luster. Mr. Luster was a convicted felon who had fled as an escapee from the California Department of Corrections 6 months earlier by jumping \$1 million bail on charges that he drugged and raped three women. He was also on the FBI's Most Wanted List, convicted and sentenced to a term of 124 years of imprisonment in absentia for 86 counts of rape, drug and weapons offenses.

Mr. Chapman went to Mexico to act on this tip and was accompanied by a

local Mexican police officer. He was also in communications with U.S. officials, who were aware of his activities.

Much to his credit, Mr. Chapman successfully located Mr. Luster and apprehended him. However, on the way to the jail to book Mr. Luster, Chapman's police escort disappeared, strangely. As a result, Mr. Chapman was detained for several days on the relatively minor charge of deprivation of freedom and conspiracy. Mr. Chapman then returned to the U.S. after posting bail.

Thanks to Dog, a serial rapist is now rightly serving a 124-year sentence and the situation seemed to have worked out for the best. But now, years after the fact, it seems that the Mexican Government is intent on extraditing and prosecuting Mr. Chapman. Incredibly, our State Department seems to have no problem being complicit in these proceedings.

I have written the Department of Justice at least once and the Department of State several times just asking them to justify what they have done. I wanted to figure out exactly what their reasoning is for handling this specific case in this way.

There are a lot of legitimate questions. For instance, how is it possible that the Department of Justice would decide to use taxpayer resources to send U.S. Marshals to Hawaii to take Mr. Chapman into custody?

□ 2130

This is an administration that routinely tells Congress that they cannot secure our borders and immigration system due to lack of resources. We are told that the U.S. Attorney's Office in the border States are simply overwhelmed with cases and cannot prosecute all of the violations, even very serious ones. We are told that ICE can't possibly tackle the task of deporting illegal aliens from the interior of our Nation. We are apparently supposed to accept the presence of roughly 100,000 criminal aliens inside our borders, a number that is growing every year, while the U.S. Marshals track down a successful bounty hunter instead.

After formally apprehending Mr. Chapman and putting him into a bevy of new legal proceedings, the question of extradition is raised. Though my observations of our extradition treaty with Mexico indicate that it is not absolutely binding, conventional wisdom has seemed to assume that the treaty between the U.S. and Mexico requires Chapman's extradition. But it is just this, conventional wisdom. It is not part of the treaty, apparently.

I am not the only one to question whether extradition ought to proceed. One recent news story reported that although the U.S. and Mexico informally agreed to recognize trans-border captures by bounty hunters as extraditable offenses, this provision was never fully incorporated into the extradition treaty. The report indicates that this "informal" addition to the treaty

came after bounty hunters captured a gentleman by the name of Humberto Alvarez-Machain, a Mexican physician implicated in the torture and execution of a U.S. Drug Enforcement Agent. Alvarez-Machain maintained that his capture violated the U.S.-Mexico extradition treaty.

The U.S. Supreme Court rejected Alvarez-Machain's claim in 1992. In the decision, Justice Rehnquist wrote that the treaty "says nothing about the obligations of the United States and Mexico to refrain from forcible abductions of people from the territory of the other nation, or the consequences under the treaty if such an abduction occurs." That is his quote.

Mexico's Government was upset by the decision which gave rise to its "informal" addition to the treaty. Alan Kreczko, then deputy legal adviser to the Secretary of State, then James Baker, said in congressional testimony that the U.S. and Mexican governments had exchanged letters recognizing that trans-border abductions by so-called bounty hunters and other private individuals would be considered extraditable offenses by both nations.

This international dispute should have remained amicably resolved by virtue of the fact that justice has clearly been served in the case of "Dog" Chapman. But now that these events have been set in motion anew, the best resolution in which we can hope for would come from the Mexican government and judiciary when they dismiss the charges pending against the Chapmans and also to withdraw their request for extradition.

Let's just say that I am not over optimistic for this stand by Secretary Rice to refuse extradition to Mr. Chapman, and I hope this good deed does not go unpunished.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORK MONTH

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor America's social workers. This month provides us an opportunity to highlight the essential role that social workers play in alleviating some of America's most difficult problems.

Professional social workers are found in every facet of community life, including our schools, our hospitals, mental health clinics, senior citizen facilities, elected office, private practices, prisons, among our military personnel, and the list goes on and on.