United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *110th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2007 *No. 30*

House of Representatives

The House met at 8 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 16, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL R. MCNULTY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we pray that You bless this country we love with all our hearts. We thank You for those who founded this Republic upon faith, respect for law, and constitutional rights of individuals and the common good of the Nation.

Fan the flame of freedom in the hearts of all Americans, and especially those who serve in the Armed Forces. Strengthen the resolve of all the Members of the United States House of Representatives, that they, attentive to Your commands, may follow their consciences and always do what is right as they wrestle with complex issues.

Grant that what they say with their lips they believe in their hearts, and what they believe in their hearts they may bring to practice in their lives and in the Nation.

May Your light so shine upon America that the world may see in us a glimpse of Your glory both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 157, proceedings will now resume on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 63) disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Thursday, February 15, 2007, 8½ minutes of debate remained on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 157, and as the designee of the majority leader, I demand that the time for debate be enlarged by 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the leaders or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, that will be the order.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) now has 35½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 33 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we gather today to consider a question that is profoundly simple: Do we support the President's plan to further escalate America's involvement in Iraq, or not? After 4 long, painful years in which we have seen so many young lives lost, are we now willing to put even more of our brave heroes in harm's way, or will we acknowledge that the current course is failing, that doubling down on the status quo while hoping for a better result would be foolish.

There are those who oppose this resolution because they say it would hurt the troops' morale. Hurt morale? Our leaders promised them they would be greeted as liberators. Instead, we have put them smack in the middle of a shooing gallery, policing someone else's civil war, backing an Iraqi government that refuses to stand up for itself.

We have sent our soldiers back time and again. We have sent many of them without the life-saving equipment and armor they needed, and now they say this resolution would hurt troop morale? To suggest that more of the same just won't do.

They have done their duty with courage and discipline. Now it is time for Congress to do its duty. They deserve not to be sacrificed in the furtherance of a policy that failed for the last 4 years.

From the beginning, this war has been a saga of miscalculations, mistakes and misjudgments for which America will pay in many ways for years to come. Let us not compound those bad judgments by ratifying another.

The President assures us that this escalation of war is the most promising path to a more peaceful Iraq. For the

Printed on recycled paper.

past 5 years we have accepted the President's assurances on Iraq, only to learn that the facts on the ground belied his aggressive assertions and rosy rhetoric. We accepted his assurances about the presence of weapons of mass destruction and Saddam's links to al Qaeda. We authorized a war on that basis, only to learn that much of what we were told simply wasn't true.

Against stern warnings, we accepted his assurances and those of the Vice President that a post-Saddam Iraq would welcome our presence and overcome deeply engrained sectarian differences. It simply wasn't true. We accepted their assurances when they told us General Shinseki was mistaken when he said we needed far more troops to stabilize Iraq than the administration planned, and that the cost of this war would be minimal. It simply wasn't true. We accepted their assurances when they told us the insurgency was in its last throes. It simply wasn't true.

Each of the last three troop surges has been countered with a surge in violence. It is for that reason that a bipartisan group of House Members and the American public oppose the forth troop increase. More troops doing more of the same is not a policy, it is not a strategy, it is not a tactic, it is the status quo plus.

The time is past for accepting this administration's assurances at face value. The human cost of its repeated assurances is too great.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I asked permission to establish a temporary memorial to the fallen in Iraq in Statuary Hall. The leadership at that time refused, so I began posting the pictures of the young soldiers we have lost outside my office. I have watched as that grim line of photos has grown past my doorway to fill the corridor. More than 3,000 dead, more than 20,000 wounded. When I walk by those photos, I see the purpose, I see the pride, and I see the promise in their young faces. They were sons and daughters, husbands and wives, mothers and fathers who will never see their kids grow up.

I ask you, how long must this grim line of photographs grow before we acknowledge that this policy is not working? How many corridors must these memorials fill before we we say, not on my watch? How many more lives must we lose? How many more hearts must be broken?

It is time for this Congress to tell President Bush that his assurances are not enough. This escalation does not mean stability in Iraq, it will mean more loss and more photographs in the corridor.

I urge you to vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield myself 1½ minutes to respond to the first assertion just made by my colleague, to the effect that we sent the troops in without what he called lifesaving equipment.

When we finished the Clinton administration, virtually no one in any of the 10 Army divisions, which, incidentally, had been cut from 14 Army divisions when that administration went into power, none of the 10 divisions that were left, virtually none of them had any bulletproof vests, any of this body armor that we talk about that our troops have today.

When we went into the first operation, we had much more than the Clinton administration had. At that point we had a number of the inserts, of the so-called Small Arms Protective Inserts. We had the outer tactical vests that incorporate those inserts with all of our Marines, with all of the infantry units going in with the U.S. Army. And very quickly after that, we developed a plan in which we fielded body armor for not only the people on the front lines, the infantry, the artillery, the armor, but also everybody that is in theater.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely outrageous to tell the American people that the Americans were dangerously unequipped when we went into Iraq. We went in with better equipment than we have ever had in any wars that this country has ever fought. And today, we have fielded over 40,000 pieces of new equipment that we didn't have 4 years ago that makes our troops yet more efficient.

I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. I thank my friend for yielding.

It has been interesting to listen to this debate over several days. Two thoughts stand out. One side says nonbinding resolutions achieve nothing and insult the troops. The other side has retired to opinion polls. The American people want to end this cost of human and financial treasure. They said so in the last election.

Thank God John Adams never consulted public opinion polls. There was never a time when more than a third of our Nation was in favor of independence and freedom. Thomas Paine said, ''If there must be trouble, let it be in my day, that my child may have peace.''

World War I was not America's war, no one attacked us; but an attack was made on freedom, and we responded. The doubters wondered why we would spend money on a war so far from our shores which didn't threaten us. The doughboys at Vimmy Ridge knew why they were there.

Hitler didn't attack us, he didn't even threaten us; he threatened all that freedom meant to the world. And while we were engaged in Southeast Asia after Pearl Harbor, we still sent troops across the channel on D Day. Many mistakes were made. Troops drowned before getting to the beach. Support aircraft bombed the wrong areas. 9,386 Americans died in the Battle of Normandy and are buried there on that hill.

But the Boys of Pointe Du Hoc climbed that ridge under withering machine gun fire. They silenced the machine guns, took out the embankments and walked across Europe, and in 11 months Europe was free. We then spent billions of dollars to rebuild a free Europe.

After World War II, we spent 50 years in a war against an idea. It was a battle of the two great religions, communism and freedom. When Whittaker Chambers left communism for freedom, he told his wife that he feared that he was moving to the losing side. He knew that communism could not survive if its people believed in a higher faith; he concluded that freedom could not survive if they did not. He had become a believer; he was unsure if we remained believers.

Many of those Cold War years were not pretty. Between 1970 and 1980, the Soviets increased their influence in Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Nicaragua, Grenada, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, South Yemen, Libya, Iraq and Syria. We watched and were timid. We even had Members of this very body go to some of those nations' dictators to apologize for our defense of what we believed; we believed in freedom.

When Israel watched its athletes murdered at Munich, we urged caution. When terrorists continued to kill Israelis, we continued to urge caution. For 21 years we urged that great friend of ours not to respond in kind. We were timid. After the attacks began against America, beginning with the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Centers, we remained timid. We chose not to engage all of the opportunities we had to be bold. In the face of a declared war against our government and our people, we were timid.

And then September 11, 2001. We stood together on the Capitol steps in solidarity that lasted a good week, and then it became politics as usual.

I don't know if this fight for freedom can succeed when about half of our Nation doesn't know we are in it; nor do I know whether our Nation can come to an honest conclusion about what we are engaged in when all they see is the worst side of everything.

When I was last in Iraq, a young man told me about going through a city and all the residents came forth to say thank you and throw flowers. He asked the embedded reporter if that was worth a picture; he was told, ''That's not news.'' I don't know how the whole story gets told.

I do know this: This President knows that he and his commanders have made some wrong decisions, but he knows, as we must know, that this war has always been about the principle, the virtue, the idea of freedom, and to walk away now will have catastrophic consequences for its future.

President Bush believes that our Nation, more than any other, ought to defend the right of people to live free. That is the only victory we can ever have over an ideology that cannot survive in a free society.

President Bush knows why Lincoln said that he often found himself on his

knees because there was nowhere else to go.

□ 0815

He also knows, as did Lincoln, that a President must continue to fight for posterity, even when it becomes unpopular to do so.

If you believe, as I do, that the idea of freedom is still worth defending, you will vote against this resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep concern that this President has chosen to escalate the war in Iraq instead of charting a course towards peace.

Today, I am reminded of the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., when he spoke out against the war in Vietnam on April 4, 1967. He said, ''The world now demands a maturity of this Nation that we may not be able to achieve. It demands that we admit that we have been wrong from the beginning of our adventure in Vietnam,'' we could substitute Iraq, ''and that our actions have been detrimental to the people of that Nation.''

Mr. Speaker, war is messy. War is bloody. It tends not just to hide the truth but to sacrifice the truth. And the truth is that this was a war of choice and not a war of necessity. It was ill-fated from its inception at the highest levels of Government, and persisting in error will not fix a policy that was fundamentally flawed from the very beginning.

Thousands of our sons and daughters have been left dead on the battlefield, and tens of thousands are changed forever, wounded physically and spiritually by the brutality of war. Our soldiers are the best men and women in the world, willing to sacrifice all they have at a moment's notice to protect our freedom. They do not deserve to pay with their lives for the errors of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we will never find the answer to the problem we have created in Iraq down the barrel of a gun. The lasting solution to this crisis will rise from skillful diplomacy, not military might. The Good Book said, ''Come let us reason together.''

We must never, ever be afraid to talk. What harm comes from sitting down with Syria, Iran and our allies in the Middle East to help bring the warring parties together? John F. Kennedy once said, ''Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.''

My greatest fear here is that the young people growing up in the Middle East will never forget this American invasion. My greatest fear is that they will grow up to hate our children, our grandchildren and generations yet unborn, because of what we are doing today in Iraq.

Yes, we must maintain a strong national defense. We must defend our borders. We must bring an end to terrorism. But not at the expense of our democracy, not at the expense of the very principles this Nation was founded upon.

I want to close by asking a question of old, Mr. Speaker. What does it profit a great Nation to gain the whole world and lose its soul? Gandhi once said, ''It is either nonviolence or nonexistence.''

Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, ''We must learn to live together as brothers and sister or perish as fools.''

It is better to heal than to kill. It is better to reconcile than to divide. It is better to love than to hate. That is why we must vote for this resolution. We must do more.

We must not place more of our young people in harm's way. We must not continue to make our soldiers sitting ducks in a civil war. As Members of Congress, we must continue to stand up, speak up and speak out. It is our duty, it is our right, it is our moral obligation. We must find a way to get in the way until we bring our young men and women home, and not to continue to escalate this war.

Vote for this resolution. It is the right thing to do. We must send a powerful and strong message to this administration to stop this madness.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. But, as this debate progresses, we should be proud of the sincere expressions of concern by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of this resolution, for the lives and well-being of America's defenders who are now at risk in order to protect our country, our communities and our families.

All of us have been to heartbreaking wakes, funerals, burials; all of us have gone to the bases to see off our Reservists and our National Guardsmen and to wish them Godspeed; and all of us have been on the tarmac to greet them when they return, sometimes having lost comrades, killed or wounded. All of us want to do what is right for our defenders and for the future of our country.

So we need to be extraordinarily careful. Whatever we do today honors their efforts and their sacrifice. We should not be the authors of a policy that ensures the lives of these American heroes have been lost in vain. If at the end of this episode our country is at greater risk, then indeed their lives will have been lost in vain.

I am supporting this last effort, this last chance, if you will, to see that our commitment to Iraq will not result in failure. A failure now will have consequences that are worse than the price that we are now paying in blood and treasure. We do not have the option of walking away without consequences. No amount of midwest corn pressed into ethanol will allow us to ignore the Middle East.

Helping establish moderate democratic governments in the Middle East is not just a favorite of the people there, but it is an imperative to our own prosperity and security. Our dependency based friendships with oil-rich yet dictatorial regimes has set the parameters for the fundamental decisions American leaders have made. It has skewed our ability to be a force for freedom and progress. And it is freedom and progress that shield us from the whims of feudalistic, corrupt despots and religious megalomaniacs. It is the onslaught of freedom that will change that reality that we are now dependent upon.

That is what we had to deal with, and now we have come to this moment of decision. I wish it were not so. But it is a sad reality that what is right is usually not easy. The right course is, in the long term, usually frustrating and heart-wrenching. There are stalls and reverses to every historically significant event and undertaking.

There are always those who walk away when the road gets rough, who cannot see the end and when uncertainty looms. If one seeks certainty, bold actions will never happen. Only if we are bold to our enemies and steadfast will we ever succeed in any international endeavor.

The current conflict in Iraq has several dimensions; and, yes, it is between the Sunnis and the radical Shiite sects of Islam, a bloody Janus, with one face to Tehran and the other to Riyadh.

But don't be fooled, Mr. Speaker. The murderers, torturers and the haters on both sides revile the United States. The sword of Sadr and the bombs of al-Qaeda have turned on each other, but they both have a dream that is close to their hearts, and that dream is a nightmare to those who cherish freedom and to those who stand with liberty and seek comity among the people of the world. That macabre nightmare is the removal of the United States influence from the Muslim world.

You see, there is another force in Iraq and throughout that part of the world, where the majority of people are guided by the visions of the prophet Mohammed. Those of whom I speak are those Muslims who desire liberty and justice, who want government to be elected and directed by the people, who do not want to live their life in fear and would choose a positive relationship with the western world.

They are there, as we have witnessed in one of the most devout Muslim countries of the world, Afghanistan. It was not the American soldiers but the Afghan people themselves who drove out the Taliban and al-Qaeda from their country. Similarly, moderate Muslims, people of good will all over the Middle East, and they are there and they tremble that America will lose its resolve and retreat before a radical form of Islam.

An American retreat condemns them to suppression under the heels of fanatic Muslims who hate our way of life

and are willing to murder anyone who suggests that Islam and the West can live in peace with one another and that we can respect each other's faith and build a better, more peaceful and, yes, a freer world.

Mr. Speaker, if the sole superpower cannot stabilize Iraq, we are not a superpower. If we cannot thwart such a gang of bandits and savages as we face in Iraq, who will stand with us anywhere? Who will be our ally? We must not lose in Iraq.

But what does that mean? That means we must not leave that country defeated and in retreat or we and our families will lose and in the short run pay a horrible price. Yes, if we retreat from Iraq, these ghouls who kill civilians, who would kill civilians and are currently killing civilians by the tens of thousands, they will follow us home and they will be emboldened.

The sides are chosen, the game is in play. We will determine, not the terrorists or the radical lunatics, who stands and who falls, who marches forward and who retreats. All of this will be determined by our military capabilities, our technological advantages, but even more so by our will, by our desire and by our sure grit.

What we do today makes the future. We choose how it will be shaped.

I am reminded of General Petain, the French commander who fought the Germans at the Battle of Verdun. Some attribute the phrase ''they shall not pass'' to him. Well, he rallied the French people to that German onslaught. But, 20 years later, he capitulated to Nazi Germany almost without a fight, because he and the people of France viewed the Second World War as not worthy of the price necessary to prevent a Nazi victory.

Well, did that defeatism and appeasement, what did it do? The cost was unimaginable.

Let us today not make this severe misjudgment again about the magnitude of the downside of retreating before an evil force that threatens the West. There will be a cost with the retreat.

So let us note that what we do in Iraq will determine if the West will truly stand behind any ally of freedom and any enemy of radical Islam. Let us make sure there is hope in the Middle East and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, let us today not make this severe misjudgment again about the magnitude of the down side of retreating before an evil force that threatens the West. There will be a cost if we retreat. Many in this Chamber supported military interventions around the world during the 1990s, including numerous civil wars, situations from which they now claim the United States should steer clear. However, the consequences of withdrawal from Bosnia or Haiti pale in comparison to withdrawal from Iraq.

What happens in Iraq determines if the West will truly stand behind democratic government in the Middle East and elsewhere in the Islamic world. Moderate Muslims must have confidence in our ability to triumph over our fears, to withstand humanitarian impulses to simply disengage from conflict, not to give in to force and pressure when applied by an enemy. Otherwise, we lose. The world loses. The moderates of the Islamic world will never prevail against this evil unless we are with them and have courage and persevere, unless we are willing to hold the line, until the moderate forces in the Islamic world can take up the fight with a reasonable chance of victory.

On the flip side, only a defeat of radical Islam will bring peace to that troubled region. A loss of faith in America's ability to persevere in the Middle East would be a catalyst for catastrophe. That region in chaos would disrupt the entire world economy. Shifts of power would channel enormous resources into the hands of the enemies of Western civilization, enemies of the United States. It's a frightening picture that doesn't need to happen.

How is this different than a year ago? The difference is 1,000 American lives lost in a distant, foreign land. America is war weary. I too am weary. Every story of another young person, blown apart, rips at my heart. Those Americans who have gone are volunteers, heroes all. We owe it to them not to call it off and change direction in haste. To withdraw quickly, without honor, that would indeed mean their lives were lost in vain. It would mean the next front line battle will be the home front.

I, then, am one who is not anxious to declare defeat and retreat from Iraq. I am willing to give the Iraqi people a while longer, a slot of time, to step forward and meet the bloody, yet historic, challenge that faces them. We can't do it for them, but we can, as the world's leading free nation, give them this chance. Otherwise, we are clearly not a leading nation at all. We are too weary to lead. That is not the America I know. Today we define ourselves, to the world, and to our children. We must have a commitment to our ideals and courage.

America has a crucial role to play in this world and we are America. Let us not fail in this our historic responsibility.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, my friend, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, by nearly all measures, the situation in Iraq is a mess. And yet what seems crystal clear to most Minnesoteans the President says that we still have a realistic chance to achieve his vision for a free and democratic Iraq and that all is needed is a short-term addition of 21,000 American combat troops. Does nobody seriously think that this is true, that success is only 21,000 more soldiers away?

Mr. Speaker, I am against the President's plan. I have given this President the benefit of the doubt on more than one occasion. But his plan to send in more troops does not pass the test of common sense. If a short-term surge was going to deliver victory and democracy in Iraq, we would have already done it.

This idea would have made more sense at the beginning of this war. And more troops at the start were what many experts counseled. I was serving on the Select Intelligence Committee when the President, senior Pentagon officials, and senior intelligence officials told us that Iraq was a threat to our national security. At the time, we had a great deal of confusing and occasionally conflicting information.

We questioned them about this, and their response was that the information that they had required us to act and that they had a plan for the aftermath. I gave them the benefit of the doubt then, and I believed them.

But as time passed and events unfolded, we all learned that, at best, we had received unreliable information and, at worst, we had been misled.

□ 0830

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus now on the soldiers in the Minnesota National Guard and talk about what the President's plan is going to mean for them.

A Minnesota Guardsman, a staff sergeant who is currently deployed in Iraq, and, by the way, that is the same rank I held when I left the Guard, sent a letter to the editor of one the newspapers in my district; and I want to read some of it to you.

He says, ''My unit, the Second Battalion, 136th Infantry, Bear Cats of Minnesota, which are now the 34th Infantry Division 1, First Brigade, is on its second deployment since 2003. In 2003, we were mobilized for a 10-month deployment to Bosnia. We returned home in April of 2004 and were mobilized again in October, 2005, for our current Iraq deployment. When our current deployment is complete, the 134th Combat Battalion will have spent 490 days in combat, exceeding the current record held by the First Armored Division, an active duty armor unit, by 35 days. A great deal has been asked of us and more will be asked of us in the near future. But our benefits do not reflect the burden that we carry.''

He says that, ''while the State and the people of Minnesota have been extremely generous towards their soldiers, the Federal Government continues to treat Minnesota soldiers like unwanted stepchildren by neglecting to give them the benefits that better reflect their roles in today's military, that is as full-time, front-line soldiers who are used on a regular basis, rather than sparingly. However, it is not our choice to be full-time soldiers, a capacity that we essentially fill for the military, given the frequency of deployments and the sheer numbers of National Guard and Reserve troops deployed across the globe at any one time. If the military is going to use the National Guard in an active duty capacity, it must increase our benefits to go along with the responsibility or there will be no National Guard for the Federal and State governments to rely upon in times of crisis.''

Mr. Speaker, I think he said it clearly; and I couldn't agree more. When called upon to serve our country, the Minnesota National Guard has a proud

history of answering that call. Over 2,500 soldiers of the Minnesota National Guard are in Iraq. Many of them were already deployed overseas, as I said, in Bosnia; and they were slated to come home in March. But, instead, they are having their tour extended for 4 more months because of this administration's plan.

Now they are scheduled to come home in July and will have spent 22 months away from their families. They will have been deployed a total of 36 months out of the last 5 years. In my opinion, that is unacceptable, and I say, enough is enough.

The soldiers of the Minnesota National Guard are performing their duties admirably. They are performing well or better than the regular Army. They are serious about completing their mission; and, from my experience, they will always do more than what is asked of them.

Another group of people that I would like to recognize are the Guard's families. They are not in harm's way, but they wake up every day worrying, not knowing what that day will about bring for their loved ones. They didn't enlist for the military, but they share their daily effects of this war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this plan.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to Mr. WESTMORELAND, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, if this undemocratic, smoke-and-mirrors Congress had been in power throughout our Nation's history, I am not sure we would have much to celebrate this weekend when we commemorate Presidents Day. On Monday, we honor the Presidents who guided our Nation through its toughest moments, Presidents who made tough decisions in the face of public skepticism despite great peril and unimaginable sacrifice.

Not all Americans supported General George Washington's campaign against the British, yet our Nation's father led a ragtag band of underfed and underequipped soldiers to victory over the greatest military of its day.

Not all Americans supported President Lincoln's decision to go to war to preserve the Union. It seems inevitable today, but, at the time, many Americans would have preferred to save the lives, treasure, and misery and just let the Nation cleave into two. But Lincoln decided to preserve the Union, a Union that, in time, would become the greatest, most powerful nation on earth, even though he had to wage the deadliest war in U.S. history, with 600,000 lives lost.

I wonder what the forebears of today's Democratic Party would think of their policy of retreat and defeat? What would they think of the timidity in the face of great danger?

What happened to the legacy of Woodrow Wilson, who faced down American skeptics to lead us to victory in World War I?

What happened to the legacy of FDR, who faced down American isolationists to defeat the evils of German fascism and the militarism of imperial Japan?

What happened to the legacy of Harry Truman, the first President to realize the peril of the Soviets and entered our war-weary Nation into the fight against the spread of communism?

The wisdom of their decisions wasn't necessarily clear to all Americans of their day, but the judgment of history validates their leadership.

Today, our Commander in Chief sees the danger to our Nation's security and freedom posed by Islamic extremist forces in the Middle East. Many in this Congress choose to believe that the violence in Iraq is a local problem. To some degree, it is, but it is also a problem for the United States.

If we were to follow the proposals of Democratic leaders, we would pull out our troops and let Iraq become a failed State. Anarchy in Iraq would give al Qaeda and other extremists a safe haven to train and plot attacks. It was in the failed states of the Sudan and Afghanistan that al Qaeda was able to plan the African embassy bombings, the attack on the USS *Cole* and the September 11 disasters.

The smoke and mirrors Democratic Congress wants it both ways. On the one hand, they say this is a nonbinding resolution. On the other hand, they say this is a first step.

Given how Democratic leaders have battled to one-up each other and have allowed their rhetoric to spiral, how can this nonbinding resolution be anything but a first step?

How can Democrats stop with the nonbinding resolution if they agree with Senator OBAMA that lives lost in Iraq have been ''wasted?''

This nonbinding resolution expresses disapproval of the military plan to strengthen our forces in Iraq and give them the resources they need. By the end of this week, every Member of this House will be on the record and answerable to their constituents about whether they are for or against the military plan.

My colleagues who vote for this resolution are for one of two things. They are either for retreat and defeat, or stay the course.

We all agree that changes need to be made, that changes need to take us toward a stable and peaceful Iraq. Withdrawal would take us in the opposite direction.

Let's reject this smoke-and-mirrors resolution and continue to fight, take the fight to the terrorists.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a great example of an important form of political debate. The Republicans specialize in this. It is kind of political necrophilia. There is this love of dead Democrats among many Republicans. Democrats who, when they were alive were trashed by the right wing, once they are dead and safely no longer possibly candidates for office, get lionized. Nothing of course shows that better than with Harry Truman, but it is John Kennedy, and it is others.

The assertion that the Democrats who are supporting this resolution, and the unspoken Republicans who will be joining with us, that we somehow oppose the use of force is terrible history. It is wrong. In fact, the most recent entirely successful use of military force by the United States came from a Democratic President, Bill Clinton—he's still alive, so don't say good things about him—and supported by Democrats in Congress, and it was opposed by many of the Republicans, including many of the current Republican leadership.

Under Bill Clinton, American military forces were used quite successfully; and the result is not perfection but a much better situation in the former Yugoslavia than we had before. And the Republicans brought forth, guess what, nonbinding resolutions.

Now, they pretend to be upset about nonbinding resolutions. Frankly, I was a little encouraged when I heard the Bush administration criticize nonbinding resolutions, because, up till now, I had thought that Bush and Cheney thought that everything we did was nonbinding with regard to national security. So they were at least implicitly conceding that some things can be binding.

But the fact is that the Democrats strongly supported—I didn't mean to make it partisan, they did—the effort in Yugoslavia over Republican opposition.

And then let's talk about terrorists. We were attacked in 9/11 from Afghanistan and overwhelmingly, with only one exception, Democrats in the House and Senate supported the war in Afghanistan. We are continuing to support that war in Afghanistan.

I am critical of an administration which has diverted military resources and energy and political resources from Afghanistan. They are weakening the number one fight against terrorism, which is in Afghanistan. And that is one of the reasons for opposing this war in Iraq.

Now, the war in Iraq has been, in my judgment, the greatest national security disaster in America history. And it isn't one in which we got sucked in and had to defend ourselves. It was an entirely voluntary error. This administration unwisely went into Iraq on inaccurate grounds; and not only did they make the wrong war, they have been disastrously wrong in virtually every decision. So the question now is, are we doing more good than harm to the causes we care about?

I believe, in fact, that fighting terrorism, fighting extremism, fighting that particularly radical fundamentalist form of Islam, not all Islam, obviously, by all means, that that is

weakened by our being in Iraq. It has clearly weakened our effort in Afghanistan. The commanders in Afghanistan beg for more troops, and instead they go uselessly to Iraq, uselessly not because of the lack of capacity of the fighting people but because they are condemned to fight in a very mistaken strategy.

It has emboldened radicals elsewhere. This administration predicted that our overthrowing Saddam Hussein would strengthen the forces of moderation. In fact, it has weakened them.

Let's remember that when America invaded Afghanistan with the overwhelming support of both parties and the united support of this country, we were popular in the world. We mobilized the world. And since that time came the invasion of Iraq. And because of the mistaken decision and the poor way in which it is carried out, I do not think there has been a time in recent history when America has been less able to accomplish in the world the things we want to accomplish.

So then the question is, okay, but isn't this escalation going to change that?

There is zero reason to think that. First, we are told this is what the administration says. If ever any group of people forfeited their right to be listened to, it is the collection of people who have shown an aggressive incompetence with regard to Iraq. Can anyone think of a single decision from the invasion forward that has been correct, that has been borne out by events?

So why do you take people who have been wrong about everything, wrong about the politics, wrong about the military situation, wrong about the economy, and then you say, oh, but this time we think they got it right. Maybe it is the theory of random occurrences, that people, having been wrong so often and so consistently, they are owed one. But that is not a basis on which we ought to be making a decision.

This war in Iraq continues to hurt rather than help our efforts overall. If I thought we were doing some good there, then it would be a different story. But the causes of the disaster, in addition to the rampant incompetence of this administration at virtually all levels, the cause of the disaster is internal, it is ethnic and political and a whole range of other things within Iraq. It is not a lack of American firepower.

So to try to resolve this disaster by taking the advice of people who created the disaster and have been wrong about it would be a terrible error, and I hope the resolution passes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just take 2 minutes to respond to my colleague who has just made a number of points.

First, there are a number of live Democrats that I like to refer to. When somebody asks me whether or not Saddam Hussein was indeed a dangerous terrorist in and of himself, I like to take the words of all of the Democrat leadership of this country in the 1990s, when, in their words, there was no Bush administration to trick them, who made that point very, very forcefully.

Secondly, the invasion of Iraq and the taking of Baghdad in record time with very low casualties has been described by most military leaders as being a remarkably efficient and effective operation. In fact, while we had people saying that our troops would be bogged down, the same talk shows would be interrupted with a news flash that Tommy Franks had taken yet another stronghold of Saddam Hussein.

□ 0845

We took Baghdad with very low casualties, very, very quickly, in a very effective and efficient military operation.

Lastly, I don't think that the gentleman can say that there have been no ripples, no ripples whatsoever in the Middle East with respect to freedom and democracy and people wanting to be free as a result of the elections in Iraq. There clearly was action in Libya where they moved lots of parts of their nuclear weapons program which are now residing in the United States, I think as a result of American actions there. Clearly actions toward freedom, toward ejecting the Syrians from Lebanon and moving toward multiparty elections in Egypt. All imperfect to be sure but nonetheless reactions from our operation in Iraq.

Lastly, I would just say to my colleague let me just say to my colleague, there are no smooth roads. The smooth roads not taken, that have been held out by the armchair critics, like we should have kept Saddam Hussein's army in place, that was an army with 11,000 Sunni generals. What are you going to do with an army with 11,000 Sunni generals? Certainly not establish stability in a country in which you have a Shiite majority.

The idea that we needed to have 300,000 Americans in Iraq and yet at the same time put an Iraqi face, as a number of the critics have said, on the military apparatus.

So I think a number of the gentleman's points have been strongly disproven by the American operation in Iraq. We are in the second period right now of a three-phase operation: stand up a free government; stand up a military capable of protecting that free government; lastly, the Americans leave. Let's give the second phase a chance to work.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me 15 seconds to respond?

Mr. HUNTER. I like a full debate. If the gentleman will hold on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. HUNTER. Let me allow the gentleman from Missouri to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 30 seconds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from California wants to claim Iraq as a success, he is entitled to do that. I must say that the initial victory was a very deceptive one, because it led to the current situation. But the biggest difference between us, I guess, is when he cites Lebanon as one of the successful ripples, as he says. In fact, the terrible tragedy that went on in Lebanon that was initially something that was promising, we have had that war with Hezbollah in control in Israel, I think Lebanon is a further sad example of the extent to which this misguided and badly run operation in Iraq has sadly strengthened the most radical and anti-American forces in the Middle East, not weaken them.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield myself 15 seconds to make a response to that last point.

My last point wasn't that Lebanon is California or New York or Massachusetts. My last point was that the free elections in Iraq inspired the Lebanese to work to eject the Syrian influence, which I think the gentleman would agree was not a good influence in Lebanon. It inspired people to want to be free.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman consider Lebanon or Syria free today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman gets more time, I will be happy to engage with him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. HUNTER, for your leadership, your military service, and your son's military service.

Mr. Speaker, complete discussion regarding the way forward in Iraq is certainly appropriate. In fact, it's our duty as elected public officials. It is sad that the resolution before us offers no solutions. It is contradictory to say in one paragraph that we support the troops and in the next paragraph oppose reinforcements for them. As the parent of a son who served proudly in Iraq and three others in the military, I want to fully support the troops.

Al Qaeda spokesman Zawahiri has made it clear that Iraq is the central front in the global war on terrorism. In a January 22, 2007 transcript, Zawahiri boasted, ''The backing of the jihad in Afghanistan and Iraq today is to back the most important battlefields.'' The enemy know Iraq is the central front of the global war on terrorism.

We must put our trust in the commanders on the ground who are living the situations we are merely debating. General David Petraeus in Baghdad is an accomplished general with a proven record of success. He has expressed his confidence that victory in Iraq can be achieved—provided he has the personnel required to do so. General

Petraeus has just been unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate to lead our troops in Iraq. We need to support him with reinforcements.

In my six visits to Iraq, I have gone to encourage our troops, but each time it is them who have encouraged me. They know firsthand that the enemies fighting us today in Iraq want to fight in the streets of America tomorrow. We must face them today to protect American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The question is, where are we today? We are looking at this conflict today and the consequences that it has upon tomorrow and tomorrow's military readiness.

I spoke about the lack of readiness last summer. Others did as well. We had a hearing on it a good number of months ago, our committee responded, and we thank the gentleman from California for helping in that massive effort to re-equip our Army as was necessary, and hopefully we will be able to do more in the future.

But where are we today? Yesterday regarding the issue of readiness of our Army, the Army Chief of Staff, General Schoomaker, said that the increase of 17,500 Army combat troops in Iraq represents only the tip of the iceberg and will potentially require thousands of additional support troops and trainers as well as equipment, further eroding the Army's readiness to respond to other world contingencies.

In the last 30 years, there have been 12 military engagements, some large, some small, that our country has engaged in. The Pentagon says they would only need some 2,500 support troops for the 20,000-plus combat troops. The Congressional Budget Office says there is going to be a necessary 13,000 in additional support troops. But the issue of readiness is real, it is there today because of additional combat troops, and that is what we are debating today. That is exactly the issue today. The readiness of tomorrow is contingent upon what happens today.

I yield, Mr. Speaker, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as we wind up this debate on escalating the war in Iraq, I wish to thank Speaker PELOSI for allowing Members of Congress to express themselves on the most serious debate that will occur in the 110th Congress. Perhaps more importantly, we should thank the American people for voting for a new majority which has allowed a free and open debate on the President's plan to escalate the war. With their votes, the American people have clearly demanded a new direction for the war in Iraq. Today's debate symbolizes more than just a debate on escalating the war, the debate symbolizes a new direction for America's policy in Iraq driven by the American people, not by a President who has lost touch.

In October of 2002, just before the general election, President Bush insisted a vote be held on Resolution 114 which would allow the use of Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in Iraq. At that time, I argued that the United States did not have the moral, legal and ethical authority to go to war with Iraq and that our Nation would lose its moral authority to speak out against aggression throughout the world.

It would be very easy for me to stand here and remind my constituents that I voted against the war in Iraq. It is sufficient, however, to simply note that the evidence to justify the war has been repudiated. Rationale for this war has been inadequate. And our Nation's credibility has been eroded.

While some of us opposed the war in Iraq, our support for our troops has never wavered. Congress has appropriated the supplies and the resources to assure that our troops have what they need to accomplish their mission and return home safely. We know too painfully that more than 3,100 Americans have not returned home and more than 23,000 have been wounded. We have visited with the wounded and comforted the families of the fallen. We simply cannot allow the President to continue to fight this war as if there were no consequences for our troops, their families and our country. By standing up against this escalation of the war, we are supporting the troops.

Because of this war, many lives have been shattered and broken. I speak of the lives of family members who have lost loved ones. I speak of the brave troops recovering from their wounds at Walter Reed Army Hospital or the recently dedicated amputee clinic in Texas. As a Nation, we are comprised of a reasonable, noble, compassionate and determined people.

I believe that it is not in our Nation's best interest to leave a shattered and broken Iraq behind. Still, we cannot continue with a policy of military might and no diplomatic foresight. Instead of military escalation, our Nation should embark upon a diplomatic and political escalation. The current administration with its ''military might makes right'' philosophy is no longer applicable in Iraq. This administration has not seriously focused on the diplomacy and political persuasion necessary to end this war.

I am struck by the recent news out of Korea. It is reported that after years of negotiation, the administration may have reached an agreement with North Korea on its nuclear threat. The journey was long, discussions were difficult, diplomacy was frustrating, but we may have accomplished our goal without having to go to war. There is a lesson to be learned here, reflected in the words of an American journalist, Anne O'Hare McCormick, who said:

''Today the real test of power is not the capacity to make war but the capacity to prevent it.''

I call on the Bush administration and this Congress to escalate diplomacy. I call on the Bush administration and this Congress to escalate political pressure. This war is a mistake and what we need now is a President who has the courage to admit his mistake. We need a President who will bring peace and stability to Iraq through diplomacy rather than military force.

In an earlier time, in an earlier war, a young man spoke out. That young man was Bobby Kennedy and his words have lived with me for many years. So to our service men and women, to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, and to those whose hearts are burdened by war, I leave you Bobby's challenge:

''Diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped each time a man stands up for an ideal or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest wall.''

Our vote for this resolution will not stop the war in Iraq. It will not restore the shattered and broken lives here in America and in Iraq. It will not bring peace and stability to Iraq. But it will send a tiny ripple of hope.

I still believe in that tiny ripple of hope.

I still believe in diverse acts of courage.

I still believe in the greatness of America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for 4 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Our uniformed men and women have given great service to the Nation by ending a tyrant's rein and fostering elections in a region that only knew dictatorship. In my judgment now, the time for decisive military action led by American and British forces is ending and the Iraqi stage should be delivered to new political leaders to work out their own differences. I will support the House resolution that recommends against the troop surge because the United States should increase the responsibilities of the elected Iraqi government to solve its own problems while reducing the number of American combat troops sent overseas.

I did not come to this conclusion lightly. The long-term security of our country depends on the United States not being defeated in the Middle East. To prevent the collapse of democracy, tolerance and supporters in our region, we need a policy that relies on America's key strengths and builds additional support among our citizens and allies.

Looking back on the last years, our troops in Iraq achieved two major objectives: First, they ended the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, a leader that

invaded two separate United Nations member countries and ordered the murder of several hundred thousand Iraqis. Second, they backed the United Nations' sponsorship of Iraq's three national elections that approved a new constitution and government.

□ 0900

Iraq is no longer a military threat to her neighbors or minorities, especially her Kurdish families, who no longer fear that a third genocide campaign will be launched by their very own government. These are major achievements, worthy of the bravery and sacrifice of Americans in uniform.

But Iraq now faces new challenges that should be solved by Iraqis, not the U.S. military. Iraq's government, led by a Kurdish president and a Shia prime minister, faces a daunting enemy composed of people that would restore the old dictatorship, or worse. But this struggle is primarily political, not military. Foreign troops, be they American or British or otherwise, are not well-suited to advance the elected government's writ.

In the coming months we should build a longer term plan for the United States and our allies in the Middle East. Man for man, Iraqi combat troops operating under the authority of their own elected government are better suited for this mission than Americans on the front lines of Iraq.

The U.S. military can offer unique advantages to the Iraqi government in our ability to provide the Iraqi army and police with logistics, communications, training and intelligence, in a way that only Americans can provide. Over the coming months, Americans should be focused on these missions, making sure that our Iraqi allies are more effective in extending the authority of their government. By winding down the combat duties of Americans, we will dramatically lower the risk to our men and women stationed overseas while providing a decisive advantage to the elected government of Iraq. This is how to win the battle and secure a lasting government for the Iraqi people.

Our plan should be strengthened by a diplomatic initiative among Iraq's neighbors and the World Bank to support the elected government in its plans for reconstruction. To date, the World Bank has been ''absent without leave'' in delivering help to this founding member of the International Bank For Reconstruction and Development.

Our efforts, based on the key American advantages, while reducing the number of American combat troops, will improve the prospects for peace and build support for our goals here and among our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I join with many Members today to say if it were up to us, we would recommend a different course of action that involves less risk to Americans. As a military man, I am fully aware that the Constitution does not place 535 Members of Congress in the direct military chain of command, and Americans who wear the uniform are also not shy in debating various courses of action. They have as many opinions on various issues as any civilian community, and that is their birthright as Americans. But as volunteers who wear the uniform, they take on an additional heavy obligation to make a decision, to bring an end to the debate, and to confront the enemies of the United States as brothers and sisters united by a common bond.

In coming days, our troops will face danger, not as Democrats, Independents or Republicans, but as Americans. We in Congress should draw on their strength once our decision is made. When a course of action is set, we are not neutral in the contest. If Americans are engaged in combat, we are for the Americans winning. We will give them the tools to bring an end to the conflict as rapidly as possible. The debate in Congress will soon close and the course will be set. For those Americans who serve farthest from home, they should know that after a vigorous debate, their democracy will make a decision, and we will back those charged with its implementation with everything needed to succeed.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to my friend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the chairman of the Budget Committee and also a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and rise to support the resolution and to talk about something the President seldom mentions, the cost of the war in Iraq. In deciding what we should do, cost is not the determining factor, but it is considerable, and with costs overall approaching $500 billion, it has to be a factor.

During the first Persian Gulf War we had real allies, Britain, France, the Gulf States and Saudi Arabia, and our gross cost was around $80 billion in current dollars. But Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States contributed in kind about $16 billion, and allies like Germany and Japan and Saudi Arabia contributed in cash around $60 billion, so the net cost to the United States was a mere $4 billion.

Because we had allies willing to share the burden, the cost of the first Gulf War was minimal. But in this war our President was able to enlist only one major ally, Great Britain, and he chose to go it alone with a motley coalition. That is one reason this war is proving more costly than the first, in lives and in dollars.

So far, over 3,100 service men and women have been killed in action; so far, over 23,000 have been wounded in action, many of them grievously; and so far, Congress has appropriated $379 billion for the war in Iraq.

As we speak, two supplemental appropriation bills are on deck. One is to cover operations in Iraq for the rest of fiscal 07, and it provides $100 billion to the $70 billion provided last year. The other supplemental is to cover operations in Iraq during fiscal 08, and it provides $145 billion. These bills, when passed, will push appropriations for the war in Iraq over $600 billion. $600 billion. When the 08 supplemental is added to the 08 base budget, these two will push appropriations for fiscal year 2008 alone to $643 billion. In constant dollars, that is more than we spent at the peak of Korea or Vietnam.

In a few weeks we will enter the fifth year of our engagement in Iraq. You would think after 5 years spending would come down. But spending over this time has not come down, it has gone up. Three years ago, 2004, the Pentagon was obligating money for Iraq at the rate of $4.8 billion a month. Today the Pentagon is obligating money for Iraq at the rate of $8.6 billion a month, and considering the supplemental for 07, with $170 billion, and the surge in Baghdad, the obligation rate will probably rise to $10 billion a month by the end of this year.

To support this surge, the President has called for five brigades, 21,500 additional troops. He sends a supplemental of $3.2 billion to pay for these troops. The CBO says, how about the support troops? How about the staff? This will cost billions more.

CBO has also looked out 10 years and tried to figure what future costs might be. By its estimation, future operations in Iraq and Afghanistan together could come to $824 billion between 2008 and 2017. Mind you, this assumes that the troops deployed in these theaters will be declining from a little over 200,000 today to a steady state of 75,000 in 2013.

If future costs are split 75–25, then over the next 10 years that is another $600 billion in store for us. Surely, surely at this juncture, as spending surges head upwards to more than $10 billion a month, surely we should ask whether we want to raise our commitment of troops and thrust them into a civil war with no clear exit, no timetable for completion, and, worse still, an urban war.

The Pentagon will say they can't see past 2008 and they don't know what the budget is for the outyears, and they will probably dispute this end state of 75,000 troops in the two theaters 10 years from now. And I hope they are right.

But there are other costs, the cost of ''reset,'' of refurbishing or repairing our equipment, which our commanders have told us could easily be $60 billion to $70 billion. And I haven't talked about the toll on our troops and their families, where some will soon be going for their third tour. The dwell time between tours is now 1 year instead of 2 years.

Whenever you go into the field to visit these troops, you have to be impressed with their attitude, with their readiness to serve and their willingness to sacrifice. I have always come away from these experiences saying thank God there are such Americans. They deserve our admiration and support, but they also deserve something else. They deserve not to be asked to do

what Iraqi troops and Iraqi police should do themselves.

For the past 2 years, the Bush administration has said to us just forebear, just wait, because we are training Iraqi forces, and as soon as these forces are stood up, ours can be stood down. Well, 118 Iraqi battalions have been stood up, and none of ours have been stood down.

In the Defense Authorization Act for 2006, Congress enacted this policy into law. We called for 2006 to be a year of transition. The resolution before us embodies that notion. The resolution heeds that advice. It does not call for pulling out our troops. It does not call for cutting off our funds. It says simply but solemnly that we disagree with the surge of our troops, thrust into what the Intelligence Estimate has called ''self-sustaining sectarian violence,'' especially when there are more than 118 Iraqi battalions trained to take on that task.

It is time for them to stand up and us to stand down, and Baghdad is a good place to start.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the ranking member on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 63 and in support of a just cause that is facing a critical turning point. The outcome hangs in the balance, and, Mr. Speaker, we should not kid ourselves into believing that victory is foreordained.

Churchill once said that there would not be war if both sides did not believe that they could win it. The enemy we face in Iraq and in the broader war against the radical Islamists is driven by an apocalyptic vision of God, and because such apocalyptic visions are rooted in faith and not facts, they are very hard to dispel. We, therefore, face an opponent who is neither open to reason nor to compromise, nor will he necessarily be defeated by calculations of military strategy and prudence.

We face the paradox of a perilous time. At the opening of the 21st century, we are opposed by an adversary who preaches the savagery and barbarism of the 12th century. We face in Iraq an enemy that will allow us absolutely no quarter, and, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say that I think we in this chamber, and, indeed, even in the country at large, have been slow to grasp that fact.

However, the difficulty of the fight should not dissuade us from waging it if the cause is just, and the cause is just.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the sad duty to attend the funerals of several of the servicemen killed in Iraq who come from my district. There are those who say that we should not withdraw from Iraq because to do so would mean that they died in vain. That is not correct. Nothing that we have done or will do will ever subtract one ounce from the valor and nobility of those who have died in the service of their country.

As Lincoln said in the Gettysburg Address, ''We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.''

However, we should pause to note that our service men and women are fighting and sometimes dying because they know the terrible price that will be paid if our adversaries prevail. They have seen, as I have seen when I traveled to Iraq, what a world our enemies would have us live in. It is a world filled by a grotesque and distorted vision of God. It is a world of slavery and submission, where the Almighty is not a benevolent and loving creator of his children, but rather is a pagan idol that demands blood sacrifice and glories in the murder of the innocent.

You need look no further than the carnage in Baghdad, or Kabul, or Mogadishu, or never let us forget the Twin Towers, to see the truth in that axiom. That is what our enemy, for all his talk of God, seeks to do, and we are all that stands between our adversary and the realization of this nihilistic vision.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in this House who are far better versed than I in the strategy and military calculations that are the essence of this conflict. There are those who say that we mistakenly entered the war in Iraq on the basis of flawed intelligence. This, I think, underestimates the nature of our adversary.

Given the expansiveness of our enemy's nightmare vision, I think it is safe to say there would have been a war in Iraq no matter what we did. That, of course, will be for historians to decide. But this much I do know: We stand for hope. We fight for peace in a world that is free. We sacrifice now so that the little children that I met when I was in Iraq might live in a better world tomorrow, and because they will have a better world, we Americans will live in a safer one. To quote DeGaulle, ''Behind this terrible cloud of our blood and tears here is the sun of our grandeur shining out once again.''

Mr. Speaker, I do have one concern. I think that we in this Congress have allowed too wide a gap to develop between the society we help to govern and the war we have been compelled to wage. We have to correct this, because we will not win this war in Iraq or beyond unless we as a Nation come to grips with what we face and begin to act accordingly.

We must never forget, to quote Lincoln again, ''Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed.'' Right now I look around me and I see a Congress and a country distracted, and nothing could be deadlier to our security and our hopes for a better future.

To some extent, this is understandable. America is and has every right to be tired of conflict. In 1917, for the first time we went ''over there'' to make the world safe for democracy. In 1941, in Churchill's evocative phrase, the new world stepped forth, yet again, to the rescue and liberation of the old.

□ 0915

Then after 1945, we stayed on to wage the long twilight struggle that came to be called the Cold War.

Then, in 1989, a miracle. We stopped holding our breaths. The Berlin Wall came down and the Soviet Union disappeared. The hair trigger nightmare of the nuclear world seemed to recede. We came off of the figurative tip-toes on which we had been standing for nearly 50 years. We had grown so accustomed to it that when the Cold War ended, we scarcely realized just how nerve wracking, and what a strain, it had all been.

Now here we are again. More war, more sacrifice, more death. It is not a pleasant picture but it offers this. It offers hope. It offers an alternative to yet another in a long line of obscene and perverted visions that seem to be forever conjured in the minds of men.

Mr. Speaker, I have dared to say today something that very few of us seem to be willing to say. We could lose this war.

There is nothing in the stars that says we must prevail. In history, freedom is the exception, not the rule. So I say to my colleagues, we must press on in Iraq. We must fight wisely, but we must not falter.

Churchill once said in the midst of another terrible war, ''Give us the tools and we will finish the job.'' Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of this House and of this Congress and of this Nation to give our men and women the tools they need to see this conflict through to the end. We must send them the reinforcements they need to win this war—and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this misguided resolution.

Most of all we must stand together. That way, when our children and grandchildren look back at this moment in history, they will say that at the threatened nightfall the blood of their fathers ran strong.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. The gentleman my friend, Mr. MCKEON, raised a very interesting issue about who is really involved in this war in this country. My opinion is those in uniform and their families.

All one has to do is to go to Walter Reed and the Bethesda hospitals, go to visitation or a funeral, and those are the ones, and the saying good-bye to the National Guard and Reserve units, the active duty units, the farewells and the welcome homes, those and their families are those that are involved.

And I am afraid the gentleman is correct, that they are the only ones that are actually involved with this war.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I have great respect for him, and I know of his strong dedication to the troops and to the people serving.

I had in my office yesterday a constituent, a young man that played football for my brother at home. I introduced him to the chairman. He has spent the last 3 years at Walter Reed. He says he is like one of those dinosaurs that has a big mouth and two hands that he can't use, and he does struggle, and he has a bad leg. He was a master sergeant and he protected his troops but he took rounds from mortar. In talking to him he said, this debate is very distracting and hard for the morale of the troops.

I pray that they will understand that all of us have different feelings, but we do understand their devotion and their commitment to duty, and they understand our commitment. We just see things differently, and at the end of the day, I hope what we end up doing is what will be best for our troops and for our country and for the world.

Mr. SKELTON. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. He reiterates what I have been saying, that it seems like the members in uniform and their families are the ones truly involved in this war.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 157, and as the designee of the majority leader, I request that the time for debate be enlarged by 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the leaders or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, that will be the order.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

I fundamentally disagree with the President's plan to add thousands of troops to the Iraqi conflict. It is time for a new course in Iraq, a rational course, a more humane course of action. It is long past time to start a phased withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is about policy and direction. Surely, the facts on the ground cannot be used to support continued or increased combat involvement in Iraq. Iraq is in a civil war. That is the truth, and it is time we accept the implications of that fact. Our soldiers have no business acting as unwanted umpires or surrogate police officers.

The latest National Intelligence Estimate concludes the term ''civil war'' accurately describes key elements of the Iraqi conflict. If this is the state of the current conflict, what do we expect the U.S. military to do about it? Settle centuries of theological or religious disagreement? Become diplomats? Whose side do they choose and what would their mission be?

I do not believe combat forces permanently stop such conflicts. The troops themselves tell us they are untrained for this role, a role that puts them at extreme risk.

Yet, the President mistakenly continues to believe we are fighting illusionary battalions on phantom battlefields. So, in his mind, we need more troops for victory, a surge that will overwhelm and destroy.

Well, that is how he sees it, but he ignores the evidence and reports of our generals, our troops, our Iraq Study Group, our diplomats, most of our allies, the views of the Iraqi people and anyone else who actually tries to find out the nature and state of the conflict.

He rapidly and recklessly proceeds ahead with one policy shift after another.

He searches for a light at the end of the tunnel, but there is no light. It was extinguished long ago. There is only darkness and despair. The chaos deepens daily, and the President sits in the Oval Office hoping that somehow, somehow it will turn out all right in the end.

This is neither policy nor leadership. The administration's policies are the stuff of dreams and fantasies, not hard core determinations of our Nation's interests or the best course for addressing strategic threats.

Mr. Speaker, hope is not a strategy. The escalation of troop levels makes no strategic sense. We must not hesitate to describe the President's policy in words that are honest and clear. We confront a policy that is wishful thinking, not realistic assessment. The administration's policy is like a conjuring trick of denial, delusion and determined folly, which will only deepen the disaster. We are given the vision of a make-believe story instead of a responsible and realistic policy.

Civil wars are solved through diplomacy, negotiation and political compromise. These are the types of developments identified by the NIE that will make a difference in Iraq. While the NIE warns against the rapid withdrawal of coalition troops, American forces can come home in a careful, safe and deliberate manner.

As the Nation's Representatives, it is our constitutional duty to stop this madness. It is our constitutional mandate to conduct oversight, and it is our constitutional imperative to act. That is what the Founding Fathers wanted. They constructed the Constitution to provide checks and balances. They did not give the President a blank check.

The Constitution is a sacred document to this body. We swear to uphold it and to defend it. We do just that when we demand accountability from the President. We honor our constitutional requirement when we scrutinize policy. We defend our constitutional process when we demand that the President listen to the American people and end unilateral actions that undermine our Nation's strength and place our troops in an untenable, lethal and unwinnable situation.

Mr. Speaker, I did not come here to ignore my oath to the American people. I did not come here to watch our Constitution be rewritten by presidential arrogance and disregard. And I did not come here to relinquish my sworn duty to protect and defend this sacred document. I did not come here to ignore the American people who want this war stopped now.

Mr. Speaker, support this resolution and begin a phased withdrawal.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, when the original resolution that brought our military to intervention in Iraq came to the Congress, I interpreted it as asking the Congress to turn over to the President our military to use anytime he wished, anywhere he wished, against any country he wished, now and forever more.

Feeling that this was patently unconstitutional, I was very pleased when the International Relations Committee, chaired at that time by Henry Hyde, revised the resolution and narrowly focused it on Iraq. That resolution had strong encouragement for the President to obtain a U.N. resolution so that when we went into Iraq it would be a part of a U.N. coalition. The U.N. would own that war; we wouldn't own it.

When the President did not get the U.N. resolution so strongly encouraged by that original resolution that we voted on, I then voted for the Spratt substitute because I felt that if we were going to send our young men and women into war, that it needed to be with the full support of the American people through their elected officials, and we needed to have that additional debate. That didn't happen. I felt that we went in with unrealistic expectations.

There is no country around Iraq that has anything like the government that we would like for them to have. Several of the countries have dictatorships. We call them royal families. Saudi Arabia, the Arab Emirates, Kuwait, but they are dictatorships. Several countries, Jordan and Syria, have kings. Iran is essentially a theocracy ruled by the mullahs. The only country that comes even close is the vestiges of the Ottoman Empire, Turkey, where they have a sort of democracy, but several times in the last few years the military has thrown out the civilian government, telling them they need to start over, hardly the kind of government that we have in this country and that we envision for Iraq.

So I thought that there were very unrealistic expectations. That was a very steep hill to climb; that success was unlikely, and therefore, I wanted to go in under a U.N. resolution.

What now? I hope I am wrong, but I believe that there will be one of two

likely outcomes, either another strong man, hopefully more benevolent, than Saddam Hussein, or three loosely federated states with an overarching entity that pumps the oil and distributes the revenues on a per capita basis.

Now, we have a resolution before us and how should one vote? If you believe that the President is the Commander in Chief and has a right to pursue the war in the way he chooses, then you would vote ''no'' on this resolution.

If you believe that this resolution sends the wrong message to the enemy that we are losing our resolution, our resolve, then you would vote ''no.''

If you believe this sends the wrong message to the troops, I know the first clause says we support our troops, but then one might argue that the right hand is taking away what the left hand gave because in the second clause we say that we do not support the surge, which some may interpret as not supporting our troops; then you would vote ''no.''

But if you believe that the Iraqis need to stand up so that we can stand down, then you would vote ''yes.''

If you believe that the surge will not help, which is very likely, then I think you need to vote ''yes.''

If you believe the surge might actually hurt by placing more of our brave young men and women in harm's way, I understand that a fair percentage of the violence over there is directed against us, if that is true, then how do we reduce the violence by putting more of us there, then you would vote ''yes.''

If you want to send a message to the President, the Congress and the American people, that this war can't go on forever, then you would vote ''yes.''

If you want to send a message to the troops that we are watching, that you won't be there forever, that you have the support of your citizens and your Congress, then you would vote ''yes.''

This is obviously a very complex vote. Whether you vote ''yes'' or whether you vote ''no,'' there will be unintended, unwanted messages that will be sent. Being required to vote either ''yes'' or ''no'' on a resolution like this is a little bit like requiring the husband to answer the question, ''yes'' or ''no,'' ''Have you stopped beating your wife?''

If that is true, then perhaps the best vote on this is a ''present'' vote.

It is so true here that what you see depends on where you stand. There has been a lot of quite intemperate rhetoric on both sides. It is hard sometimes to imagine that we are debating the same resolution.

It is so true here that he who frames the question determines the answer.

Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be here. After the debate, this vote is somewhat irrelevant. Indeed, the listening Americans have each cast their own vote. In spite of all the divisive rhetoric, I want one thing to be certain, that all 435 of us want only what is best for America, what is best for our troops, a good and bright future for the Iraqis and especially want to assure our brave young men and women there that they have the total thanks of a grateful Nation.

□ 0930

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I wish this resolution of disapproval articulated our disapproval of the administration's failure to accomplish certain chores in preparation for our fine troops undertaking this new mission under General Petraeus.

Everyone, including the President, now acknowledges mistakes over the past 4 years, but those well-documented errors are not the mistakes I am talking about. Now, today, mistakes are being made. Now, today, high-ranking officials in the administration fall short in their performance.

Why, after 4 years of the Iraq war, is the Secretary of State unable to get the appropriate reconstruction, economic development, and other necessary personnel to Iraq? Why did the State Department recently have to request the Defense Department to help fill in these necessary positions? Why have the efforts of political reconciliation been so ineffective? Why has the American diplomatic effort in the region been so ineffective? Where are the trained police and judges who will need to deal with all the detainees to be arrested in Baghdad? Why aren't an adequate number of property detention facilities not available for these future detainees that are sure to come from an aggressive effort to decrease the violence in Baghdad?

General Petraeus, clearly one of America's finest military leaders, during his recent opening statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee, felt an obligation to plead for the help and commitment from other U.S. government agencies commensurate with what our troops give 24 hours a day, day after day, week after week, month after month.

I have had references being made to Winston Churchill, but I remind those speakers who make such comparisons that we are not a parliamentary system. If we were, the Secretary of State and other high-ranking officials would be gone because of their failures. We are, thankfully, the American system; and in our responsibility to support our troops, we know we must not just equip and train them. We know that all agencies of American government, the nonmilitary agencies, must pull their load if our fine troops are to be successful.

So we now have a situation where our new commander on the ground, General Petraeus, says he needs the additional troops. On the other hand, he says he needs all the other agencies of government to step forward with, in his words, ''an enormous commitment.''

It is clear this commitment of other agencies is not yet being made. Regardless of the result of this vote today, our troops will still be in Iraq needing the commitment of all government agencies.

The House leadership has stated that this resolution today is the first step of other legislation to come. This other legislation to come must address the issues of the shortcomings of other agencies of U.S. government, the nonmilitary agencies of U.S. government. Our troops deserve the help.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) 7 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, since learning we would consider a resolution regarding troop levels in Iraq, I have spent considerable time listening to veterans of this war and other wars questioning some of America's top national security officials, reading every e-mail, literally every letter on this most serious issue of this day that has come into my office from my constituents. I have listened to voices of leaders of other nations who surround Iraq. I have read the National Intelligence Report. I have read the Iraq Study Committee Report. I have been given books such as ''Fiasco'' to digest, and I have reached out to the parents of brave Americans who are on their way into this conflict, and I have heard from the parents of sons who were lost in this conflict. I have heard strong opinions on both sides of this issue, and I have reflected upon my own vote to authorize the war in the first place.

To say the least, it has been an agonizing experience. Agonizing, because I want to do what is right for America with minimal sacrifice to the brave Americans who wear our Nation's uniform. I want to do what is right to protect our freedom and our security.

I will always remember the days and nights when the smoke from the burning Pentagon wafted into the apartment I lived in just blocks from that building. I remember the images of that day when rescue personnel were trying to save lives, only to lose their own. I remember the pledge I made to myself that I would never let that happen to America again if I had my way.

So I supported implementation of the 9/11 Commission Report. I supported efforts to improve our intelligence gathering and processing efforts so that America does not miss key indicators of danger or, worse, misinterpret the data that is gathered.

Policymakers must be given accurate, reliable intelligence if we are to make responsible decisions. Had Congress been given an accurate intelligence assessment, I doubt the vote to invade Iraq would ever have come to this floor in the first place, and I certainly would not have cast the vote I cast because the threat was not what we were told it was, despite the horrific brutality of Saddam Hussein and his henchmen sons.

Unfortunately, though, we cannot edit history; we cannot change the

past. Our responsibility is to the present and even more so to the future, America's future.

In some areas of the world, America has made strong diplomatic progress on the most difficult issues facing our planet. I speak of the recent agreement with North Korea coming out of the Six Party talks. I am reminded of the willingness of Libya to give up its weapons of mass destruction and come into line with the world community. And while much work remains regarding Iran's nuclear development, America's work with other countries and through the United Nations is having an effect on Iran.

Meanwhile, our troops and our work internationally in Afghanistan continues to show progress, even in light of the recent resurgence of the Taliban. Consider the historic role NATO is playing to bring peace and stability to that far-off land.

So if we are accomplishing good in Afghanistan and elsewhere, why is the situation in Iraq still such a mess? And what can or should America do there now that will hasten Iraq's move towards stability and hasten the bringing home of our troops to America?

As my colleague from New Mexico, HEATHER WILSON, so eloquently and forcefully asked this week: What are America's strategic interests in Iraq, and how can we best achieve them?

These are the serious questions of our day, and these are the issues tragically missing from this nonbinding resolution.

In this new world where war is not waged by armies in uniform with codes of honor but by terrorists who blow up food markets and behead journalists, how do we respond in an effective way to prevent the insanity from coming again to our shores? How best do we prevent a whole region from ripping apart at the seams and perhaps taking much of the world with it?

While Congress has a clear constitutional role and responsibility when the Nation is at war, where is the line that Congress should not cross? Are we really best equipped to decide precisely how many reinforcements are sent into which battle? Isn't that a decision best left to the commanders in the field? Can Congress really give General Petraeus a unanimous vote of support to lead our effort in Iraq and then turn around and deny him the strategy he told us he believes is necessary to win?

A former colonel in the Air Force wrote to me recently on this very topic. She said, ''Some in Congress say they support General Petraeus but don't want them to undertake the mission they were confirmed to do. It seems right out of Alice in Wonderland.''

And if Congress is going to make these decisions, then have we really carefully analyzed where the other 134,754 troops in Iraq are, what they are doing, and what they should do?

Another of the e-mails I received was from a veteran of the Vietnam War who, like many other veterans of that conflict, urged me to vote against this resolution; and he wrote, ''Our troops need unqualified support. They don't need to be told they are participating in a lost cause.''

Indeed, this two-sentence nonbinding resolution does send a very mixed message to our troops. Moreover, this resolution is a lost opportunity to address at least five major issues that a serious Congress needs to address.

First, this resolution fails to even mention the Iraqi role. Where is the siren call for the Iraqi government to keep its word and perform as promised? We cannot expect for long to do for Iraq what it is unwilling to do for itself.

Second, this resolution fails to even mention the need for this administration to embrace the Iraq Study Group Report's call for aggressive diplomatic initiatives with Syria, Iran, and other nations in Iraq's neighborhood. Where is the call for enhanced diplomacy?

Third, this resolution fails to even mention the need to replenish the equipment that our National Guard units have left behind while serving our country overseas. My State's own National Guard's ability to conduct training is deeply affected by lack of equipment.

Fourth, this resolution fails to call on Iran, Syria, and other nations to stop directly or indirectly supplying the weapons and explosives to those who detonate car bombs in Baghdad and elsewhere in Iraq, killing women and children as they try to buy food in local markets. Where is the condemnation of their actions?

Fifth, this resolution fails to define what our strategic national interests are in Iraq and how we can best achieve them.

I know that I stand alone in my State's delegation by opposing this resolution. I have been told by some I should just vote for it. It would be easier politically for me because then the problem is off my back. It is someone else's. They will own it. I cannot do that and look at myself in the mirror.

I cannot ignore the counsel recently given to us by diplomats in the region whose advice we ignored when America took on this challenge in Iraq and who now counsel us with most seriousness in the strongest of terms against leaving Iraq before the country is stabilized. They have made it clear to this Member of Congress that failure in Iraq will have grave and dangerous consequences to the entire region. In short, we broke it, we need to fix it before we leave it.

But fixing Iraq does not mean ending religious differences, differences that have ripped apart that region for 1,300 years or more. Fixing Iraq does not mean installing our form of democracy. Fixing Iraq means ensuring a new terrorist haven is not created or allowed to be created from which they can train and plan safely to carry out attacks against the West. Fixing Iraq means ensuring their government can stand on its own and not collapse into a sinkhole that drags other nations in the region into an abyss.

Given the glaring shortcomings of the nonbinding resolution we have before us today, I will vote ''no'' for as many of those who served in Vietnam have told me its message does undercut our troops. Moreover, it fails to call for the increased diplomatic initiatives in the region, it fails to call for Iraq to do its part, it fails to define our strategic national interests of stabilizing Iraq so as to prevent the creation of another terrorist training haven, and it fails to address the very real needs of our National Guard.

It is unfortunate that the opportunity to actually affect these very serious policy choices was not allowed on the Floor of the House today. It is, indeed, a missed opportunity for America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 of this year, the President in his State of the Union address said, ''This is not the fight we entered in Iraq, but it is the fight we are in.''

Nearly 4 years after President Bush took us to war, 4 years, that is longer than our involvement in World War II, it is fair to say that this is not the debate we expected to have, but it is the debate we must have. We owe it to our troops who have fought honorably and valiantly, and we owe it to the American people.

More than 3,100 American soldiers dead, more than 23,000 American soldiers injured, $500 billion in costs, 14,000 weapons that our Nation bought for the Iraqi Army missing, $9 billion in reconstruction funds missing. Mr. Speaker, stay-the-course has failed, and sending 20,000 more troops is no more than stay-the-course on steroids.

The American people would know this had the previous Republican Congresses exercised their oversight responsibilities to tell the American people what was going on. They would have known, for example, that we have already tried three previous troop surges. In each case, between 17,000 to 21,000 troops. Have we seen the improvement? What are things like today? Where were the hearings to find out how those troop surges went? Where are the reports? Mr. Speaker, this is a debate long overdue.

The truth is, Iraqis must take responsibility for their own future. When General John Abizaid met with commanders on the ground in Iraq, he was asked, ''If we get more troops, will we succeed?'' And here is what he told them: ''They all said no. And the reason is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking

more responsibility for their own future.'' That, General Abizaid said on November 15, 2006.

U.S. troops are sitting today in the crossfire of a civil war. We have no guarantee that an Iraqi Shi'a soldier will defend an Iraqi Sunni civilian and that an Iraqi Sunni soldier will defend an Iraqi Shi'a civilian. Iraqis must decide what future they want. Only Iraqis can save Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we need to redeploy our troops responsibly, to continue training Iraqi soldiers, and to refocus our efforts on counterterrorism. And we need a surge in diplomacy, not troops.

The consequences of stay-the-course are real. Just yesterday, President Bush exhorted our allies to help us, not in Iraq, in Afghanistan. The U.S. is sending more troops and billions of dollars more. His words were telling yesterday. Quote, ''The Taliban and al Qaeda are preparing to launch new attacks.'' New attacks. ''Our strategy is not to be on the defensive but to go on the offensive.'' 1,985 days since the 9/11 attacks, and Usama bin Laden remains free, and we hope to go on the offensive in Afghanistan.

Americans deserve to hear the truth and the consequences, not slogans. ''Mission accomplished'' wasn't true. ''Stay the course'' didn't work. And this new Congress will not be paralyzed by those who argue that we must stay the course in Iraq to support the troops. The troops didn't chart this course, the troops didn't ask to be plunged into the middle of a civil war, and the troops didn't under-man and under-equip.

It is time that the buck for the debacle in Iraq stops where it belongs: Here in Washington, D.C. And if the President won't accept that reality, then guess what? This new Congress, this new Democratic leadership is prepared to stop the buck here.

This is a debate we must have. This is a debate about us. Us, those of us here in this Chamber. Will we lead? Will we be responsible overseers of this war? Will we heed the call of the American people?

Today, with this vote, Mr. Speaker, we will tell our troops, our generals, our beloved people: We hear you loud and clear. It is time for a new direction in Iraq.

□ 0945

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with mixed emotions. I am proud of our troops and the sacrifices they have made in Iraq, their dedication, their perseverance and the love and support of their families here at home. I am disappointed that the strategies employed thus far have not been more successful and that our progress in Iraq has been too slow, and I am saddened that those who have drafted this resolution are offering no alternatives of their own for our mission in Iraq. Indeed, they are prohibiting consideration in this Chamber of any alternative.

Therefore, I will vote against this resolution.

I believe most Americans share the same goal for Iraq, a stable government that can serve its people, a strong security force that can protect its people, and a growing economy that can encourage prosperity for its people.

We want the Iraqis to succeed, and we want our troops to come home. There is no question and no denying that mistakes in the planning and execution of the war have led us to where we are today. Hindsight is 20/20, and we can all offer suggestions for how things should have been done differently, done better, done more effectively during the past 4 years.

But that is not what is going on in this Chamber here today. Members are being cynically asked to vote on a resolution that does not address victory or success. It does not offer a pathway toward the peace and the prosperity that are vital to the region. It simply plays politics with the war and, in so doing, does our troops and their families here at home a terrible disservice.

While no one in this Chamber or any general in uniform can guarantee the success of this new initiative in Iraq, we can safely say that not pursuing it and continuing the status quo will lead to failure. Iraq then likely would fall into further chaos and transform itself, much as Afghanistan did a decade ago, into a breeding ground for terrorists, who plot attacks not on our troops in Iraq but upon our civilians here at home.

Make no mistake, failure of the U.S. mission in Iraq will not end the war. It will only shift the battlefield. The terrorists are at war with us, whether we fight back or not.

The consequences of failure in Iraq would be as dramatic as the fruits of victory. An Iraqi government stable enough to take the lead role in providing for its own internal security will allow us to achieve our collective goal, the return of U.S. troops. Rather than being allied with terrorists, Iraq would be an ally with America and the war on terror. In so doing, it would honor the more than 3,000 American men and women who have died fighting for its freedom and countless more who have been wounded and will bear for their lifetimes the scars of battle.

The status quo in Iraq is unacceptable. We need a new strategy, new tactics, new commanders on the ground, and a new and sustained commitment from the Iraqi government that they will do more of their share.

We know that the road ahead will be difficult and that the prospects for success are dwindling. But I believe a renewed and amplified effort by U.S. forces and Iraqi troops to retain security in Baghdad may offer the best hope we have for the lasting success of the U.S. mission and for the future stability of Iraq's government. It may also be, I believe, our last chance for victory. The President knows this, and I believe the Iraqi government and its people know this, too.

It is in that spirit and with that understanding that I will vote against this resolution. Our collective prayer is for the safety of our troops, for their success, and that they will be reunited with their families here at home as soon as possible.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I love America. America means something to me. No one loves the Constitution more than I. No one believes in the Declaration of Independence more than I. No one respects the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance more than I. No one appreciates the American soldier more than I.

So I stand here today in the well of the United States House of Representatives as a proud American who understands that it is not the Constitution that gives us or protects government of the people, by the people, for the people. It is not the Declaration of Independence that preserves the concept of all persons being created equal. It is the soldier.

It is not the Pledge of Allegiance that preserves liberty and justice for all. It is the soldier. It is the soldier who shields those who would make real the great American ideals. Regardless as to how we feel about the war, we should all thank God for the American soldier.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers have done their job. More than 84,000 National Guard and Reservists have been deployed more than once since 2001. More than 170,000 soldiers in the Army have served more than one tour of duty. More than 23,000 soldiers have been wounded, and more than 2,200 of these from Texas were from Texas alone. More than 3,100 soldiers have died, including more than 200 from Texas.

Our soldiers have liberated Iraq from a ruthless, brutal dictator. Our soldiers have answered the clarion call for help for which too many will never come home for the holidays and far too many will never see home again.

So for this I say, God bless the American soldiers, their friends, their families, and their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been that friend, indeed, in Iraq's time of need. In addition to blood, sweat and tears, the American people have spent more than $267 million, not per year, not per month not per week, but more than $267 million per day on this war.

Mr. Speaker, with this money, according to CNN and the National Priorities Project, we could have hired 6.4 million public school teachers. We could have built 3.3 million public housing units. We could have insured 220 million children for 1 year.

On a more lofty level, America has helped the Iraqi people develop a constitution. We have helped the Iraqi people establish democratic elections. We have helped the Iraqis reconstitute their military and overhaul their constabulary.

Mr. Speaker, after all that we have done, more than 23,000 wounded. After all that we have done, 3,100 are dead. After all that we have done, more than $267 million per day. After all that we have done, whenever we leave, it will not be cut and run. We have helped the Iraqi people to have the opportunity to embrace freedom and democracy.

It is now time for the Iraqi people to seize upon this precious, priceless opportunity and have a free and independent Iraq, something that all the money in the world cannot buy and not even the most powerful military in the universe can impose.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot want liberty and justice for all Iraqis more than all Iraqis want liberty and justice for themselves.

If the Iraqis want government of the people, by the people, for the people, then their soldiers, not ours, must provide it. We can stay in Iraq forever and never have a free and independent Iraq, not as long as the Iraqi people engage in an uncivil war with each other. You can debate whether it is a civil war or not, but there is no debating that it is an uncivil war that they are having with each other.

Mr. Speaker, because I support our soldiers and oppose the President's policies, I will vote for the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution condemning the President's proposal for achieving success in Iraq and overall victory in the global war on terror. We are not formulating policy today. We are not offering the President an alternative. All this resolution is saying is that we do not support our Commander in Chief, and all it is doing is emboldening the terrorist enemies we are facing today.

I am the first to welcome an open discussion about our involvement in Iraq. But, without the opportunity to consider an alternative, this is not open discussion. Why isn't this an open discussion? Because although the majority party has the authority to govern, they have no plan to lead.

For over a year, the majority party criticized the President for not making changes in his strategy in Iraq. Well, the President has made changes, and the majority party still is not satisfied.

We can all agree that our progress has not been as swift and decisive as we once hoped. We all recognize that the war in Iraq has carried on longer than we wanted and consumed more resources than we expected. However, we all knew from the beginning that it would not be easy, that the war against terror would not be a quick fight.

But when the going gets tough, it does not mean that we should give in and come home. As we cannot and must not turn back, we need a fresh approach to move forward. The President, along with his generals on the ground, have proposed a way forward. He has put forth a strategy to suppress the sectarian violence in Iraq and allow democratic reforms to take hold and economic institutions to flourish.

His plan is the only plan that provides for a way forward in Iraq. For us in Congress, it is not our job to become involved in tactical decisions that will lead to success in our mission. It is our responsibility to help shape the parameters of the mission and to conduct oversight on our progress in achieving the mission.

Republicans in Congress have proposed setting verifiable benchmarks with which we may measure our progress in Iraq. Such benchmarks will help us hold the Iraqi regime responsible for the progress made towards democracy, stability and peace in the country. We should be discussing our responsibility as oversight today, but we are not. We are left with debate on an empty and nonbinding resolution.

I am a proud cosponsor of Congressman SAM JOHNSON's bill to ensure that funding is not cut off or restricted for members of the Armed Forces deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan. We must support every effort in our fight against terrorists. If the majority allowed us an opportunity, I would have gladly supported a vote on that bill to reaffirm that the House will not abandon our Armed Forces under any circumstance.

Whether the majority would like to acknowledge it or not, the fight we are engaged in against terrorists in Iraq is not a new fight. It has been waged for a decade. We have faced terrorists in Beirut, we have faced terrorists in Saudi Arabia, and we have faced terrorists here on our own soil on September 11, 2001.

We have learned it is absolutely essential to confront terrorists abroad before they attack us at home. Despite what some of you may say, our withdrawal will not end the terrorist threat. After all, it is they who have declared Iraq to be the central front in the struggle.

We cannot withdraw. We cannot send our troops and other allies the message that we will quit when the going gets tough. Instead, we must move forward with the operations in Iraq, with the Iraqi people, to ensure that peace and stability take hold. We must change our strategy as the situation in the field dictates. To do otherwise would be foolish.

But by maintaining our commitment in Iraq, we preserve the prospects of peace. By withdrawing, we surrender our chances of permanent stability in the Middle East.

This resolution in so many words says that we cannot be successful, and we are bound to fail. I refuse to agree. I refuse to undercut the brave work of our troops by questioning their abilities and refuse to allow terrorists to flourish and our enemies be emboldened and thereby let you, the American people, down.

Our brave men and women risk their lives to provide peace and security here at home, and we are all proud to know such patriots. These young men and women, full of promise, voluntarily defend our Nation wherever they are called.

It reminds me of a young man in my district, and I presented him with his Eagle Scout awards when he was 17 years old. It was in 2003. A little less than 2 years later than that, in 2004, I attended the funeral for Lance Corporal Abraham Simpson, who made the ultimate sacrifice in Fallujah. He was just 19 years old.

When I went to the parents of Abraham and presented a flag that was flown over our great Nation after the funeral, it was honestly one of the most moving experiences I have had, not only in my congressional career but of my life. When I looked at Abraham's father in his car, I couldn't talk. All I could say to him was, ''I voted to send him there.'' Abraham's dad looked me square in the eye, with as serious a look as he could get, and he said, ''Congressman, it was the right vote.''

Like so many families across our country, the Simpson family has made a great sacrifice for our Nation. This resolution, however, says that the world, that the men and women like Lance Corporal Simpson, gave their lives for, was worthless, that America cannot be successful in the pursuit of which they nobly sacrificed themselves. I believe that we can. I know that if we stand firm in our principles and remain true to our convictions, we can succeed.

For that reason, I am going to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

I rise today in opposition to this resolution condemning the President's proposal for achieving success in Iraq and overall victory in the Global War on Terror.

FLAWED PROCESS

I know I join many of my colleagues in lamenting the process by which we are considering this resolution. We are not formulating policy; we are not offering the President an alternative. All this resolution is saying is that we do not support our Commander in Chief and all it is doing is emboldening our terrorist enemies.

While the valiant men and women of our Armed Forces are fighting for freedom abroad, the majority party has cut off democracy here in the House of Representatives so that we may consider a partisan resolution.

I am the first to welcome an open discussion about our involvement in Iraq, but without the opportunity to consider alternatives, this is not an open discussion. And why is there no open discussion? Because although the majority party has the authority to govern, they have no plan to lead.

For over a year, the majority party criticized the President for not making changes to his strategy in Iraq. Well, the President has made

changes, and the majority party is still not satisfied. Today, the majority party still opposes the President's strategy, but they have not offered any alternatives. They continue to criticize—destructively and not constructively.

WINNING THE WAR IN IRAQ

We can all agree that our progress has not been as swift or as decisive as we once hoped. We all recognize that the war in Iraq has carried on longer than we wanted and consumed more resources than we first thought.

However, we all knew from the beginning that it would not be easy—that the war against terror is not something that would be a quick fight, but that it would take years. As history has taught us, war is not an easy prospect and sometimes does not go according to plan.

But when the going gets tough, this does not mean that we should give in and come home. That is not the American way—that is not how America honors its commitments and carries out its obligations. And it is not how America pays respect to those who have fallen in its service.

As we cannot—and must not—turn back, we need a fresh approach to move forward. The President, along with his generals on the ground, has proposed a way forward. He has put forth a strategy to suppress the sectarian violence in Iraq to allow democratic reforms to take hold and economic institutions to flourish.

His plan is the only plan that provides for a way forward in Iraq. While the majority party proposes to stand still and do nothing, the President's plan aims to allow American forces to stand down as the Iraqi people stand up.

For us in Congress, it is not our job to become involved in the tactical decisions that will lead to success in our mission. It is our responsibility to help shape the parameters of our mission and to conduct oversight on our progress in achieving the mission.

Republicans in Congress have proposed setting verifiable benchmarks with which we may measure our progress in Iraq. These strategic benchmarks, concerning the transfer of military operations to Iraqi-led units, the development of democratic institutions and the rule of law in Iraq, and increased regional cooperation and stabilization, are important in moving forward in Iraq. Such benchmarks will help us hold the Iraqi regime responsible for the progress made toward democracy, stability, and peace in their country.

There is, however, no attempt at oversight in this resolution. Once again, all the majority party is doing is complaining without providing an alternative. We should be discussing our responsibility at oversight today. But we are not. We are left with debate on this empty and nonbinding resolution.

TROOP SUPPORT AND FUNDING

No matter what, we must support funding for our troops that are serving in harm's way—with no ifs, ands, or buts. I am a proud cosponsor of Congressman SAM JOHNSON'S bill to ensure funding is not cut off or restricted for members of the Armed Forces deployed in Iraq or Afghanistan. We must support every effort in our fight against terrorists.

If the majority allowed us the opportunity, I would have gladly supported a vote on this bill to reaffirm to our troops, our constituents, and our enemies that the House will not abandon our Armed Forces—under any circumstances. Unfortunately, Republican voices were shut out of this process and we are left to consider this empty and non-binding resolution.

CONSEQUENCES OF WITHDRAWAL

All we heard on this floor for the last year was talk about bipartisanship and cooperation. The talk was about the need to be more bipartisan. Boy, we sure do have short memories. Despite the partisan atmosphere here in the House, the fact is that we have to be successful in Iraq because the consequences of our withdrawal would be disastrous.

Whether the majority would like to acknowledge it or not, the fight we are engaged in against terrorists in Iraq is not a new fight—it has been waged for decades. We have faced terrorists in Beirut. We have faced terrorists in Saudi Arabia. And we have faced terrorists on our own soil—on September 11, 2001. We have learned that it is absolutely essential to confront terrorists abroad before they may attack us at home.

If we withdraw from Iraq, we give our terrorist enemies—and they are our enemies—a safe haven from which to plan their attacks against us and our allies. Despite what some of you may say, our withdrawal will not end the terrorist threat. After all, it is they who have declared Iraq to be the central front in this struggle. If we withdraw, it will only encourage the terrorists. They will not rest until their agenda of violence and hatred is advanced worldwide. We cannot withdraw. We cannot send our troops and our allies the message that we will quit when the going gets tough.

Instead, we must move forward with operations in Iraq—with the Iraqi people—to ensure that peace and stability take hold. We must change our strategy as the situation in the field dictates. To do otherwise would be foolish. But by maintaining our commitment to Iraq, we preserve the prospects of peace. By withdrawing, we surrender our chances for permanent stability in the Middle East.

CONCLUSION

The United States has a long and proud history of championing liberty. As a Civil War history enthusiast, I am reminded of the parallels between this generation's fight against terrorism and the Civil War. Both wars brought new and grave challenges to our people and our way of life. Both struggles were fraught with opposition in the press and in Congress. But imagine what would have happened to our nation if President Lincoln did not continue the fight to preserve our union.

Just as Lincoln fought against all odds and in the face of grave danger to ensure freedom for all people and to preserve democracy, our troops are doing the same today. Just as Lincoln was successful by standing firm in his commitment to liberty and democracy, I strongly believe that we can—and will—be successful in Iraq if we are to ensure our freedom for the future.

This resolution, in so many words, says that we cannot be successful—that we are bound to fail. I refuse to agree. I refuse to undercut the bravel work of our troops by questioning their abilities. I refuse to abandon our Iraqi allies when they need us the most. And I refuse to allow terrorism to flourish and our enemies to be emboldened and thereby let you, the American people, down.

Instead, we must go forward. We must continue to support our troops and their important work in Iraq. We must tell them loudly and clearly that the American people stand with them as they fight to bring liberty and security to Iraq.

Most importantly, we must honor our troops and the memory of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom by rejecting this empty resolution. These brave men and women risk their lives to provide peace and security here at home and we are all proud to know such patriots.

As members of Congress, we all understand the responsibility we have when our nation calls our best and brightest to serve in harm's way. These young men and women, full of promise, voluntarily defend our nation wherever they are called.

One such brave young man from my district was Marine Lance Corporal Abraham Simpson from Chino, California. In early 2003, I presented Abraham with his Eagle Scout award to recognize his achievement of the Boy Scouts' highest rank. A little less than two years later, in November 2004, Lance Corporal Simpson made the ultimate sacrifice during the Battle of Fallujah. He was just 19 years old.

When I presented his parents with a flag flown over the Capitol of this great Nation, it was one of the most moving moments not only of my congressional career, but of my life. All I could say to Abraham's father was, ''I voted to send him there.'' He looked me square in the eyes and he said, ''Congressman, it was the right vote.''

To honor his cousin's sacrifice, Marine Sergeant Jonathan Simpson, who had originally joined the Marines as a flight navigator, asked to be transferred so he could fight on the front lines. Jonathan Simpson was killed during combat operations in Iraq in October 2006.

Abraham and Jonathan Simpson, true American heroes, gave their lives in service to this Nation, and for that—and for all of our fallen heroes—I will always be humbled and grateful. Like so many other families across our country, the Simpson family has made a great sacrifice for our Nation, our ideals, and our freedom.

This resolution, however, says to the world that men and women like Lance Corporal Simpson and Sergeant Simpson gave their lives for naught—that America cannot be successful in the pursuit for which they nobly sacrificed. I believe we can. I know if we stand firm in our principles and remain true to our convictions we can succeed.

For this reason, I wholeheartedly oppose this empty resolution and strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1000

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of debate time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from California has 14 minutes remaining.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there are two fundamental questions we face in voting on this resolution: First, is it appropriate for Congress to express its views on the escalation of U.S. troops in Iraq? And second, is the escalation the best use of military forces in our war on terrorism?

First let me say that it is wrong for anyone in this debate to question the

patriotism of someone on the other side of that issue. That tactic was tried by Senator Joseph McCarthy in the 1950s. It was wrong then, it is wrong now.

In our democracy, there is nothing patriotic about questioning the patriotism of someone with an opposing view. We all love our country; we all support our troops; and we all want to defend America from terrorism.

On the appropriateness of this resolution being before the House, I believe this debate is consistent with our Founding Fathers' deep commitment to the constitutional checks and balances of government. They chose to make the President our Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. At the same time, they chose not to give the President the authority to declare war or to fund a war. Those solemn responsibilities were given to the Congress in article I of the Constitution.

It is noteworthy that on the most solemn act of government, to put citizens into harm's way, our Founding Fathers clearly chose to put in place constitutional checks and balances on the executive branch. This resolution is a proper exercise of that constitutional principle, especially given this war has now lasted longer than America's involvement in World War II, with no end in sight. Blind allegiance to the executive branch is not a constitutional principle.

The second question before us is whether the escalation in Iraq is the best use of U.S. military forces in our war on terrorism.

After nearly 4 years of combat, two facts are indisputable: First, our service men and women have served our Nation with courage and professionalism. They and their families have sacrificed above and beyond the call of duty, and I salute them.

Second; there have been major mistakes made by policymakers in Washington that have complicated at every step the challenges our troops have faced in Iraq, dead wrong intelligence on weapons of mass destruction and Iraq's involvement with September 11; rejecting General Shinseki's call to send an adequate amount of troops to Iraq in 2003, the disbanding of the Iraqi Army, the de-Baathification process, inadequate armor for our troops; and the repeated assertion that the insurgency was on its last leg, despite facts to the contrary.

Given mistakes made in the build-up to this war and its management, and the enormity of this issue in terms of lives at risk and our Nation's future, it is time for Congress to give a voice to the clear majority of the American people who oppose escalation in Iraq.

Since the President has already started the escalation, I personally hope and pray that he is right, and that more U.S. troops in Iraq will lead to long-term stability there. However, in good conscience, I must express my profound concerns for this policy for several reasons.

First; I believe until the Iraqi government creates a government that is respected by Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds, no amount of U.S. forces can stop sectarian violence there in the long run.

Second; I want U.S. forces fighting terrorists, not standing on street corners in Baghdad as target practice for Sunnis and Shiites locked into deep-rooted sectarian violence.

Third; I believe it is necessary to send a blunt wake-up call to the Iraqi political leaders that America has sacrificed our sons and daughters and hundreds of billions of dollars for their nation, but we will not do so forever for an incompetent government that is rife with corruption and sectarian bias. This is not a test of America's will, rather, it is a test of the Iraqi government's will to make the tough choices to ensure its nation's own future.

Fourth; with the increasingly serious situation in Afghanistan, where al Qaeda and the Taliban are resurging, we will definitely need additional U.S. troops there to prevent the kind of chaos that is rampant in Iraq.

For these reasons I believe this resolution is the appropriate and the right thing to do. This resolution will send an unequivocal message to the Iraqi political leaders that the time to end their corruption, their incompetence, and sectarian favoritism is over. When that message is truly heard, then and only then will there be real hope for stable and lasting peace in Iraq.

I urge support of this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution. I oppose the resolution not for what it says, but for what it does and what it will lead to.

As someone who enlisted at the age of 18 and spent 6 years as a member of the Air National Guard, I can tell you firsthand that this resolution will undermine our troops' morale and diminish their ability to accomplish their mission.

Passage of this resolution is also a first step towards cutting funding for our troops, and that is something that I absolutely cannot support.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is an important part of the global war on terror. Failure in Iraq will go beyond being a disaster for American foreign policy. Failure would destabilize the country, destabilize the Middle East, and make America less safe.

The American people are well aware of al Qaeda's plans to turn Iraq into a staging area to spread global terrorism. Failure in Iraq would also result in diminished influence and credibility for America at a time when global alliances are critical to address threats from Iran and North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, this week I have been briefed by the U.S. intelligence officers, foreign ambassadors from the region, and I have reached out to many of my constituents, including Colonel John Saputo, who served in Iraq, and Colonel Lee Kitchen, who served in Vietnam. We all agree that although legitimate questions can be raised about whether this surge strategy will prove successful, the stakes are too high, the threats to America too great to walk away without giving our troops one last chance to restore order in Iraq. Passage of this resolution would deny our military leaders and our troops this one last opportunity.

Like all Americans, I want to bring our troops home safely, successfully and soon, but now is not the time for an immediate withdrawal. Now is the time to support our troops, support the values they fight for, and do everything possible to give them the best chance to succeed in their mission. This resolution does nothing to help in those efforts. In fact, it does the opposite. It is for this reason that I must oppose this resolution.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 157, and as the designee of the majority leader, I demand that the time for debate be enlarged by 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the leaders or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, that will be the order.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am honored to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this week on the floor, the House will provide our Nation with a clear, unambiguous answer to the most important question facing the country: Will this body side with the President's approach to the war in Iraq, or will we demand change?

Since Tuesday we have been debating President Bush's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. It is a debate that was long overdue and one which the American people and our troops risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan deserve.

The simple reality is that two-thirds of the American public, including myself, do not trust the President's judgment when it comes to the war. It is a conflict that has been defined by mismanagement and misinformation since it began, and the results have been devastating for the Iraqi people and for our men and women in uniform.

We know that top administration officials, men like Douglas Feith, abused the public trust and misused the work of the intelligence community when making the case for the war. Since then, every piece of evidence suggests that the strategy employed by this administration has failed in Iraq. Sectarian strife in Iraq has not abated, with routine bombings that kill dozens of civilians daily. The unemployment rate in Iraq is as high as 25 percent and 40 percent. Baghdad has only a few hours of electricity per day.

Our troops have continued to pay the price of being caught in the middle of

another nation's civil war. 84 troops were killed last month, 48 more have been killed already this month.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, corruption, fraud and lack of oversight have haunted every aspect of our involvement in Iraq. Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, has uncovered $10 billion in reconstruction funding that simply disappeared once it was sent overseas. Projects critical to the rebuilding and stabilization of Iraq society have been handed out to private firms, using no-bid contracts, firms that failed to live up to their responsibilities.

To cite one example, the construction of a new Baghdad police college to train Iraqi security officers, a $75 million project of vital importance to stability, was completely undermined by a private construction company. The work was so shoddy that the classrooms it built posed a health risk to the students and had to be abandoned. That same fraud and lack of oversight for years have posed mortal risk to our soldiers.

In January of 2006, we learned that 80 percent of the U.S. Marines who had died of upper body wounds in Iraq would have lived if they had had the proper armor. A Pentagon report released last month stated once again that our troops have been sent into battle time and time again without proper armor equipment, a reality which still exists today.

This simply hasn't been a case of going to war with the army you have, as Mr. Rumsfeld said. We have faced these shortages in part because the Pentagon contracts were given to companies who weren't up to the job and couldn't meet the demands of the conflict.

A legitimate question might be, are we funding the troops or are we funding crooked contractors and Iraqi government officials? Hundreds of dollars have simply disappeared. These are borrowed dollars, ladies and gentlemen, mainly from China.

My friends on the other side of the aisle made two arguments against the resolution. They have told us that to condemn the President's surge means that this Congress is giving up in Iraq, and they told us that we cannot support the troops without supporting their mission.

Our troops have done their job in Iraq and they have risked their lives countless times, but now they are being asked to do something that no army can do, find a military solution to a political problem. If the mission we have given our brave soldiers is the wrong one, and the past 4 years prove that it is, why would we help our enemies by refusing to change course? If that mission is the wrong one, how is supporting the mission that is wrong supporting the troops? If the mission is the wrong one, then how is demanding a change giving up? Giving up means just the opposite, it means insisting on a continuing failing strategy.

This escalation of the war is the same failed strategy, all it will do is put more and more of our young men and women in harm's way. That reality has led it to be opposed by a bipartisan majority in this House. A Republican Representative recently said, ''This is not a fresh approach, it is just more of the same.''

The plan has been publicly opposed by numerous high-ranking generals, such as General John Abizaid, General Colin Powell and General James T. Conway, the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He recently said that the Joint Chiefs ''do not believe that just adding numbers for the sake of adding numbers, just thickening the mix, is the necessary way to go.''

We need to stop this escalation and change what we are doing in Iraq. We need to promote a political solution and a diplomatic solution to the problems.

I urge the passage of this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to Mr. FOSSELLA, who represents the families of multiple victims of the 9/11 attacks on our Nation.

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. I thank the lady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is whether the front line in the war on terrorism moves from Baghdad back to America.

Although this resolution is nonbinding, the message it sends to our troops on the battlefield and to our enemies is crystal clear. Our words have consequences, as powerful as our actions. We must choose them carefully, for they are being listened to all over the world. And the words this Congress speaks today will send a message to both our allies and enemies about our resolve.

It is not a contradiction to support our warriors in battle and also to seek a lasting peace. That principle has guided us through tougher times than this. Indeed, it is America's gift from one generation to the next that we create a Nation that is stronger, freer, more prosperous, and more likely to enjoy God's world in peace.

To abdicate this responsibility for political expediency is a dereliction of duty and a sign of lost faith in the promise of America.

Throughout history, it has been proven that you cannot surrender the battlefield and still win the war. This war on terrorism was thrust upon us. America and other free nations were attacked by evil forces. To leave these forces unchecked would stoke the insatiable appetite of the beast. We know this because we have seen it before.

Regarding the fall of Cambodia, Henry Kissinger wrote:

Sirik Matak, who was the prime minister, was asked by then Ambassador John Dean if he would like to be evacuated, as the United States had just announced it was leaving. The prime minister responded, in part: Thank you for your offer to transport me towards freedom. I cannot, alas, leave in such a cowardly fashion.

□ 1015

As for your great country, I never believed for a moment that you have the sentiment of abandoning people which have chosen liberty. You have refused us your protection and we can do nothing about it. You leave, and my wish is that you and your country will find happiness under the sky. But mark it well, that if I shall die here on this spot and in my country that I love, it is no matter because we are all born and we must die. I have only committed this mistake in believing in you, the Americans.

The very next day the New York Times reported the evacuation with the following headline, ''Indochina Without Americans: For Most, a Better Life.''

As for the Prime Minister, he was shot; and it took him 3 days to die without medical help. Every other government official and their families were executed, and one to two million Cambodians were rousted from their homes and led to the slaughter like cattle.

Is this the fate we wish to leave millions of Iraqis who have tasted freedom after decades of oppression?

Is this the fate we wish for our allies and the leaders who are nurturing an infant democracy?

Is this the legacy we choose for our airmen and our soldiers and for those heroes who have fallen?

With an open mind I have spent hours this week listening to the debate. Like many Americans, I was willing to listen to new ideas and explore a new course in Iraq. But an opportunity was wasted, because all I have heard is no from the other side. I have not heard a plan, nor have I heard a strategy.

And let me be clear. It is not my place to question one's motivation or patriotism. But I can question judgment. This resolution is either an endorsement of the status quo or a clarion call of retreat, and neither is acceptable to me or to many in this Chamber.

Some now talk about a slow bleed strategy to cut off funding for our troops. I ask, if we surrender this battlefield, which battlefield will our enemy choose next? Will it be New York? Will it be Los Angeles? Will it be Washington, D.C.? Appeasement does not work. Just look back. The World Trade Center in 1993, Somalia, the Khobar Towers, Kenya and Tanzania, the USS *Cole* and, of course, September 11, 2001.

This copy of the Staten Island Advance, my local paper, shows the faces of some of the victims, 240 on this sheet alone. These are the people I knew, and they were the people who we promised, these 240 people who left 450

children without parents because they perished because evil people attacked this country. We made a promise to them that we will never let this happen again. I ask you, do we break that covenant? Do we surrender to the beast? To that I simply respond, no.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Fanaticism, George Santyana famously said, is ''redoubling your effort when you have forgotten your aim.''

Let us measure our efforts against our aims in Iraq. After great effort, Saddam is dead. After long effort, we have established there are no WMD. We have eliminated Iraq as a threat to its neighbors. We have achieved the President's Iraq war aims.

Why are we sending 21,000 more troops there, rather than redeploying all our troops out of Iraq? Because we have forgotten our aims. Now we referee a civil war between the peoples of Iraq. The President admitted as much in his State of the Union, saying ''This is not the war we entered but the war that we are in.''

The use of force resolution we passed in 2002 nowhere authorizes our participation in an Iraqi civil war. It has, therefore, expired. The President must come back to Congress for reauthorization if he wishes to war further in Iraq or to extend the war to Iran.

The fact that we are in a civil war is backed up by our own national intelligence estimate, as well as my conversations with soldiers who served, serve or who will serve in Iraq.

I share with you a typical comment: ''I joined the Army, and I will go as many times as they send me. But I will tell you what. These folks have been killing each other for 1,000 years. They are killing each other today and may kill each other for another thousand years. I just don't see what good we are doing there.''

This loyal soldier deserves our support and our protection.

JOHN MURTHA's efforts to craft an emergency supplemental appropriations bill to protect our troops is commendable. No soldier should be repeatedly deployed to Iraq without being rested, retrained and ready. To do so otherwise is an abuse of our citizen soldiers. It is a criminal dereliction of duty. It is an abuse of power.

The Constitution gives Congress the express power to regulate the military. We must exercise this responsibility and stop the abuse of our troops by building thoughtful guidelines into our defense appropriations bills.

Some want us to believe that we must either stand aside and let the President have his way or use the blunt axe of cutting off all funding for the Iraq war. Not true. Not only does the Constitution give to Congress, not the President, the power and responsibility to regulate the military, there is ample precedent to support Congress's authority in wartime.

In the 19th century, Congress went so far as to require President Andrew Johnson to obtain the signature of General Ulysses S. Grant to any of the President's military orders before it could become valid. The President obeyed.

President Truman was forced in the Youngstown Steel case to recognize that his powers as Commander in Chief were severely limited when they undermined congressional decisions. Even though a steel strike seriously affected our ability to fight the Korean war, the Commander in Chief could not act independently of Nation's laws.

President Bush needs to learn that we are a Nation of laws and that no one in America is above the law. He needs to listen to the American people. He should heed our professional military, rather than shop for a convenient opinion.

The American people understand the challenges in Iraq are political and that no amount of military force can retrieve the situation. Only the Iraqis can solve the problems of Iraq. Our staying merely delays their day of full responsibility, and that is why this Iraqi government asked us not to escalate until, like our own generals, they were browbeaten into submission by President Bush.

We must end this war with a minimum of domestic recrimination, a maximum of motive and opportunity for the many peoples of Iraq to solve their own problems without genocide, one last chance to win the war in Afghanistan, the last known mailing address of Osama bin Laden, and we must begin the long task of rebuilding America's foreign policy on its traditional bipartisan basis.

We must forsake fanaticism and never forget our national aims.

My colleagues, this President has never had the authorization from Congress to enter a civil war in Iraq. Our mission is done. Bring the troops home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 63.

This proposal sends a dangerous message to the terrorists in Iraq. It informs them that they have succeeded in dividing us, that they should continue training their fighters, rebuilding their resources, and then they should attack with their full force when we leave.

There is no denying the difficulty of our current situation in Iraq. Terrible fractures exist along ethnic and religious fault lines. The need to stabilize Baghdad has never been more apparent.

All these realities are reflected in the President's new way forward, which is much more than just an increase in troop strength.

On January 10, the President changed the strategy on how we will fight this war. The President has laid out in great detail a plan for the Iraqis to take a leading role in their own security, a plan to isolate violent extremism and protect Iraq's citizens, a plan to make room for political and economic progress.

Most importantly, though, this is a plan for victory, to stabilize Iraq, to secure Iraq's democratic future, and then to bring our troops home.

In testimony before the Senate Armed Forces committee, General David Petraeus, the commanding officer in Iraq, described the implementation of the President's plan, as ''a test of wills.''

General Petraeus confirmed that the congressional action against the President's new plan would only encourage our enemies. Today, the will of the House of Representatives is being put to the test.

Underpinning the resolution before us today are calls to defund our military in a time of war. This proposal most certainly does not pass the test of wills. Rather, it puts us on a path to defeat.

The expulsion of U.S. troops from Iraq is critical to al Qaeda's plan to spread their deadly jihad beyond September 11, 2001, beyond Iraq's borders, and into the greater Middle East and the rest of the world.

Failing to achieve victory in Iraq will roll back the clock in the war on terror, giving al Qaeda the opportunity to establish a base in the heart of the Arab world, a place to train, rebuild resources, and plot the demise of American citizens across the globe.

A rapid U.S. withdrawal would lead to chaos, sectarian genocide, and military intervention by Iraq's neighbors.

We can, as the President has proposed, pass the test of wills and implement our plan for victory. The alternative to the President's plan is to retreat from our objectives, setting the stage for regional conflict in which terrorist agitators like al Qaeda, Hamas and Hezbollah will thrive.

Radical Islamists have declared war on the United States. This is a harsh and striking reality. We did not choose to be put in the cross-hairs of terrorists, and yet we have been for decades.

We do have a choice, however, in whether or not we have the will to win this war. My choice is to provide for the safety of our citizens and the security of future generations. My choice is to oppose today's misguided and dangerous resolution. My choice is to vote ''no,'' and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in unwavering support of our troops. I support our troops who are stationed around the globe and, particularly, those stationed in harm's way in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. That is why I wholeheartedly support H. Con. Res. 63 which disapproves

of the President's decision to deploy more than 20,000 additional combat troops to Iraq, because support of our troops means I must vote to move them out of harm's way.

This 110th Congress debate marks the beginning of the end of the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq and a realignment of our strategy utilizing America's might against the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, we now know that nothing said in justification of this war was fact. It was all fiction created by this administration to justify the unjustifiable.

Our military service men and women are doing their duty. They have accomplished their mission. They have brought Saddam Hussein to justice. Remember, ''Mission Accomplished.''

This administration has distracted us from the real war on terror, the war with al Qaeda. When are we going to bring Osama bin Laden to justice?

In Afghanistan, U.S. Central Command General Tommy Franks, the war's operational commander, misjudged the interest of our Afghan allies. He ran the war from Tampa, with no commander on the ground above the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. The first Americans did not arrive until 3 days into the fighting.

It is noted that Osama bin Laden slipped through the cordon ostensibly placed around Tora Bora as U.S. aircraft began bombing on November 30, 2002. More precisely, bin Laden was in Tora Bora on November 26, 2002, spoke to his fighters about the fight being a holy war, then, as quickly as he had come, bin Laden vanished in the pine forest with four of his loyalists walking in the direction of Pakistan.

□ 1030

Bin Laden escaped somewhere between November 28 and November 30, 2002, in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, Department of Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said, ''He,'' meaning Osama bin Laden, ''doesn't have a lot of good options.'' Obviously, that was false.

Further, it was reported that the administration pays bin Laden no attention, and that is evidenced by the fact that official reports no longer identify Osama bin Laden as a threat. The administration anticipated that they would have bin Laden erased by September 11, 2002. They failed at that mission.

Again, the failure of this administration to get the job done, to secure our homeland, and to get the man who masterminded the attacks upon us and continues to recruit and train al Qaeda agents is parallel to the failures of the mission in Iraq. The administration did not plan to fail; they failed to plan.

I support the men and women who put their lives on the line for our liberty. I am indebted to them, the sacrifices that they have made, and that is why I support this resolution. We must redeploy and make preparations to leave Iraq today.

As the representative of the 11th District from New York, I and my constituents deeply resent the lies and deceptions thrust upon us to justify this war by creating a distraction away from homeland security we all require as an inalienable right. The fire that I witnessed that refused to die was stamped out by the resilience of New Yorkers, Americans who believe in our democracy and the ultimate victory of good over evil.

The question I have and the question of the people from New York and the rest of America wants answered is: When will Osama bin Laden be brought to justice?

Thanks to the failed policies of this administration, Iraq is now in the midst of a civil war. Due to the lies and deceptions, the civil war in Iraq is now raging. We must redeploy our troops now. Thus far, there are 135,544 troops deployed in Iraq today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), with whom I had the opportunity to visit his Pennsylvania troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the status quo in Iraq is unacceptable, and allowing our enemies to win is unacceptable, too. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this House Democrat leadership resolution, H. Con. Res. 63, for three specific reasons:

First, the language of the resolution is essentially meaningless. Its passage will place the Congress on the side of the status quo.

I heard the Speaker say a few days ago that it is time for a ''new direction'' in Iraq. But where is this ''new direction'' in this resolution? It doesn't demand that all the troops return home. It doesn't advise the President to send more troops or even to reassign or relocate one soldier who is in the field today. It simply states, in essence, the current plan is bad. That may be good politics for some in this Chamber, but it is highly irresponsible and is certainly no way to fight a war.

If Congress wants to be a true partner in this fight, we must offer clear guidance, not mere criticism of the Commander in Chief. Unfortunately, this resolution is irresponsibly silent on what the ''new direction'' ought to be.

The second reason to oppose this resolution is that it is fundamentally vague and ambiguous. By only saying that Congress opposes the President's troop surge proposal of January 10, the resolution does not differentiate between the positive aspects of what the President called for on that date and the more controversial elements as well.

For example, I continue to have a tremendous concern over the President's plan for increasing our military force level in Baghdad to fight the sectarian violence between the Sunni and Shi'a factions of the Iraqi population. With the current lack of commitment of some Iraqi security forces and police forces to deal effectively with this violence, I am not confident of success of this surge into Baghdad. Nonetheless, I do think the strategy is correct in calling for additional American troops to go to Anbar Province to fight al Qaeda terrorists in that part of Iraq and to add more troops along the Iraq-Iranian border to interdict the flow of arms and more terrorists.

But, unfortunately, again, this resolution does not differentiate between these critical elements of the President's strategy and, therefore, on its face is weak and flawed.

The third reason to oppose this resolution is that it serves to undercut the morale and the support of our fighting men and women at the very time they are carrying out their orders. The President's decision of January 10 is now being implemented. Our troops are already carrying out this mission in the field.

I know of no instance in our Nation's history when Congress has passed a resolution disapproving a mission while that mission is in progress in the field. Can any proponent of this resolution come to the floor and cite a case where Congress has undertaken this type of action while a mission is already under way?

Any politician, it seems to me, who openly disapproves of an ongoing mission in the field only undercuts troop spirit and morale as they move forward, and that clearly lends support to the aims and the goals of our enemies. But don't accept my view on this. Listen to Gary Kurpius, the National Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who states that this resolution debate is ''a major distraction to U.S. forces because it does nothing to improve the morale or strength of their resolve.''

So while I cannot support this resolution for these reasons, I do believe there is a ''new direction'' for us, as Republicans and Democrats, to unite behind and support. H. Con. Res. 45, introduced by Congressman FRANK WOLF, would declare Congress's support for the numerous recommendations of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, a distinguished group of Republicans and Democrats that have set forth a plan of action deserving of administration, congressional, and public support.

Included in the group's recommendation is the call to establish milestones of success for military training, government stability, national reconciliation, which would result in Iraqis taking control of their country and allowing our troops to withdraw; number two, to create an Iraq International Support Group to work with the Iraqi government to achieve these milestones; and, three, to focus U.S. assistance on training of Iraqi police forces and military personnel with the goal of completing the training by early 2008 so American troops can return home.

Contrary to the flawed, simplistic, and purely political resolution before us, the Wolf resolution offers clear, bipartisan, and nonpolitical direction for Congress to support and to promote in this very difficult time in our involvement in Iraq. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote down H. Con. Res. 63 and for the Democrat leadership in the House to immediately allow H. Con. Res. 45 to be voted in the full House. Because the status quo in Iraq is unacceptable and victory for our enemies is also unacceptable.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy at this time to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is concerned about victory for our enemies. Well, the victory for our enemies is made possible by our pursuing a failed policy.

We are creating an inevitable situation in which our country continues to lose prestige and support around the world. But, much more importantly, we are losing the precious lives of our young people; and tens of thousands have been injured.

I was over at Walter Reed. I met and visited with some of the wounded soldiers. And I will never forget the day I met Cassandra Bryant, 20 years old, who lost both her legs to an improvised explosive device in Iraq. She was in a mechanical unit that was supposedly nowhere near the front line, but, nonetheless, for the rest of her life, she will have to go without her legs. Her sacrifice on behalf of our country, if in the face of a national security threat, would be understandable, and she was prepared to even give more. But to sacrifice so much. Our young people have done it in a place in a war that we should have never fought, we should have never been in.

There was ample information and evidence that Saddam possessed no weapons of mass destruction. The international inspectors were forced out of the country when, first of all, they found none and they wanted to continue their work.

This administration rushed to judgment into a war in which we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars and in which over 3,000 young people have lost their lives. And in Philadelphia, for Mrs. Zappala and for Mrs. Jeff Coat and for other mothers and fathers who have lost their sons and daughters in Iraq, this war and this effort in Iraq, which some suggest if we would just prosecute it more vigorously would somehow overnight become a success, we need to look at the conduct of this war on behalf of our Armed Forces.

This administration has failed our troops on the ground on so many occasions. On one occasion, there was a shortage of bullets. On others, we have seen reports that they were not having access to enough long rifles. We know that they have never had, in the 4 years now, enough up-armored vehicles to be able to do their patrols. We have failed to provide the body armor and Kevlar vests that are necessary and in the quantities that are needed.

The embarrassment of the conduct of this war is only equal to the stupidity that took us to Iraq in the first place. And what we need to do is not just vote in support of this resolution but this Congress would do better if we would understand that our young men and women don't wear Democrat or Republican dog tags. They are sons and daughters of our country. They are precious. Their willingness to sacrifice on behalf of our Nation should not be taken for granted.

We should move to redeploy. Forget the question of an additional surge. Why would we want to have our young people in a situation where the only time the Sunnis and the Shiites stop killing each other is when they both are willing to turn their weapons against our young people?

We are in the middle of a civil war. Clearly, in the case of a civil war, the definition suggests that we are unwelcome visitors. We should redeploy.

And if there are needs, and I think there are, for peacekeeping and stabilization forces, we should ask some of our friendly Arab countries in the region to provide some of their troops. We provide over $1 billion a year to the Egyptian military, one of the largest in the world and the largest in the Arab world. They do joint training with our troops and have done so for decades. If there is a need for troops, let us get our young people out of the way. And since the President said we went there in part to stabilize the region for our friendly Arab neighbors, let them step forward now and secure the region.

Our young people have done the hard work. They have done the heavy lifting. They have died on the fields of battle in Iraq, and it is time for this Congress to act responsibly. Let us rise on this day and speak not just in symbol but in substance on behalf of the fighting men and women of the American military.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the vote today is very simple: Will America give up and walk away from the fight to preserve American civilization? Are we proud of our military and will we support them and protect them in time of war?

The people of Houston's District Seven are immensely proud of the men and women of our Armed Forces. We want our soldiers and their commanders and our Commander in Chief to know that we will always support them and to know that we will do our best to protect them, especially in time of war; and we thank them for keeping us safe and free from another terrorist attack for 1,985 days.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Houston's District Seven, I will vote no, to tell our enemies and our friends that Americans will never quit and Americans will never surrender in the fight to preserve, protect, and defend American freedom.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored at this time to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from the great State of California (Mr. WAXMAN), the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

□ 1045

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has mishandled the situation in Iraq from the very beginning.

It misled the country into a war based on false and misleading statements about the threat from Iraq.

It failed to plan for the aftermath of the military victory.

It assumed that we would be greeted as liberators, the occupation would be brief, and that Iraq would pay for its own reconstruction.

It sent our troops to battle with dangerous shortages in body armor and devices needed to defuse remote-controlled bombs.

It sent in too few troops to Iraq to provide security, leaving the Iraqi people to rely on their sectarian militias to give them some protection from the chaos.

It disbanded the Iraqi army and, through an anti-Baathists campaign, gave the Sunnis a sense that the U.S. was aiding the Shiites against them.

It refused to take on war profiteering, even as auditors, investigators and inspector generals unearthed massive graft, fraud and abuse by reconstruction contractors.

It alienated the Iraqi people with the shameful and criminal acts of Abu Ghraib prison.

What we now have in Iraq is a defeat. We cannot achieve the illusions of the Bush administration that we will be able to create a stable, unified, liberal democracy in Iraq that is pro-American. Instead, we have sectarian fighting, death squads and a destabilized Middle East that threatens to be engulfed by the nightmare that we have unleashed.

The administration's mistakes have weakened our fight against al Qaeda. In fact, the war has enhanced the group's terrorist recruitment. The planned escalation in Iraq will divert more troops, resources and attention from the pursuit of Osama bin Laden's operation in Afghanistan; and we have enhanced the influence of Iran, not just in Iraq but throughout the region.

The President proposes an escalation of a failed policy. The fighting now only prolongs our losses and blocks the way to a new strategy. We are trying now to mediate a civil war, which is impossible. Instead, we are being drawn into that civil war by trying to prop up

a government that, in the final analysis, cannot unite the country.

Politically, this administration has tied the faith of American soldiers to a Shi'a-dominated government that lacks the authority, the will and the manpower to stop the roving gangs and insurgent militias that have shattered Iraqi society. Instead of acknowledging these failures and embarking on a new course of action, the President gives us more of the same: Send more troops to Iraq.

We need to redefine our mission and our hopes for ''success.'' Our goal should be to try to stabilize the situation, stop the killing, contain the violence.

We cannot do it alone, and we cannot do it militarily. We must seek a diplomatic strategy with Iraq's neighbors and the international community.

Certainly, it will take more action than just the resolution before us to bring about the policy changes that we need. The Congress must stand ready to use the checks and balances necessary to extract ourselves from the morass we face in Iraq. We can do that through more oversight, but it is also time for Congress to use the appropriations process to end this war.

We should pass this resolution and make it clear to the President that we will not stand for more of the same.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking member of a subcommittee.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my concern about the Iraq resolution offered by my friends on the other side of the aisle is what impact it will have on our troops and our mission and its consequences on our mission. How can you say support our troops when you don't support sending in the people necessary to back them up to do the job that we sent them there to do to start with?

Let's be clear, Mr. Speaker, about who the real enemy is. We are at war with the Islamic jihadists. Jihadists have vowed to destroy America, the West and all sympathizers with democracy. We are at war for our very existence against jihadists who have vowed to enslave us with a fundamentalist philosophy that rejects all human rights.

The consequences of failure in Iraq are not just failure in Iraq. Iraq's stability has direct repercussions on Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel and all of the Middle East. If our efforts to bring peace and stability to Iraq are successful, we will accomplish a great deal. If not, if Iraq fails, it will provide Islamic jihadists with a sanctuary similar to the one we removed from Afghanistan, only the sanctuary in Iraq would be many times worse, as the terrorists would have access to billions of dollars of oil resources to carry out their evil plans. Such a sanctuary would threaten Europe and the United States.

If we are in support of our military men and women, we must support their mission against Islamic jihadists. The alternative is defeat in Iraq and a greater threat of attack here at home.

A defeat in Iraq would not just be a defeat for the United States. It would also set back any chance for peace and stability in the Middle East. It would empower terrorists to unleash greater sectarian violence, which would draw all of Iraq's neighbors into a Sunni versus Shi'a conflict for control of Iraq.

I am also concerned about the resolution because it does not offer any alternative whatsoever that could lead to a successful outcome for the United States in Iraq. All the resolution does is to criticize the President's plan to augment our existing force in Iraq by 21,000-plus troops.

The Democratic resolution offers no other plan. It does not address what should be the right strategy or the right tactics. In effect, and I think this is the real issue, it endorses the status quo in Iraq, a position that I certainly can't support, and I hear lots of those that are supporting this say they can't support either, but they are de facto supporting the status quo by supporting this resolution.

I look forward to the majority offering a comprehensive proposal that would set forth a specific course of action. Then we could have a real debate on the pros and cons of the Democratic plan versus the President's plan to secure Iraq and defeat the terrorists in that country. Unfortunately, the resolution before us fails to do this, and therefore I can't support it. It should be rejected.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, as this debate comes to a close, much has been said. Certainly not everything. The House is considering a resolution concerning the Iraq war. It expresses the unequivocal support of this body for the American troops serving in Iraq and for their families. This resolution expresses opposition to the President's planned surge, escalation, augmentation. Call it what you will. But, more than anything else, this resolution opposes the administration's deeper commitment to a fundamentally and deeply flawed military strategy.

The fact is that Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki lacks the authority or the will to confront Shi'a militias. To do so would result in a major confrontation with the militia leader Moqtada al-Sadr, without whom the Iraqi government has little support. These dangerous Iraqi alliances and compelling evidence of a strong Iranian alliance demonstrates how weak the National Unity Government is and how pathetically dependent we are on them for success in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve much better. Surging troop levels in Iraq was tried in 2004, 2005 and 2006. Each time, it failed to reduce violence and only served to inflame anti-American sentiment.

Under the President's plan, it is still the American troops that do most of the fighting and, regrettably, will do most of the dying. For any decent outcome in Iraq, the President has to be serious about setting and enforcing deadlines. The President needs to demand that Prime Minister Maliki stop protecting the militias and make clear there will be serious consequences if he continues to do so.

The problem in Iraq is the same as it was when the conflict started: American war planners never provided the resources to successfully create a vital and secure center from which a functioning society could evolve.

The history is clear. Modern Iraq was born out of a strong nationalist aspiration in the early 20th century. Shi'a, Sunni, Christians and Jews stood united against the British and peacefully created and coexisted in a new, ethnically diverse Iraq.

Then, Iraqis prayed at each other's mosques. Today, Shi'a and Sunni militias bomb each other's mosques with impunity. Last month, 70 college students were slaughtered by a car bomb in Baghdad. Iraqi weddings, funerals and schools are the regular targets of suicide bombers. These are called ''revenge killings.'' They are carried out in the name of destiny and in the name of God.

Where is the outrage? Where is the condemnation for these atrocities in the Arab Muslim community? Nowhere does the Koran talk about revenge killings, violence, hate or intolerance. The Koran describes the Prophet Muhammad as the Prophet of Mercy. At the core of Islamic belief is compassion, forgiveness and tolerance: To you your faith and to me mine.

Absent the real possibility of a functioning government, a functioning society, a functioning economy, the National Unity Government of Iraq cannot succeed because it lacks legitimacy in the very eyes of those it seeks to govern. Elections and forming governments are the symbols of democracy. Legitimacy in the eyes of the governed is the substance of democracy and that of free and open societies throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, I don't stand here as a partisan. I am an American, and I want my country to succeed. I want my President to succeed, regardless of party affiliation, regardless of who he or she may be.

The fact of the matter is, we have an obligation to tell the truth to the American people at every level, militarily and politically. This strategy, advanced and sustained by this administration, has been an abject failure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to express our appreciation to the brave men and women of our Armed Forces. I have met with our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan and our wounded soldiers in Walter Reed and Bethesda Naval Hospitals and the families of those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice defending our freedoms. We thank them for their unwavering commitment to our country and believe we owe it to them to have an open and honest debate regarding our next steps in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the war in Iraq has been challenging. We are fighting a war against terrorists and radical Islamic militants who are determined to kill as many Americans as possible. They believe that killing American soldiers will drive us out of Iraq and out of the Middle East, allowing radical terrorists free rein and a base to expand their influence around the world.

These are the same radical Islamic militants who bombed the World Trade Center in 1993, the Khobar Towers in 1996, the embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 and the USS *Cole* in 2000. We surely can't forget the slaughter of 3,000 innocent American citizens on our soil. And just last year a couple arrested in Britain planned to use their 6-month-old baby as a human bomb to destroy a civilian airliner over the Atlantic Ocean.

□ 1100

We must recognize that we are dealing with irrational, radical, maniacal monsters who will not respond to diplomatic niceties.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the vast majority of Americans do not support an immediate withdrawal from Iraq, just as they do not support a never-ending deployment of U.S. forces there. They want us, they expect us, to work together and with the President to find a way to win the war on terror while bringing our troops home as soon as possible.

We should be past the point of political posturing when it comes to Iraq. Yet this resolution is more of the same, once again placing politics over policy. Instead of encouraging substantive discussion on options in Iraq, the majority has once again shut us out of the process and refused to consider any alternative to their point of view. That is truly unfortunate because this nonbinding resolution does nothing to increase the accountability of the Iraqi government or provide for our troops or even propose a new course in Iraq.

We all agree that this administration has made mistakes in Iraq. Most harmful, I believe, has been the slow pace of training Iraq troops and security forces to take responsibility for their own country. Early lapses in this area are a principal reason why our troops remain in Iraq today.

But the administration has taken action to accelerate this training and better prepare Iraqi forces. So now it is time for the Iraqi government to demonstrate that it has the ability to confront the problems facing their country, both politically and militarily. That is why it is so important that we hold the Iraqi government accountable for what they say they are going to do and require them to take the lead in securing their Nation. The Iraqi government and the Iraqi people must recognize that they, not American troops, are responsible for the future of their country.

With that being said, we must continue to support our troops and commanders on the ground by giving them the resources they need to be successful. It would be a tragic mistake to cut off funding or limit support for our troops fighting against terrorists abroad. We also must be very careful about the message we send to our allies and our enemies and, most importantly, to our troops in the field who have performed with great courage.

The bipartisan Iraq Study Group has stated that it could support a shorter redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize Baghdad or to speed up the training and equipping mission, if the U.S. commander in Iraq determines that such steps would be effective, and that is a quote from the Iraq Study Group report. Well, General Petraeus says that it can be effective.

Clearly, the path forward must include military and political strategic benchmarks so that we are in a position to measure the progress and commitment of the Iraqi government, but we must also be willing to give our troops, who have sacrificed so much for our Nation, the opportunity and the resources to be successful and provide the short-term support needed to achieve increased stability in Iraq.

There are serious consequences to our national security if we fail in Iraq. Cutting off funding, limiting military options or pushing for immediate withdrawal will only make our future more dangerous. It is time to stop the politics, stop the games, stop the finger pointing, and do what is best for America. Let us put partisanship aside and discuss concrete plans on how we can defeat radical terrorists and protect our Nation from those who mean us great harm.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The Democratic side has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 157 and as the designee of the majority leader, I demand that the time for debate be enlarged by 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the leaders or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, that will be the order.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), a member of the Defense appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. ROTHMAN. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my deepest appreciation and gratitude to the men and women of our Armed Forces, to the families of those who have died, who have been wounded or are presently in harm's way.

My prayers and all of my efforts as a United States Congressman are devoted to ensuring the well-being and support of our military, as they fight to protect our Nation, to honoring their memories, and to helping them when they return to our country.

Mr. Speaker, after we deposed Saddam Hussein and removed him from power, it became clear to most Americans and most people around the world that so much of what our President had told us about Iraq was not true. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Saddam had no intention of sending Iraqi agents to slaughter Americans on our shores, and Saddam had precious little, if any, contact with foreign terrorists or anyone else who wanted to do harm to America.

Mr. Speaker, now after nearly 4 years and the death of more than 3,100 American servicemen and -women, after more than 23,000 American men and women have been wounded, and after the United States has spent almost one-half a trillion U.S. taxpayer dollars in Iraq, I believe we have met our moral obligation to the people of Iraq.

We have given the Iraqi people an opportunity over nearly 4 years to decide whether they will live together with themselves in peace, neighbor to neighbor, Iraqi, Sunni, Shia and Kurd.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Iraqi people have not yet decided they want to live together with one another in Iraq in peace.

Our having our United States brave young men and women standing there, being shot at, being blown up is not encouraging the Iraqis to live together in peace. Not only are our troops dying and being wounded, but 80 percent of the Iraqi people say they want us to leave their country immediately.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush implies that al Qaeda will take over Iraq if we leave. In my opinion that is nonsense. Today, you have less than 1,500 al Qaeda in Iraq. Iraq has a population of 25 million people. Today, you have not only Iraqi Shiites killing al Qaeda Sunnis, you have Iraqi Sunnis killing al Qaeda Sunnis. They don't like foreigners in Iraq, whether they be Sunnis, and especially if they are al Qaeda or Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the only hope that our enemies have to destroy the United States is to have us remain bogged down in the swamp of the Iraqi civil war. Are we smart enough to pull ourselves out of that swamp of the Iraqi civil war? Or are we going to continue to allow our Nation to have our soldiers bled, our resources taken away,

our equipment destroyed, taking our attention away from the other military threats and realities in this very hostile world?

I believe that the United States' vital national interests will only be served if we withdraw all of our troops out of Iraq as quickly as possible for the safety of our troops being uppermost in our minds. Then we can leave several thousand in the region just in case. We can, more importantly, encourage the regional players, through diplomacy, to come together to help the Iraqis decide to live in peace.

Mr. Speaker, leaving Iraq's civil war will serve America's vital national interests by allowing us to rebuild what is now a depleted U.S. Army and U.S. Marines, a military that is not fully up to its strategic requirements to deal with all the possible threats in the world.

We need to refocus on Afghanistan and the resurgence of the Taliban. We need to be prepared militarily for the potential threats from North Korea, Iran and, yes, even the People's Republic of China.

It is also important that we take these resources that we have been spending in Iraq not only to rebuild our military but to spend the money here at home. There is al Qaeda in 60 Nations in the world. They have pledged to come to America and harm us; yet we have spent more money in Iraq since 9/11 than we have spent on our homeland security needs.

Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, that is the truth and that has to change.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for this resolution. Iran and Syria and Saudi Arabia have an interest in stabilizing Iraq. They will not permit the destruction of that country. They are afraid of refugees coming into their countries and destabilizing their Nation.

We need to vote for this resolution and withdraw from Iraq.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate all week, and I must say I admire the seriousness and the civility of most, if not all, of those who have come to this floor in this historic week to address the issue and express themselves on this resolution. But I rise respectfully to urge my colleagues in both parties to vote ''no'' on this no-confidence resolution.

I support the President's call for a surge of 21,500 forces in Baghdad because the President has not just asked for more troops for more troops' sake. Despite what has been said again and again on this floor, Mr. Speaker, this is a new strategy. It involves new tactics and new rules of engagement on the ground.

This surge of forces in Baghdad, designed to quell violence in that capital city and enable a political solution to take hold, was part and parcel of the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, which said, as Americans could see for themselves on page 74 of the Iraq Study Group, and as Chairman Lee Hamilton of Indiana said before the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Iraq Study Group concluded that a temporary surge, and they used the word ''surge,'' a temporary surge of forces in Baghdad would be acceptable to them to quell violence.

But while I must tell you that many of my colleagues have no confidence in the President's new way forward in Iraq, I say with respect, I have no confidence in the ability of Congress to conduct war. It was Napoleon Bonaparte who said hundreds of years ago, ''I would rather face 20 brilliant generals than one mediocre one.''

I would assure you today, Mr. Speaker, that our enemies would rather face 435 commanders in chief rather than one.

Our forefathers rejected war by committee when they enshrined the power to conduct war exclusively in Article II of the Constitution of the United States. In Article I, where this House finds its home, is the power to declare war. It is the power to appropriate funding and to set essentially military rules of conduct by statute. But the ability and the conduct of the war of the Commander in Chief is exclusively vested in the President of the United States, in that document upon which we all swear our oath of allegiance.

So I stand with our Commander in Chief, but also in a very profound sense, Mr. Speaker, I stand with the Constitution.

Vote ''no'' on this resolution and embrace our Constitution as written.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a chief deputy whip.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California, and I rise to thank our young men and women in our armed services and their families, those who have understood the sacrifices that they have made on behalf of our great Nation.

But Mr. Speaker, I also rise to speak out in strong opposition to President Bush's misguided escalation of troops in the Iraq War and to commend the Democratic leadership of this House for holding a real debate on our involvement in Iraq.

Since January 4, when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, the Democratic majority has delivered on its pledge of oversight and accountability of this war in Iraq, and Democrats have changed the direction of the discussion and have changed this war to lead us to the ultimate goal of all Americans, that is, to bring our troops home.

For too long, Congress has taken a backseat on the President's handling of this war, but this majority has held more hearings on Iraq than the Republican-controlled Congress did since this war began.

□ 1115

This debate is about not about trying to embarrass our President for political purposes. We are debating the escalation because the American people have demanded a change in direction. The President has failed to recognize the will of the people and many of the top military and foreign policy thinkers around the country who view this escalation with little hope of success.

Our constituents spoke with their voices loudly on Election Day, and they have been even more vocal since about the dissatisfaction with the way this war has been managed. Many in this country want to see a deescalation of America's forces, not the increase the President has proposed.

The President and his advisors created this problem, and it is now on the Congress to find a way to disengage Iraq without causing the country and the region to be engulfed in a further outbreak of violence.

In the last week, we have seen some of the most horrific bombings that cost the lives of hundreds of Iraqis and the downing of several U.S. helicopters. Over 3,000 of our young American men and women have lost their lives; tens and thousands have been physically and mentally maimed; and hundreds of Iraqi citizens, the vast majority of them trying to live normal lives, have been killed or injured.

This was not how this war was to be conducted.

Four years ago, when this President came to the Congress for authorization to invade Iraq, he stated that Iraq posed a clear and present danger. He talked about how invading Iraq was part of the greater war on terror and how, if Saddam Hussein was not toppled, he would attack our allies and maybe even on our own soil.

After seeing the death and destruction al Qaeda did to my city on 9/11 and to our Nation, I wanted to trust our President and all the President's men and women. When I sat across the table in the Roosevelt Room in the White House from Condoleezza Rice and then-CIA-Director George Tenet, I thought I could trust them. Because of them and the false intelligence they gave, I voted for authorization of this war.

As the only Member of this Congress to lose a relative on 9/11 and as someone who has lost 125 constituents to the attacks of the Twin Towers, I do believe that America must always act to defeat threats before those threats act against us.

As they say, in life, there are no do-overs; and if I could turn back time, I am sure that most of the Members of this House and most of my colleagues in this House would never have given this President this authority to wage this war in Iraq.

This war has cost us a fortune from our national treasury, a fortune in American lives lost and ruined, and a fortune in our ability as a Congress to trust our Commander in Chief and our President.

Today, we have an opportunity to stand as a group and to say what our constituents want us to say, to say what the Army generals want us to say, to say what many of them, those men and women in our Armed Services in uniform on the front line want us to say: ''Mr. President, adding more troops is not the answer. Adding more troops to fight what has become a civil war is not the answer.''

The answer is we need to start to begin to bring our troops home, reducing our presence in Iraq, and create the conditions for the Iraqi people themselves to stand up and secure their own country.

The Iraq Study Group set out a plan that many of us support, but the President continues to believe that history will judge him favorably.

As the Iraqi government attempts to clamp down on the Shi'a and Sunni militias, it has become abundantly clear these forces are not as strong as we have been led to believe, those being the Iraqi government's forces. I believe we need to look strongly on redeploying our troops in Iraq along the border and in the Kurdish north, removing American citizens from harm's way in Baghdad and Anbar Province, and forcing the Iraqis, both politically and militarily, to secure these areas. U.S. troops should only be used in an advisory role, not in direct combat.

Mr. Speaker, I have more to submit for the RECORD, but I want to send our young men and women home as soon as possible and an end to putting them in harm's way.

Only when the violence stops should the U.S. in small numbers work with Iraqi and multinational forces in keeping the peace, building the military infrastructure and securing long term stability.

Right now, with the exception of Great Britain and a few other countries we are doing all the work, taking all the risk, and losing our best and our brightest while the Iraqis lay waste to their country.

It is time for us to get back to our roots and be the beacon of freedom and democracy that we are.

We need to increase our conversations with the moderate Arab states and get them invested before Iraq, and possibly the whole region, is at war.

The focus should be making sure that countries like Iran and Saudi Arabia are not funding Sunni and Shia extremists, respectively.

Diplomacy is not the end all fix, but it is a start.

Whether or not my colleagues want to refer to the President's plan as a surge or escalation, I see it as a target on the backs of our armed forces.

This resolution clearly states that the House does not support the escalation, but we will not abandon the safety of our troops by cutting off the supplies they need for force protection.

I do not support this escalation.

Instead of bringing our troops home President Bush has decided to put even more of our overburdened arm forces in an increasingly sectarian bloodbath.

Our country has been asking for answers to why our men and women of the armed forces continue to die in Iraq and we have not received any answers.

Until these answers are forthcoming, I will not support the President's escalation and I wholeheartedly support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to my Florida colleague, Mr. STEARNS, a senior member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

And I want to have the opportunity to speak. I have spoken earlier on this debate, but I thought I would bring some simple common sense to my colleagues that perhaps was best brought forward by David Broder in the Washington Post. Now, David Broder obviously is more sympathetic to the Democratic point of view than they are to the Republicans, but I think he makes three points which I will also echo in my conversation today.

Basically, we are at the end of the debate, but we are all moving towards a decision most of us already have decided, but I have some simple common sense that I would bring to the attention of my colleagues.

When General Petraeus was unanimously supported by the Senate, it was with the idea that he would bring his new thoughts, his new strategy to this plan in Iraq. So don't you think, as members of this body, we should give General Petraeus an opportunity to implement his plan and not immediately come forward with a resolution that says that it is a disapproving of the decision to deploy more troops to Iraq?

When we deployed more troops for the Iraqi elections, why didn't you complain then? That happened twice before. We went up to almost 160,000. When we deployed more troops to ratify the Iraqi constitution, why didn't you complain back then? That went up to almost 160,000.

So now you are coming against a simple new strategy with the best we have in America who actually has written the manual on how to do it. You are not even willing to give him a chance. No breathing space. This nonbinding resolution shows your motives, which are to eventually reduce all funding for Iraq.

My third point is, you are so willing to do this, you are not even willing to look at what could happen with this new strategy. Let's say it works. Are you still going to offer these resolutions to cut off funds even though this strategy works and General Petraeus is successful? No matter what, you seem hell bent on reducing funds for Iraq. Yet we didn't hear any time before when we increased the surge for the Iraqi elections or for the ratification of the Iraqi constitution.

You know, in a way, Bush went to your retreat with a willingness to listen to your ideas. He is showing bipartisanship. In fact, he has a quote here which I think illustrates what the American people are saying. ''What really matters,'' quote, ''is what happens on the ground. I can talk all day long, but what really matters to the American people is to see progress.''

So he realizes also that he must show progress. And we are asking for this new strategy to have a chance, and we owe it to them.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New York, the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, first and foremost, to praise the courage, performance, and commitment of our troops stationed in Iraq and elsewhere. We are immensely grateful for their sacrifices.

Because of this war in Iraq, today the lives of the 135,000 military families are disrupted, and 125,000 civilian contractor families are divided. Nearly 4,000 U.S. soldiers and civilian contractors have already given their lives. We have lost over 140 young New York military men and women in Iraq.

I voted against this war from day one. It was a mistake then, and it is a mistake today. This week, we have a chance to act. Escalation is wrong, and we must take it upon ourselves to make things right by seeking a political solution to this war.

This administration's flawed foreign policy has damaged our relationship with our allies. The public opposes this war, Iraqis oppose this war, the world opposes this war, and this Congress should speak loudly against this war, too.

Our military has been stretched to the brink of breakdown. Our actions in Iraq have set back the war on terror and made problems in the Middle East much worse.

This war has distracted us from our responsibilities at home, too. Poverty is raging. Millions have lost their jobs and health insurance. Families struggle to pay for the cost of transportation, energy, and housing. Yet we choose to spend $8 billion of hard-earned money every month in Iraq, not at home.

While the cost of the war escalates, our most important social programs for our kids, the elderly, and the poor get slashed to pay for it. We have dug a deep hole of debt to finance this war in Iraq, and we will ask the children of working families to pay off that debt.

These priorities are misplaced. We should be investing in our children, not borrowing against their future.

Our young men and women return from Iraq with all sorts of health problems, both physical and psychological. The trauma of this war will affect the lives of our veterans forever. This resolution expresses our commitment to supporting our veterans' needs. We must honor the sacrifices that our veterans have made for this Nation. We must provide for them from the moment they get home to their families.

I believe this war is more wrong today than ever before. We must stand forcefully for what is right, for our troops, for the victims of this war, and for the priorities we are neglecting at home.

Let this body send the world a powerful message that the United States is changing course in Iraq. We must end this war.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise for the second time during this 36-hour marathon to strongly oppose this, I almost want to say, meaningless resolution, Mr. Speaker. But make no mistake about it, this is not a meaningless resolution. The consequences of failure in Iraq are drastic, and let me just read to you what some of those are.

Number one, collapse of a democratic Iraqi government, likely, very likely leading to mass killings and genocide in the nation.

Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups would use this defeat to boost recruitment. They would use Iraq as a staging ground for deadly attacks paid for with Iraqi oil revenue.

Iran and Syria would exert tremendous influence over the region. You think they are bad actors now, you just wait until this scenario plays out. And, indeed, and they have said that Israel would be pushed into the sea.

Mr. Speaker, the real Democratic plan is coming later. And if you don't believe me, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle just read a recent article this week in Roll Call. I am not going to stand up here and read it to the Members. You can read it.

But the Progressive Caucus of the House Democratic Conference, the Out of Iraq Caucus of the House Democratic Conference, led by Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. WATERS, basically say that this is just the first step. They say that in this op ed article. This resolution is not meaningless. It is the first step, my colleagues, toward cutting off funding for the troops and pulling the rug out from under them.

What does this say then to our brave fighting men and women who are trying to defend this country? We have heard over and over again from the other side that, ''Look, we can't afford this war anymore. It is costing too much in lives and money. We are making too big a commitment there, and we need to bring our troops home because some other conflict may break out in this world.''

Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues. What is more important than the current war? What indeed are we going to save our troops for? Working the rope lines at 4th of July parades, helping senior citizens cross the street? We have got to stop this and stop it now.

And listen to what the terrorists themselves say about the message that that would send. And this is a quote, Mr. Speaker, from bin Laden himself: ''Hostility toward America is a religious duty, and I am confident that Muslims will be able to end the legend of the so-called superpower that is America.''

His top deputy, bin Laden's deputy Zawahiri, says, ''The Jihad in Iraq requires several incremental goals. The first stage: Expel the Americans from Iraq.''

Make no mistake about this. What we are doing with this resolution is not a salute to GI Joe, it is a capitulation to Jihadist Joe.

□ 1130

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to my friend from California, the gentleman who is also the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for all of his hard work in struggling on this issue and our troops and force strength, Mr. Speaker.

But I rise in strong support of this bipartisan resolution regarding the Iraq war. I rise in strong support to this resolution to say to the President, no more. I rise in strong support of this resolution to say to the President, your policy is wrong. Yes, you have tried the surge before, and the surge has not brought peace to Iraq. It has not brought an end to the insurgency. It has not brought an end to the sectarian war that is going on in that country every day.

Yes, this is the fourth time that the President tried this policy, and it has not worked in any of those times. When we pass this bipartisan resolution, the President should pause. Because, at that moment, the President will not have the support of the United States House of Representatives; and, at that moment, the President will not have the superintendent of the people of the United States.

The President better think long and hard about he really believes that he should commit these troops, and continue to commit these troops, without the authority of the people, without the authority of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, American men and women have been fighting in Iraq, and they will soon begin their fifth year. In 5 years, they have done all that we have asked them. But what we have asked them to do cannot be accomplished by the military.

We have known for some time that Iraq now requires a political solution, and it requires the Iraqi government, the Iraqi people, the Iraqi society and the communities to take hold of their country and to decide whether they want a future of continued sectarian violence or whether they want an orderly society. They must make that decision.

The President has had it wrong for many, many months, for many years. He has continued to say that, as the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down. Mr. President, you have it wrong. As we begin to stand down, they will begin to stand up.

The fact that our military troops are on the streets of Baghdad and Anwar Province and elsewhere enables people to continue a level of violence that randomly and wantonly takes the lives of men, women and children, innocent bystanders, for almost no good reason at all, no good reason at all. It allows that to continue because each knows, if it gets out of control, the American troops will ride to the rescue, the helicopters will come, and the missiles will fly. We are the enablers of the continuation of this violence.

Once they have to take responsibility for their actions, once we leave, this is no longer an insurgency. This is crime on crime, Iraqi against Iraqi. Somebody has got to take the responsibility for that, and that will not be us. We will not be able to bring it to an end. The Iraqi government will be.

The time has come for our troops to leave. The time has come for us to understand that we cannot cure what is wrong in Iraq.

But for these troops that are there and for the troops that are being sent in spite of the will of the American people and the will of the Congress, we ought to understand that they should be fully equipped. We should not repeat the history of this administration in this deployment where men and women were sent into the theater without proper vehicle armor, without proper body armor, without proper interpreters and without proper training.

Many Members have come to this floor for many hours now and said, what is the message you are sending to your troops?

What was the message the Congress is sending?

What was the message this Congress sent to the troops when the President allowed them to go to war without enough troops to secure the peace?

What was the message this Congress sent when it allowed the troops to go to combat without proper vehicle armor?

What was the message that the Congress sent when it allowed our troops to go into combat without proper protective armor?

What was the message this Congress sent to the troops when it allowed this President to continue this failed course with no adjustment over the past 4 years?

And what was the message that we sent to the troops when it allowed the President to effectively draft American volunteers by continuing their tours, shortening their time at home, shortening their time with their families and sending them back without proper training, shortened training and without proper equipment?

We cannot do that to the troops. The message of this resolution is we are not going to do that. We are not going to do that. We will make a pledge to you that we will not let you fight and die forever with no plan to get you out, with no exit plan for you, with no change in the policy that has led tragically to so many deaths and so many wounded.

That is what this resolution is about. That is the message we must send to the troops, and that is the message we must send to the Iraqi people, that they must take responsibility.

This surge is not an election-day surge. This isn't a constitutional-day surge. This is a surge for the purpose, this is an escalation for the purposes of door-to-door combat, street by street, block by block, house by house.

Yet today we see General Schoomaker saying in the paper that these troops that are getting engaged in this up-close battle in the midst of the Iraqi people will not have enough interpreters. They will not have civil affairs soldiers. They will not have enough translators. So now we are putting them again where they are at greatest risk, and this Congress is agreeing to go forward and repeat history and put them at risk when it is not necessary.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. We have been discussing this now for days here in the House, but I want to tell you that I am opposed to this resolution, because it doesn't do anything.

I want to see our troops home, and I want to see our troops safe. I would venture to say that, with the exception of, maybe, Mr. MURTHA, I have seen and visited more wounded troops, soldiers and Marines at our military hospitals than anybody in this Chamber; and I don't want them to be in harm's way any longer.

The problem is, I have strong recollections of September 11; and even before September 11, I remember the bombing of the USS *Cole* where our military, our sailors were killed and wounded. I remember the bombings of the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. I remember the bombings of the Khobar Towers, where American airmen were housed in Saudi Arabia. I remember the bombing of the Marine barracks in Lebanon. I remember the hostages taken by terrorists and held for 444 days in Iran.

I remember all of that, but what I remember, that I will never, ever get out of my mind, is September 11, being on the highway immediately next to the Pentagon when the airplane hit the Pentagon and killed many of our friends and colleagues.

I remember going to Ground Zero just a few days after September 11 to deliver satellite telephones to the police and the firefighters because their existing communications didn't work due to all of the confusion, because of the disruption to the communications lines.

I remember the smoke was still rising, the dust was still flying.

I remember the American people demanded that something be done. They were tired of us being subjected to terrorist attacks, Americans being killed, and nothing being done about it.

The American people demanded that something be done, and they demanded through our Congress that something be done. The President was under this pressure and demanded that something be done. Congress debated then and two-thirds of the Members who were here at the time voted to give the President legal, lawful authority to do whatever had to be done.

This Congress should be prepared to do whatever has to be done to eliminate the terrorist threat. I don't care whether it is in Iraq, whether it is in Afghanistan, whether it is in Somalia, whether it is in Mogadishu, wherever it is, we have got to protect Americans from the threat of terrorism and from terrorist attacks; and we need to support our troops who are out there on the front line making sure that we at home are being protected.

Now these soldiers have been promised by the Commander in Chief that they are going to have some reinforcements, that they are going to have some help to fight this fight, the aggressive fight that is now finally taking place. The Maliki government was finally pressured to allow us to attack the targets that were real targets, to allow us to attack whether they were politically harmful to the Maliki government or not.

What about the soldiers in the field who were expecting that they would get some reinforcements and that maybe, with those reinforcements, they might get an extra night's sleep?

What about the soldier who had hoped that reinforcements would allow him or her to sit down to a hot lunch, rather than having to grab an MRE and eat that MRE on the run?

What about the soldiers in the field who hoped that reinforcements would allow them to find time to read their mail or send a letter to their loved ones back home?

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious issue. If this House is serious about Congress bringing home our troops, then do it right. This resolution doesn't bring any troops home. It doesn't provide any safety or security for our troops. It doesn't provide anything to help with the mission in the global war on terror.

If you want to do it right, bring a resolution out here to the floor that does it right, that brings them home, that stops whatever it is that we are doing there in Iraq.

But, if you know anything about what our military troops are doing, you know that once you get into a battle, once you get into a fight, it is easy to get into a war. You can almost slip into it without recognizing you are getting into it. But once you are in the fight, getting out is not easy.

Once you are in the battle, you have several options. You win or you lose or you surrender or you retreat or you negotiate. Who do we negotiate with? Negotiating would be nice if we could end this by negotiations. Who do you negotiate with? You can't even find Bin Laden, if, in fact, he is alive.

The problem here is, once you get into the fight, which we did with the support of the American people and with the support of this Congress, once you get into the fight, it is just not that easy to get out of it unless you win or you lose. Winning is better than losing.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today is, indeed, a day for thoughtfulness and courage in this House. As we debate the future of our involvement in Iraq, we must not forget that our troops are engaged in armed conflict a half a world away. It is their future and their sacrifice which necessitated this debate today.

Now is the time when this hallowed institution must dig deeply within its own conscience and rise above the politics and the platitudes which have plagued us for far too long. The American people and our troops demand and expect no less of us. Yet no simple solutions face us.

Let's look first at the decisions we have made.

We were advised that the conflict in Iraq would require more troops, a longer engagement, and an exit strategy. We did not heed that advice, and now we face an escalating insurgency and civil war.

We were told the cost was $50 billion. We were wrong. It cost more than $380 billion and climbing fast, and we have not been good stewards of the taxpayer money, as there has been much corruption and waste in our spending.

We were told of eminent success in Afghanistan, and we pulled out our troops in order to provide an earlier surge in Iraq. We were wrong, and we have seen a rise in violence in both countries.

We must break this pattern. We can ill afford any further misjudgments, because it is our obligation in this deliberative body to consider every option available.

We stand here today to engage in the first substantive discussion of the policies we need to implement in order to succeed in Iraq and bring our troops home. It is abundantly clear that Iraq has been and remains deeply embedded in the conscience of the American people. As this world watches, we must demonstrate from the well of this House that democracy flourishes only when honest and open debate occurs.

In this difficult decision, I believe this body has two primary obligations to the American people: one, to fully support our troops with resources they need in order to accomplish the missions they are assigned; and, two, to ensure full accountability for the vital resources that we have sent to Iraq. This House has neglected both of these obligations for too long, and it is time for us to exercise our responsibilities on behalf of our troops, the American people, and the world.

I stand here today in opposition to the proposed troop surge. We all agree that cutting off funding for our troops currently serving in Iraq is an untenable option that will send the wrong message to our partners and our enemies alike.

□ 1145

I will never vote to leave our troops stranded. But the question facing us now is, how can we vote to put upwards of 20,000 additional troops in harm's way without adequate resources and without a clear and detailed plan?

Because I stand in support of our troops, I cannot support this proposed surge. It is clear that the burden of our Nation's current struggle continues to rest with the brave men and women in our armed services.

It is no longer fair to our troops to rubber-stamp this war. I want them to know that we were deliberative in our decision. I fear this surge will not by itself be sufficient today. It is time for Members of both parties to listen to the experts for whose opinion we have asked, yet have ignored: our military leaders past and present, the bipartisan members of the Iraq Study Group, and soldiers returning from Iraq.

It is time for a strategic change in course in Iraq, one including diplomacy and education and an honest reconstruction effort. These actions partnered with the actions of the military will show our dedication to improving the lives of all Iraqis in making their nation one of peace, freedom, and democracy.

I am not here today to criticize the President or to engage in partisan grandstanding. This war is not a partisan issue. I have no doubt that one day the actions of our Nation will help bring peace and democracy to the Middle East. However, the strategy we are here to debate today remains flawed. Too many questions remain unanswered. While my loyalty to and my confidence in our troops remains steadfast, this Congress and this Nation must today seek a new direction.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I support the troops wholeheartedly and without reservation, but I cannot support a resolution that simply opposes a new strategy without offering an alternative plan to win. There is too much at stake.

Many of you know that I was a cop in the Seattle area for 33 years. I was the sheriff for 8 years. And as the sheriff I had an opportunity to attend a remarkable ceremony. Every year a group of naturalized American citizens gathered to remember the circumstances of their arrival in the United States.

The group is comprised of police officers from Vietnam, men that fought side by the side with our American soldiers. These Vietnamese officers assumed the greatest risks, risking their lives and endangering their families, to join the United States in their fight for freedom.

When the United States pulled out of Vietnam, there were dire consequences for these brave men who risked everything to fight for the United States. The officers were rounded up. Some were imprisoned for 15 years or more and some were executed.

Those who managed to flee and escape death made their way to the United States. They left everything in Vietnam, and made new lives in the United States. And they were able to enjoy the freedoms that they had fought for, but not in the country that they had hoped for.

Let me just take a moment to set the stage for this ceremony. As the sheriff, I sat down at a round table with many of these Vietnamese soldiers and police officers. They came in their uniforms that they brought along with them, those that were able to escape, those that spent 15 to 17 years in a prison camp where they were beaten, where they were tortured, where they lost their freedom. They lost their dignity, but they never gave up hope.

When they came here to the United States of America and they come together on this evening to celebrate their freedom, and the American flag is brought into that room, those men stand at attention and they salute. But you know what else they do? They cry. When the American flag is brought in, they cry because they lost their freedom. But now they know what it is like to have it back. It is a dramatic scene.

If we leave too soon in Iraq, what happened to these Vietnamese officers could certainly happen to those Iraqi soldiers who bravely fought side by side with our troops today. I don't use this example as a way of comparing this conflict with Vietnam, as some have done. I believe that the two wars are very different. I use it because it could happen again.

I never want to attend an event where former Iraqi soldiers are attending a similar ceremony. The fact is that we are engaged in a global war with people intent on killing us, killing Americans. And regardless of how we got into Iraq, Iraq is now the central front of this war.

I understand that there are many who think we should not have entered Iraq. We now know there was faulty intelligence that led us into Iraq and to make that decision. But the war is upon us nonetheless. I am elected to deal with what is happening now.

The consequences of declaring an end to the war in Iraq without victory would be felt for decades. Our enemies around the world would be emboldened. Iran and al Qaeda would declare victory. Our allies in Iraq would certainly face bloodshed and our allies around the world would question our resolve to help protect them.

Our troops are clear about their dedication to their mission; they want to succeed. American soldiers dutifully responded when we asked them to go to Iraq and oust a dictator, establish an infrastructure, and train the Iraqis so that they are able to protect themselves.

Now we must do what the troops have asked of us. They have given us their service, and in too many cases they have given us their lives. We must give them the opportunity for victory.

Our current strategy in Iraq is failing. And yet failure is not an option, not only for the United States' security, but also for the security of the Iraqi soldiers and police officers that still fight today, side by side with our troops.

In November the American people told us that they wanted a new strategy, not because they wanted to lose, but because they want to win. And now we have a new strategy before us. Is this new plan going to work? I don't know. No one in this body that will vote on this resolution, this nonbinding resolution, knows whether or not this plan will work.

But what I do know is that we first must find a way to achieve victory. And simply saying ''no'' to a plan without offering an alternative won't work, and it sends a terrible message to our enemies and to our soldiers. This is an historic war. America is engaged in a war for our freedom on a scale that we have never experienced before.

I understand the dissension, the questions, and the uncertainty. I understand the cost is high and the way is unclear. As a cop, I have lost partners, I have lost friends in the line of duty. I know the pain that causes. I understand the loss. It is sad. It is tragic, and you never forget. But we must remain focused, ladies and gentlemen. Please don't let those sacrifices be in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution and let us send a message to our enemies and our troops alike, we will always support our young men and women who put their lives on the line for freedom and

that we will give them what it takes to succeed in the missions that we have given them.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, our brave men and women in Iraq have answered every call, accomplished every task, won every battle. Our brave men and women in Iraq have fought valiantly. They have executed their mission with quiet dignity and with honor that is worthy of our praise.

In looking back at all that our military has done, there has been no task that these brave men and women have not accomplished. They have risen to every occasion. However, we are not here today just to applaud our troops' performance. We are here today to ask if the surge direction that the President is taking us is the right direction for these brave troops. Is it the right direction for our country, and is it the right direction for the people of Iraq? The answer is unequivocally ''no.''

For the last 4 years of this conflict, the President has relied on the judgment of his military to execute this war and to follow their advice. Now at this critical hour, he has chosen to ignore their expertise and advice. The Joint Chiefs have unanimously disagreed with the surge.

General James Conway, commander of the Marine Corps, is quoted as saying, ''We do not believe that just adding numbers for the sake of adding numbers, just thickening the mix, is necessarily the way to go.''

General John Abizaid has met with every divisional commander and asked, ''If we were to bring more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success?'' They all said ''no.''

General Colin Powell has said the surge will not work. General Wesley Clark, Ambassador Holbrooke, Oliver North, Michael Vicker, Lawrence Corb, Richard Haas, have all said the surge will not work. And the list goes on and on and on.

Why does the President, Mr. Speaker, choose to ignore expert after expert, soldier after soldier, who say the surge will not work? Even General Petraeus has said, and I quote, ''The way ahead will be neither quick nor easy, and undoubtedly there will be tough days. We have a determined, adaptive barbaric enemy. He will try to wait us out. Any such endeavor is a test of wills and there are no guarantees.''

Mr. Speaker, former Secretary of State James Baker has said, ''There is no magic bullet to solve the problem of Iraq. No single answer. No quick fix.'' From this microphone over the last 2 days, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to frame this debate about success and failure in Iraq.

That debate is for another day. Today and tomorrow, the debate is about the wisdom or the lack of wisdom for the surge. The President and the members of his party today need to listen to the experts who they have relied upon in the past. To do otherwise, casts doubts about who the President is listening to.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that this surge in the troops is the wrong policy at the wrong time, in the wrong war. The actions that need to be taken to help the Iraqi people and ultimately bring our brave men and women home safely is not as simple as rushing more troops to the front lines.

Mr. Speaker, a while ago I heard my good friend and colleague from Indiana speak about how the Iraq Study Group actually said that a surge is something that probably is necessary.

But there is more to the story than just a military surge. They also recommended that there has to be economic surge, and diplomatic surges, not just military. I talked to one of the Iraq study members just yesterday, who told me that a military surge by itself will not work.

The military has done all it can do, and they have done it very well. Now is the time to move in a different direction, Mr. Speaker. Vote for this resolution. Vote ''no'' to the surge.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this pretend, fake, disingenuous, cruel-to-the-troops resolution. It is impossible, despite what the Democrats have claimed, to both support the troops and not support the increase in troops necessary to win the war.

With this nonbinding, fake, pretend resolution, Democrats maintain they support the troops but at the same time disapprove of their mission. This confusing message simply lends encouragement to the Iraqi insurgents and terrorists to believe that every roadside bomb brings them closer to their goal of a terrorist state in the heart of the Mideast.

□ 1200

The simple fact is the deployment of troops to secure Baghdad has already begun. In fact, soldiers of the 82nd Airborne Division, who were deployed after President Bush's call for a temporary increase in troops, are already in Iraq doing critical work with the Iraqi Security Forces.

The passage of this misguided, pretend resolution does nothing except demoralize these brave men and women in uniform and invigorate those who wish America great harm.

The consequences of failure in Iraq could not be greater. The outcome in Iraq will directly affect America's efforts in the global war on terrorism for many generations. A victory for the Islamic militants, such as the al Qaeda members who are embedded in the Anbar Province in Iraq and the Iranians in Iraq who are provoking sectarian violence, would embolden the enemy to expand the reach of their efforts. Retreat would result in instability in the region, encourage radical Islamic terrorists and rogue regimes to expand into the region, and give terrorists a sanctuary from which to launch attacks against the U.S. and the West.

The bipartisan Iraqi Study Group, a bipartisan group, recognized the need of a troop surge to secure Iraq. To this end, I submit page 27 through 29 and page 73 of the Iraqi Study Group report for the RECORD on this issue to highlight the grave humanitarian consequences of a withdrawal of the U.S. forces from Iraq.

I am tired of hearing Democrats constantly criticize our plans for Iraq, yet they do not have a plan of their own. It is a shame that they have chosen to play politics with the men and women in uniform in Iraq. Democrats now have the responsibility to govern, but they lack both a plan for success in Iraq and the political will to advance a bill that cuts off funds for our troops.

They say that the problems in Iraq can only be solved by a political solution. While this is true to some extent, you cannot solve the problems in Iraq diplomatically and politically without first providing security to the Iraqi people. Security must go hand in hand with the political solution.

Democrats need to understand that their political choices and rhetoric hurt our troops and morale and give comfort, great comfort, to our enemy.

We also agree that this is a time for Iraqis to step forward and end sectarian violence and build a responsible government. Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki has promised the American people that in this new campaign Iraqi troops will be the ones knocking down doors, arresting insurgents and patrolling streets, with U.S. troops in a supporting role. We cannot give up at a critical point in Iraq's fledgling democracy.

Failure in Iraq is not an option. If we do not win in Iraq, we leave it up to our future generations to tackle the problems of Islamic terrorism in an unstable region. There is no short-term solution in Iraq because there is not a short-term problem.

Today, our brave men and women in Iraq are rising to the challenge to secure Baghdad. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this ill-timed resolution.

PAGE 27

The United Kingdom has dedicated an extraordinary amount of resources to Iraq and has made great sacrifices. In addition to 7,200 troops, the United Kingdom has a substantial diplomatic presence, particularly in Basra and the Iraqi southeast. The United Kingdom has been an active and key player at every stage of Iraq's political development. U.K. officials told us that they remain committed to working for stability in Iraq, and will reduce their commitment of troops and resources in response to the situation on the ground.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The United States has made a massive commitment to the future of Iraq in both

blood and treasure. As of December 2006, nearly 2,900 Americans have lost their lives serving in Iraq. Another 21,000 Americans have been wounded, many severely.

To date, the United States has spent roughly $400 billion on the Iraq War, and costs are running about $8 billion per month. In addition, the United States must expect significant ''tail costs'' to come. Caring for veterans and replacing lost equipment will run into the hundreds of billions of dollars. Estimates run as high as $2 trillion for the final cost of the U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Despite a massive effort, stability in Iraq remains elusive and the situation is deteriorating. The Iraqi government cannot now govern, sustain, and defend itself without the support of the United States. Iraqis have not been convinced that they must take responsibility for their own future. Iraq's neighbors and much of the international community have not been persuaded to play an active and constructive role in supporting Iraq. The ability of the United States to shape outcomes is diminishing. Time is running out.

B. Consequences of Continued Decline in Iraq

If the situation in Iraq continues to deteriorate, the consequences could be severe for Iraq, the United States, the region, and the world.

PAGE 28

Continuing violence could lead toward greater chaos, and inflict greater suffering upon the Iraqi people. A collapse of Iraq's government and economy would further cripple a country already unable to meet its people's needs. Iraq's security forces could split along sectarian lines. A humanitarian catastrophe could follow as more refugees are forced to relocate across the country and the region. Ethnic cleansing could escalate. The Iraqi people could be subjected to another strongman who flexes the political and military muscle required to impose order amid anarchy. Freedoms could be lost.

Other countries in the region fear significant violence crossing their borders. Chaos in Iraq could lead those countries to intervene to protect their own interests, thereby perhaps sparking a broader regional war. Turkey could send troops into northern Iraq to prevent Kurdistan from declaring independence. Iran could send in troops to restore stability in southern Iraq and perhaps gain control of oil fields. The regional influence of Iran could rise at a time when that country is on a path to producing nuclear weapons.

Ambassadors from neighboring countries told us that they fear the distinct possibility of Sunni-Shia clashes across the Islamic world. Many expressed a fear of Shia insurrections—perhaps fomented by Iran—in Sunni-ruled states. Such a broader sectarian conflict could open a Pandora's box of problems—including the radicalization of populations, mass movements of populations, and regime changes—that might take decades to play out. If the instability in Iraq spreads to the other Gulf States, a drop in oil production and exports could lead to a sharp increase in the price of oil and thus could harm the global economy.

Terrorism could grow. As one Iraqi official told us, ''Al Qaeda is now a franchise in Iraq, like McDonald's.'' Left unchecked, al Qaeda in Iraq could continue to incite violence between Sunnis and Shia. A chaotic Iraq could provide a still stronger base of operations for terrorists who seek to act regionally or even globally. Al Qaeda will portray any failure by the United States in Iraq as a significant victory that will be featured prominently as they recruit for their cause in the region and around the world. Ayman al-Zawahiri, deputy to Osama bin Laden, has declared Iraq a focus for al Qaeda: they will seek to expel the Americans and then spread ''the jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq.'' A senior European official told us that failure in Iraq could incite terrorist attacks within his country.

The global standing of the United States could suffer if Iraq descends further into chaos. Iraq is a major test of, and strain on, U.S. military, diplomatic, and financial capacities. Perceived failure there could diminish America's credibility and influence in a region that is the center of the Islamic world and vital to the world's energy supply. This loss would reduce America's global influence at a time when pressing issues in North Korea, Iran, and elsewhere demand our full attention and strong U.S. leadership of international alliances. And the longer that U.S. political and military resources are tied down in Iraq, the more the chances for American failure in Afghanistan increase.

Continued problems in Iraq could lead to greater polarization within the United States. Sixty-six percent of Americans disapprove of the government's handling of the war, and more than 60 percent feel that there is no clear plan for moving forward. The November elections were largely viewed as a referendum on the progress in Iraq. Arguments about continuing to provide security and assistance to Iraq will fall on deaf ears if Americans become disillusioned with the government that the United States invested so much to create. U.S. foreign policy cannot be successfully sustained without the broad support of the American people.

PAGE 29

Continued problems in Iraq could also lead to greater Iraqi opposition to the United States. Recent polling indicates that only 36 percent of Iraqis feel their country is heading in the right direction, and 79 percent of Iraqis have a ''mostly negative'' view of the influence that the United States has in their country. Sixty-one percent of Iraqis approve of attacks on U.S.-led forces. If Iraqis continue to perceive Americans as representing an occupying force, the United States could become its own worst enemy in a land it liberated from tyranny.

These and other predictions of dire consequences in Iraq and the region are by no means a certainty. Iraq has taken several positive steps since Saddam Hussein was overthrown: Iraqis restored full sovereignty, conducted open national elections, drafted a permanent constitution, ratified that constitution, and elected a new government pursuant to that constitution. Iraqis may become so sobered by the prospect of an unfolding civil war and intervention by their regional neighbors that they take the steps necessary to avert catastrophe. But at the moment, such a scenario seems implausible because the Iraqi people and their leaders have been slow to demonstrate the capacity or will to act.

C. Some Alternative Courses in Iraq

Because of the gravity of the situation in Iraq and of its consequences for Iraq, the United States, the region, and the world, the Iraq Study Group has carefully considered the full range of alternative approaches for moving forward. We recognize that there is no perfect solution and that all that have been suggested have flaws. The following are some of the more notable possibilities that we have considered.

PAGE 73

THE WAY FORWARD—A NEW APPROACH

Deter even more destructive interference in Iraq by Syria and Iran.

Because of the importance of Iraq to our regional security goals and to our ongoing fight against al Qaeda, we considered proposals to make a substantial increase (100,000 to 200,000) in the number of U.S. troops in Iraq. We rejected this course because we do not believe that the needed levels are available for a sustained deployment. Further, adding more American troops could conceivably worsen those aspects of the security problem that are fed by the view that the U.S. presence is intended to be a long-term ''occupation.'' We could, however, support a short-term redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize Baghdad, or to speed up the training and equipping mission, if the U.S. commander in Iraq determines that such steps would be effective.

We also rejected the immediate withdrawal of our troops, because we believe that so much is at stake.

We believe that our recommended actions will give the Iraqi Army the support it needs to have a reasonable chance to take responsibility for Iraq's security. Given the ongoing deterioration in the security situation, it is urgent to move as quickly as possible to have that security role taken over by Iraqi security forces.

The United States should not make an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq for three compelling reasons.

First, and most importantly, the United States faces other security dangers in the world, and a continuing Iraqi commitment of American ground forces at present levels will leave no reserve available to meet other contingencies. On September . . .

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to now yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, like most Members of Congress, I have visited our men and women in uniform in Iraq. I have visited our wounded in the hospital at Ramstein Air Force Base in Germany and at the hospital in Balad Air Base in Iraq; and I have offered my condolences to grieving families who have lost loved ones in Iraq. I respect and appreciate our men and women in uniform in Iraq. They have served nobly, and they deserve our prayers.

Mr. Speaker, they have done their duty, and now we must do our duty. Our duty to the Constitution, our duty to our country, our duty to our men and women in uniform is to look with clear eyes at the facts and to exercise independent judgment.

For 4 years, this Congress has failed in that duty. For 4 years, this Congress has passed one resolution after another, offering uncritical support for the President's policies in Iraq.

In June, Congress passed a resolution finding that we were well along the path to a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq and the Iraqi Security Forces were operating independently of our forces and were increasingly leading the fight to secure Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, that is what Republicans did when they were in the majority. They played make believe.

Americans knew better then, and we certainly know better down. The Iraqi Study Group report, just a couple of months ago, described the situation in Iraq as grave and deteriorating. The most recent National Intelligence Estimate, just a week ago, described the

situation in even starker terms, ''The violence is now feeding on itself, and it is too complex to be called simply a civil war.'' The estimate concluded that all of the likely outcomes are grim.

For 4 years, patriotic Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, have anguished over events in Iraq and have given deep and prayerful thought to alternatives, but the Bush Administration dismissed and insulted dissenters and often made fierce attempts to discredit them.

Not even General Eric Shinseki, the Army Chief of Staff, or James Baker, Secretary of State for the first President Bush, was spared; and the Bush administration has treated criticism by Members of Congress as meddling, as sticking our nose in their war.

House Democrats have offered plan after plan to alter our course in Iraq, and House Republicans have greeted every plan with strident attack.

Let's consider the new plan that President Bush has proposed.

The force initially committed to Iraq was well short of what General Shinseki said would be required to secure the country. When I visited Iraq 3 years ago, the presence of our forces in Baghdad may not have been enough to secure order, but it was more than enough to remind every Iraqi every day that there was a foreign army on their soil.

When I visited Iraq a year and a half ago, our military forces in Baghdad were less noticeable. Our briefing officer explained that we had deliberately reduced our footprint to lessen the resentment of Iraqis so that Iraqis would come into daily contact with Iraqi security forces, not our men and women. But the violence only increased.

We tried twice last year to reduce the violence by increasing Iraqi and American forces in Baghdad. The Iraqi forces didn't show up, and twice the effort failed, and violence has continued to increase.

Now we are trying it again and calling it a new plan: Less troops, more troops, less troops, more troops. House Republicans are playing make believe again to call that a new plan.

The apocalyptic violence in Iraq will not be solved militarily. Congressman DAVID PRICE and I introduced a resolution setting forth a comprehensive plan which Mr. PRICE described here the other day. We need to engage Iraq's neighbors through regional diplomacy to provide economic assistance, conditioned on a genuine attempt at national reconciliation, and to begin a phased withdrawal of our troops. Our plan includes many of the suggestions of the Iraq Study Group.

The Iraq Study Group report was right: No path is certain of success. And after 4 years of failed policy, all of our options are grim. But the resolution we will vote on shortly is a first step toward doing our duty by looking realistically at events in Iraq and by forcing us to consider what our options really are.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, can you advise us as to how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The gentleman from New York has 16½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, the narrow issue is: More troops to the front, or not? Many here say ''no more troops,'' but what are the consequences for the troops on the ground without more aid? What will happen in and around Baghdad where those troops are supposed to be sent? Their mission there will be more difficult without more troops.

Does this Congress want to tell our troops on the ground, do your job with less, even though we have it in our power to send you aid?

Mr. Speaker, 171 years ago this month, a somewhat similar call for aid was made; and it, too, was refused.

In an old, beat-up Spanish mission in central Texas, Bexar, Texas, to be exact, 187 men from every State in the United States, 13 foreign countries, including Mexico, found themselves in a precarious situation. They were behind the walls facing an enemy. They needed help.

Texas politicians, even so-called military experts, had it within their power to send more troops. And for all the similar reasons that are mentioned here, including the troops shouldn't even be in the mission and the plan was a bad idea from its inception, this plan is not working, your troops there should even leave, similar reasons we hear today, no help was sent.

The place, Mr. Speaker, was the Alamo, and the time was February 24, 1836. And behind the cold, damp walls of the Alamo, by candlelight, a 27-year-old lawyer, commander by the name of William Barrett Travis, wrote this letter. I read it today:

''To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world, fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannon fire for over 24 hours, but I have not lost a man.

''The flag still waves proudly over the north wall. The enemy has demanded surrender at its discretion. Otherwise, this fort will be put to the sword. I have answered that demand with a cannon shot. I shall never surrender or retreat.

''I call upon you, in the name of liberty and patriotism and everything dear to the American character, to come to my aid with all dispatch. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself for as long as possible, die like a soldier who never forgets what is due his honor and that of his country. Victory or death.''

William Barrett Travis, Commander of the Alamo.

Mr. Speaker, we know what happened at the Alamo. Those 187 men died because no help was sent. Later, Texans did provide troops and rallied and won independence from Mexico. But the answer then, as it has been in many wars in the past, is the answer now: More troops are necessary. We need to finish what we started. We need to do what it takes.

Now, Baghdad will be no Alamo. We cannot lose in Baghdad. But this body has it in its power to prevent a victory in Baghdad and Iraq.

So, Mr. Speaker, heed the warnings of the past, heed the history, and send aid with all dispatch.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 157, and as the designee of the majority leader, I demand that the time for debate be enlarged by 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the leaders or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, that will be the order.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before we respond to the President's call for an additional 20,000 troops in Iraq, we must put his call in the context of the history of the war, beginning with the discussion of what the current 130,000 troops are doing there now.

The original reasons we were provided with the rationale for going to war, that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that Iraqi leaders were connected with the 9/11 attacks, and that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States, all turned out not to be true. Saddam Hussein was captured and recently hanged, al-Zarqawi is dead, and Iraq held democratic elections over a year ago, and yet we are still in Iraq.

Throughout the war, the President has attempted to associate our presence in Iraq with a so-called war on terrorism. The truth is that our presence in Iraq has actually increased our risk to terrorism.

Furthermore, the term ''war on terrorism'' is a rhetorical term without any relationship to reality. Terrorism is not an enemy. It is a tactic. The enemy is al Qaeda. We attacked Afghanistan because al Qaeda was there, not in Iraq.

The President is now saying he is laying out a new mission in Iraq, thereby clearly acknowledging that, whatever the old mission was, it was not working. But there is still no clearly defined end goal and no clearly defined explanation of how failure or success can be measured.

If our mission now is to stabilize Baghdad, many military experts have already said that an additional force of 20,000 troops is woefully insufficient to

accomplish that goal. The fact is that the administration has already increased troop levels on several occasions during this war. None of the previous surges in troop levels have had any lasting effect on the war, and there is no credible evidence to believe that this surge will be any different.

And how can we have confidence in predictions of success? Before our invasion in Iraq, Secretary Rumsfeld predicted that the war in Iraq would last ''6 days, 6 weeks. I doubt 6 months.'' Vice President CHENEY predicted we would be greeted as liberators.

Almost 4 years ago, the President stood before a sign that said ''Mission Accomplished'' and proclaimed major combat operations in Iraq have ended.

□ 1215

A year and a half ago Vice President CHENEY said the Iraqis were ''in the last throes'' of the insurgency. And yet here we are discussing an increase, not a decrease, in troop levels.

At the outset of this war, the administration predicted that the cost of the war would be so minuscule that it advised the House Committee on the Budget not even to include the cost of the war in the Federal budget. The administration official who suggested that the cost of the war might exceed $100 billion was fired. To date we have appropriated nearly $400 billion, and the President has already formally requested another $200 billion more, with no end in sight.

Over 3,100 courageous Americans and countless Iraqis have already lost their lives. How many more will die if this strategy falls as far from the predicted result as the original length of time and cost estimates of the war?

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as part of developing a mission and strategy, it is imperative that we ask where these additional troops are going to come from. Many will undoubtedly come from the National Guard and Reserves, but they have already been in Iraq for longer-than-average deployments and many have already completed multiple tours of duty. Other troops must be redeployed from other assignments; so we must ask what moving these troops will mean to our global national security.

Last November the American people sent a powerful message. They want a change in Iraq, not more of the same. They expect an honest explanation of why we entered Iraq in the first place, what the present situation is, what goal do we expect to achieve, and what the strategy will be to accomplish it. Only then can we intelligently discuss the troop levels necessary to accomplish that goal. Unfortunately, all we have gotten from this administration is essentially ''Don't worry, be happy, success is around the corner; and if you don't believe that, then you are not patriotic and you are not supporting the troops.''

For my colleagues who say that failure is not an option, I ask what will happen if the President's so-called ''New Way Forward'' fails, as many experts predict it will? Are we then required to further escalate the war, further strain our military, sending thousands more of our troops to Iraq? How many more of our young men and women must die before the administration acknowledges what was in the National Intelligence Estimate? And I quote, ''The term 'civil war' accurately describes key elements of the Iraqi conflict.' ''

Mr. Speaker, although the resolution before us is technically nonbinding, it gives the House an opportunity to call upon the President to work cooperatively with Congress to develop an effective strategy to bring our troops home. The American people and our courageous men and women on the front lines deserve a clearly articulated and sensible approach to ending the war. This resolution puts the House on record as saying that an escalation of military forces is a step in the wrong direction.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 5 minutes to the good gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the senior and esteemed leader, Mr. KING from New York, for yielding to me.

I want to start a point here, Mr. Speaker, that I would ask all Members to focus on to understand where we really sit in history, in this course of history. If you would go back to the most successful military known in history for the longest period of time, spanning centuries, it was the Roman legions. And the Romans had a statement called ''nosce hostem,'' which, of course, is Latin for ''know thine enemy.'' We need to do that here in this Congress. We are part of this effort, of course. Know thine enemy. Von Clausewitz wrote the book on war, his treatise on war, that everyone goes to because he boiled it down to understandable principles, certainly ''know thine enemy,'' but his point was the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war.

Now, if you know your enemy and you are going to destroy their will and ability to conduct war, you wouldn't just go after their ability, you would go after their will as well. So that has been true throughout history. And if you were charged with the task of defeating the preeminent world's Superpower in, say, about the year 1963 under President Kennedy, ''How do you defeat undefeated America?'' was the question that was presented to the Vietnamese.

Enter General Vo Nguyen Giap. He was the general that orchestrated the Vietnamese effort throughout the war in Vietnam. He certainly understood history. He understood the Roman legions. He understood nosce hostem. He also understood that you had to defeat the will and the ability of the United States if you were going to defeat them. He knew that he couldn't defeat our ability. He had to attack our will. And that is what happened.

And he wrote the book. This is the primer, ''How Do You Defeat the United States of America?'' by General Vo Nguyen Giap. How We Won the War is the title of it. And in the primer he said, ''The beginning was when the United States failed to succeed in a complete victory in Korea, then we knew the will of the United States was weakened. On page 18 he talks about how they went after the will of the United States through public opinion, how they supported it and encouraged the antiwar activists because they knew they couldn't win militarily. So their front on the war that had the greatest chance for success was with the will of the American people. Here is the primer.

Our enemies read this primer, Mr. Speaker. They understand this. And one of our enemies over there is Moqtada al-Sadr, who laid it out for us when he said on June 11, 2004, and I saw this on al-Jazeera TV when I was in Kuwait, ''If we continue attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way that they left Vietnam, the same way that they left Lebanon, the same way that they left Mogadishu.''

Mr. Speaker, that is the message that his people heard. That is the message we should hear. I have heard it. I have put it on this floor many times. A couple nights ago I put Moqtada al-Sadr down here on the floor. In the night he went off to Iran to join up with the people who have been supporting him. He understands this.

I will tell you this. If this resolution passes and if Mr. MURTHA and the people who are working with him are successful in a slow bleed of our resources, then what you will see, Mr. Speaker, is you will see Osama bin Laden say, If we keep attacking America they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, Lebanon, Mogadishu, and Iraq. That is what is coming. That is what is being perpetrated by the rhetoric here on this floor. That is what is being staged in appropriations bills that we will certainly see coming after this resolution.

The destiny of America is put at risk, Mr. Speaker, and this says to all of our enemies it is easy to take on the United States if you can just get Congress to lose their will, if you can get them to lose their spine.

So I would then simply close with the reiteration of a request made from a major from Kentucky whom I met with in my last trip over there in Iraq. He loves his kids and his cows and he loves God and I know he speaks the truth. He said, ''We have everything we need. So when you pray for us, pray for the American people. Pray they understand the threat and pray they do not lose their resolve. We will not lose ours.''

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to my friend and

colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, America will hear 435 separate ideas about Iraq, but I want to note one great shining light about our country. The American people are absolutely unified, no matter what they think about the policy in Iraq, of holding American warriors and our sons and daughters close to our hearts. This is a unified position across this country, and it is a bright light for America.

Now, I have heard some people have suggested that soldiers who fall in Iraq will have fallen in vain. That is wrong. Any American who falls in the course of the conduct of American wars, they do not fall in vain. They fall into our arms, and they fall into our hearts, and there they will always remain. And we are unified on this principle. And when I go to a memorial service for a young man from Redmond, Washington next Monday, I will carry the unified American prayers and hearts of the 650,000 people I represent.

Now we are in a difficult situation in Iraq and none of us have a silver bullet, and none of us have a magic wand. And it seems to me that when we are in dark times, we should go back to fundamental American character to find a way forward.

There are three parts of the American character we should think about here: first, the character of the American mission in Iraq; second, the character of American common sense; and, third, the character of American democracy.

What is the character of our mission in Iraq? President Bush, when he started this war, said we have three missions:

Eliminate WMD. Mission accomplished. They were never there.

Second, eliminate any terrorist that attacked us on 9/11. Mission accomplished. They were never there.

Third, eliminate Saddam Hussein as a threat. Mission accomplished. He is no longer a threat to anyone who walks the face of the Earth.

Our proud men and women have fulfilled the three mandates of missions set forth by George Bush. And now we have one moral mission to complete, and that is the moral responsibility to give the Iraqis a reasonable chance to form a government. We have done that after 4 years; and our investment of 3,000-plus lives and hundreds of billions of dollars of American money has fulfilled that moral obligation in spades.

Second, what is the American character of common sense? Why did General Abizaid, when he asked all the divisional commanders whether this escalation would help and every single one of them say no, why is that? It is because they have common sense.

I was on a walk a couple of months ago, and I met an old high school friend. His son was serving in Baghdad, and I asked him what he thought about Iraq. And he said, We have no common sense in our policy. He said, the fundamental problem in Iraq was that the Shiites were not agreeing with the Sunnis principally over oil revenues. And my son is serving in Baghdad today as a security blanket because the Iraqi politicians will not make the compromises necessary to form a government.

That has to end. It is American common sense to understand the real enemy in Baghdad is sectarian intransigence. The real enemy in Baghdad is their failure to compromise. And the best weapon we have is a dose of reality to the Iraqi people of all sectarian faiths. You have to get a grip on your country because you will very shortly have your own fate in your own hands. The best weapon we have in Iraq is to tell the rest of the immediate region that they must become responsible for their own neighborhoods. That is the weapon of reality we should use.

And, third, what is the character of American democracy? George Bush said that he was the decider. That is wrong. The decider is the American people. And the American people had a message to George Bush that there has to be a change in Iraq policy. And he is not listening to the generals, he is not listening to the bipartisan commission, and he is not listening to the American people.

Congress has a responsibility coequal with the President under Article I of the Constitution to declare war, to raise and support armies, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. It is time for Congress to stand up on our hind legs and take away the keys from the man who has driven our foreign policy into a ditch. It is time to restore the American mission to where it belongs, to American common sense where it belongs, and to American democracy where it belongs.

Support this resolution. Prevent this escalation in Iraq.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who has made 15 visits to Iraq.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for conducting this debate.

This debate has been constructive. I appreciate the thoughtful comments made on both sides. Speaking for the second time, I realize it may be tempting for some to support this resolution to somehow express our strong dissatisfaction with how the administration has conducted the war and to separate ourselves from an unpopular President.

I do not believe, however, support of what is truly a ''stay the course,'' ''status quo resolution'' will be a constructive outcome of the debate. It sends the wrong message to our troops, to the Iraqis, to our allies throughout the world, and, in particular, to our enemies.

Is it the American way to attack another country, disassemble its entire security forces—military, border patrol and police—and then leave before this broken country is capable to rebuild its security forces and stand on its own? The shame of this possibility haunts me.

□ 1230

And how can this resolution possibly help our troops on the battlefield who are there already who still have to carry out their mission?

We, the Congress, are in effect telling our troops, we support you, but we do not want you to have the reinforcements you need to carry out your mission, and we do not trust the judgment of your new commanding officer, General David Petraeus. How destructive is that?

Our troops deserve to know we have a plan to win. If we do not have a plan to win, we have a plan to leave. The resolution before the House neither helps us succeed nor gives us guidance on how to leave.

It is so counterproductive for 535 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate to micro-manage the war.

It is the responsibility of the administration to conduct the war effort. It is Congress' responsibility to conduct tough oversight, holding the administration accountable for the implementation of the war.

Having chaired 14 hearings on the operations in Iraq and been to Iraq 15 times to conduct on-the-ground oversight, I will continue to ask the administration the difficult questions and provide my observations and recommendations.

Regretfully, too few Members of Congress have fully considered the consequence of leaving Iraq prematurely. The Iraq Study Group warned, ''If the situation in Iraq continues to deteriorate, the consequence could be severe for Iraq, the United States, the region and the world.''

The ultimate goal for me is to bring our troops home without leaving Iraq in chaos. This is achievable if Republicans and Democrats, the White House and Congress, agree on a bipartisan solution as outlined by this Study Group.

Officially endorsing the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group and acting on them is the best way to make this happen.

The only way I think we should leave Iraq is the same way we got into Iraq, together.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. I certainly appreciate very much the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as you would guess, I am an American, a very proud American. If I had selected my place of birth, I would have chosen the United States of America. It is just full of

promise, full of democracy, full of patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the chorus of those who have said enough is enough. The President has had the chance to plead a case for victory in Iraq, but he has never clearly told us how or when we are going to get to this turning point and when we will be able to bring our soldiers home.

Twenty-three thousand troops injured, over 3,100 dead and not enough armor to ensure that our healthy troops remain that way. I did not vote for the war, and I don't bemoan the fact that I did not. But I did say then, as I say now, that our soldiers did not have enough armor nor equipment, and they did not have enough benefits at the time, and this Congress has turned some of that around.

When we have soldiers on foreign soil depending on the kindness of strangers for the donation of armor and helmets because their President has failed to provide them with the life-saving tools after placing them in harm's way, we know something is not right. We have stretched ourselves too thin and used the awesome power of our military might in the wrong way.

Mr. Speaker, our priorities are not straight. We have sent children into harm's way, and if the President had his way, we would send more recklessly into battle in Iraq without a clear exit plan or understanding of their roles.

In Indiana alone, we have seen 76 Hoosiers lost to this and 511 whose lives were forever altered by injuries sustained in this war. Unfortunately, however, President Bush's interest in supporting our troops ends the moment they become veterans. Because, as he asks for more troops, he has cut the funding for the Veterans Administration to help them return to civilian life healthy and prepare for what lies ahead.

On May 1, 2003, the President announced, ''Mission accomplished.'' At that time, we had lost 139. Yet over 3,000 have now died, and the mission still has not been accomplished. We will not know the mission has been accomplished until we have set the goals and benchmarks that allow us to place Iraqis in a position of being self-governing and allow our troops to come home.

In short, I love our troops. I love them dearly. I love our veterans, and I love our country. It is time to begin to bring our loved ones home from overseas and not send more into the hostile battlefields in downtown Baghdad.

We often sing a song in church that goes, we are soldiers in the army. We have to fight before we die. We have to hold up the bloodstained banner. We have to hold it up until we die.

Let us not beat around the bush, so to speak. Our military presence in Iraq cannot diminish the violence there. It will only add to it. We have lost a lot of our support, a lot of our friendship with other nations because of our reckless behavior in Iraq. So to stay there, our military presence will increase violence there and bring on more around the world.

They have suicide bombs; we have a suicide policy. And those who started this madness, not being the young Americans they sent to be slaughtered, strutted their vicarious, which is to say artificial, heroism.

This bloody blunder was conceived in childish computer war-game fantasy and executed in unconstitutionality, borrowing billions from foreigners to borrow trouble from other foreigners, putting this land we love into international hock and its prestige into an international hodge-podge.

There are a lot of bad-guy dictators in this world, some of whom are friends of this administration and one of whom was a friend of this administration's forbearers. That one was Saddam Hussein. But John Adams tells us, ''America does not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy . . .''

When you realize you're making a mistake, sanity calls for stopping it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this vote and the debate that we are having is about politics and providing some political cover. It does nothing to help our soldiers win.

Remember, it is a nonbinding resolution. What does that mean? It means that we could talk, as my mother used to say, until the cows come home. It has absolutely no effect. It has no power, no teeth and absolutely no effect.

To be more specific, there is not one single mention in the Democrat resolution of how we will send more body armor for the troops, not a single mention of new tools to detect IED explosives, not one word dedicated to up-armored Humvees.

Mr. Speaker, there is not one mention of the method to fund the health care needs of the veterans who come home. Not one mention. And this is important to remember: It has absolutely no mention of sending one soldier, let alone the 20,000 additional who are going over there or our fine young men and women who are already there, when they are going to come home one day sooner.

In my district, Floridians have seen through this nonbinding resolution. The headline of the Orlando Sentinel calls it an ''empty measure.'' It says, ''The pointless House resolution on Iraq fails to set goals.'' The editorial goes on to say that the resolution ''isn't thoughtful policy; it's political cover.'' It is not just me saying it. This is certainly not a conservative newspaper, the Orlando Sentinel.

My constituents know over the past few days we have debated a resolution with no teeth, no enforcement, delivered in a way that has no guts, no character and provides no leadership.

Need to hear more? The Veterans of Foreign Wars said that, ''Other generations have learned the hard way when military decisions are second-guessed by opinion polls or overruled by politicians.''

The VFW and the American Legion know what happens when politicians play politics with war. Our veterans' message to Democrats is to support the surge and give our soldiers a chance to win. That is really what they want. They want to win.

In closing, I must echo the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars with the words that ring in the hearts of veterans everywhere: Give our sons and daughters in this fight the chance to win. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what they are asking for.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to my esteemed friend and colleague, the gentlelady from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are having this open discussion and this debate on Iraq, but let me first make my position very clear: I did not vote on this war. After 9/11, when the President urged military action against Osama bin Laden, I, like all other Members, was fully supportive of that position and voted to send our troops to Afghanistan. Despite the heroic efforts of our Armed Forces, Osama bin Laden, the mastermind of America's darkest hour, has yet to be brought to justice.

While the search for bin Laden has not been completely abandoned, President Bush turned his attention away from our most deadly adversary and devoted our military resources into invading Iraq. The search for bin Laden was neglected for a search for weapons that were never found and perhaps may have never existed.

One thing is very clear here, Mr. Speaker: All Members of this Congress support our troops. Many of us have been with families who have lost a loved one. Many of us have gone to visit them. And on Memorial Day I give special recognition to those whom I have lost in my district in the State of California. Also, I have a special community pride, where I give the names of all of those who gave the ultimate sacrifice. So let it be very clear that the Members of this Congress support our troops.

Now, while the war has hindered our search for Osama bin Laden, it is shocking and regrettable that Iraq is more of a breeding ground for terrorism than it was before we invaded in March of 2003.

So many Americans, in my district and throughout the Nation, have fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters who are being placed in harm's way by being deployed two or more times to Iraq. Transfixed and horrified, we watch an escalation in violence that has all the characteristics of a civil war. We recognize that on November 7 the American people asked for a new

direction. But they also asked for the truth as we know it.

We know that there is too much rhetoric surrounding this issue. But the truth is, first, the President's proposal for an escalation or resurgence is a flawed strategy that will put more than 21,500 more Americans in harm's way. In fact, this escalation leaves Americans and Iraqis in a perpetual state of war, a condition that is not sustainable or supportable.

□ 1245

Secondly, Iraq's problems are best solved by Iraqis. While a number of American troops will be needed to continue training operations of Iraqi forces, it will only be successful if those living in Iraq, the Sunnis, Shias and Kurds alike, fully embrace democratic principles and work together to make their nation secure.

Thirdly, I support the principal recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that we engage Iraq's neighbors such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria and others, in problem-solving. The President's plan should emphasize diplomacy. There is no Commander in Chief that I know of that does not, and did not, during a war engage in diplomacy. That is the answer, not military force. This type of position that the President is going, this is a brute force that will not deter the insurgency. Any viable solution must contain a diplomatic element.

Mr. Speaker, the House has taken 4 days to debate the war because clearly we need a sensible resolution to this quagmire. Democrats have borne much criticism for bringing this resolution to the floor, but it is fair to remind our Republican detractors that they also brought nonbinding resolutions to the floor. What it is, is to really send a message to the American people that we are moving in the wrong direction. Stay the course is not the course to take. The resolution we are considering today is entirely straightforward, and the premise is simple: Do you or do you not support the President's escalation?

The resolution before us marks the first time this Chamber will vote whether or not to disagree with the President's war plans. I hope that everyone who recognizes that this ''stay the course'' is not the issue, that we vote for H. Con. Res. 63. It is an important step.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise of the time remaining. The gentleman from New York has 31½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 16 minutes remaining. The Chair will try to even out the time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, various news organizations have now confirmed what the Democrats really have in mind with this nonbinding resolution, and that is, choke off funding for the troops.

Though they haven't really said it on this House floor, they have said it to their political base, moveon.org, and I hold the transcript in my hand. Let's listen to the words of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) who, as we all know, controls our military spending panel.

''They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment, they don't have the training and they won't be able to do the work. There's no question in my mind.''

He was further quoted as saying, ''We have to be careful people don't think this is the vote.''

Last evening, CBS News noted that our colleague's proposal ''is a way to get at the same goal without holding a vote to cut funding.'' Again, Mr. Speaker, that goal is to cut funding of the troops. The goal is to accept defeat.

Now, I know the author of this proposal has served his Nation with great courage and great honor, but I for one fail to see the courage and the honor in this proposal.

The Politico Magazine has called this proposal the ''Slow Bleed Strategy.'' The slow bleed strategy. I wonder who it is who is doing the bleeding.

Mr. Speaker, how does anybody look one of our brave soldiers in the eye and tell them, I don't believe in your mission. I don't believe you can succeed and I have the power to bring you home; I have the power to bring you home today but I am not willing to do it because, if I did, I would have to take responsibility and I am concerned about political ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, if my Democrat colleagues truly want to cut off funding for the troops and withdraw from Iraq, then let them vote on it today. Let them show the courage of their convictions and vote on it today. We cannot accept this slow bleed strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I know that fighting this war is costly. It is costly in terms of blood. It is costly in terms of money. Like many other of my colleagues, I have met with the mothers who have lost sons in Iraq. Their plight is profound; it is sad. But Mr. Speaker, I never, never, never want to meet with the mothers whose children might perish in the next 9/11 if we accept defeat in Iraq.

Iraq must be seen in the context of this larger war we are having with radical Islam. The battle lines are drawn, and whether we like it or not, they are drawn in Iraq. Don't take my word for it. Listen to Osama bin Laden. ''The epicenter of these wars is Baghdad. Success in Baghdad will be success for the United States. Failure in Iraq is the failure of the United States. Their defeat in Iraq will mean defeat in all their wars.''

We have to soberly reflect on the enemy that we are facing. Listen to the number two in al Qaeda, al-Zawahiri. ''Al Qaeda has the right to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children.'' As the father of a 4-year-old and a 3-year-old, I find that to be a chilling statement.

Listen to Hassan Abbassi, Revolutionary Guard's intelligence adviser to the Iranian President. ''We have a strategy drawn up for the destruction of Anglo-Saxon civilization.''

This is the enemy we face, and we face him foremost in Iraq. If we leave Iraq before subduing him, he will follow us to America, make no mistake about it, and the consequences are immense. Read the National Intelligence Estimate. Read the report of the Iraq Study Group.

Iraq has the potential to become what Afghanistan once was under the Taliban, and that is, a breeding ground and a safe haven for the recruitment, training, financing and sanctuary of radical Islamists bent upon attacking our Nation and attacking our families. There will be no greater event to empower the radical Islamists in our defeat in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't have to be this way. We are Americans. We can meet this threat. We can work together. Vote against this resolution. Let's support our troops. Let's protect our Nation and our children from this threat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In an attempt to try to equalize the time, I recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to work with the Speaker on this, and I recognize the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 8 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the manner of our withdrawal from Iraq will dramatically affect the credibility of American foreign policy. Our actions must not lead to anti-Semites masquerading as the President of Iran with the misimpression that his thirst for nuclear weapons can ever end with the realization of his dream of nuclear holocaust, this time engulfing the Jewish national homeland. In the larger geopolitical context, like it or not, credibility is the currency of a global Superpower.

The argument has been made on this floor that our engagement in Iraq has had the effect of diverting our attention from other threats to our security interests such as a nuclear North Korea or the military buildup of China or even a resurgent Russia.

The recent glimmer of hope from the multiparty talks with the hermit kingdom demonstrates that it is possible for our Nation to, yes, walk and chew gum at the same time. The war in Iraq has not come at the cost of disengagement. However, perhaps more importantly, we cannot avoid the fact that

the manner in which we turn control over their country to the Iraqis will send a message across the globe to friend and foe alike of whether we are a reliable ally and a predictable adversary.

It is simply not possible for us to divorce our role in the world from our credibility as a Nation. The stakes are great for Iraq, but they are just as great, if not greater, for those of us in the United States, for those of us presently in the United States and for our children and our grandchildren.

Although everyone including the President has acknowledged the fact that things have not gone as planned in Iraq, this should not lead us to overlook the fact that the Iraqi people have chosen their Nation's leadership in democratic elections, three in a row, with more and more people participating, larger percentages of the population participating, in numbers and percentages that frankly would embarrass our country when you look at the turnout we have for elections. Sometimes we explain the low turnout in our elections because of bad weather. Their bad weather was not the question. It was the threat of death if they participated in elections, and yet they went forward to do so.

They ratified a Constitution that represents a dramatic departure from the rule of one of the most repressive regimes of the globe, and we sort of slide by that and say, well, we got rid of Saddam Hussein, but look at the mess those people are in over there. It is a difficult proposition. This President warned us after 9/11 it would be a difficult proposition; it would take fortitude; it would take persistence; it would take resolve.

At the same time, however, it is this very hope of democracy that has led those extremists who fear such a prospect to lash out in a wave of violence. In this regard, we must not fall prey to the error of failing to hold those responsible for violence accountable for their murderous actions.

The idea that we are somehow responsible for violence in Iraq is both preposterous and the crassest form of moral ignorance. Those who commit the murders, those who drill holes in people's brains, screw fellow human beings to walls and consider decapitation a form of religious expression, they are the ones who are responsible for the atrocities and massive human rights violations concerning the people of Iraq.

Charles Krauthammer aptly captures such moral illogic with the query of whether the police in America are somehow responsible and have on their hands the blood of the 16,000 murders they failed to prevent last year.

The tragic irony of such logic is that it suggests that those who murder in order to manipulate the Western media and public opinion by the spectacle of mangled bodies and blood-stained streets should be able to realize their aim of driving us away from the scene of their crime. We must not reward these thugs by giving them what they want. We are in Iraq to protect the Iraqi people, and the blame for the violence should be placed where it belongs.

As Prime Minister Blair so eloquently stated the proposition: ''Here is where we have to change radically our mindset. At present, when we are shown pictures of carnage in Iraq, much of our own opinion sees that as a failure, as a reason for leaving. Surely,'' Prime Minister Blair says, ''it is a reason for persevering and succeeding. What is the purpose of the terrorism in Iraq? It is to destroy the prospect of democratic progress. In doing so, they hope to deal us a mortal blow. They know victory for them in Iraq is defeat not just for Iraqi democracy but for democratic values everywhere.''

The challenges before us relate to the formulation of policy, but this should not be considered in a vacuum. The most important asset of the United States in Iraq is the quality of the men and women of our Armed Forces. It is in this regard that the person in charge of the responsibility of implementing our new policy, General David Petraeus, is well-suited to perform such a task.

In addition to his experience in the area around Mosul, he is the coauthor of the recently released Military Field Manual on Counterinsurgency Doctrine. History provides us with examples where military commanders have been brought into a theater of operations in order to turn around what seemed at the time less than promising, as illustrated by the appointments of General Grant, or even General Patton, to name just two examples.

If there ever was a need for such leadership in Iraq it is now. General Petraeus is a critical component to our prospects for progress.

□ 1300

And I know everybody says they support General Petraeus, they support our troops. But it does seem odd that when the other body confirmed General Petraeus unanimously, they followed it up by suggesting what he was going about was a fool's errand. And I know everybody here supports our troops, but listen to what you are saying. On the one hand you say, ''Godspeed, General Petraeus,'' and on the other hand you say, ''You are doomed to failure.''

The need to meet the challenge of stabilizing Iraq, primarily in Baghdad and Anbar Province, is essential to the orderly withdrawal of American forces. Any precipitous action which fails to accommodate this concern would likely have untold consequences for innocents within Iraq, the broader Middle East, and ultimately the security of the American people.

Again, however, it must be emphasized that the long-term success or failure of democracy in Iraq rests with the Iraqis themselves. As Faoud Ajami of Johns Hopkins University has pointed out, we have given the gift of freedom to the Iraqi people, which, by nature, entails the conclusion that their future is in their own hands.

This new strategy, and I stress it is a new strategy, recognizes that our remaining days in Iraq must be dedicated to making this transition to a new political order possible, not just getting out, but getting out as we succeed in our effort to establish a stable democracy in Iraq.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Congressman MARION BERRY.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to keep in your hearts and minds, certainly in your prayers, our men and women in uniform and their families, especially those on the battlefield today; and to reach out to them and their families, and let them know that you understand and appreciate the sacrifice and commitment that they make out of the goodness of their heart.

Our Kansans have done their part to protect our freedom, contributing heavily to the war efforts since the conflict began. Our State alone has roughly 1,500 soldiers currently overseas, we have deployed 15,000 since September 11, 2001; 45 of our Kansans have paid the ultimate price, and 350 more have been seriously wounded. Congress cannot forget the sacrifice of these men and women. We will continue to support our Nation's servicemembers and provide them with every resource that they need.

After listening to President Bush's recent proposal to escalate troop levels in Iraq, I am even more concerned with his failure to recognize the severity of this conflict and what it really means.

Recent short-term troop escalation proposals in Iraq have not stopped the violence from getting worse. President Bush has said nothing to convince me, or almost no one else, that his latest strategy will result in success.

Our military forces deserve a policy commensurate with the sacrifices that they have been asked to make and have made. Regrettably, the President has not provided that policy or plan. Our leaders need to think long term and make strong commitments to diplomacy with all of the other countries in the region and the world community. Our credibility as a Nation must be restored.

As the Iraq Study Group concluded, this is an international conflict that cannot be solved by U.S. military strategies alone. Furthermore, President Bush's proposals will create additional strain on our military readiness, as well as our military personnel and their families.

There is already a shortage of military equipment that jeopardizes the safety of our men and women in uniform. We cannot and should not send more troops overseas without providing the equipment and support they

need to safely and effectively accomplish the mission that is charged to them.

I oppose this escalation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. God bless the men and women in uniform.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of time on each side be enlarged by 36 minutes.

I think I have the authority to do that under the rule; it has been done in consultation with the minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESHOO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize Mr. KING from New York, the ranking member of Homeland Security, for 7 minutes.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution and in strong support of our troops and their mission.

This resolution is wrong in every respect. It is wrong constitutionally. Never before in our history has Congress attempted to control or restrict battlefield decisions. It is wrong as a matter of policy, and it will come back to haunt us for years to come.

Madam Speaker, wars must not be waged according to opinion polls or applause meters. For instance, just look at the battle of Iwo Jima, an island in the Pacific where in less than 6 weeks, more than twice as many Americans were killed as have been killed throughout the entire Iraq war, and yet Congress didn't jump in to question the policies of the President.

And look at the Korean War. There was no declaration of war. The United States and the overwhelming majority of coalition troops in the field, 36,000 Americans were killed and another 8,000 were missing. More than 70 percent of the American people opposed President Truman and his handling of the war. Yet today, President Truman is honored as one of our greatest Presidents, and the Korean War is looked upon as a key turning point in our struggle against communism.

Madam Speaker, Iraq cannot be looked upon or looked at in a vacuum. This war in Iraq is an absolutely essential component of the war against Islamic terrorism which must be fought in many places throughout the world, including right here at home.

As a Member of Congress who lost upwards of 150 friends, neighbors, and constituents on September 11, 2001, I have seen firsthand how evil this enemy can be. And al Qaeda itself has said that Iraq is a major battleground in this war.

Madam Speaker, we cannot allow ourselves to do anything which would undermine our troops who are the frontline soldiers in this war against Islamic terrorism.

I know that the resolution expresses support for the troops, but talk is cheap and actions have consequences. You cannot support the troops if you are undermining their mission and challenging their commander in the field. And that is what this resolution does.

Speaker after speaker in support of the resolution has said that the new policy in Iraq will not work. But General Petraeus, who is the author of this policy and who has just been unanimously confirmed by the Senate, has said this policy can work and that his troops can carry it out. By opposing this new policy, the supporters of the resolution are clearly undermining a new commander in Iraq at such a vital time in the conduct of this war.

As the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars said earlier this week, ''When military decisions are second-guessed by opinion polls or overruled by politicians, it is the common soldier and their families who pay the price. The VFW is very concerned with the tone and timing of this debate. We need to send the message to our troops that America wants them to succeed in Iraq by giving the buildup a chance to succeed.''

Madam Speaker, what makes this worse is that we know today's resolution is only the first step to prevent General Petraeus and his troops from carrying out their mission. The Democratic leadership has admitted, indeed proudly acknowledged, that it is their goal to impose as many conditions as they can to prevent General Petraeus from getting the troops and the reinforcements he needs to win this war.

Madam Speaker, never in our history have the Speaker of the House or the House Appropriations Committee attempted to superimpose their policies on troop training or troop leave, and override the Commander in Chief and the commander in the field.

Madam Speaker, this is not the time for sunshine soldiers or summertime patriots. It is time for Members of this body to show at least a small percentage of the courage shown every day by our troops in Iraq.

If you want to cut off the funding for our troops who will be in the line of fire, don't be cute, don't try to sneak it through the back door. Have the guts to do it directly.

Madam Speaker, this debate is not about this President or this Congress or the next election. It is about our survival as a Nation and our survival as a civilization. Vote for our troops and against this misguided and dangerous resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 10 minutes to my friend and colleague and neighbor from California, the esteemed Speaker of the House of Representatives (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his exceptional leadership in the national security of our country.

My colleagues, for 3 days and nights, more than 350 Members of Congress have come to the floor to speak their conscience about the war in Iraq and the President's escalation proposal. I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the tenor, for the most part, and the substance of their remarks.

There is one proposition on which we can all agree: Our troops have performed excellently in Iraq. They have done everything asked of them. And as the resolution states, Congress and the American people will continue to support and protect the members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving or who have served bravely and honorably in Iraq. We owe our troops a debt of gratitude for their patriotism, for their courage, and for the sacrifices they are willing to make.

As a sign of our respect for them, particularly those who have lost their lives in the war, and for their families, I request that we observe a moment of silence.

Thank you.

We owe our troops a course of action in Iraq that is worthy of their sacrifice. Today, we set the stage for a new direction on Iraq by passing a resolution with fewer than 100 words which supports our troops and disapproves of the President's escalation proposal. Instead, Democrats have proposed a different course of action to the President.

□ 1315

Over and over again we have suggested a different plan.

One year ago, Senator HARRY REID and I stood with House and Senate Democrats to propose our agenda for real security, to project our power and our values, to protect the American people. Consistent with our real security agenda, Democrats have sent the President four letters, starting in July, and the most recent one the end of January, urging him to adopt a strategy for success, containing these elements: change of mission, redeployment of troops, building a political consensus, engaging in diplomacy, reform of reconstruction and a refocus in the war on terror.

In terms of changing the mission, U.S. forces in Iraq must be transitioned from combat to training of Iraqi forces, real counterterrorism activities, force protection and logistics. A shift in mission will allow the number of U.S. troops in Iraq to be reduced, diminishing their presence in the daily lives of Iraqis and minimizing the chance of these troops being caught in the crossfire between rival Iraqi factions. Ending the emphasis on a combat mission will allow the phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq beginning within the next 4 to 6 months.

Declining troop levels will require fewer bases, and none of them will need to be permanent, consistent with legislation introduced and passed by this House by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and also introduced by Congressman DAVID PRICE.

A smaller military presence in Iraq will also relieve some of the strain on

our troops, their families, and our military equipment. Success in Iraq requires more than military force, and that really is what this debate is about today.

General Peter Chiarelli, a three-star General, until recently the Commander of the Multinational Corps Iraq, observed in December, and I quote, ''We need to get out of thinking that this is solely a military conflict where we must simply apply more U.S. or coalition or Iraqi forces against an enemy that we can destroy. All our Nation's strengths—diplomatic, economic, political—must be leveraged to help the Iraqis find their way through this process.''

Unfortunately, there has been no sustained and effective effort to engage Iraq's neighbors diplomatically. Iraq's neighbors have the greatest stake in Iraq's stability and the role it will play in the region. Leaders of those countries are best able to help Iraqi leaders improve security by reducing ethnic tensions. To this end, an international contact group should be established to support a political settlement in Iraq and preserve Iraq's sovereignty.

Senator REID and I also wrote to the President that an international conference should be convened to broaden support for the reconstruction effort that is essential if Iraqis are going to be put to work building their country's future.

On the subject of reconstruction, there has been little effective reconstruction in Iraq because of mismanagement and disappearances of funds. That is why we propose that, in order for the reconstruction of Iraq to attract international support, it must be conducted according to practices which are honest, transparent, and accountable.

Reconstruction must be guided by the kind of process set forth in legislation introduced by Congressman PATRICK MURPHY and the Blue Dog Coalition. The United States should take the lead on accountability in reconstruction. Politically, there has been no sustained and effective effort to engage rival Iraqi factions.

The U.S. must insist that Iraqi leaders make the political compromises needed for a broad-based and sustainable political settlement that will produce an inclusive political system in Iraq. A good beginning would be to press Iraqi leaders to amend the Constitution to achieve a fair sharing of power and resources. That was promised at the time of the referendum over 1 year ago.

The resulting political consensus will allow Iraqi security forces to challenge the militias on behalf of the nation and to disarm them.

Proponents of the President's escalation are equating the war on terror to the war in Iraq. As our esteemed chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Congressman IKE SKELTON of Missouri, a great patriot, has observed, ''Two conflicts. Two wars. And the two should not be confused. There are those who attempt to fuzz the two conflicts together as 'the war on terror,' but the wars are truly separate and distinct,'' Chairman SKELTON stated.

The war in Iraq continues to detract from our ability to fight against the war on international terrorism effectively. We need to finish the job started more than 5 years ago in Afghanistan against al Qaeda and the Taliban and address other conditions around the world in which the appeal of terrorism breeds.

The longer it takes us to resolve the situation in Iraq, the longer resources and attention will continue to be diverted from the war on terrorism. Our ability to respond to the escalating conflict in Afghanistan and other potential crises in the world is constrained severely by the deterioration in military readiness to levels not seen since the Vietnam era.

There we have the six elements that we talked about: change of mission, redeployment of troops, building of political consensus, engaging in diplomacy, reform of reconstruction, and a refocus on the war on terror. By placing so much emphasis, instead, on dealing with the problems in Iraq militarily and not enough emphasis on sustained political and diplomatic engagements, the President's escalation plan repeats past mistakes.

The stakes in Iraq are too high to recycle proposals that have little prospect for success. The bipartisan resolution today may be nonbinding, but it will send a strong message to the President. We here in Congress are committed to protecting and supporting our troops.

The passage of this legislation will signal a change in direction in Iraq that will end the fighting and bring our troops home safely and soon. Our troops are working together to secure our Nation, and we in this House must work together to secure our Nation as well and to do so in a way that honors their sacrifice.

I urge my colleagues to support our troops and a new direction in Iraq by voting ''aye'' on the bipartisan Skelton-Lantos-Jones resolution.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 6 minutes to Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, a prominent feature of this debate has been two sharply contrasting visions of the future. One vision sees no hope for us in Iraq and counsels that we withdraw, just give up. By contrast, the other mission focuses on success. We understand what accepting defeat means for Iraq.

We understand what accepting defeat means for Iraq, the region and our Nation's security interest. We support modifications and strategy to address the enemy's changing tactics, and we are committed to destroying the enemy before the enemy can destroy us. This success policy is rooted in the fabric of the American character, in our belief in the ability of our troops to achieve success in Iraq and Afghanistan and on all the fronts on this global war against Islamic militant jihadists.

The resolution at the center of this debate, Madam Speaker, lacks hope. It accepts defeat. It opposes reinforcements for our troops on the battlefield, reinforcements that strengthens their capacity to confront the enemy and succeed in their mission.

General Petraeus said that he cannot accomplish his mission without the deployment of additional U.S. forces. This resolution, however, announces that Congress will deny the commander in Iraq the means he says he needs to win. This resolution seeks to transform this House into 435 generals.

What is the next step in the strategy, Madam Speaker, after the crippling of our war effort? We know from statements and bills that have been introduced that plans will mandate the nature and the timing of a withdrawal by placing limitations on the funding of our efforts. A vote for this resolution then is a vote to proceed toward defunding of our troops.

Some believe that the impact of these decisions is confined to Iraq, but Iraq is only one front in the global war against radical Islamic jihadists. This is a war without boundaries. This is a war that poses the greatest challenge to our generation.

I will quote al-Zawahiri in his own words. He describes this fight in this way:

'' . . . Afghanistan and Iraq are the two most important fields for confronting the contemporary Crusader war. Therefore, the Muslim nation should support the mujahidin in these two countries with all its power.''

Those are al-Zawahiri's own words. He talks about the war in Iraq as being central. He added that Iraq ''is the gateway to the liberation of Palestine and the restoration of the Islamic Caliphate.''

Iran's leader has echoed similar views. He stated, we will soon experience a world without the United States; and he goes on to state, we must prepare ourselves to rule the world.

The enemy understands what is at stake. We must, also.

Once the retreat has started, where will it stop? Afghanistan? The Persian Gulf? The entire Middle East? Once we have abandoned our allies in Iraq, why should anyone in the world believe when we say that we draw a line in the sand and say that we will never abandon them.

Lawrence Haas, a former communications director for Vice President Gore, stated recently, '' . . . our enemies anticipate that Iraq will be the latest chapter in the book of American defeatism. Our withdrawal will embolden them to push ahead, confident that we

lack the stomach for confrontation, that our commitments mean nothing, that they can win simply by outlasting us.''

A withdrawal in this generational fight will ensure that what is to come will be even worse. While urging a withdrawal, some state that they support the troops. But as leaders of the American Legion and the Veterans for Foreign Wars have stated, you cannot separate the warrior from the war.

My stepson, Douglas Lehtinen, and his wife, Lindsay, proudly served as Marine pilots in Iraq. Lindsay will soon leave for a tour in Afghanistan. Far from seeing their mission as hopeless, far from urging withdrawal, they and their fellow service men and women are committed to victory. They are so confident in that success that they are willing to risk their lives to secure it.

□ 1330

They would tell you that victory can never be ensured but that we can make defeat inevitable by giving our consent. The hopelessness from which this resolution springs is alien to our American spirit and it runs contrary to our history. What Thomas Paine said over two centuries ago stands still today: These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shrink from the service of their country. But he that stands by it now deserve the love and the thanks of every man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. Yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.

If you like the status quo in Iraq, Madam Speaker, then you vote ''yes'' on this resolution. If you favor a mission of success in defeating the Islamic militant jihadists who are our enemies, then please vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend and our distinguished colleague from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I am hopeful today. Finally, 4 years into a very controversial war, Congress will begin to fulfill its constitutional responsibility as Representatives of the people. This week, every Member of the House of Representatives has had an opportunity to express their views on the war in Iraq. And today, every Member will cast their vote for or against the President's escalation of the war. This is only right.

For my part, I believe the President's proposed escalation would be a tragic mistake. Our need for a change of direction could not be more clear. But rather than change direction, the President proposes that we continue down our current disastrous path, only at a faster pace and with more human life placed in harm's way.

We should be bringing troops home, not sending more there. We should be ending this war, not escalating it. Considering this resolution is only the first step of many Congress will need to take to force a change in direction, but as Thomas Jefferson once said, honesty is the first chapter of the book of wisdom. Congress writes that chapter with this resolution, but it is only the first chapter.

Sadly, the burden created by the lack of honesty and wisdom this administration has brought to this conflict is shouldered by our brave men and women in uniform. Two years ago, I spoke with a group of women in Sacramento whose husbands were serving in the National Guard in Iraq.

One woman told me she had to buy her husband a Kevlar vest and a canteen before he deployed to Iraq, something all too many families were doing for their loved ones because the military was not providing it. A short time later, the administration assured the public that the issue had been addressed. And yet just this week we heard reports that the Army lacks armored Humvees and other equipment necessary for the troop increase the President is implementing; once again, a failure in vision and planning, and once again, our troops pay the price.

Escalation of this conflict will further increase the strain on a military that is already stretched to the breaking point. Every Member of this Chamber knows this. Earlier this month, I spoke with a friend and reservist in Sacramento named Richard Beach. Richard shipped out to Iraq 4 years ago as a chaplain in the Army Reserves. He is home now. But he still keeps in touch with his old unit. Richard shared with me a note he sent to some of his fellow members of the 114th.

He wrote, ''I remember 4 years ago we were getting ready for our trip to Fort Lewis and then on to Iraq. I hope as the fourth anniversary of the war comes up, you are all in good health and living life to the fullest. I, too, pray that soon this war will end and we will stop sending our soldiers off to war.''

Four years later, he reports that many of the same soldiers and their families are making the same sacrifice. But that is a heartbreaking reality here. Implementing the President's policy will mean that members of his regiment along with so many others will have to endure more and more of the back-to-back deployments to Iraq.

The notion of shared sacrifice is something that helped make this country great. Americans are strong believers in shared sacrifice. But all too often in this war, only our troops and their families share the sacrifice. That is too much to ask on behalf of policies that have not worked.

The administration offers us scant reason to believe this troop increase will work when it has tried and failed with several previous troop increases. This proposal offers us nothing but more of the same.

Our brave men and women in uniform have done everything that has been asked of them. It is our political leadership that has failed. There is a saying, It takes two people to speak the truth: one to speak it and one to hear it. I hope the administration will choose to hear the truth and I hope that we pass this resolution today.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the ranking member on the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, this debate is about whether or not America is a great Nation that will lead in the face of difficulty. We have come up short. This resolution falls short. It is small and not worthy of this House. Why small? Let me begin with a threat that some either don't understand or refuse to acknowledge.

This resolution does not address the fact that the current threat is not just the single front in Iraq, but rather the larger threat of militant Islamic jihadists who hate us enough to want to kill. These militant Islamic jihadists are a fringe element of Islam who have very specific ideas and goals about how to revive Islam, return Muslims to world power, and how to deal with their enemies.

They are committed to a violent overthrow of existing international systems and to their replacement by an all-encompassing Islamic state called the caliphate. In explaining his approach to creating the caliphate, centered in Iraq, al-Qaeda's number two leader, Zawahari, outlined a four-stage plan:

Stage 1, expel the Americans from Iraq in defeat.

Stage 2, create an Islamic religious government in Iraq, developing and supporting it until it achieves a level of a caliphate.

Stage 3, extend the jihad wave to secular countries neighboring Iraq.

Stage 4, clash with Israel, because Israel was established only to challenge any new Islamic entity.

I think you get the picture.

Let me also be clear. This jihad is about them, their God, and their religion, it is not about us. These militant jihadists believe that the modern world has forsaken the pure religious life and that only with a caliphate can they return to ''pure life.''

It is this narrow ideology that poses the direct and real threat to us. It is this ideology that threatens not only us, but also includes the belief that killing other Muslims is justified to achieve their radical goals. Here is the true threat to America and the world, this militant Islamic jihad, a jihad that attacks around the globe, including the United States and Iraq. The resolution we debate today does not address this global problem, this threat to peace and stability. Iraq is not the problem, it is only one front in this larger war.

The second point. This resolution omits specifically all of the men and women of the Armed forces who are defending our freedoms in other theaters

such as Kuwait, Afghanistan and Bosnia. It says, by not saying, that this Congress may not support troops who will be sent to Iraq.

Is this intentional? Is this part of the plan to choke off funding for our troops? I also take great umbrage that this resolution omits and completely slights the incredible contributions to this Nation's security of our dedicated men and women in the Intelligence Community, many serving in Iraq, who provide our combat troops with the information vital to their security.

Is this the first step in cutting off their funding, too, returning to the Clinton administration's policies of the 1990s that decimated our intelligence capabilities?

Finally, Madam Speaker, I need to address the issue of the consequences of failure. What happens if Iraq collapses due to a sudden withdrawal of U.S. troops? Our enemies have made it clear that they will fill the void. Surely America is wary of the conflict in Iraq, but the difficulty of this conflict does not justify giving into their strategy; yes, their strategy. They believe that they are winning by wearing America down. Will we quit? Do we understand the consequences?

Make no mistake, this resolution is a dangerous and naive first step to cutting funding to our troops in an unwise withdrawal from the region. Iraq is not a faraway place where the United States has no interest and where we can pull our troops out of without paying a price in the global war against militant Islam.

This debate is not about Iraq, it is about us, us as a Nation of people who will do the right thing. The fundamental question is, Do we have the resolve that will be necessary to defeat radical militant Islamic jihadists that contain bad actors such as Iran, and will we stand and fight for the future of our kids and their kids?

We have faced similar threats before. In 1945 my parents were liberated by Canadians and American troops in the Netherlands. They never forgot the sacrifices that were made by brave soldiers and by a great Nation, a Nation on a great mission.

America did it for them, but it also did it for itself. America recognized that the threat was a direct threat to America and the world. We then led a global effort to victory. Today we face a very different but, again, a very real threat: radical militant Islam. The challenge to this Congress is to rise to the occasion, to help lead America and to help lead the world to victory.

This petty resolution falls far short of that noble and worthy calling. Vote ''no.'' We can and we must do better.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, this week during the debate on H. Con. Res. 63, I spoke of the men and women of our Armed Forces and the sacrifices they have made for our country. I noted that I had visited them in theater, at Walter Reed, and with their families in New Jersey. As I said, the quality of these men and women, and their earnest wish to serve their country, makes this situation in Iraq all the more tragic. I am sure I was quite clear regarding my sentiments, but it would appear that some in this House chose to mischaracterize my remarks.

The gentleman from California, Mr. HUNTER, said that I ''referred to our wounded folks in Walter Reed as tragic.'' I want the gentleman to know I said no such thing, and I will ask him to be accurate if he chooses to quote me again.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend and our distinguished collegue from West Virginia, Congressman MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution opposing the President's decision to escalate this war. My position on the Iraq war is uncomplicated. I voted against the initial war resolution back in 2002, mostly because I never believed the President made a compelling argument that Iraq posed the sort of substantive threat to the United States that would justify war, and the considerable human, political, and financial costs that it would bring.

□ 1345

I thought it was a bad decision at the time, and I think it is a bad decision today.

In my limited time this afternoon, I would like to comment on a couple of refrains that we keep hearing. The first is the President's repeated criticism that those who support this resolution are prejudging a plan that hasn't even been ''given a chance to work.'' He makes that charge with a tone of wonderment, as though somehow it weren't our duty to anticipate the consequences of different courses of action and to avoid the bad ones before embracing them. If more of us had prejudged his 2002 decision, taking us to war before it was ''given a chance to work,'' we wouldn't be having this debate today.

The difference between today and 2002 is that a majority of this House and this Congress are no longer willing to give the President the benefit of the doubt he enjoyed 5 years ago. We are no longer willing to suspend judgment and trust the decider. That should surprise precisely no one.

For 4 years we have been asked to trust this administration, to trust, as the Vice President emphatically declared, that they knew where the weapons of mass destruction are; to trust that the Iraqis would welcome us as liberators; to trust that we had a large enough invasion force to stabilize the country; to trust that the Shi'a would find common cause with the Sunni and the Kurd in a united Iraq; to trust that Iraq's oil reserves would pay for its reconstruction; to trust that Iraq would serve as a beacon of democratic ideals throughout the Middle East; to trust that those early signs of a growing insurgency were nothing more than the ''last throes of a few dead-enders.''

And now the President asks us not to prejudge his plan to put another 21,000 Americans in harm's way. He asks us to trust him yet again. With respect and humility, Madam Speaker, I ask him, how can we? And how can he even ask it of us? Paraphrasing the President, fool me once, shame on you. Fool me five times, shame on me.

And another criticism of this measure that we have heard repeated over and over this week is that, as a nonbinding resolution, its passage and this debate is meaningless.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is far from meaningless. If need be, Congress will end this war with binding legislation. As even the President acknowledged, we retain the power of the purse, and we have ample opportunity to exercise that power.

But just as wars should be started with a united government, so, too, should wars be ended with a united government. And that is the meaningfulness of this resolution. It is the last chance to draw this government back together on Iraq. It is the last call for us to work together, Democratic and Republican, legislative and executive, on ending this war. It is the last call for the President to come back to the people.

He may ignore that call. He may dismiss this resolution and this debate as meaningless. He may dismiss the voice of the people expressed through 439 newly elected Representatives as meaningless. But if he does, Madam Speaker, he forces us to move forward without him. I hope that doesn't happen.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution, and I urge the President to listen to this debate and to join with us.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would yield 5 minutes to Mr. HUNTER of California, ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

This is, indeed, a sad time in our country. Five years ago we came to this floor united. We joined in sending our troops off in this war against terror.

You know, Madam Speaker, for the first number of strikes that were delivered by Muslim extremists in this war, the terrorists chose the battlefields. They chose a battlefield as a Marine barracks in Beirut. And Mr. SKELTON and I were there, he shortly after the explosion that killed our Marines, I shortly before that explosion. They chose the Khobar Towers, they chose the embassies in Africa, they chose the USS *Cole*, and then they chose New

York, Washington, DC, and Pennsylvania. We chose the next two battlefields, Afghanistan and Iraq.

Our Democrat colleagues say that Iraq was the wrong battlefield, and I have heard resonating through the floor over the last 4 days statements that they were tricked, hornswoggled, fooled about Saddam Hussein.

From my side of the argument as to whether or not Saddam Hussein was a dangerous terrorist, I will simply offer all the statements by every Democrat leader in America during the 1990s, when there was no Bush administration to, in the words of my Democrat colleagues, ''trick them.'' I will offer their statements about Saddam Hussein.

Madam Speaker, we have expanded in the last 60 years. We have been in the business of expanding freedom. We understood after World War II that if we didn't change the world, the world would change us. And that lesson was relearned after 9/11.

No one would argue that it is not in our interest to have a Japan on the other side of the Pacific, where we stood up a free government, where we have a free nation, or that it is not in our interest to have a free El Salvador in our own hemisphere, or that it is not in our interest to have those dozens of nations that were behind the Berlin Wall that are now free and working for freedom. Many of them are partners in Iraq. We understand that.

And now we are trying to expand freedom in a different part of the world, a very dangerous part of the world. And we are undertaking the same three-point strategy that we have had for 60 years: Number one, you stand up a free government; number two, you stand up a military capable of protecting that free government; and, number three, the Americans leave.

And we can build on this Baghdad plan, which is right now in the execution phase, this plan of having two or three Iraqi battalions out front, with an American backup battalion to mentor them, and we can rotate every one of the 129 Iraqi battalions through this type of a combat rotation, stand them up, give them battlefield experience, and then the Americans can leave.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have heard it said throughout this debate that there was somehow a smooth road not taken. And let me just say, that is not true. There are no smooth roads in the Middle East. There are no smooth roads to standing up new governments, especially in communities and states where people have been trained to live under dictatorships.

And for those who say if we had just kept Saddam Hussein's army in place, with it is 11,000 Sunni generals, everything would have been fine and we would have had a peaceful situation in Iraq right now, that is nonsense. And for those who said if we had had 200,000 or 300,000 troops, the Shiites and Sunnis would have forgotten their ancient rivalries, that is also nonsense.

What are the facts, the reality, our Democrat friends say we have to be realists here, is this is a tough, difficult road. We are on the second stage right now. Most importantly, Madam Speaker, our troops are in the field already on this plan that is now being retroactively disavowed by the Democratic leadership.

You know, it was in June, I think it was 2130 hours, June 6, 1944, when the first elements of the first aircraft of the Pathfinder companies went out in front of the 82nd Airborne over Normandy, and they shortly were followed by hundreds of airplanes with American paratroopers. The 82nd Airborne going into Normandy had the full support and prayers of everybody in the United States Congress.

Today, you have got an 82nd Airborne Second Brigade now operating under this plan in Baghdad already there in Baghdad. Now, is this going to be the day, I would ask my colleagues, when some trooper from the 82nd Airborne writes on the concrete wall next to his position in Baghdad, ''This is where I stood when the United States House of Representatives led by the Democrat leadership rejected my mission''? I hope that doesn't happen, Madam Speaker.

Vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESHOO). The gentleman from California has 29½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to Mr. MCCOTTER from Michigan, the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, President Lincoln warned, ''A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. It will become all one thing or all the other.''

Today, our House is divided; tomorrow, it will become all one thing or all the other. What are the possibilities?

In our divided House, one side believes we must win in Iraq to avoid a catastrophe; another side assumes we can lose in Iraq without consequence.

One side believes we must support our troops in harm's way and continue their funding; another side claims we can support our troops in harm's way and cut their funding.

One side assumes we must defeat al Qaeda in Iraq; another side asserts we can retreat from al Qaeda in Iraq.

And one side believes the American people voted to change course in Iraq to win; another side feels the American people voted to change course in Iraq to lose.

Shortly, we will see how divided we are. One side will vote to support the President's plan to win in Iraq by reinforcing our troops, and then pray to God we are right; one side will vote against the President's plan. And in this question rests the answer to the future of our divided House.

My friends, many of you are about to put yourselves in a precarious position, for no one knows what the future holds. While we may feel sure of our decisions in the evanescent present, the unfathomable vagaries of fate have yet to fully play upon the stage of human history. As a result, many supporters of this resolution made an ominous omission while urging its adoption: In denouncing the President's plan, too few of you have openly hoped our troops' new mission would win the day and prove you wrong.

Being your colleague, I know you share this hope in your hearts. But your fellow Americans in fields abroad and constituencies at home must now wonder, will you cut our troops funding to prove yourselves right?

Sooner than you imagine, this nonbinding resolution will instigate binding legislation to commence a ''slow bleed'' of funding cuts while our troops battle against the enemy. Again, because I serve beside you every day, I know you abhor the thought of American soldiers being harmed by such an abject betrayal of their trust during combat, but it is upon this crucible of conscience you will be judged by all. And when the time comes to confront the consequences of today's expediency, I pray you make the right decision. If, however, you make the wrong decision, you will not only betray our citizen soldiers' trust, you will disastrously unite this House in a callow contentment with our own liberty and a calloused apathy to others' enslavement.

Could there be any more dishonorable epitaph for our free Republic's revolutionary experiment in democracy? True, some allege I exaggerate the danger, but they have turned a blind eye to the epitaphs of liberty etched above the ruins of nations once gloried, now dead: the Athenian city-state, the Roman Republic, the Weimar Republic.

Thus, even as we today divide in our own House, we remain compelled to unite behind the cause of our free Republic in this dangerous age of globalization, wherein humanity's destiny is daily entwined across the disparate reaches of Earth.

Our cause is this: Our world cannot permanently endure half slave and half free. It will become all one thing or all the other, as it has before in the darkest ages of human existence.

My friends, at this crossroads of our Republic, we must heed the better angels of our nature. We must unite our divided House behind the self-evident truth that all human beings are endowed by their Creator, with the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We must extend freedom to the Iraqis and, in so doing, enhance the liberty of ourselves and all free peoples and inspire our fellow human beings caged in

tyranny's embrace. And emulating our nation's greatest generations, we must let hope to flow from God's heart to our humble hands so we may, where He allows, emancipate humanity into a new birth of freedom for ourselves and generations unborn.

Madam Speaker, we must reject this resolution, unite behind our heroic troops and, God willing, win our country and humanity's mortal struggle to be free.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of our Homeland Security Committee, Congressman THOMPSON.

□ 1400

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, 3 months ago the American people sent a resounding message for change. They voted for a new direction in Congress and new direction for the war in Iraq.

In solemn tribute to the sacrifices of the men and women of the Armed Forces in Mississippi's Second Congressional District who have served in Iraq and who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, I would like to recognize some of Mississippi's Second District heroes:

Staff Sergeant Kenneth Bradley. Hometown: Utica, Mississippi; 39 years old; died May 28, 2003, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Larry K. Brown. Hometown: Jackson, Mississippi; 22 years old; died April 5, 2003, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Rapheal S. Davis. Hometown: Tutwiler, Mississippi; 24 years of age; died December 2, 2003, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Captain Kermit O. Evans. Hollandale, Mississippi; 31 years old; died December 3, 2006, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Joshua S. Ladd. Port Gibson, Mississippi; 20 years old; died May 1, 2004, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Master Sergeant Brian McAnulty. Hometown: Vicksburg, Mississippi; 39 years of age; died December 11, 2006, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Staff Sergeant John McGee. Cary, Mississippi; age 36 years; died May 2, 2005, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Staff Sergeant Joe Wilson. Crystal Springs, Mississippi; 30 years of age; November 2, 2003, in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Madam Speaker, the Department of Defense reports that as of February 15, 2007, 3,126 U.S. military servicemembers have died as a result of their service in Iraq. More than 25,000 have been wounded.

This bipartisan resolution before us today asks Members a straightforward question: Do you approve of the President's announced proposal on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq?

There is no question that the way forward in Iraq is one of our greatest challenges. The open debate offered here today allows us all an opportunity to express our sentiments on the administration's proposal. The sacrifices, dedication, and patriotism of our elite military and their families deserve no less.

I oppose the President's proposal. Until the President is willing to sit down with Congress and provide accurate data on what is really going on in this war, I cannot in good conscience support putting more men in harm's way.

This administration used bad intelligence to justify the rationale for war, and I fear that they are using bad judgment here today in their call for sending 25,000 more troops into harm's way.

The administration keeps calling this proposal a troop surge. Let us call it what it is. The proposal is a troop increase. Rather than a troop surge, what we need from this administration is a truth surge. The incompetence and misinformation that has gotten us into this mess is not the competence it will take to get us out.

The President and this administration must remain faithful and truthful to Congress and the American people by openly discussing appropriate measures to resolve the situation in Iraq that is worsening daily. The President must allow Congress to do what it was formed to do under the Constitution. His decision to continue in this direction is not democratic and, therefore, does not demonstrate the best example of what we are fighting for in Iraq. We must not allow the President to escalate the Iraq War without specific congressional approval.

Madam Speaker, we must send the President a message he cannot ignore. We must pass the Skelton-Lantos-Jones resolution.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the deputy whip of the minority.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, just 2 days ago, on February 14, Osama bin Laden's deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, posted a speech on an Islamist Web site where he blessed jihad fighters in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Somalia and urged the mujahadeen all over world to remain steadfast since complete victory was near. He made special mention of those in the Islamic jihadist media and thanked them for their blessed efforts which cause the Crusaders to lose sleep.

There is no doubt about it, Madam Speaker. We are fighting against an enemy that uses every weapon at its disposal to inflict casualties upon our soldiers in the field. This enemy seeks not just victory in Iraq but the reestablishment of a greater Islamic caliphate that would threaten the security of America and freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Today, this House will vote on a nonbinding resolution that disapproves of a surge in Iraq, a resolution that discourages our troops yet fails to satisfy the antiwar movement of America's left.

The resolution will likely pass today with near unanimous support of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Yet, Madam Speaker, I am troubled by their seeming unwillingness to accept the real consequences of this outcome. This from the party of John F. Kennedy, who so inspired our Nation when he said in his inaugural address: ''Let every Nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to ensure the survival and the success of liberty.''

Madam Speaker, we have come a long way since our Nation's 35th President spoke those words 46 years ago.

This debate arrives at an historic time in our Nation's history, not because of the resolution we are considering today but because the results of our efforts in Iraq will have a true impact on the lives of our soldiers and the security of all of us for generations to come.

Recently, I received a letter from one of my constituents who expressed some very real concerns about the Democrats' view of the war in Iraq. He writes: ''I am a servicemember that has served in Iraq, training Iraqis. I have 19 years of service. I spent 6 years in the Virginia Army National Guard, and I am entering my 13th year of active Federal service.

''Pulling out of Iraq doesn't send the right message to those we are fighting,'' he said. ''Not enough is being said about what the U.S. will do if we withdraw and what will happen in the midst of a power vacuum . . . ''

The soldier went on to say: ''I personally served in the streets of Baghdad in 2006, and I would have felt better serving, thinking that both houses of Congress gave me their full support.''

Madam Speaker, what we debate in this House, how we conduct ourselves, does have real consequences. Some of our country's bravest are on the battlefield and on the streets of Baghdad as we speak.

We have seen throughout our history what happens when our resolve is weak. In 1993 this country halfheartedly supported the commitment of troops to subdue the violent warlords of Somalia. The precipitous withdrawal in the face of casualties left a chaotic nation to this day that harbors terrorists and is a feeding ground for instability.

The lessons of history must not be forgotten as we face a determined enemy of Islamic terrorists who are waging a war upon freedom.

Madam Speaker, the American people want us to fight and win in Iraq and bring our troops home. Our soldiers seek nothing more than the support they require to perform their mission and the knowledge that the American people believe that their sacrifice is necessary and noble.

Contrary to some of those on the other side of the aisle who have stood here in this well believing and saying

that this debate is a breath of fresh air, our enemies will be the only ones satisfied by this debate. They will have received all the political rhetoric they require to convince their followers that complete victory is at hand. One can only imagine with horror how many Islamic radicals will be inspired to continue the fight after this House resolves that it supports our troops but not the mission we ask them to perform.

To those who support this resolution and oppose any effort to achieve victory in Iraq, I challenge you to be true to your convictions and bring a binding resolution to the floor to cut off funds for our troops, because that is really what this is all about.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this resolution and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and send a message worth hearing to America, our soldiers, and our enemies.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While this resolution may be nonbinding, we will all be bound by its consequences: the immediate and long-lasting consequences, those here and in the combat zone.

Democrats continue to put forward an inherently contradictory message with dire consequences, on one hand offering rhetorical support for the troops and on the other, advancing a slow-bleed strategy that methodically constricts those troops' ability to succeed.

From the testimonials we have heard, it is clear our troops believe their mission is winnable. And the message they are routinely delivering to us could not be more clear. They want a chance to get the job done.

Ladies and gentlemen, our troops are not speaking off of a slickly produced focus group-tested set of talking points. They are vocalizing the overwhelming sentiments that exist on the front lines. We do a disservice to the very troops we claim to support when we advance a slow-bleed strategy that cuts off their lifeline of support.

We don't support them when we choke off the funding they need to succeed. We don't support them when we erect political roadblocks designed to deny them the equipment that they need to carry out their mission. We don't support them when we tie their hands behind their back. And we certainly don't support our troops when we attach strings to the funding needed to ensure that when they need help, it is on the way.

Yesterday the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee unveiled this dangerous slow-bleed doctrine on a Web site, movecongress.org, that is directly affiliated with some of the most extreme elements of the antiwar left. This is a political machine designed to elect and defeat politicians by using our troops as pawns, and now they seek to deprive those same troops of the resources they need to succeed in their mission. According to news reports, these groups are prepared to spend $8.5 million on a national ad campaign to target lawmakers who did not adhere to their extremist, defeatist views.

This resolution is not an earnest expression of congressional sentiment. It is phase one of the far left's plan to elect more of their own. And all of this is for what? To send a message or settle a score with our Commander in Chief? To raise campaign cash?

It turns out our worse fears are true; that this resolution is, in fact, a first, dangerous step to cutting off the funds our troops so desperately need. The remarks of the Defense Appropriations chairman, the remarks of the Speaker with major national reporters lending support to the slow-bleed doctrine; and next week senior House leaders will convene to map out their strategy for maximizing their ability to defund the troops while minimizing the political fallout.

Before you cast your vote today, you should see this resolution for what it is: phase one of a political campaign to strip our troops of the funds they need.

□ 1415

Right now, in some cave in Iraq or Afghanistan, information is being located on a hard drive that talks about a plan for a new attack in America. Right now, somewhere in the Middle East, teenage boys are being groomed to be human bombs to further the aims of these Islamic extremists. Right now, money is being transferred across a global finance network to fund the attacks here on our soil or on other allies' soil who believe in the types of freedom and open society we enjoy, in Madrid, in London, in Hamburg, in New York, in Washington.

Regardless of how many Republicans cross the aisle and vote with the Democrats or how many Democrats cross the aisle and vote with the Republicans, tomorrow morning the terrorists will still wake up with hate on their hearts, plotting the next scheme to bring down our economy, to bring down our system of government, to bring down the lives of innocents.

As recently as last August, as if we didn't learn from the events of 9/11, as recently as last August, there was still an attempt to blow up 10 more airliners using baby food as the means for bringing on the explosive device.

Resolutions like this do nothing to stop that type of hate. They only send the wrong signals to the men and women on the front lines for all of us.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the minority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise again today, as I did at the beginning of this debate, to urge a ''no'' vote on this nonbinding resolution. We have spent the week discussing the situation in Iraq and trying to find out what the resolution may really mean.

As I said at the start of this debate, it is hard to imagine a less qualified group prepared to determine tactics on the ground than 535 Members of Congress, or 535 members of anything else; how many troops to deploy, where to deploy them, which car to stop. Where does it end?

There is a disagreement on how we should fight this war on Islamic totalitarianism, but this fight is the challenge of our generation.

Madam Speaker, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle supported this mission at the beginning. Now they are ready to give up in the middle of the fight.

Those who join me in opposing this nonbinding resolution have been saying all week, while this resolution will have no impact because it is nonbinding, it is still the first step toward cutting funding for our troops.

Yesterday, we were told that this is the first step toward pulling the rug out from under our troops in the field.

This week, one of the veterans on our side of the aisle was accused of being dishonest in her representation when she said that this resolution we will vote on today did not support those who are deploying. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, said just yesterday, during the unveiling of his strategy to pull the rug out from under our troops, ''They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment. They don't have the training, and they won't be able to do the work.''

He also said, ''I think, first of all, we have to be careful that people don't think this is the vote. The real vote will come on the legislation we are putting together. This nonbinding legislation is just an opinion.''

I would say this resolution says just enough not to say anything at all. We have already heard the Democrats calling the debate this week the ''bark before the bite.'' Their so-called slow-bleed approach is the bite that will surely hurt those fighting under America's flag overseas.

This nonbinding resolution is the first step in an all-too-binding spiral toward defeat in a fight that we cannot afford to lose.

I am not pleased to vote ''no'' today, but I will vote ''no,'' knowing that the ''no'' vote is the right vote.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, as we come to the end of this debate, I want to commend every participant on both sides for conveying powerfully and eloquently their deeply held views.

I started this debate in the firm belief that escalation is a flawed idea. After listening carefully for the past 4 days to all of my colleagues, I am more convinced than ever that escalation is a flawed idea.

Escalation is not only the wrong policy for the United States, it is also the

wrong policy for Iraq. If Iraq is to succeed as a stable and prosperous state, it must learn to take responsibility. It must learn to make difficult decisions. It must amend its constitution in the interests of Iraqi reconciliation. It must devise an equitable law for sharing its oil and gas revenues. And it must take primary responsibility for its own security.

Unless we de-escalate, Iraq will never step up to the plate. But that is not the only reason we must de-escalate. Unless we do so, our great Nation will be unable to fulfill its many far-flung global responsibilities. Unless we de-escalate, we will simply lack the resources for critical tasks here at home and overseas.

All of us, Madam Speaker, are passionately committed to supporting and defending our troops. In the coming weeks, my fellow Democrats and I will bring forth specific proposals to enhance this Nation's support and defense of our brave troops.

Madam Speaker, the American people are not well-served by the surge and our present course in Iraq. This omelet cannot be unscrambled. There have been far too many mistakes made to undo the damage.

For the sake of Iraq, for the sake of our own national interests and for the sake of our incomparable troops, de-escalation must begin, and it must begin now.

I strongly support the resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do so.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support our troops and our Nation. It is really that simple.

We in Congress have an obligation and duty to debate the many different issues facing the country. Our words and our actions traditionally make their way to our constituents' living rooms and the national news, but now, with communications being what they are, to our troops in the field through the Internet.

Our words are the guiding principles by which the voters ultimately make their decision on who they want representing them here, and this week obviously is no exception.

Our words will carry on for many months to come. Our constituents are listening, as there is no issue more sobering or more somber than this one.

Over the last 4 days, though, I have been struck not so much by the rhetoric on display here but the effects this debate will have on the morale of our troops. Our words have carried much further than those living rooms this past week. This debate will inevitably make its way to our troops there in Iraq standing watch in some remote outpost, training Iraqi security forces.

This debate will inevitably make its way to the parents of our troops, their spouses, their children. These children will remember parts of this debate and will grow up learning just how much their country supported their parents during these trying times.

The talk also goes to the enemy, who is watching and listening to us in the caves, on the battlefield, the terrorist cells wherever they may be. They monitor what we are saying to learn of our resolve. So even if we just talk, we ought to be very careful what we say. The world is watching and listening.

And since we have the power to fund our military, I want to talk briefly. We have one Commander in Chief. The President's premise for going to war in both Afghanistan and Iraq has always been to go on the offensive. It is hard to prove a negative, but it is obvious we have not had one terrorist attack in the U.S. since 9/11. That is not all because of our decision to go to war in Iraq, but it is one of the reasons.

Everybody ought to know by now the basic mindset of the terrorist jihadists. They are attracted to volatile parts of the Middle East, where broken regimes make it okay to practice hatred and violence. They are looking for safe sanctuary that provides secrecy, communications capabilities and a basic infrastructure with which to concoct their next scheme. They plan and plot and wait to pounce in various hot spots around the world, just as they have done in Kenya, Tanzania, the USS *Cole*, Bali, Madrid, London. It is a low-grade world war.

If we finish this job, Iraq might be a place where people are more concerned with getting to work and raising a family than one where terrorists can plan attacks and sectarian violence is rampant. It won't be perfect.

And let's be honest about what is called sectarian violence. Where did that come from? A lot of it from terrorist organizations, al Qaeda foremost. It is provoked and prodded along because our enemies know it will test our resolve. Listen to the tapes of Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahari. They talk about it all the time.

What they want for themselves is for the U.S. to give up. They call us a paper tiger, a country that gives up when support wanes or when the going gets difficult. In their view, after we give up, they will claim victory and turn Iraq into a terrorist factory of training camps, weapons making and surveillance operations, all designed for the express purpose of waging the next attack in the U.S. or otherwise advancing this low-grade world war.

The President knows this, and we need to end this war. He has taken the input of others and readjusted our strategy and, as we speak, is readjusting our tactics. The Iraqis must take charge of their own security.

Our military is pressing for action, action from our own troops to quell the violence and action to get the Iraqi security forces trained, equipped and ready to act.

I hope to bring the Kentucky troops home, but not until the work is done. Oppose the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, this is a bipartisan resolution, and I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to Chairman SKELTON and Chairman LANTOS for giving me the opportunity and the privilege to be part of this resolution, first of all, to thank our men and women in uniform for their service and, secondly, to question whether the sending of 20,000-plus troops to be policemen in Baghdad is the right thing or the wrong thing to do.

I think this has been a great debate, no matter which side of the aisle you have been on or which position you have had.

Madam Speaker, I want to say again, as I did 2 days ago, I know we cannot live in the past, but I will tell you, my heart has ached ever since I went to a Marine's funeral in April of 2003.

Michael Bitz died a sergeant, a sergeant who left a wife and three children, twins that were born 2 weeks after he was deployed. He never saw them. At the funeral, the wife read the last letter word for word. She cried, and I cried too, by God.

Then I started questioning. The intelligence given to the Congress and the American people, was it verified? Was it true? Then I started speaking out and asking for those who were on the inside, and I am going to read this to you today very quickly.

□ 1430

General Gregory Newbold, Marine general, and as far as I am concerned, he is a hero because he gave up a third star because he could not sit there and see the manipulation of the intelligence to send our troops to Iraq, and I quote very quickly from an article that he wrote for Time magazine, April 9, 2006.

''Two senior military officers are known to have challenged Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld on the planning of the Iraq War. Army General Eric Shinseki publicly dissented and found himself marginalized. Marine Lieutenant Greg Newbold, the Pentagon's top operations officer, voiced his objections internally and then retired, in part out of opposition to the war.''

I further read from his writing to Time magazine. ''From 2000 until October 2002, I was a Marine Corps lieutenant general and director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After 9/11, I was a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war. Inside the military family, I made no secret of my view that the zealots' rationale for war made no sense. And I think I was outspoken enough to make those senior to me uncomfortable. But I now regret that I did not more openly challenge those who were determined to invade a country whose actions were peripheral to the real threat, al Qaeda. I

retired from the military 4 months before the invasion, in part because of my opposition to those who had used 9/11's tragedy to hijack our security policy.''

He further stated, ''To be sure, the Bush administration and senior military officials are not alone in their culpability. Members of Congress, from both parties, defaulted in fulfilling their constitutional responsibility for oversight.''

These are not my words. They are the words of two-star Marine General Gregory Newbold who gave up the third star because he could not stay and see what was happening to our military and to this country.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be part of this resolution. Debate has never hurt anyone. In fact, at the Armed Services meeting 2 weeks ago, a question was asked, either by my side or your side, Would this demoralize the troops? And General Pace and Secretary of Defense Gates said, no, it will not; they are smart, they understand. This is what freedom is all about is debate, disagreement, and discussion.

Madam Speaker, our troops have done a magnificent job, and they cannot afford to continue to be policemen in a civil war. It is not fair and makes no sense at all.

Seventy percent of the American people are opposed to this surge, and Madam Speaker, I want to read Retired Army Lieutenant General J. Garner, the first U.S. official in charge of postwar Baghdad. Madam Speaker, he said, ''I don't know that the Iraqi Government has ever demonstrated ability to lead the country, and we shouldn't be surprised. You'll never find, in my lifetime, one man that all the Iraqis will coalesce around. Iraqis are too divided among sectarian, ethnic, and tribal loyalties, and their loyalties are regional, not national.''

Let's pass this resolution, and God bless our men and women in uniform.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the minority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for yielding and thank him and all of you for, once again, to have an opportunity to come and speak on the floor on this resolution.

The resolution before us is nonbinding, but it is the first step down a very treacherous path, a path that, if followed, will endanger Americans for generations to come.

Iraq is the central front in a global war between the United States of America and radical Islamic terrorists, a war that began long before the horrific events of 9/11, a war the American people did not seek and did not start.

It is mind-boggling to consider how fanatically committed our enemies are to destroying America, even at the cost of destroying themselves in the process. Our enemies recruit young people, fill them with hate and rage, and then send them on suicide missions to kill innocent victims. We face an enemy that loves death more than it loves life.

As Americans, we cherish freedom and democracy. Ours is a way of life. Theirs is a way of death, of murder, of suicide.

The global reach of radical Islam stretches from North Africa, through the Middle East, to South Asia, to Indonesia and to the Philippines.

The other side wants Americans to believe that the war in Iraq is different from the war on terror. They even say that we are not fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, ignoring the fact that al Qaeda has made it the central front in their war against America.

According to the experts, and according to their own words, radical Islamic terrorists will never stop fighting until much of the world is under Islamic law.

In 2004, Osama bin Laden said the following about the conflict in Iraq: ''The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries; the Islamic Nation . . . and the United States and its allies on the other. It is either victory and glory or misery and humiliation.''

And our enemies are watching this debate, and through the Arab media we know what they are saying.

Recently, the second-in-command of al Qaeda issued a warning to moderate Muslims in Iraq and Afghanistan who are working and dying to build peace and security, and he said this: ''These traitors in Iraq and Afghanistan must face their inevitable fate, and face up to the inescapable facts. America is about to depart and abandon them, just as it abandoned their like in Vietnam.''

The consequences of failure in Iraq would be catastrophic for America and the world.

Last month, General Petraeus spoke of the very real possibility of Iraq's neighbors taking sides in sectarian violence.

Failing in Iraq would jeopardize Israel and greatly benefit Iran, a nation governed by a fanatic and actively building nuclear weapons.

The battle we fight in Iraq is the biggest part of our global war, and if we leave, the fight will, in fact, follow us home. And what we will leave behind is chaos, the same kind of chaos we left behind in Vietnam, the same kind of chaos we left behind in Lebanon, and the same kind of chaos that we left behind in Somalia.

Who does not believe that we will not see chaos in Iraq, destabilizing the Middle East and jeopardizing the very safety and security of the American people?

As Americans, we are fortunate in so many ways. We have so many blessings, including a great and proud history to inspire us. Earlier this week, I talked about President Lincoln and the challenges he faced during some of America's darkest days. During the Revolution, America faced down what was then the most powerful empire in the world, with a rag-tag army. We survived a Civil War that would have permanently divided any other Nation.

After a crippling depression in the 1930s, we defeated Japanese imperialism and Hitler in Germany. We then defeated the Soviet Union and their communist empire in a test of wills that lasted for a generation.

The greatness of America is exemplified in a simple short letter about duty and sacrifice. The letter was written by Marine Staff Sergeant Daniel Clay, the husband of my former staffer, Lisa Bell Clay.

Sergeant Clay was one of 10 Marines who were killed in Fallujah a little over a year ago, and he left behind this letter to his family in case he did not come home.

In it, he said, ''What we have done in Iraq is worth any sacrifice. Why? Because it was our duty.'' He says, ''That sounds simple. But all of us have a duty. Duty is defined as a God-given task. Without duty, life is worthless.''

Our troops are not the only Americans who have a God-given task. If a noncommissioned officer can understand his duty, then certainly Members of Congress can understand theirs.

Congress has a duty to protect the American people now so that the next generation can enjoy prosperity and freedom.

Congress also has a duty to the men and women in uniform when we send them into harm's way, a duty to provide them with the full support and resources they need to accomplish their mission and return home safely.

My friends on the other side have described this nonbinding resolution as their first step. It is a first step. It is the first step in a plan to cut off funding and reinforcements for American troops in harm's way.

The next step is to micromanage the war through the budget process. To quote the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), who said yesterday, ''They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment, they don't have the training and they won't be able to do the work.''

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment American troops are fighting radical Islamic terrorists thousands of miles away, and it is unthinkable that the United States Congress would move to discredit their mission, cut off their reinforcements and deny them the resources they need to succeed and return home safely.

The American people will not support a strategy that involves pulling the rug out from under American troops in the combat zone by cutting off their reinforcements and forcing them to face an enemy without our full support.

This resolution is nonbinding, but it is the first step toward a tragic, unthinkable goal.

Four years ago, this body agreed that fighting this war was a worthy cause. There have been setbacks where Members on both sides of the aisle are rightly dissatisfied with the results. But this is war. We face a sophisticated, determined enemy who wants to annihilate our way of life.

We have a duty to stand and fight against those who seek to destroy America and the freedom that defines us. Our troops are committed to fighting and winning this global war. We owe them our unfailing support.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the marines, the soldiers, the sailors and the airmen and vote down this resolution. I urge my colleagues to think about our duty, our duty to support our troops, our duty to protect the American people, and our duty to leave for our kids and their kids a safe, free, and secure America. Our soldiers are dying around the world to protect us, upholding their duty. Do we have the courage to uphold our duty?

Vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to yield 7 minutes to an American hero, a hero of the State of Texas, a pilot in Vietnam, one of the longest serving prisoners of war of the Vietnam era and a personal hero of mine, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

□ 1445

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. You know, as he said, I flew 62 combat missions in the Korean War and 25 in Vietnam before being shot down. I had the privilege of serving in the United States Air Force for 29 years, attending the prestigious National War College, commanding two air bases, among other things.

I mention these stories because I view the debate on the floor not just as a U.S. Congressman elected to serve the good people of the Third District in Texas, but also through the lens of a lifelong fighter pilot, student of war, a combat warrior, a leader of men, and a prisoner of war.

Ironically, this week marks the anniversary that I started a new life and my freedom from prison in Hanoi. I spent early 7 years as that prisoner of war, more than half of that time in solitary confinement. I flew out of Hanoi on February 12, 1973, with other longheld prisoners of war, weighing just 140 pounds. And tomorrow, 34 years ago, I had my homecoming to Texas, a truly unspeakable blessing of freedom.

While in solitary confinement, my captures kept me in leg stocks, like the pilgrims, for 72 days. As you can imagine, they had to carry me out of the stocks because I couldn't walk.

The following day they put me in leg irons for 2½ years. That is when you have a tight metal cuff around each ankle with a foot-long bar connecting the legs. I still have very little feeling in my right arm and right hand, and my body has never been the same since my nearly 2,500 days of captivity. But I will never let my physical woes hold me back. Instead, I try to see the silver lining.

I say that because, in some ways, I am living a dream, a hope that I had for the future. From April 16, 1966, to February 12, 1973, I prayed that I would return home to the loving embrace of my wife, Shirley, and my three kids, Bob, Jenny, and Beverly. My fellow POWs and I clung to the hope of when, not if, we returned home. We would spend hours tapping on the adjoining cement walls about what we would do when we got home to America. We pledged to quit griping about the way the government was running the war in Vietnam and do something about it. We decided we would run for office and try to make America a better place for all of us.

So, little did I know back in my rat-infested 3-by-8 dark, filthy cell that, 34 years after my departure from hell on earth, I would spend the anniversary of my release pleading for a House panel to back my measure to support and fully fund our troops in harm's way; and, that just days later I would be on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, surrounded by distinguished veterans, urging Congress to support our troops to the hilt.

We POWs were still in Vietnam when Washington cut the funding for Vietnam. I know what it does to morale and mission success. Words cannot fully describe the horrendous damage of the anti-American efforts against the war back home to the guys on the ground. Our captors would blare nasty recordings over the loudspeaker of Americans protesting back home, tales of Americans spitting on Vietnam veterans when they came home, and worse. I don't think we should ever, ever let that happen again. The pain inflicted by your country's indifference is tenfold that inflicted by your ruthless captors.

Our troops and their families want, need, and deserve the full support of this country and the Congress. Moms and dads watching the news need to know that the Congress will not leave their sons and daughters in harm's way without support.

Since the President announced his new plan for Iraq last month, there has been steady progress. He changed the rules of engagement, removed political protection. There are reports we wounded the number two of al Qaeda and killed his deputy. And, yes, al Qaeda operates in Iraq. It is alleged that top radical jihadist, al-Sadr, has fled Iraq maybe to Iran, and Iraq has closed its borders with Iran and Syria.

The President has changed course, has offered a new plan. We are making progress. We must seize the opportunity to move forward, not stifle future success. Debating nonbinding resolutions aimed at earning political points only destroys morale, stymies success, and emboldens the enemy.

The grim reality is that this House measure is the first step to cutting funding of the troops. Just ask JOHN MURTHA about his slow-bleed plan that hamstrings our troops in harm's way.

Now it is time to stand up for my friends who did not make it home and those who fought and died in Iraq already, so I can keep my promise that when we got home we would quit griping about the war and do something positive about it.

We must not allow this Congress to leave these troops like the Congress left us. Today, let my body serve as a brutal reminder that we must not repeat the mistakes of the past. Instead, learn from them. We must not cut funding for our troops. We must stick by them. We must support them all the way. And, to our troops, we must remain always faithful. God bless you all. I salute you and this Congress.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to share this body and this floor with the remarkable gentleman from Texas. I applaud him for his patriotism, his courage, and commitment to America.

Madam Speaker, we have had a long debate on this resolution. I have listened to critics, and I find it quite interesting that the criticism is focused almost exclusively on what this resolution doesn't say, rather than what it does.

Let me review, if I may. The resolution says two simple things: We support the troops completely, wholeheartedly, now and in the future; and we disapprove of the White House's plan to deploy more than 20,000 additional combat troops to Iraq.

That is what we are voting on today, and nothing said on this floor or in this Chamber will change the fact that that is what is before us.

I oppose the President's plan because it will embroil our troops even more deeply in a sectarian conflict. Some call this conflict a civil war, some call this more complicated than a civil war, and, either way, it is a conflict we cannot resolve and which ultimately cannot be resolved militarily.

The President's plan to deploy more troops is simply not the answer. It cannot fix the three irretrievable mistakes made in 2003 when the administration insisted on de-Baathification, dissolving the Iraqi army, and shutting down the state-run industries, throwing hundreds of thousands of Iraqis out of work and creating untold numbers of insurgents.

The President's plan hastily put together is insufficient in a number of ways:

It is insufficient in the requirements for progress it places on the Iraqi political system, the true center of gravity in this whole conflict.

It is insufficient in the support it provides to our combat forces both in terms of equipment as well as support forces.

And it is insufficient in the amount of training time it allows for deploying units.

As a result, under the President's plan, U.S. military forces will be less ready to go into during and after this troop increase; and, sadly, they could be stretched to the point of breaking. To the point of breaking.

Now, finally, I oppose the White House's plan because it will heighten the already unacceptable level of strategic risk currently facing our Nation,

strategic risk that exists because our military is overcommited in Iraq and is ill-equipped and ill-positioned to respond to emerging crises elsewhere in the world. And this worries me, it worries me deeply.

I have been privileged to serve here in Congress slightly over 30 years, and over that time 12 significant military contingencies have occurred in which our military have been involved. Each of them occurred in an unexpected place and at an unexpected time. It will happen again. Right now, we are not prepared as we should be for an unforeseen military threat. That worries me.

Unfortunately, it is the magnificent, wonderful, courageous men and women of our military who will pay the price for that failure.

Madam Speaker, we must send the White House a message that cannot be ignored; and that is why we are here today. I urge that we pass the Skelton-Lantos-Jones resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, despite my belief in the inadequacies of the President's new strategy, to vote for the resolution with the troops already deployed is a step I cannot take. I am unwilling to—after the fact—say to them, I oppose your mission.

My vote should not be interpreted as approval of the administration's conduct of this war. I have had the opportunity to meet General David Petraeus, the new commander of the U.S. forces in Iraq. I believe he is one of the most capable military commanders America has available for this mission. General Petraeus has indicated there is a chance for success and that he will report to the American people in 6 months as to whether or not the President's plan is working.

Let us give the new leaders and the new strategy this short period of time to see if stability can be achieved—an investment necessary to ensure the lives lost and families damaged thus far have not sacrificed in vain.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, given my tensure in the House of Representatives, I have seen more than my fair share of good and bad legislation come to the House floor. In addressing the nonbinding House Continuing Resolution 63, I would like to take a step back and call this bill what it is, it is a façade, and a political maneuver. If we are going to spend four days discussing a piece of legislation, if we are going to vote on something, we should vote on funding. Our power in Congress is the power of the purse. If the Democrats have an action item, we should get to the point; let us vote on funding the war in Iraq, and stop making pointless partisan political arguments.

However, all of my colleagues are aware that a vote to stop funding for the war will not pass, as the Republicans will not support it and many Democrats would oppose such legislation as well. This is true because we all have American resolve, meaning we will work together as a country to finish what we began.

American resolve does not quit when a situation gets messy, we do not tuck our tail between our legs and run away scared. My colleagues and I are also aware that our legislative agenda does not exist in a bubble; that there are many factors at play. If we do not have the intestinal fortitude in Iraq, how will we be viewed by other countries like Iran?

It is vital to our prosperity that the United States maintains her impenetrable stance in the international community. If the United States is seen as a Paper Tiger there will be many deep, far reaching implications; one of them being Iran's nuclear missile program, which threatens the safety of the world.

In addressing the real threat posed by Iran, Ambassador Gregory Schulte has explained that,

"The pursuit of nuclear weapons by the leadership in Tehran threatens Iran's neighbors and threatens the wider world community. In the Middle East, Iran's influence is rising. The fall of the Taliban and Saddam, increased revenues from the high price of oil, the electoral victory of Hamas, and the perceived success of Hezbollah in attacking Israel all extend Iran's shadow.

He also stated that:

"A nuclear-armed Iran could embolden its leaders to advance their ambitions even more aggressively across the Middle East. Even without detonating a single nuclear weapon, the mere possession of an atomic arsenal could encourage Iran's leaders to employ their conventional forces and step up terrorism to advance their regional ambitions. Iran, with Syria, is allowing terrorists and insurgents to use its territory to move in and out of Iraq and is helping to train and arm militants who are killing coalition forces and innocent civilians."

In today's news, it was reported that Iraq had to shut down its border with Syria and Iran. U.S. officials have long suspected Syria of allowing foreign fighters to cross its long, porous border into Iraq, and this past weekend evidence was presented of Iranian-manufactured weapons being smuggled into Iraq. We will be paving the way for Iran and Syria to be the victors if we do not allow our troops the full force of our assistance in Congress.

I would like to be the bearer of a positive aspect of our work in Iraq, highlighting some major accomplishments achieved by our leaders and troops. Here is the positive side of the story that is rarely brought to light or reported on in the mainstream media:

Free Elections are transforming Iraq. In 2005, Iraq held two parliamentary elections and a constitutional referendum, with turnout increasing each time cumulating in 76 percent of registered voters participating in the December 2005 elections.

Economic recovery is picking up. The International Monetary Fund estimates GDP grew by 2.6 percent in 2005, and is expected to grow by 10.4 percent in 2006, adjusted for inflation.

A stable currency, introduced in October 2003, has allowed the Central Bank of Iraq to manage inflation; the IMF estimates inflation was 32 percent in 2004 and remained stable at this level in 2005.

Iraq is rejoining the international community. It is on the road to WTO accession, and received both an IMF credit facility and its first World Bank loan in 30 years.

Debt relief agreements are helping Iraq with its economic outlook; Iraq has secured an agreement to forgive at least 80 percent of its Saddam-era debt.

Foreign and domestic banks are opening new offices.

The stock market established in April 2004 currently lists nearly 90 companies.

Iraq had virtually no cell phone subscribers in 2003. Today, there are more than 5 million cell phone subscribers, and an estimated 2,000 Internet cafes.

Seventy-seven percent of Iraqi businessmen anticipate growth in the national economy over the next 2 years, in a recent nationwide poll, and 69 percent are "optimistic" about Iraq's future.

In conclusion, we must stand behind our troops, military commanders, and our Commander in Chief. We need to finish the job and secure areas in Baghdad and the Anbar Province. We must secure the situation on the ground so Iraq can establish the rule of law. We must provide this secure environment so social and economic development can take place.

Finally, we must protect the population and critical infrastructure. These are fundamental elements of counter insurgency strategy. These fundamental elements simply have not been able to take hold due to the amount of insurgents in the area and their ability to overturn our previous work.

I beg of my colleagues to refuse to allow our troops to become a casualty of partisan rhetoric. If we want to win the war, then we have one option. Support them. Support the mission. Support the military intelligence officers focused on this victory. Refuse to quit, refuse to weaken, and allow the counter insurgency this chance to succeed.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, today is a day that we will look back on and know that fundamental decisions regarding our Nation's history were made.

The discussions that we are engaged in will go a long way in determining our future in the ongoing global war on terror and Iraq's role in that fight. When this vote is cast on the nonbinding, Democratic resolution, we will be sending a message to the world. The only question remaining is what message will we send?

Will we say that America remains steadfast against the rising tide of hate and intolerance offered by militant Islamists? Will we say that we don't have the stomach to finish the fight against terrorists who actively seek to kill us and destroy our way of life?

The war in Iraq has become such a flashpoint that we struggle to separate the politics of the situation from the reality. The politics attacks the intelligence that led us to war, questions our Nation's elected leadership, and condemns the decisions made along the way. It leads to the resolution that we now have before us. The reality recognizes that we are at war now and our troops are putting their lives on the line each and every day. It says that if this is a fight that we believe in, a fight against global terrorism, we must do everything possible to support the men and women who are carrying it out on our behalf and never giving a hint to the contrary.

Unfortunately we are at a point today where some have forgotten exactly who and what we are fighting.

Prior to 9/11, we failed to understand the hate of people like Osama bin Laden and what could result from it despite all evidence to the contrary. In 1979, 66 American diplomats were held hostage in Iran for 444 days; in 1983, 241 Marines were killed in Beirut when their barracks was attacked; militant Islamic terrorists bombed the World Trade Center in 1993; 225 people were killed in attacks

on U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya in 1998; and, in 2000, 17 American sailors were killed when al-Qaeda attacked the U.S.S. *Cole*.

Today we are at a historic crossroads: we either boldly tackle the issue of militant Islam that exists on the Iraqi front and is part of this world-wide struggle, applying the lessons we have learned from the years leading up to 9/11, or we approach the issue as we naively demonstrated before 9/11 and expect more attacks and more American deaths.

The war in Iraq has gone on longer than any of us would have wished. We've seen too many funerals for too many sons and daughters, husbands and wives. To all those who have lost a friend or loved one, our hearts go out to you.

It should be noted that mistakes have been made, of that there can be no doubt. We must know without question what led us to this point, and that time will come. But now is not that time. Not while we still have American service men and women in harm's way. History will play its part, teaching us our mistakes and urging us not to repeat them. But we don't have the luxury of waiting on history to pass its judgment.

Without resolve, it is certain we will fail in Iraq and there will be far-reaching consequences for our Nation, the region and ultimately the world. Since September 11, there have been major terrorist attacks in Karachi, Bali, Moscow, Casablanca, Riyadh, Istanbul, Madrid, London and Amman. If we allow the terrorists present in Iraq to win, we can expect more of the same. We can expect to see another Afghanistan—a puppet government established to support and back the aims of their terrorist masters. This is totally unacceptable.

Victory in Iraq is our only option. It is the only path through which we can hope for peace. Without victory, our terrorist enemies gain confidence in their opposition to the United States and their ability to defeat us militarily. We embolden them and offer them the opportunity to further their attacks against American men, women and children.

The resolution that we are debating will send a message to the world. What will that message be? My fervent hope and prayer is that it will be a message of resolve, a message of strength, a message of victory.

Now is the time to support our troops in the field unequivocally and vote against this nonbinding resolution. We don't want anyone to construe our action here today as not fully supporting our men and women who serve us in Iraq.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I wish to address three questions here on the floor today: Where are we? Where do we want to be? How do we get there?

First, where are we? We're in phase 3 of a conflict in Iraq. In Phase 1 we overran Iraq in response to an American national security threat. We won.

Then came Phase 2. We were forwardly deployed; the terrorists brought the fight to us; we busted up terrorist networks; America was protected from further attacks. We won.

Now comes Phase 3. At best, Iraq is engulfed in a sectarian killing spree. At worst, Iraq has descended into a civil war.

So where are we? We're thankful for the incredible work of our military in winning Phase 1 and 2. We're aware—and I think all of us are aware—that only the Iraqi people can win Phase 3. We're united in imploring the Iraqi people to choose order over chaos; pluralism over theocracy; and freedom over authoritarianism. As we had the help of the French, the Iraqis have had the help the United States.

But just as it was only American patriots who could decide the future of our country, only Iraqi patriots can decide the future of their country. It is a neo-con mistake to charge our war fighters with building an Iraqi national consensus. Iraqis must decide for themselves if they want to live in a unified, peaceful and pluralistic Iraq. No amount of American military might can compel that result.

So where are we? Thankful for success in the outcomes that we could control; aware of the outcomes that we cannot control.

Where do we want to be? We want the Iraqis to take responsibility for their own country. The President is wisely pressing them to do so. We want the Iraqi leadership to make some key political decisions that could bring reconciliation. We want them to divide up the oil fairly, to allow banned Baathists back into positions of public trust and to develop a working model of pluralism.

We want the Iraqi leadership to know that they don't have forever, that they should settle these reconciliation questions quickly. We want them to know that we are not content to provide an overall security umbrella for their country while they dispatch death squads to kill their enemies and improve their sectarian positions. We want them to know that we're reaching for the button that would lower that umbrella. And we want to avoid the error of nation building.

The job of the U.S. military is to crush, kill and destroy the enemies of the United States. They are not nation builders; they are warriors. And they do their jobs very, very well. As commanded, our military entered Iraq to destroy what we understandably believed were threats to our national security.

We were successful in destroying those threats and thereafter in interrupting terrorist networks. Those were outcomes that we could control.

Now we are rightly asked for inputs that we can control but we are faced with outcomes that only the Iraqi people can control. It is right to evaluate the quality of our forces' inputs, but wrong to hold them accountable for outcomes beyond their control. Diplomats, statesmen, peacemakers and everyday Iraqis must work with us to develop a path to progress—a path that has milestones along the way and which has rewards for meeting those milestones and consequences for failure. Our military must help plan the path because they are the most stable and trustworthy institution on the ground in Iraq and because they are experts at planning and logistics.

Since our military is in control of the ''planning'' input, they will rightly be evaluated on the basis of the quality of that planning. Because they are the most trained and capable force in the world, our military must also continue to provide protection for the decisionmakers as they plan the path to progress. The quality of that protection is an input that will rightly be evaluated.

Because they are experts at discipline and structure, our military must help define the agreed-upon milestones, the rewards for meeting those milestones and the consequences for missing them. The quality of those inputs will rightly be evaluated.

Because they are capable, our military must provide strength for the first steps on the path. The quality of that strength and the capabilities with which it is delivered will rightly be evaluated.

Having well supplied those inputs, the American military will leave Iraq successful—in Phase 1, 2 and 3. If the Iraqi people follow the path to progress to a peaceful, pluralist and unified Iraq, they will have been successful. The path may lead to something less.

Any lesser outcome is the responsibility of the Iraqi people. So we want a path to progress, and we hope for the blessings of liberty for Iraq.

Now. how do we get there? The President has ordered an increase in troop strength in Iraq. He thinks a surge in troops will give breathing room for the development of a path to progress.

I'm concerned that a surge will have the opposite effect—that it will give breathing room to the death squads, that our service men and women will be caught in the crossfire and that the surge will end right where it began. In fact, that's what happened in Baghdad in August and September of 2006.

I'm concerned that a surge sends a conflicting message. On the one hand we're telling them, ''You don't have forever; you've got to make progress in solving these political questions; you've got to stop legging up on your enemies; it's your country.'' By surging, we may be saying, ''Not to worry, we're increasing the size of that American security umbrella; there's no urgency; we're here to stay; in fact, more of us are coming.''

I want all Iraqi factions and leaders of factions to worry. I want them to see us reaching for the button that would bring that umbrella down. I want them to imagine the click of that button and the feel of the wind from the descending umbrella.

The resolution before us isn't written the way I would have written it, but it's the resolution before us. Resolutions are the way that Congress discharges its constitutional responsibility to communicate with the President. This resolution says, ''We disapprove of the surge.''

Parties on both sides have added additional and conflicting meaning to those words. In the end, I just have to vote on the basis of the words. That's why I'm going to vote in favor of the resolution and express my concern about the effectiveness of the surge.

Unlike many others who will vote for this resolution, I will not follow it with a vote to cut off funding. Nor will I follow it with a vote to withdraw immediately. Both of those actions would be mistaken.

Some will say that I am too impatient and insistent for decisions from the Iraqi leadership. It's true that it took us nearly 100 years to figure out that slavery was antithetical to freedom. It took us even longer to figure out that women should have the right to vote.

But as I had the opportunity to say to one of Prime Minister Maliki's advisors in Baghdad in August, it is our right as Iraq's protector and our obligation to our servicemen and women to insist on a timetable for these decisions. I've only been to Iraq twice. Both times I found that the hardest thing was leaving.

While there, surrounded by America's best, I had the sense that I was at ground zero of mission and purpose. The Americans serving in Iraq are the most impressive people in the

world. Everyone of them is a volunteer. Everyone of them, everyone of their predecessors and everyone of their non-deployed comrades has offered his or her life in preservation of our lives.

America's best deserve our best—our clearest thinking, our freshest analysis, our steadfast devotion. Forget the political consequences; protect no one's ''legacy;'' don't worry about ''saving face;'' make sound decisions; take decisive action. Tell them what their mission is. Discharge the Constitutional responsibility of the Congress. Give them a clear description of the inputs we expect from them. Evaluate them on the quality of those inputs but don't hold them accountable for outcomes they cannot control.

Ask them to do accomplishable things. Don't ask them to do the impossible.

No amount of force can cause someone to choose freedom, and freedom cannot be given—it must be earned. We have provided the conditions under which freedom can take root. Iraqis must nurture the seed and water it with their own sweat and blood.

If they do so, Iraq will enjoy the blessings of liberty. If they don't, our military will nevertheless have been successful.

Mr. MACK. Madam Speaker. I rise today to express my strong support for our country's troops as they defend our freedoms and protect our national security.

Today we are debating a non-binding resolution that threatens to undermine the morale of the very troops who are at the tip of the spear defending our shores. This resolution does a disservice to the very troops some in this body are pledging to support by voting for this today.

President George W. Bush has proposed sending additional troops to Iraq to give those currently in the field the necessary manpower and resources to win the war. In addition, the President has put in place a new leadership team and a new strategy in Iraq.

While we all know that mistakes have been made in the war in Iraq, I am inclined to support the President's new plan. But make no mistake: there must be new benchmarks, clearly defined goals, and we need to see real results soon.

Some in this body are using this resolution today as a first step to defund the troops in the field. Madam Speaker, choking off the funding for American troops serving in harm's way will do nothing more than embolden our enemies and ensure defeat.

Throughout our nation's history, millions of men and women have served the United States in times of crisis and need in the armed services. These men and women—and the soldiers currently in the theater of combat—have made sacrifices that must not ever be forgotten.

Madam Speaker, instead of debating non-binding resolutions that threaten to undermine morale and embolden our enemies, we should be helping our troops by making sure they have the support and resources they need to defend our country by fighting our enemies overseas. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to reject this political gimmick and vote against this resolution.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Speaker, as an elected representative of our brave men and women serving in harm's way, every vote regarding war is a solemn matter.

Debate about the war in Iraq is necessary, required, and many important points were brought up over the more than forty hours of discussion.

No doubt about it, there have been setbacks in Iraq. And mistakes have been made on the ground and here in Washington. It's safe to say that all of us—the President, the Congress, and the American people wish we could have achieved stability in the region sooner.

However, I believe it's necessary to separate the resolution being debated in the House from the real issue. The real issue is that a failed state in Iraq would present a serious threat to the United States' national security interests, could allow terrorists to further establish safe-havens in Iraq, and could create regional and global unrest for many years to come. This is a threat we must not pass on to our children and grandchildren. September 11th showed us that terrorists can reach our soil and kill innocent Americans. We must fight this war on our terms, but on their turf.

This non-binding resolution, H. Con. Res. 63, is nothing more than an opinion about a strategy.

While opinions are interesting, solutions are necessary.

So I say to those who want to support this non-binding resolution: If you disagree with the strategy—put forward a plan; if you disagree with the tactics—put forward an alternative; if you disagree with the mission—put forward a solution.''

A non-binding resolution means non-leadership; a non-binding resolution means non-accountability. A non-binding resolution is not a plan for victory.

This week, Congress has spent a lot of time debating one of the most important issues facing this body. Unfortunately, this legislation limited a true debate on the alternatives and direction we can take.

A real resolution on Iraq needs to include real benchmarks and real guidelines, not simply a vote of no confidence.

There are those of us who are willing to disagree with the President at the strategic, tactical or project level, and a true solution would be for Congress to debate the McCain-lieberman proposal. This bipartisan alternative not only reaffirms Congressional support for our troops, but provides military, political, and social benchmarks for the Iraqi government. This approach lays the groundwork for not only victory, but also brings our troops home as soon as possible.

We owe it to our troops and their families to provide the necessary oversight to ensure any new strategy is successful, while at the same time giving our troops confidence that Congress will not cut off their funding to settle policy disputes while they are separated from their families by distance and danger. I continue to stand, ready, willing and able to contribute to that oversight.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I am in complete opposition to President's plan to send an additional 21,000 Americans into Iraq.

This ill conceived plan will only make a war that never should have started much, much worse. The generals don't want this surge. Our allies oppose it. 60 percent of the American people think it is a terrible idea and, the enemy is using it to boost recruitment. There is no conceivable reason for this surge. Yet, President Bush is pushing ahead with it.

I opposed the original Iraq war resolution because I didn't see the connection between Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein, the evidence of an immediate threat from Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, or even compelling evidence of the existence of WMD. But, we went in anyway. We rushed off, unprepared, into a needless war that has killed thousands and scarred 10's of thousands of Americans and hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis.

Now, here we go again. It is time for this administration to end its policy of ready, fire, aim. It is time to begin a policy of ready, aim, fire. I urge all of my colleagues to listen to the American public, to our troops and to our friends around the world. Vote yes on this resolution.

Mrs. BONO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 63, the non-binding Iraq War Policy resolution.

We are being asked today to vote on a non-binding resolution that stands as nothing more than a political statement on an issue that greatly transcends the politics of the Nation's capital. The importance of ensuring our troops have the supplies and equipment they require for battle is clear. Unfortunately, we haven't been able to use valuable time during this legislative week to address true tangible needs that exist for those with enough courage to stand up for the freedoms our country affords.

The importance of a stable and secure Iraq should not be underestimated, given the responsibility to assist the Iraqi people to further their personal freedoms. Sadaam Hussein's brutal dictatorship is one that cannot be soon forgotten. Those who share his world view of oppressing fundamental human rights must know that we Americans will continue to support policies that will protect all citizens from these radical and militant Islamic terrorist cells. This battle is only one front on the larger war on terror, and today's non-binding resolution does nothing to achieve more stability in the international community.

To me, supporting this resolution only serves the purely political purpose of second-guessing a decision already made to move forward by the Commander in Chief. Those voting in favor of this resolution appear only to have a hunger to score meaningless political points, while lacking an appetite for pursuing the larger goals of keeping our brave soldiers equipped as they strive to ensure the safety of our country and citizens abroad.

I would like to make clear that I have grave reservations regarding the current situation in Iraq. For too long, circumstances have limited our ability to reduce the sectarian violence plaguing this region, especially in Baghdad. It is critical that we see a greater commitment from the Iraqi government and the citizens of Iraq to help quell the insurgency. I question whether or not this increased level of force will accomplish the desired goal but I also respect the need to explore all options to stabilize the situation in this troubled country. My hope is that General Petraeus, given his extensive direct experience in training our troops on the ground, will have a strong sense of what can be achieved on the ground given the challenges of the future.

My vote today is not an open-ended endorsement of the policy in Iraq. Rather, I will continue to monitor closely the situation and encourage continued Congressional oversight of the war. Today's debate displays the different views that we hold on this matter, but we should be unified in our support of those

who are moving forward to complete the mission at hand. Recognizing that continued difficulties lie ahead, we should again not be voting on a resolution that will achieve a political end, rather we should be looking for ways to help those soldiers who continue to carry out this mission or have returned from battle.

Our vote today is one that will be remembered as either for or against a decision already made by the Commander in Chief. In the short term, though, we should remember this nonbinding resolution serves no practical purpose in our larger fight against the war on terror.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this two-sentence non-binding resolution which demoralizes our troops in the field while providing aid to our enemy during a time of on-going conflict. These brave men and women deserve the full support of their government, not second-guessing from politicians in Washington, DC. Instead of discussions regarding appropriate funding levels to support our troops, the Democratic majority has chosen to rebuke the conduct of the war while it is still occurring. This is reckless and ill-advised.

This resolution encourages our enemies to continue provoking our fighting men and women. America's enemies around the world are closely watching what we say and do today. By passing this non-binding resolution, Members of Congress are sending a vote of no confidence to our troops in the field and a message of surrender to our enemies.

I strongly believe it is not the place of politicians in Washington to devise military tactics and strategy. Congress must not tie the hands of our military commanders in the field. You cannot fight a war by committee, thousands of miles away. The responsibility of conducting America's military strategy and the tactics of our armed forces should be left to our military commanders on the ground.

The plan to increase the number of additional troops to the mission in Iraq should be given a chance to succeed. These 20,000 additional soldiers will assist the Iraqi government in its new, Iraqi-inspired security plan. As Prime Minister Maliki said, ''This is 100 percent an Iraqi plan under an Iraqi Command.''

The majority of U.S. forces will be deployed to Baghdad to assist in maintaining control of areas cleared of terrorists and insurgents. As our military commanders in the field have repeatedly told us, part of the problem in securing Baghdad comes from the fact that many of the insurgents lie in wait until American troops move to another area only to emerge and retake precious territory gained by hard battle. By having additional troops in the field, the Iraqis will have a better chance to capture all of the insurgents, including those who stay hidden, waiting to attack again.

Our commanders on the ground have given this plan a green light, and I will defer to them to make military decisions. We should keep in mind our top commander in Iraq, Lt. Gen. David Petraeus, has warned against passing this very type of resolution. Our troops have said they want the chance to finish the mission that has been started.

Our troops do not want Congress to conduct this war. As one soldier posted to a blog on February 5, 2007, ''Proposing to legislate the conduct of this long war looks worse than cut and run. It feels like the betrayal of the families who bear the burdens.''

Congress should not tell our soldiers how to conduct a war any more than Congress should tell a lawyer how to argue a case or a doctor how to perform a surgery. Congress's place is to support our troops by providing the funding they need to finish the mission that was started. If my colleagues are so strongly opposed to the mission in Iraq, they can vote to cut the funding of our soldiers in harm's way.

We must recognize the War on Terror requires perseverance and patience. American patience, however, is not infinite. The lack of visible progress in Iraq is deeply troubling. The Iraqi conflict has a crucial role in the war against al Qaeda. American troops are stemming the tide of a worsening situation. Failure in Iraq is simply not an option. It is important we in Congress demonstrate quickly our ability to win in Iraq before the situation gets worse.

This may well represent the Administration's last chance to demonstrate sustainable progress is securing the country. It is equally important; however, that Iraqis take ownership for their own country. Our troops, in whatever number, are not there permanently. The Iraqis must take an active role in shaping their country's future. Americans took control of America after the American Revolution; the Iraqis must do the same. The Iraqis must be made to recognize the need for Iraqis to control the future of their nation. Iraq's future should not be determined by Americans, only the Iraqis can and should do that.

In closing, I believe in and support our American troops. They have made tremendous progress in Iraq and should be commended for the actions towards making Iraq a country for the Iraqis. Since the declaration of the Global War on Terror, our brave men and women have worked hard to stem the tide of a worsening situation. Because of them, elections have been held in both Afghanistan and Iraq; the terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi has been killed, former Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein was captured, tried and executed, and more than three-quarters of al Qaeda's known leaders and associates have been detained or killed.

At the same time, Iraqis must assume responsibility for their country. Americans will not stay in Iraq forever; Iraqis must assume control of their country. We must recognize the War on Terror requires perseverance and patience. American patience, however, is not infinite. The Iraqi conflict has a crucial role in the war against al Qaeda and American troops are stemming the tide of a worsening situation. However, I believe the Iraqi people must take an active role in shaping their country's future. Iraq's future should not be determined by Americans, only the Iraqis can and should do that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I have listened to some of the debate on this resolution. I have been disappointed by the misleading talking points and faulty analysis that have been repeatedly used by those who support the President's escalation of the war in Iraq.

Many speakers have tied Iraq to the broader war against al-Qaeda. These are two distinct wars. Iraq had not declared war on the U.S. Al-Qaeda had. Iraq did not attack the U.S. Al-Qaeda did. Iraq did not harbor al-Qaeda leaders. The Taliban in Afghanistan did. By shifting military and intelligence resources out of Afghanistan before the Taliban and al-Qaeda were wiped out the administration has actually undermined the important war against al-Qaeda. The administration's blunders mean the U.S. is at risk of losing two wars at once: Afghanistan and Iraq. The war in Afghanistan is salvageable and winnable. The war in Iraq will not be won by military means alone. Vigorous diplomatic efforts within the Gulf region, in addition to a political realignment within Iraq will be necessary .

U.S. intelligence agencies, including military intelligence agencies, have refuted the claim that the conflict in Iraq is driven by al-Qaeda. It is not. The violence is driven by a civil war, primarily between Iraqi Sunnis and Shias. The recent National Intelligence Estimate should definitively put that issue to rest.

Even the President has recognized that al Qaeda is not the driving force for violence in Iraq. In a speech on December 12, 2005, the President made important distinctions between the insurgent elements in Iraq. He mentioned ''rejectionists,'' which are mostly Sunnis who miss the privileged status they enjoyed under Saddam Hussein. He mentioned ''Saddamists'', who are former regime elements who want to return to power. Again, they are Sunni. And, he mentioned foreign terrorists affiliated with or inspired by al Qaeda, which even the President acknowledged was the ''smallest'' element of the insurgency. The one huge element he left out was nationalist Shias, such as those influenced by radical cleric Moqtada al-Sadr.

The President and his allies justify the continuing U.S. presence in Iraq by claiming that if we don't fight there, we'll have to fight here at home. However, the Iraqi Sunni rejectionists, Saddamists, and nationalist Shias, who combined make up the vast bulk of the insurgents and militias committing violence in Iraq, have no interest and no capability to attack the U.S. homeland. They just want U.S. military forces out of their own country. U.S. forces are a target of convenience in their escalating civil conflict. It is deceitful to argue that if we don't fight there, we will fight them in the streets of the United States.

The war in Iraq is not a part of the war against al Qaeda. And, in fact the war in Iraq is undermining our fight against al Qaeda.

Some in this debate have made the ridiculous argument that if the U.S. leaves Iraq that somehow Osama bin Laden will take control and establish a safe haven for terrorists to attack the U.S. There is no chance that the Shias and Kurds, who represent around 80 percent of the population in Iraq, will allow Sunni foreign terrorist elements like al-Qaeda to take over the country. Even many Sunnis have grown tired of foreign terrorists operating in Iraq, with several Sunni tribes fighting al Qaeda operatives.

Iran and al Qaeda are the primary beneficiaries of the U.S. invasion of Iraq and the two entities that most want the U.S. to stay there. With respect to Iran, the U.S. removed a threatening neighbor of Iran's and helped put in power a fellow Shiite regime, in addition to tying down the U.S. military and sowing international discord that has limited our options in confronting Iran's nuclear program. With respect to al Qaeda, U.S. intelligence agencies have noted that Iraq is serving as a training ground for terrorists and a recruiting poster that is swelling the ranks of terrorist organizations and inspiring attacks around the world.

It is past time to end the open-ended commitment the President has made in Iraq. As long as the U.S. military remains stuck with the President's pledge of open-ended support, Iraqi politicians and security forces will use the U.S. presence as a crutch. They will continue to fail to take the necessary steps to solve their differences, establish an effective and inclusive government, end sectarian violence, and create the foundation for a secure and prosperous society.

Democracy and stability cannot be imposed on unwilling parties. As New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman said on Meet the Press, a stable, pluralistic democracy in Iraq is everyone's second choice except ours. The Shias want power for themselves. The Sunnis want power. And the Kurds want power and independence. What they don't want to do is share that power. The President's stay-the-course, more-of-the-same, status quo policy provides no incentive for the parties to reach the political compromises that are necessary.

Negotiating a timeline for bringing home U.S. troops with responsible parties in the Iraqi government would also boost the Iraqi government's legitimacy and claim to self-rule, and force the Iraqi government to take responsibility for itself and its citizens. Negotiating a withdrawal time line and strategy with the Iraqi government could, more than possibly anything else, improve the standing of the Iraqi government in the eyes of its own people, a significant achievement in a region in which the standing of rulers and governments is generally low.

As the Iraqi National Security Advisor, Mowaffak al-Rabaie wrote in the Washington Post on June 20, 2006, the removal of U.S. troops from Iraq, ''will help the Iraqis who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be. It will remove psychological barriers and the reason that many Iraqis joined the so-called resistance in the first place.'' He went on to write, ''Moreover, the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people . . . the drawdown of foreign troops will strengthen our fledgling government to last the full four years it is supposed to.''

Being confronted with the reality of a U.S. withdrawal should force the Iraqi factions to reach the political compromises necessary to move their country forward. If not, there is no reason to prolong the U.S. involvement in Iraq if we want a stable country more than the Iraqi people and their elected leaders do. The U.S. cannot force Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds to make peace or to act for the common good. They have been in conflict for 1,400 years. Nor should the U.S. military be forced to remain in Iraq essentially as an army for one side of a civil war. Supporters of escalating the war may pretend that they're doing it for the Iraqis, but large majorities of both Sunnis and Shias approve of attacks against U.S. troops and want us to bring them home.

The President believes that the U.S. needs to escalate the war in Iraq by sending more than 20,000 additional troops to Iraq. I think that is a mistake. It will not bring stability to Iraq, and I oppose it. That is why I will vote for the resolution on the floor this week.

The administration blunders in Iraq are well-known. They went in with too few troops against the advice of military leaders like General Shinseki. They disbanded the Iraqi army. They failed to understand the ethnic tensions and power bases in Iraq. They purged the Iraqi government of the bureaucratic experience necessary to have a functioning government, among others.

I do not believe there is any level of U.S. troops that could stabilize Iraq at this point and resolve the underlying ages old sectarian conflicts. The time when more troops might have made a lasting difference has come and gone. There might be a small, temporary reduction in the chaos in Iraq, but the escalation will not solve the deep and underlying political conflicts that are preventing a long-term resolution to the violence.

The administration already increased the number of U.S. troops in Baghdad last summer in Operation Together Forward and has increased the number of troops throughout Iraq at other times as well, yet the violence against our troops and Iraqi security forces and civilians continues to increase. Short-term improvements in security in the wake of U.S. troop increases have always given way to the long-term trend of increased violence and a growing civil war.

Based on historical analysis, counterinsurgency experts, including General Petraeus, who is now the top U.S. General in Iraq but also recently rewrote the Army's counterinsurgency manual, estimate it takes around 20 U.S. troops per 1,000 inhabitants to successfully fight a counterinsurgency. To achieve that ratio in Baghdad alone would require 120,000 troops. Even with the increase proposed by the President, the U.S. would only have a third of that at best. For all of Iraq, it would require 500,000 troops. General Shinseki's original estimate that it would take several hundred thousands troops to invade and stabilize Iraq was based on this counterinsurgency literature. After the escalation we'll only have around 160,000.

The bottom line is that a proposal to increase U.S. troop levels in Baghdad or Iraq more generally by more than 20,000 is not a serious effort to restore stability to Iraq. As General John Abizaid, then the head of all U.S. forces in the Middle East, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on November 15, 2006, ''I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the corps commander, General Dempsey, we all talked together. And I said, in your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American Troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq? And they all said no. And the reason is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future.'' Essentially, the President is proposing to put more lives at risk with virtually no chance of changing the dynamic in Iraq.

A better strategy for Iraq is to announce a timeline negotiated with the Iraqi government for bringing our troops home over the next 6 months to a year. The administration has always set timelines for political developments in Iraq—for elections, for the drafting of the constitution etc. The administration argued such timelines were necessary to focus the energy of Iraq's leaders and to force compromises. We need to do the same on the military side.

In the interim, I have also proposed that U.S. troops be removed from front line combat positions in Iraqi cities and towns, turning over daily security patrols, interactions with citizens, and any offensive security actions to the Iraqis themselves.

The training and equipping of Iraqi security forces should be accelerated and the sectarian balance must be improved.

The U.S. must renounce any U.S. interest in constructing permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq.

It is also important to accelerate reconstruction spending and grant the bulk of reconstruction contracts to local companies employing Iraqis rather than multinational corporations, whom have proven inefficient, inflexible, sometimes fraudulent and have even imported workers rather than employing Iraqis.

The U.S. embassy in Baghdad should also be reduced to normal size and authority rather than establishing one of the largest embassies in the world.

And, the U.S. must engage in robust diplomacy with all factions in Iraq, except the foreign terrorists and domestic al Qaeda elements, and work with Iraq's neighbors in an effort to bring about political reconciliation among Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds.

Our troops have done all that has been asked of them in Iraq. Saddam Hussein is dead. His allies are on the run or in prison. The threat from WMDs in Iraq is nonexistent. Arguably, the war that Congress authorized has been won. Our troops should come home. Congress did not authorize U.S. troops to referee a civil war in Iraq.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an Editorial from the Wall Street Journal regarding the Iraq Resolution, H. Con. Res. 63.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 15, 2007]

AWAITING THE DISHONOR ROLL

Congress has rarely been distinguished by its moral courage. But even grading on a curve, we can only describe this week's House debate on a vote of no-confidence in the mission in Iraq as one of the most shameful moments in the institution's history.

On present course, the Members will vote on Friday to approve a resolution that does nothing to remove American troops from harm's way in Iraq but that will do substantial damage to their morale and that of their Iraqi allies while emboldening the enemy. The only real question is how many Republicans will also participate in this disgrace in the mistaken belief that their votes will put some distance between themselves and the war most of them voted to authorize in 2002.

The motion at issue is plainly dishonest, in that exquisitely Congressional way of trying to have it both ways. (We reprint the text nearby.) The resolution purports to ''support'' the troops even as it disapproves of their mission. It praises their ''bravery,'' while opposing the additional forces that both President Bush and General David Petreaus, the new commanding general in Iraq, say are vital to accomplishing that mission. And it claims to want to ''protect'' the troops even as its practical impact will be to encourage Iraqi insurgents to believe that every roadside bomb brings them closer to their goal.

As for how ''the troops'' themselves feel, we refer readers to Richard Engel's recent story on NBC News quoting Specialist Tyler Johnson in Iraq: ''People are dying here. You know what I'm saying. . . You may [say] 'oh we support the troops.' So you're not supporting what they do. What they's [sic] here

to sweat for, what we bleed for and we die for.'' Added another soldier: ''If they don't think we're doing a good job, everything we've done here is all in vain.'' In other words, the troops themselves realize that the first part of the resolution is empty posturing, while the second is deeply immoral.

All the more so because if Congress feels so strongly about the troops, it arguably has the power to start removing them from harm's way by voting to cut off the funds they need to operate in Iraq. But that would make Congress responsible for what followed—whether those consequences are Americans killed in retreat, or ethnic cleansing in Baghdad, or the toppling of the elected Maliki government by radical Shiite or military forces. The one result Congress fears above all is being accountable.

We aren't prone to quoting the young John Kerry, but this week's vote reminds us of the comment the antiwar veteran told another cut-and-run Congress in the early 1970s: ''How do you ask a man to be the last man to die for a mistake?'' The difference this time is that Speaker Nancy Pelosi and John Murtha expect men and women to keep dying for something they say is a mistake but also don't have the poiitical courage to help end.

Instead, they'll pass this ''non-binding resolution,'' to be followed soon by attempts at micromanagement that would make the war all but impossible to prosecute—and once again without taking responsibility. Mr. Murtha is already broadcasting his strategy, which the new Politico Web site described yesterday as ''a slow-bleed strategy designed to gradually limit the administration's options.''

In concert with antiwar groups, the story reported, Mr. Murtha's ''goal is crafted to circumvent the biggest political vulnerability of the antiwar movement—the accusation that it is willing to abandon troops in the field.'' So instead of cutting off funds, Mr. Murtha will ''slow-bleed'' the troops with ''readiness'' restrictions or limits on National Guard forces that will make them all but impossible to deploy. These will be attached to appropriations bills that will also purport to ''support the troops.''

''There's a D-Day coming in here, and it's going to start with the supplemental and finish with the '08 [defense] budget,'' Congressman Neil Abercrombie (D., Hawaii) told the Web site. He must mean D-Day as in Dunkirk.

All of this is something that House Republicans should keep in mind as they consider whether to follow this retreat. The GOP leadership has been stalwart, even eloquent, this week in opposing the resolution. But some Republicans figure they can use this vote to distance themselves from Mr. Bush and the war while not doing any real harm. They should understand that the Democratic willingness to follow the Murtha ''slow-bleed'' strategy will depend in part on how many Republicans follow them in this vote. The Democrats are themselves divided on how to proceed, and they want a big GOP vote to give them political cover. However ''non-binding,'' this is a vote that Republican partisans will long remember.

History is likely to remember the roll as well. A newly confirmed commander is about to lead 20,000 American soldiers on a dangerous and difficult mission to secure Baghdad, risking their lives for their country. And the message their elected Representatives will send them off to battle with is a vote declaring their inevitable defeat.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the brave men and women in our military. Thank you, and thank you to the families who have made so many sacrifices.

Today we are taking the first step towards defeat. No one likes where we are today, but our goal should be success, not to accept the defeat the Democrats are leading us towards.

I am very disappointed that the new Democrat leadership will not allow a true debate on what should be our focus today: what can we do to help achieve success in Iraq, and what metrics should we use to measure that success. That is the debate we should be having on the floor this week. Our military, our children, our fellow citizens, and the people of Iraq deserve nothing less.

Instead, this Democrat leadership is telling the brave men and women who serve in our military that their efforts have not been good enough and that they do not think they deserve the tools to fight this war.

We've been safe in the United States since September 11, 2001. But that is only because the Bush Administration and Congress and our brave troops took the fight to the terrorists. But it is by no means over. The United States remains a Nation at war. It's hard for Americans who do not have loved ones in the military to remember that sometimes.

We are not safe simply because we have not seen an attack on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001. We are safer today because of the professionals of the worldwide network of intelligence, military and law enforcement officials who continue to pressure and strike al-Qaeda and its followers.

September 11, 2001 showed us the danger of Islamic terrorism. It also taught us that we can't wait for them to come to us. We have to go to the root cause of terrorism and sever the root.

We are blessed with an outstanding military that has taken the battle to the enemy. It is very important that we take the fight to them in places where fortunately every American carries a gun—rather than on the streets of New York, Washington or Wichita, KS. And make no mistake, Iraq is where the terrorists have to come to fight.

Our most important duty as Members of Congress is to protect our Nation from ever experiencing the lesson of 9/11 again. For that reason, we must continue to focus on improving our national security, our homeland security and our intelligence systems. Today's resolution does the opposite and sends the exact message the enemy wants to hear.

Our enemy is not going away. The war in Iraq is a tough one, as is the overall Global War on Terror, GWOT. That is what the terrorist have promised in their letter, written by Ayman al-Zawahiri.

Just because it is tough does not mean that it is not worthwhile. The Democrat approach is dangerous and naive. We cannot put our heads back in the sands. Our enemies are ready to strike. Leaving Iraq will not mean the end to our troubles or to our enemy's plans.

Ayman al-Zawahiri, Osama bin Laden's chief deputy, has stated again and again that Iraq is the centerpiece of Al Qaeda's strategy to establish dominance in the Middle East and beyond. A July 9, 2005 letter from al-Zawahiri listed al Qaeda's objectives in Iraq. Let me remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle what those objectives are:

1. Expel Americans from Iraq.
2. Establish an al Qaeda ''emirate'' in Iraq.
3. Extend a jihad from Iraq to secular states neighboring Iraq.
4. Clash with Israel.

Senator FEINGOLD and many other Democrats can't wait to pull out of Iraq and have introduced legislation to that effect. While I would like nothing more than to see our men and women home safely, I know that pulling out now would be a disaster for U.S. security and would only mean that those men and women would have to go back to the Middle East to fight a stronger, recharged enemy. Because the enemy knows that all he has to do is make life difficult for a couple of years and the United States will back down in retreat.

In this resolution, where is the Democrat plan for success, where is their plan to fight terrorism? What is the Democrat plan to stop al Qaeda from turning Iraq into a base of operations for worldwide terrorism if we leave? What is the plan to deal with Iran, who has already targeted the Shia majority, when they fund allies against Israel, America, you and me? These are the questions the American people need answers to.

Unfortunately, we have seen how the Democrats respond to terrorism, to those whose stated goal is to kill Americans and destroy our Nation. Their response is to ignore the problem and hope it goes away. September 11, 2001 was not the first time this enemy attacked us—there were numerous attacks preceding that horrible day—the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993, the 1998 bombing of our embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, and the bombing of the USS *Cole* in 2000. Our enemies are looking for signs that we will resume that attitude of ignorance. Today my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are telling our enemies that the United States does not have the wherewithal to fight the Global War on Terror. In fact, today's resolution will carry no weight—except with our enemies.

Let me put this war in perspective. On June 6th, 1944, General Dwight David Eisenhower sent 156,000 allied troops ashore in Normandy in the D-Day invasion. That is about 7,000 more troops than we will have in Iraq after the surge.

Now, Eisenhower was coming off of three pretty rough years in North Africa. The campaign there displayed the serious shortcomings in the Allies' ability to diplomatically engage the Vichy French, establish and maintain lines of communication and hold terrain in key locations. The Allied Forces were forced to retreat from engagements with the Germans in battles like the Kasserine Pass.

What if Congress, after assessing the difficulties in the North Africa Campaign, called on President Roosevelt to tie Eisenhower's hands? What if they asked Ike to pare back the D-Day landing party because it was just too risky?

We didn't have that problem because in 1944 Congress, like President Roosevelt, knew that we were fighting to secure the future of the world. After reading this resolution, I am convinced that the Democrats have yet to grasp the importance of today's struggle.

What will happen if we pull out now? What will the Middle East look like?

Iraq will become utter chaos, violence will only increase and terrorists will have an unchallenged base of operations. It is likely that Shia extremists would dominate Iraq. Iran is eager for this to happen so that it can control Iraq. This is extremely worrisome. President Bush was correct when he labeled Iran one of the axes of evil. We know that Iran is gaining

the capabilities to become a nuclear power. Iran is also collaborating with many radical Islamist groups, including Hezbollah and Hamas. With Iraq also under its thumb if the U.S. pulls out, this could cause a regional war that threatens Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Israel. It is hard to see how the U.S. could avoid being drawn into such a conflict. This would put our troops in an even graver situation than they are today, with less hope for success. It also will reverberate through our economy at home, with skyrocketing oil prices.

The Democrats need to understand the reverberations of defeat.

House Republicans take our role in Iraq seriously, and we want to see success. Our leadership has called on the Speaker to appoint a bipartisan select oversight committee to monitor and implement the effectiveness of the President's new strategy. Instead of taking this responsible suggestion, what is their response? Spending a week on a do-nothing resolution to embarrass the President and encourage our enemies. Even in the majority, they are still more comfortable with being the party of ''no'' rather than the party that governs.

Republicans on the other hand have a plan, because we know that success in Iraq means a safer, more secure America. We have proposed strategic benchmarks to measure our effectiveness. We are prepared to work with the Democrats to construct a plan for success in Iraq. The Democrat leadership will not allow us to present our plan this week because they do not wish to see success in Iraq, they want to pull out despite its effects on Iraq and the United States. We need to support our military, our new Secretary of Defense, and our Commander-in-Chief as they work to achieve success in Iraq and the Global War on Terror.

I leave you with a question a constituent asked me recently: If the Democrats get their wish and we pull out of Iraq without attempting to achieve victory, what happens the next day? Unfortunately, we know that answer because our enemies have made it clear: they bring the fight to the United States.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I thank you for the time to debate the very important issue of the war in Iraq. The resolution we are debating today is technically non-binding—however, we must not discount the influence of the words of this body. I am here today to reiterate to the American people that the war in Iraq, as a part of the larger Global War on Terror, is absolutely vital to the security of our great nation as well as the rest of the free world.

It is true, we were led into this war with poor intelligence; yet intelligence that every major fact-finding and data-gathering agency in the world believed to be true. Nevertheless, spreading freedom to the Muslim world is our best long-term strategy in the Global War on Terror.

Four years after the invasion of Iraq, our brave military men and women are still actively engaged in combat, and their actions have not gone without great achievement—the Iraqi people participated in their first true democratic election, they have established a representative government, elected a parliament and written an Iraqi constitution. These great accomplishments should not be brushed off as mere side notes, because to do so would diminish the achievements of the Iraqi people and the tremendous courage of our soldiers; some of whom have bravely given their lives for the chance an Iraqi citizen would be able to vote and live free from fear.

The establishment of a democracy in the Middle East is fundamental to winning the Global War on Terror. The United States is in our 231st year of a democratic government, and as I am sure many of my colleagues will agree—we haven't exactly perfected it yet. The Iraqi people are barely in their second year of a democratic government. The Iraqi government needs time to grow their citizens' confidence in the institution of democracy and become a stabilizing force in the region. We must help them achieve this.

We are fighting an enemy who does not believe in democracy, freedom, or the inherent value of human life. These radical Islamic terrorists see a democratic Iraqi government as a direct threat to the mayhem and havoc they seek to impose on the free world. To retreat from Iraq—to wave a white flag in submission to these terrorists, would only worsen the instability we now see in the region, and embolden terrorists around the world.

When the United Sates ridded Iraq of Saddam Hussein, we committed ourselves to assisting the new Iraqi government become self-sustainable. The President has consulted his commanders in Iraq, who have heard from the soldiers on the ground. The result of these hours of consultation has led the President to ask for an increase in troops so we may finish the job we set out to do. I ask my colleagues to trust the military commanders, and allow our courageous military do their job. I ask my colleagues to not support this resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today not because I want to take part in this debate, but because I am ashamed that this Congress is engaging in it at all.

I've heard a lot of posturing so far this week. I've heard a lot of hyperbole and a lot of revisionist history. I've also heard some things that just don't mesh with reality. I don't think that everything my colleagues say is completely honest. So for a moment, let's be honest—because that is the least we owe to our constituents and to the men and women who are fighting this war.

I am willing to admit that if Congress knew in 2002 what it knows today it might not have voted to authorize the war. Knowing that Saddam Hussein apparently did not have weapons of mass destruction, Congress might have preferred to contain him, perhaps bomb him, strengthen international sanctions, and work with our allies in the region to undermine his regime.

But we can't go back to 2002 and redo that vote. We have to deal with the situation that is currently before us. And what is before us right now is a Congressional resolution that undermines our troops while they are in the middle of fighting a war that Congress sent them to fight. I do not understand why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't see that.

For just a moment, I want to ask my colleagues to put themselves in the positions of the thousands of soldiers on the ground in Iraq. What would you think if you learned that the very people who sent you to fight this war are now saying that they don't support what you are doing? On the ground in Iraq, there are two things that keep you going: the thought of returning home to your family and the knowledge that you are doing something to protect your nation from terrorism. But if Congressional Democrats have their way today, they will take away from our soldiers the support of their Congress and of their country. What a terrible message to send to these brave soldiers.

For just a moment, put yourself in the shoes of the terrorists. What would you think when you heard the U.S. Congress is voting against the war? You would think you were winning. You would be encouraged by the news. You would think that everything Osama Bin Laden had said about Americans had been true all along. You would think that Americans cannot stand bloodshed and will cower from the fight. You would think that they don't have the stomach for a long-term battle and if the terrorists just hold on, the United States will eventually leave with its tails between its legs. What a terrible message to send at the exact moment that we are preparing to send more troops into battle.

At some point, my colleagues across the aisle have to let go of the fact that their newfound opposition to the War in Iraq is popular in their districts and act in the best interests for the future of our Nation. This resolution isn't a diversion, a side-show, or even a shot across the bow. It is a dangerous message to send.

I don't say any of this lightly and I don't say it for political reasons. I say it because I mean it. In 2006, I was the only Republican to vote against the rule when my party tried to embarrass Mr. MURTHA. Then, I thought that my party was playing games with the war and I refused to support that effort. Today, I think that the other party is playing games with the war and I refuse to have any part of this.

I would rather we consider a motion to pull all of our troops out of Iraq immediately than vote on this Democrat resolution that undermines our troops while at the same time puts them in harm's way. This resolution is the worst of all worlds.

My final thought today is that it is clear to many of us that this resolution is simply a Democratic attempt to embarrass President Bush. My friends across the aisle know they can not impeach him. They know they can not change the fact that many of them voted for the War in Iraq. And most of them recognize the dangers of voting to defund the war. So instead, they are trying to embarrass the President.

I say fine, embarrass the President. Send him a message that you are now in charge. Remind him that voters demanded change last November. Do whatever you need to do, but don't undermine our troops in the process. Leave them out of your plans for payback because they did nothing to attract your anger or frustration.

Madam Speaker, what we are doing today is wrong. We're better than this. We're smarter than this. We're above using the war, and our troops, for political gain. What the Democrats are doing with this resolution is not just intellectually dishonest, it is morally bankrupt.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, five and a half years ago, our Nation was attacked by terrorists opposed to freedom and individual liberty. Our President vowed to keep Americans safe by taking the fight to the terrorists, and holding the regimes that support them accountable. We are currently engaged in that fight. Like any war this size, mistakes have been made, but we must continue to progress.

The consequences of failure in Iraq would be dire. Allowing al-Qaeda the opportunity to gain a safe hold would be dangerous to Americans. Leaving before the Iraqi government can defend itself would only lead to further destabilization, and open the door to outside influence from countries such as Iran, which has called for the downfall of our society and for the destruction of Israel, our ally in the Middle East.

With violence headlining the nation's nightly news, at times we forget that successes have been achieved. Through successful elections which achieved a 70 percent turnout, we know that the citizens of Iraq have rejected the brutal rule of Saddam Hussein, and strive for peace and prosperity. But violence supported by al-Qaeda, the remnants of Saddam Hussein's government, and armed militias, have created difficult conditions for diplomacy.

Our President, working with a wide range of involved professionals, has created a new strategy to ensure progress in Iraq. James Baker and Lee Hamilton, the leaders of the Iraq Study Group, have called for support of the President's plan. General Petraeus supports the President's plan. But Democrat leaders are bringing a non-binding resolution to the floor, denouncing the President's objectives.

This resolution, without any power of law or policy objective, is merely political gamesmanship, and it is dangerous to Americans and our troops in harm's way. We are in the midst of an ongoing military operation; our soldiers are engaging al-Qaeda and violent insurgents. We have set objectives, but Democrat leaders want us to vote on a resolution that sets us up for failure and attempts to retroactively impede a military operation that is currently underway. General Petraeus has stated this will only embolden the enemy, and I agree.

Many Democrats have stated this is only the first step toward cutting the funding for our troops in Iraq, and forcing a withdrawal before stability has been achieved. But the majority offers no plan to achieve stability. Without any other alternative, withdrawal can only lead to defeat.

Our troops should have every confidence their government will ensure they have the necessary supplies and funding to achieve their mission. Military leaders should be able to move forward with their directives without fear that Congress is working to tie their hands. Yet this objective has been the stated one of the majority: to precipitate a withdrawal by slowly cutting off funding to our soldiers. I believe this is the wrong approach to supporting our troops currently involved in the military operation.

This resolution does nothing to win the war, and by not allowing amendments or other measures to be considered, true debate is being restricted. It is my hope, for the safety of our troops and for the good of the Nation, that all members of the House may reject this political maneuver and truly stand behind those men and women called to duty by our Commander in Chief.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, due to my recovery from a medical procedure, I regret that I am unable to participate in the debate on the resolution that is before the House of Representatives today. The Iraq War Resolution offered by the Democratic majority is nothing more than a political exercise, and does nothing to support our troops or help solve the issues that we are facing in Iraq. The resolution offers no solutions or recommendations, but instead criticizes an action that is already underway. As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness in the House Armed Services Committee, I am open to supporting legislation that actually presents solutions to stabilizing Iraq. Unfortunately, this resolution does not provide anything other than criticism, and I would have opposed this resolution if I had been in Washington, DC for the vote.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution.

Four years ago, President Bush plunged our Nation into a misguided, pre-emptive war with Iraq. I voted against authorizing it then—and I have come to the floor today to affirm my strong opposition to this irresponsible war.

Unfortunately, after 4 years of failed strategies by this administration, the President is now poised to confound his tragic blunder, and ignore the will of the American people, by attempting to increase our presence in Iraq. And that is why this resolution is so important. Because it sends a strong statement. A statement that the vast majority of the country supports. And that is: escalating our presence in Iraq will not lead to success in the region, and more blank checks will not make America more secure.

Madam Speaker, our brave men and women in the military have done all that is asked of them over the course of the last 4 years. They are heroes who represent the finest our country has to offer—and they should be treated accordingly. But, from day one, this administration has spent more time planning its attacks on those who offered legitimate criticisms of the war and its tactics, than it has on planning for a stable and peaceful reconstruction of the region. And the results have been devastating and unworthy of our brave men and women serving in harm's way.

Enough is enough. Troop surges have not worked in the past, and there is no evidence that the same failed policies will work today. In fact, former Secretary of State Colin Powell said in December, ''I am not persuaded that another surge of troops into Baghdad for the purposes of suppressing this communitarian violence, this civil war, will work.'' Yet, this administration continues to ignore the guidance of military experts, the Iraq Study Group, diplomats, decorated war heroes and former senior White House officials of both parties.

And rather than being open to debate and discussion with these experts, this Administration has routinely attacked their character and questioned their patriotism. Many of these individuals have bled on the battlefield. But to this administration, and its swift boat strategists, they are treated merely as political pawns. It is truly shameful.

Because of this Administration's hubris, we have seen troops without proper equipment, without basic body armor, without vehicles equipped to deal with roadside bombs and without the appropriate veteran's services when they return home.

Because of their ignorance, we have seen giant banners saying, Mission Accomplished, when today Iraq has spiraled into a bloody, religious civil war.

Because of their arrogance, we were told that we were going to be treated as liberators, not as occupiers.

And because of their incompetence, we were told that future oil revenues would more than cover the cost of the reconstruction.

They could not have been more wrong. The cost of the war continues to grow at an outrageous rate. To date, we have spent approximately $379 billion on this war, with estimates from some experts saying that the total long-term cost could exceed $1 trillion.

Think about that for a minute: $379 billion spent, more than $8 billion a month. That is enough to fully fund Head Start—100 times over. To give virtually every student in America a computer. Pay for prescription drug coverage for virtually every senior in our Nation. Offer summer jobs to every teen in our country. Put hundreds of thousands of additional police officers on the streets. Provide millions of scholarships to public universities for deserving students. And pay the salaries of millions of public school teachers.

But what do we have to show for that $379 billion—a country plagued with hardened religious sectarian violence.

Madam Speaker, it is time to stop this charade. It is time for the truth. It is time for the administration to really level with the American people.

Resurrecting and rehashing failed policies of the past is not the answer.

Real action is needed. Leadership is needed. Courage is needed. And that is why we are engaged in this debate—to stand up to the deception and the dishonesty.

We are here today to begin to set our strategy back on the right course. To protect our soldiers. And to ensure that we can win the real war on terror.

Madam Speaker, we are here today as patriots because we love our country. We are here because we support our troops. And we are here because we want our troops to be able to come home to their families and loved ones.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this important resolution.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I stand before you today, offering a candid reflection of the tasks before us. As someone entrusted to be a leader in this great nation, I find myself humbled by the decisions we make and the traditions of this institution. In times of hardship, America has often looked to the House of Representatives, the ''people's house,'' as a place for deliberation and decision. Many great leaders have preceded our place in this Chamber, and many more will undoubtedly follow. By design we find ourselves here again today, in the footprints of those who stood so firm against the winds of adversity. It was in this very room that President Franklin Roosevelt so famously addressed the Nation after the tragic events surrounding Pearl Harbor had unfolded; and Members of Congress were faced with the daunting effort of placing our nation in a second world war.

America was forged long ago as a beacon of democracy, shining bright onto the shores of the world. Ever since our bold proclamation to others that we would shelter ''your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breath free,'' we have called on this body to answer the question: How tired, how poor, how yearning must the oppressed be to warrant our assistance? And so we find ourselves here today, paused at an intersection on the road of democracy. Will we turn back and embolden those that oppress the free and murder

the innocent? After careful consideration, I must vote against this resolution and choose instead to follow the path blazed by those who pledged our commitment to freedom.

On September 11, we were forced to witness the consequences of a decade of inaction against a determined enemy. Osama bin Laden and other radical Islamists, have declared war on every American, for no other reason than we practice freedom and democracy. Beginning in the 1970s, radical Islamists began targeting America with a steady campaign of terror. Although the images of that tragic September day remain seared in our minds, it forced us to awaken from our long period of denial and realize the true determination of our enemy. The war in Afghanistan and subsequent invasion of Iraq have discouraged any major terrorist attack from occurring on our soil in the last 5 years. Our enemy is patient, calculating, and determined. However, by supporting Iraq's efforts to become a free and Democratic society, we have forced the terrorists to focus their resources in the Middle East and away from American soil.

The only impact this resolution will have: is embolden our enemy and convince them of our weakness. The overall commanding officer in Iraq, General David Petraeus, recently agreed that a resolution such as this would only ''give the enemy some encouragement.'' Although I will continue to be an advocate of free speech, we must remain aware of our speech's impact. One can only imagine the result here at home if we formalize a resolution of no confidence in this body.

As a member of this body, I have made clear my support for the war in Iraq and our fighting men and women. I stand behind our military and appreciate the importance of our mission, but am also aware that some mistakes have been made along the way. War is unpredictable and we can do no better than by putting our armed forces in the capable hands of our military leaders. We owe it to the generations of Iraqi's murdered under the reign of Saddam, and our brave country men and women who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, to move forward with our mission.

The decision to commit our military to harm's way, is the toughest made of any leader. Some of my colleagues in Congress will argue that we cannot afford to vote in approval of the job our military men and women have done in Iraq. After looking at the facts, I say we can't afford not to. This non-binding resolution being offered by Democrats, is little more than a political sound bite. Although I have respect for many of my colleagues across the aisle, I urge them to consider the negative effect this resolution will have.

It should be clear to all that have listened to this debate, that this resolution is the first step by the majority party in their quest to cut off funding for our troops in Iraq. This is not fair to our soldiers on the ground and it dishonors the fallen and injured heroes that have so bravely served this Nation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, ''this is a dangerously wrong-headed strategy that will drive America deeper into an unwinnable swamp at a great cost. And if it's carried out it represents the most dangerous foreign policy blunder in this country since Vietnam.''

This assessment the Bush escalation policy was made by the Republican Senator from Nebraska, CHUCK HAGEL—a decorated Vietnam veteran who originally supported the invasion of Iraq.

And I concur with his observation. But his conclusion should come as no surprise. After all, this administration's Iraq policy has been a series of mistakes and bad choices from the beginning.

The Bush/Cheney team was obsessed with Iraq. In fact, according to former Secretary of the Treasury Paul O'Neill, their very first National Security Council meeting focused on Saddam and Iraq. Just days after President Bush was inaugurated. And a map, noting Iraqi oilfields and potential bidders for oil contracts, was presented for review. That was in February 2001. Months before 9/11.

We all remember that awful day in September 2001. When America was attacked by al Qaeda. Not Iraq. But by al Qaeda. Nevertheless, almost immediately, plans for attacking Iraq were initiated. With the Vice President as its most vigorous advocate. Secretary Powell is reported to have observed that the Vice President had ''the fever''—war fever.

Former counterterrorism czar Dick Clarke has described how, even as the smoke was still rising from 9/11, the administration began looking for ways to use it to attack Iraq.

The American people were told that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction. That he was a clear and imminent threat. That he was an ally of al Qaeda. That if we did not invade Iraq, there could be mushroom clouds over American cities.

None of that was true. To the contrary, there was plenty evidence that the secular Baathists of Saddam Hussein's regime and the religious fanatics of Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda were rivals. In fact bin Laden had publicly condemned Saddam as an apostate who had corrupted Islam and repressed Muslims. There was little evidence that Saddam's regime possessed nuclear or biological weapons, or—even if it did—that it would share such materials with an uncontrollable group of apocalyptic terrorists like al Qaeda.

But the administration did not listen to those who knew what they were talking about. Professionals like Greg Thielmann, the Director of the strategic, proliferation and military issues office in the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. He told me personally that in his professional opinion, after years of studying the issue, Saddam did not have a nuclear weapons program.

Instead, the administration relied on the likes of Ahmed Chalabi. An embezzler who had been convicted in Jordan of bank fraud. Who is alleged to have provided Iran with information about U.S. troop movements. And who is presumably still under investigation by the FBI.

Chalabi provided so-called ''defectors'' from Iraq who—surprise, surprise—said exactly what the Administration wanted to hear. The most notorious was codenamed ''Curveball''—how appropriate—and was the source of the now-discredited claim about a mobile bioweapons program. The German intelligence agency warned that the man did not live in Iraq and described him as an ''out of control'' and mentally unstable alcoholic. It later turned out that he was the brother of one of Chalabi's top aides. But he was one of the primary sources for Secretary Powell's statement at the United Nations that convinced many to support the war.

Furthermore, in the lead-up to the invasion of Iraq, the administration told the American people that it would be easy. That we would be greeted as liberators. That Iraq would pay for its own reconstruction. And that peace and democracy would flourish.

None of that was true. The American people were sold a bill of goods. But those of us who raised doubts were ignored. Some even questioned our patriotism.

But the responsibility for this mess is not the President's alone. It is shared by the preceding two Congresses, which abdicated their constitutional responsibility to oversee and review the conduct of the war and the occupation. We will never know if serious oversight and insisting on answers over the past 4 years would have made a difference.

But we do know that thousands of Americans and Iraqis have died. Billions of American and Iraqi taxpayer dollars have been wasted. The Middle East is on the verge of a war that could devastate the region and the global economy. And terrorist groups are multiplying because of Iraq. Some confuse the war on Iraq with the war on terror. But that could not be further from reality.

The fact is that the war in Iraq has severely damaged our efforts to fight al Qaeda and terrorism. That's not just my judgment: that's the consensus judgment of U.S. intelligence agencies. In April 2006, they prepared a National Intelligence Estimate. It represents the consensus judgment of the entire U.S. intelligence community. Here's what it said:

> The Iraq conflict has become the ''cause celebre'' for jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of U.S. involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global jihadist movement.

Meanwhile, the war in Iraq has done nothing to stop al Qaeda and its affiliates from launching attacks around the world. I refer you to a Dear Colleague letter sent by two of our Republican colleagues which clearly describes that reality. It includes a list of attacks that plainly demonstrates that terrorism is global in nature. While we are stuck in the sands of Iraq, radical Islamists are launching major assaults everywhere. Because this Administration, as a result of its bungled misadventure in Iraq, has hurt our efforts against terrorism.

Remember, we were attacked on September 11, not by Iraq, but by al Qaeda. Which was based in Afghanistan. And we responded, with worldwide support, by going to war against al Qaeda and liberating Afghanistan from al Qaeda's allies, the Taliban. But then what happened? The administration took its eye off the ball. And invaded Iraq. It's as if we had responded to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor by invading Mexico. Even though we had not yet defeated al Qaeda, the administration pulled intelligence and Special Forces assets from Afghanistan in order to prepare for the invasion of Iraq. Now we are in danger of losing Afghanistan to al Qaeda and their Taliban allies.

Enough. As Senator HAGEL said, this is ''Alice in Wonderland . . . it is folly.'' And the American people know it. It's time to get back to fighting the terrorists. It's time to concentrate on victory in the war on terror.

Oppose the escalation. Support the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the President's plan to deploy an additional 21,500 American troops in Iraq. I oppose this course of action and feel that contributing more troops to this war is not in the best interest of our country.

One only needs to look back on the timeline of events in Iraq to realize how much we have given that country. From the deposing of Saddam Hussein and his ruthless heirs, to the drafting of a constitution and free elections, the United States has fulfilled its role in liberating Iraq. However, the sacrifices our country has made must be met by an even stronger commitment by Iraq's leaders to face the challenges of a fledgling democracy and ensure the safety and freedom of its own people.

Our troops have served with tremendous bravery during this nearly 4 year endeavor. The resolution we are discussing today contains a pledge that Congress will "continue to support and protect" our courageous men and women who are serving or who have served in Iraq. This is a promise we must keep and I will work with like-minded colleagues to ensure that the members of the United States Armed Forces continue to have the resources they need while they are in harms way and after they return home.

However, I am in disagreement with the President on sending 21,500 more troops to Iraq because the time has passed for the leaders and citizens of Iraq to ascend and defend their country. The people of this country sent a message to the Congress a few months ago and my constituents have made it increasingly clear to me that they do not support the escalation of U.S. troop involvement amidst the seemingly endless sectarian strife inside Iraq.

Therefore, I rise in support of this resolution.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 157, the concurrent resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 182, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—246

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—182

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Baird
Boustany
Davis, Jo Ann
Hastert
LoBiondo
Nadler

□ 1522

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 99, H. Con. Res. 63, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 188. An act to revise the short title of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006.

S. 487. An act to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donations shall not be considered to involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration.

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to mark the significance and importance of the Medal of Honor and to celebrate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor on the anniversary of the first award of that medal in 1863.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 67

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, February 16, 2007, or Saturday, February 17, 2007, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2007, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs

first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Saturday, February 17, 2007, through Saturday, February 24, 2007, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, February 26, 2007, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2007, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 556, NATIONAL SECURITY FOREIGN INVESTMENT REFORM AND STRENGTHENED TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2007

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services have until midnight on Friday, February 23, 2007 to file a report on H.R. 556.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 161 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 161

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Friday, February 16, 2007, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the bill (H.R. 976) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate purposes only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 161 is a rule to provide for consideration of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act, under suspension of rules at any time on the legislative day of Friday, February 16, 2007.

This rule is necessary because under clause 1(a) of rule XV, the Speaker may entertain motions to suspend the rules only on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of each week. In order for suspensions to be considered on other days, the Rules Committee must provide for consideration of these motions.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying how honored I am as a member of the distinguished Rules Committee to manage the rule for consideration of such an important piece of legislation that will provide $1.3 billion of tax relief for our Nation's small business.

This legislation, the Small Business Tax Relief Act, is strongly supported by a host of business organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the NFIB, the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Restaurant Association.

Small businesses are the backbone of this Nation's economy. Every day we as Americans utilize the services of small business owners, whether it is dropping off our dry cleaning, grabbing a bite to eat at a local diner or pizzeria, or waiting in line to pick up a prescription at a local pharmacy. We depend on our small businesses.

□ 1530

It is a constant struggle for most small businesses just to keep the lights on. Utility costs continue to skyrocket, and larger companies continue to expand services, pushing out the mom-and-pop stores in cities and towns across the country. My constituents in Upstate New York have experienced this loss of economic activity firsthand, but that trend has continued.

The Small Business Tax Relief Act would help small businesses grow and hire new workers by extending and expanding tax provisions that encourage investment in new equipment and promote the hiring of disadvantaged workers, and it does so in a fiscally responsible way that meets the pay-as-you-go requirements. Small business owners have to balance the books and stay on budget each month. It is only fitting that we do as well.

Specifically, the bill would help small businesses invest in new equipment by extending and expanding expensing options for 1 year and increase both the amount small businesses can deduct from their taxes and the number of small businesses that can take these deductions.

The bill would extend the work opportunity tax credit, which provides incentives to employers to hire individuals that frequently experience barriers to work for 1 year, and expand it to cover disabled veterans. In other words, it helps those who need jobs by giving employers tax credits for creating jobs.

It would enhance the current tip credit for small businesses by maintaining the current tip credit that small businesses take for the Social Security taxes they pay on their employees' tips, instead of allowing it to drop with the long-overdue increase in the minimum wage this legislation will help achieve.

The bill also contains a provision that would simplify tax-filing requirements for businesses owned jointly by a husband and wife, providing much-needed relief for the many small firms throughout this country.

Right now, there is a glitch in the Social Security tax law which only allows one spouse, most often the husband, to get credit for paying into Social Security. This leaves women who work as equal partners in an unfair situation. The Small Business Tax Relief Act fixes this glaring inequality by ensuring that both partners, equal members of the team, receive their justly deserved entitlement benefits.

Moreover, this legislation does not only help small businesses. It is a win-win, because passage of the Small Business Tax Relief Act is also a critical step in finalizing an increase in the Federal minimum wage for 13 million hardworking Americans.

I made a promise to my constituents that I would go to Washington to fight for a long-overdue increase in the Federal minimum wage. Passage of this measure takes us one step closer to fulfilling that promise.

I want to be clear. I support a stand-alone increase in the minimum wage, like the legislation we passed a few weeks ago with overwhelming bipartisan support. However, 10 years is too long for any hardworking Americans to wait for a wage increase. Let's not force them to wait any longer. The time to act is now.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from New York for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 161 provides that it will be in order at any time on the legislative day of today to consider H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007, under a suspension of the rules.

The passage of these tax cuts for small businesses across the country is very important. Small business, Mr. Speaker, is the engine that drives our economy. Small businesses employ over half of all private-sector workers and pay approximately 45 percent of all United States private payroll.

Over the last decade, small businesses have generated 60 to 80 percent of net new jobs each year. Hispanic small businesses now number over 2 million, Mr. Speaker, and their number has been growing at three times the average of non-Hispanic businesses.

But we must not take the extraordinary performance of small businesses for granted. They still face considerable hurdles, so it is appropriate that steps be taken to ensure that small businesses are able to continue to grow and employ more and more Americans.

The Small Business Tax Relief Act will provide extraordinary savings to small businesses in the United States through targeted tax cuts. The bill increases the amount that small businesses will be able to deduct for equipment purchases and extends the deduction to the year 2010. It also extends the work opportunities tax credit for another year and expands three categories of the eligible workers to encourage employers to hire disabled veterans, high-risk youth, and individuals with disabilities.

Under this legislation, Mr. Speaker, businesses will be able to use their FICA tax tip credit against their regular and AMT liability, saving small businesses over $500 million over 10 years.

The Small Business Tax Relief Act also allows spouses who operate a business together to file as a sole proprietorship, without penalty. It allows both spouses to claim Medicare and Social Security taxes. This is an important piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. It will help our small businesses continue their admirable growth and job creation.

I would like to commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, and the ranking member, Mr. MCCRERY, and all of those who, in a bipartisan manner, have worked to quickly bring this important bill to the floor for debate.

I look forward to the debate on H.R. 976. However, Mr. Speaker, we could have done more. On Wednesday, at the hearing of the Rules Committee and the markup of this rule, Mr. SESSIONS, my dear colleague from Texas, the gentleman from Texas, offered an amendment to the rule that would have allowed us to consider H.R. 60 under suspension of the rules today.

H.R. 60, authored by our colleague, Mr. BAIRD, a Democrat, would make the local and State sales tax deduction permanent. This sales tax deduction is set to expire at the end of this year. Without passage of this bipartisan legislation to extend the deduction, millions of individuals and States without an income tax, such as Texas, Washington, Nevada, Tennessee, South Dakota, Wyoming and Florida, will face an unnecessary and unfortunate tax increase. However, the majority in the Committee on Rules voted against allowing us to debate and pass this widely supported bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

Ms. BEAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act.

America's small and medium businesses are our Nation's stimulative engine, employing roughly 80 percent of our domestic workforce. Too often, our Tax Code is weighted in support of our large lobbying interests, without consideration of those small businesses who are the backbone of our communities and have vital economic impact there.

I am proud to join Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, Chairman RANGEL and other colleagues in support of the Small Business Tax Relief Act, which provides needed tax relief to our Nation's small businesses in support of their growth and profitability. In particular, the Small Business Tax Relief Act will provide incentives to businesses in my district and around our country to continue to invest in the infrastructure important to their growth.

In addition to extending deductions in plant material investments, this bill also extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit. This credit has been successful in helping people move from welfare to work and gain on-the-job experience by incentivizing employers to hire disadvantaged workers, including returning veterans and the disabled.

As Chair of the Small Business Tax and Finance Subcommittee, I will continue to champion initiatives that help our Nation's small businesses prosper.

I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Tax Relief Act as part of that effort. As our small businesses grow stronger, so do the communities in which they reside and the workers they employ.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Florida, who has worked so hard to make the sales tax a deductible and who is obviously extremely concerned about the fact that we cannot vote on it today, Ms. BROWN-WAITE.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the deductibility of sales tax is so important to so many people. It makes a big difference.

There are those of us, long of tooth, who remember when you used to be able to deduct both State and local sales tax on your Federal income tax. I remember when I lived in the chairman's State, in New York, and we could do that, where I would save up all those receipts. And I was darn sure that I spent more money on purchases than what the maximum amount deductible was.

But in the mid 1980s, they eliminated the deductibility of sales tax on your Federal income tax. What did this do? What it meant was that States that did not have an income tax were at a very distinct disadvantage, citizens who lived in those States.

So a few years ago we remedied that by saying you could deduct either the State and local sales tax on your Federal income tax or at the State income tax, whichever was higher. So you had that opportunity.

It certainly doesn't put my colleague from New York and those people who are still left in New York at a disadvantage because they can still deduct the State income tax. States that don't have a State income tax have been put at a disadvantage.

I know that the good gentleman from Florida did try to put this amendment on, and it would make a lot of sense. It expires this year. We need to continue to have the deductibility of the State and local sales tax for residents of States that do not have an income tax.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 161 and the underlying bill, H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007, which I am proud to have cosponsored.

This important piece of legislation is much more than a tax cut for America's small businesses. It is an investment in our Nation's workers, especially those from economically disadvantaged areas, as well as our veterans.

Specifically, the underlying bill extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit for 1 year. This important tax credit, originally enacted in 1996, has been an important component in an effort to move people from welfare to work, while gaining on-the-job experience.

H.R. 976 also fosters entrepreneurship in our communities, an important variable in keeping Americans competitive in a global economy by making it more affordable to own and operate a small business. This Congress and the individuals who have brought this bill to passage today bring their ideas, ambitions and knowledge and support of entrepreneurs and small business.

Finally, I applaud Chairman RANGEL and the members of the Ways and Means Committee for working within the House PAYGO rules to produce a revenue-neutral tax bill. H.R. 976 is a bipartisan example of a fiscally responsible tax measure that takes into account America's values and priorities.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and the underlying bill.

□ 1545

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ELLSWORTH).

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007 provides long overdue tax relief for small businesses and their employees.

Small businesses form the backbone of the American economy. They create hundreds of millions of new jobs each

year, and they drive the innovation that makes America great. The men and women whose blood, sweat, and sometimes tears go into building their small businesses are living examples of the American dream, and they deserve our support.

There is no doubt that this bill is a win-win for Indiana. It is a win for Hoosier small business owners who work hard, play by the rules, and provide good jobs for thousands of hard-working people in south and west Indiana.

It is also a win for Hoosier workers. Small businesses employ 1.2 million workers in Indiana. And that is why we must make every effort to ensure that small businesses prosper in a progrowth economy. As Congress works towards increasing the minimum wage for the American workers, legislation like this is necessary to help small businesses across the country stay competitive.

Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Tax Relief Act enjoys wide bipartisan support for a reason. We know it is the right thing to do for America's small businesses and for its workers. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to give it their full support. Let us come together and show that the path toward fiscal responsibility can be both probusiness and proworker.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER).

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as an entrepreneur myself, I am proud to stand strong in support of our Nation's small business owners. Western North Carolina is blessed with thousands of small manufacturers, technology entrepreneurs, shopkeepers, and restaurant owners. Small businesses are the backbone of our Nation's economy.

Today's legislation will cut taxes and increase opportunities for our small business communities. This is what happens when Democrats and Republicans work together.

I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means for their efforts on this bill. I look forward to working with them in further addressing the needs of small businesses and increasing opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

One of the great successes for our country's economy, and we all say it here as Members of Congress as we talk about the value of small business, but it is important for us in Congress to look at effecting public policy in a way that assists small business in making success, in being competitive relative to the rest of the world in terms of pursuing job creation.

And I really want to applaud the leadership of our caucus for moving ahead this early in this Congress with the small business tax relief package. I think that is a real important statement. I hope everyone is paying attention to that. It is certainly something that a lot of us in this caucus have advocated for, and I think it is a great step to be taking today.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. I want to thank Chairman RANGEL for doing such an excellent job in the Ways and Means Committee in working in this bipartisan fashion to come up with this very well-crafted bill. I think this is a great moment for this Congress to work in a bipartisan way to help our economy move forward. I encourage all of us to vote for this legislation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of yielding 5 minutes to my colleague, who, in the Rules Committee, made the motion for us to debate today the sales tax deduction to allow us to consider legislation by Mr. BAIRD, a Democrat. Unfortunately, the majority of the Rules Committee did not allow that motion to go forward, voted it down, that amendment.

But it is my pleasure to recognize for 5 minutes not only a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, but a great leader in this House whom I am honored to serve with, Mr. SESSIONS.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from the Rules Committee from Miami, Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening at the Rules Committee, we met to bypass regular order once again, which seems to be a new regular order for the 10th time under the new Democrat leadership. I brought forth the ability to discuss a small tax item with the germaneness to the tax bill that we are debating here today. I wish that we were considering this rule under regular order that the Democrat candidates, out on the campaign trails, promised voters this last election cycle. I believe that the tax bill will end up enjoying bipartisan support on the House floor today. So since we are already bypassing regular order to consider this legislation, I offered an amendment to bring another tax bill to the floor that would enjoy also broad bipartisan support, making the State and local sales tax deduction permanent for residents of non-income-tax States.

This issue is a matter of fairness. It is quite simple in its honesty. It enjoys support from a huge number of Democrats and Republicans and would allow taxpayers a deduction for sales tax in lieu of income tax for taxpayers in States that do not have a State income tax.

Nine States currently have no income tax: Texas, Florida, Washington, South Dakota, Tennessee, Nevada, Wyoming, New Hampshire, and Alaska. The 1986 Tax Reform Act eliminated the sales tax deduction from the Federal Tax Code but maintained the State income tax deduction. That change has a disproportionate impact on States that do not use a State income tax.

A 2-year sales tax deductibility provision was signed into law as part of the American Jobs Creation Act. This law restored fairness to those in States with no State income tax for the first time in nearly 20 years and kept an estimated $3.6 billion in the hands of taxpayers that choose to deduct State sales tax in all nine affected States. This critical tax relief is said to expire at the end of this year and must be extended, or my constituents in Texas and taxpayers from eight other States will see a massive, unavoidable tax increase.

H.R. 60 would permanently restore fairness to taxpayers in the nine affected States. I am disappointed that the amendments did not include this one and it was defeated by the Rules Committee Democrats along a party-line vote.

While I support the legislation for continued tax fairness for small businesses that we are about to consider, I am sorry that we were not allowed to have this amendment on the House floor today as a golden opportunity for taxpayers to finally find this tax disparity and this loophole closed for good.

I appreciate the gentleman's extending the time to me. He also is from the State of Florida, which is hugely affected by this unwelcomed tax.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the hardworking gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY).

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007, because small businesses play such a vital role in Indiana's economy and in our country's economy. Small businesses are the engine and account for half of all jobs in my State's economy.

I want to thank Chairman RANGEL for his leadership in introducing this fiscally responsible tax relief for America's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the challenges our entrepreneurs and small business owners face while training to remain competitive and profitable in today's global economy. I have seen firsthand the impact that rising costs of health care and new technologies and growing competitions from overseas can have on our local businesses.

Today's legislation provides crucial, bipartisan tax relief so that our local small businesses can invest in the equipment and technology they need to remain successful. Perhaps more importantly, these tax cuts allow our local business leaders to reinvest in Indiana's economy, creating new jobs and sharing today and tomorrow's prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to commend this Congress for passing important commonsense tax relief without contributing to our mounting national debt. This bill proves that we can provide tax relief to our business community without increasing the burden on our children and grandchildren.

I urge all my colleagues to pass H.R. 976 and reduce the tax burden for our small business owners.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chairwoman of the Committee on Small Business.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan legislation that will provide tax relief and simplification for this Nation's entrepreneurs.

As the Chair of the House Small Business Committee, I believe economic policies in Washington must address the needs of our small businesses. Today's bill will not only provide tax relief but will also provide simplicity to the Tax Code for entrepreneurs.

One of the most critical portions of this bill is the extension of section 179, expensing. This is a provision that encourages investment while simplifying recordkeeping requirements. This legislation will also make more entrepreneurs eligible to use section 179 expensing.

For small businesses it can often be difficult to make expensive investments or purchases because of the upfront costs. Expensing helps them defray some of these costs while also reducing paperwork burdens associated with depreciation schedules. This proposal is a win for small businesses, the job creators, and our economy. After all, they are the ones who create 80 percent of all new jobs in this economy. And it is a win-win for our Nation's economy.

There are many other good elements of this bill that will help small businesses, and I want to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means and the ranking member's efforts in moving this quickly.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee for yielding.

I rise to finally say we have relief. I thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee because without you, we wouldn't be here today being able to finally move forward not only tax relief for small businesses but getting a vote for the minimum wage. Thank you very much.

And I thank you for working it out with the ranking members. Finally we will be able to move in the other body that would not give us an up-or-down vote on the minimum wage. But we have good news because we extend the Work Opportunity Tax Credit. We help small businesses invest in new equipment, which is so very important. And, third, and what is certainly not least, we win the support, as I said, of the Senate to move forward on the minimum wage.

But it is important to note that this WOTC will help veterans, ex-felons, high-risk youth, and welfare recipients, individuals who create the engine of our economy who are trying for a second chance. So this is the right kind of mixture, giving relief to small businesses, which I have always said, are the backbone of the economy of America. I am grateful to say that the small businesses in the 18th Congressional District, which have created an economic engine in our community, will now have the right kind of tax relief to create opportunities for them to reinvest in their own businesses to buy more equipment, because every one of us go home to the churning of small businesses. Every day small businesses open their doors and create jobs for one and two and three and four and five and six and seven and eight and nine and ten employees. So this will be the right message that we will send.

Then, of course, we will give the opportunity for training for our welfare-to-work mothers. We will give training for our veterans. We will give training for high-risk youth. And, yes, we will help those who are trying to reenter to be able to create an opportunity for their families.

Finally, of course, I am gratified that we will have the opportunity now in 10 years to provide the opportunity for those on minimum wage. And in the State of Texas this will create a $4,000 increase for our working families with a minimum wage increase.

Let me thank the proponents of this bill. I ask for a vote in support of H.R. 976.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 976, the "Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007." I support the bill for several reasons. First, H.R. 976 extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC)—which provides incentives to employers to hire individuals from targeted groups that frequently experience barriers to work—for one year and expands it to cover disabled veterans.

Second, H.R. 976 helps small businesses invest in new equipment and more easily afford large capital expenses. It extends small business expensing (Section 179) for one year—increasing both the amount small businesses can deduct from their taxes (from $112,000 to $125,000) and the number of small businesses that can take these deductions (by increasing the income limits for businesses taking the deduction from $450,000 to $500,000).

Third, and not least important, passage of H.R. 976 is necessary to win the support of the Senate and signature of the President on the legislation passed earlier by this House to raise the minimum wage for millions of hard-working, low-wage workers by $2.10 per hour to $7.25. It has been more than nine years since the minimum wage was last increased, the longest period in the history of the law. In contrast, during this time period Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that it removes the last major hurdle between low-wage workers and the long-overdue pay raise they desperately need, is reason enough for me to support the bill before us.

But evaluated on its merits, the Work Opportunity Tax Credit included in the bill before us is a good and useful measure. The Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) is a successful federal tax credit that encourages employers to hire eight persons belonging to one or more of eight targeted groups of job seekers by reducing employers' federal tax liability. The credit limit is $2,400, and the targeted groups include veterans, ex-felons, high-risk youth, and welfare recipients.

Mr. Speaker, government data show that 7 out of 10 welfare recipients who obtain jobs in the private sector are using WOTC, and that placing workers in private employment is highly cost-effective compared to State-funded public service jobs. Under the WOTC, employers pay the bulk of job costs, so the average cost to the Government is about $900 per job per quarter (with a ceiling of $1,560 annually) while the cost of a State-funded public service job at $7 per hour averages $3,700 per quarter with no ceiling. Thus, WOTC enables States to economize their welfare and training block grants and saves money that can be used for child care and transportation.

And what are the benefits to the less-skilled and disabled workers WOTC is intended to help? Virtually every study of jobs credits by the Government Accountability Office and independent evaluations funded by the Department of Labor have shown that employment and skills of these workers are increased. In fact, in one study, GAO reported that WOTC workers achieve gains in real wages as a result of their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the WOTC provides a market incentlve to employers to hire and train less-skilled and disabled workers. To continue this human capital investment in workers who might otherwise be left out of the job market—some 20 million high school dropouts, less-skilled high school graduates, single parents on welfare, disabled workers, and returning combat veterans—we need to extend the WOTC. By extending the WOTC, many more employers, especially small businesses, will have an incentive to look for and offer jobs to people who at first glance may not appear to be good job prospects.

Mr. Speaker, the job site is the place where the most effective learning occurs for a young worker or slow-starter. Because the growth of the nation's labor force is slowing, future economic growth will depend on raising productivity by upgrading skills and making every worker count. Extending the authorization for WOTC will advance this goal. That is why the legislation before us, H.R. 976 is worthy of our support.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let us also remember how important that the minimum wage be increased. Today's minimum wage of $5.15

today is the equivalent of only $4.23 in 1995, which is even lower than the $4.25 minimum wage level before the 1996–97 increase. It is scandalous, Mr. Speaker, that a person can work full-time, 40 hours per week, for 52 weeks, earning the minimum wage and would gross just $10,700, which is $5,888 below the $16,000 needed to lift a family of three out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, since 2000 the cost of college tuition has risen 57 percent, which is only slightly less than the increase in the cost of gasoline. Health insurance premiums have skyrocketed by 73 percent and inflation is up 13.4 percent. But during that time, the minimum wage has not increased one cent. That is unconscionable and downright un-American.

Mr. Speaker, today more than ever America's hard-working families are feeling squeezed, living paycheck to paycheck. I can tell you Mr. Speaker that record prices at the pump, skyrocketing health care costs and the rising cost of college in the face of falling or flat wages, are squeezing hard-working Texans in my Houston-based Congressional District as they struggle to make ends meet. That is why ensuring that the minimum wage is increased to $7.25 per hour is one of the nation's highest priorities.

For Texas workers the basic cost of living is rising; it is only fair that the pay for hard-working Texans does too. Nearly 890,000 hard-working Texans would directly benefit from raising the federal minimum wage to $7.25 an hour, and 1,774,000 more Texans would likely benefit from the raise.

Raising the minimum wage is vital for Texas families. At $5.15 an hour, a full-time minimum wage worker in Texas brings home $10,712 a year—nearly $6,000 below the poverty level for a family of three. An increase of $2.10 an hour would give these families a much needed additional $4,400 a year to meet critical needs such as rent, health care, food and child care. The increase in the minimum wage before us today will not allow workers to live as large as the typical CEO, who now earns 821 times more than a minimum wage worker, but at least it will allow these low-wage workers to make a little better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, 89 percent of Americans favor raising the minimum wage. Americans know that the minimum wage must be increased. They know low-wage workers, many of whom live in your district and mine, badly need the money and have been waiting for it for too long. That is why I urge all members to support H.R. 976, which is inextricably linked to the minimum wage increase.

□ 1600

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everybody who participated in this debate and all of those who worked so hard to bring forth this legislation in a bipartisan fashion.

I will be asking for a ''no'' vote, Mr. Speaker, on the previous question, so that we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider H.R. 60, a bill by our colleague, Mr. BAIRD, under suspension of the rules.

As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, Congress passed last year the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006, which included State and local sales tax deductions.

Over the last 2 years, the sales tax deduction has resulted in billions of dollars in tax savings to millions of hardworking taxpayers throughout the United States. These tax savings have meant a boost to the economy of seven important States affected by the deduction: Washington, Texas, Florida, Nevada, Tennessee, South Dakota and Wyoming. However, that important tax deduction will expire at the end of this year. Failure to extend the sales tax deduction will mean that our constituents may face an unfortunate tax increase.

By defeating the previous question, we will give Members the ability to vote on H.R. 60. Without passage of this important legislation that extends the sales tax deduction, millions in States without an income tax, Washington, Texas, Florida, Nevada, Tennessee, South Dakota and Wyoming, will face a tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I first of all would like to thank my fellow New Yorker and the dean of our delegation, Chairman RANGEL, for his very hard work in bringing this very important bipartisan bill to the floor. I think it shows the depth of his knowledge and understanding of the issues, and I think it is very critical that we address this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, $1.3 billion in tax relief for our small business owners is the kind of sensible, responsible tax relief I am proud to support. Let's help small businesses do what they do best, and that is create jobs and strengthen our economy.

During the debate at the Rules hearing, some of my colleagues were asking the question why we had to move so quickly on this bill, why we couldn't wait until Congress came back in session.

I couldn't help but think of the old adage, why put off until tomorrow what you can do today. People who earn $5.15 who want the minimum wage raised have been waiting for 10 years. People in small business who pay more than they need to want tax breaks. It is the sensible thing to do, and it is the sensible thing to do right now.

As I said earlier, this is a win-win scenario, because passage of this bipartisan fiscally responsible legislation will also clear the way for a much-needed and well-deserved increase in the minimum wage. America's workers have been waiting far too long for a pay raise. Let's not make them wait any longer.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule and on the previous question, because our small business owners need some relief and American workers deserve a raise.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 161 OFFERED BY REP. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

On page 1, line 6, strike the period and insert '', and the bill (H.R. 60) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes.''.

___

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's American Congressional Dictionary: ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled Amending Special Rules states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion

and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adopting the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 188, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Baird
Berman
Boustany
Calvert
Costello
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
Everett
Flake
Gallegly
Gohmert
Goode
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hulshof
Kaptur
LaHood
Latham
LoBiondo
Lowey
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Nadler
Smith (TX)
Stark
Wicker

□ 1628

Messrs. THORNBERRY, BILBRAY, HALL of Texas, COOPER, GORDON of Tennessee, EDWARDS, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, TANNER and SHAYS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WYNN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 184, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—220

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space

Spratt	Udall (NM)	Waxman
Stupak	Van Hollen	Weiner
Sutton	Velázquez	Welch (VT)
Tanner	Visclosky	Wexler
Tauscher	Walz (MN)	Wilson (OH)
Taylor	Wasserman Schultz	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Waters	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Watson	Wynn
Tierney	Watt	Yarmuth
Udall (CO)		

NOES—184

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Pearce
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Peterson (PA)
Alexander	Gerlach	Petri
Bachmann	Gilchrest	Pickering
Bachus	Gillmor	Pitts
Baker	Gingrey	Platts
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Poe
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Porter
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Price (GA)
Biggert	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Bilbray	Graves	Putnam
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Blackburn	Hayes	Regula
Blunt	Heller	Rehberg
Boehner	Hensarling	Reichert
Bonner	Herger	Renzi
Bono	Hobson	Reynolds
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Jordan	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Keller	Saxton
Cannon	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cantor	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Kingston	Sessions
Carter	Kirk	Shadegg
Castle	Kline (MN)	Shays
Chabot	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Coble	Lamborn	Shuster
Cole (OK)	LaTourette	Simpson
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	Linder	Souder
Culberson	Lucas	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel E.	Sullivan
Davis, David	Mack	Tancredo
Davis, Tom	Manzullo	Terry
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Thornberry
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Turner
Doolittle	McCrery	Upton
Drake	McHenry	Walberg
Dreier	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McKeon	Walsh (NY)
Ehlers	McMorris Rodgers	Wamp
Emerson	Mica	Weldon (FL)
English (PA)	Miller (FL)	Weller
Fallin	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Feeney	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Ferguson	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Forbes	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Neugebauer	Wolf
Fossella	Nunes	Young (AK)
Foxx	Paul	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)		

NOT VOTING—29

Baird	Green, Gene	Miller, Gary
Berman	Gutierrez	Murphy, Tim
Boustany	Harman	Nadler
Calvert	Hastert	Pence
Costello	Hulshof	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Jo Ann	Kuhl (NY)	Smith (TX)
DeFazio	LaHood	Stark
Everett	Latham	Towns
Flake	LoBiondo	Wicker
Gallegly	Lowey	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1636

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 101 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 976) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 976

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; amendment of 1986 Code; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Extension and modification of work opportunity tax credit.
Sec. 3. Extension and increase of expensing for small business.
Sec. 4. Determination of credit for certain taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.
Sec. 5. Waiver of individual and corporate alternative minimum tax limits on work opportunity credit and credit for taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.
Sec. 6. Family business tax simplification.
Sec. 7. Denial of lowest capital gains rate for certain dependents.
Sec. 8. Suspension of certain penalties and interest.
Sec. 9. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF WORK OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 51(c)(4)(B) (relating to termination) is amended by striking ''2007'' and inserting ''2008''.

(b) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AGE FOR DESIGNATED COMMUNITY RESIDENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 51(d) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) DESIGNATED COMMUNITY RESIDENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'designated community resident' means any individual who is certified by the designated local agency—

''(i) as having attained age 18 but not age 40 on the hiring date, and

''(ii) as having his principal place of abode within an empowerment zone, enterprise community, or renewal community.

''(B) INDIVIDUAL MUST CONTINUE TO RESIDE IN ZONE OR COMMUNITY.—In the case of a designated community resident, the term 'qualified wages' shall not include wages paid or incurred for services performed while the individual's principal place of abode is outside an empowerment zone, enterprise community, or renewal community.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (D) of section 51(d)(1) is amended to read as follows:

''(D) a designated community resident,''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS UNDER INDIVIDUAL WORK PLANS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 51(d)(6) (relating to vocational rehabilitation referral) is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', or'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) an individual work plan developed and implemented by an employment network pursuant to subsection (g) of section 1148 of the Social Security Act with respect to which the requirements of such subsection are met.''.

(d) TREATMENT OF DISABLED VETERANS UNDER THE WORK OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.—

(1) DISABLED VETERANS TREATED AS MEMBERS OF TARGETED GROUP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 51(d)(3) (relating to qualified veteran) is amended by striking ''agency as being a member of a family'' and all that follows and inserting ''agency as—

''(i) being a member of a family receiving assistance under a food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 for at least a 3-month period ending during the 12-month period ending on the hiring date, or

''(ii) entitled to compensation for a service-connected disability, and—

''(I) having a hiring date which is not more that 1 year after having been discharged or released from active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or

''(II) having aggregate periods of unemployment during the 1-year period ending on the hiring date which equal or exceed 6 months.''.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 51(d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the terms 'compensation' and 'service-connected' have the meanings given such terms under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.''.

(2) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF WAGES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR DISABLED VETERANS.—Paragraph (3) of section 51(b) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''($12,000 per year in the case of any individual who is a qualified veteran by reason of subsection (d)(3)(A)(ii))'' before the period at the end, and

(B) by striking ''ONLY FIRST $6,000 OF'' in the heading and inserting ''LIMITATION ON''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF EXPENSING FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(5), (c)(2), and (d)(1)(A)(ii) of section 179 (relating to election to expense certain depreciable business assets) are each amended by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2011''.

(b) INCREASE IN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 179 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$100,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2002'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$125,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2006'', and

(2) by striking ''$400,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2002'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500,000 in the case of taxable years beginning after 2006''.

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 179(b)(5) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2007'',

(2) by striking ''$100,000 and $400,000'' and inserting ''$125,000 and $500,000'', and

(3) by striking ''2002'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''2006''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR CERTAIN TAXES PAID WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEE CASH TIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45B(b)(1) is amended by inserting ''as in effect

on January 1, 2007, and'' before ''determined without regard to''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to tips received for services performed after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 5. WAIVER OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX LIMITS ON WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT AND CREDIT FOR TAXES PAID WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEE CASH TIPS.

(a) ALLOWANCE AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—Subparagraph (B) of section 38(c)(4) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by inserting a comma at the end of clause (ii), and by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(iii) the credit determined under section 45B, and

''(iv) the credit determined under section 51.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to credits determined under sections 45B and 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006, and to carrybacks of such credits.

SEC. 6. FAMILY BUSINESS TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 761 (defining terms for purposes of partnerships) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) QUALIFIED JOINT VENTURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified joint venture conducted by a husband and wife who file a joint return for the taxable year, for purposes of this title—

''(A) such joint venture shall not be treated as a partnership,

''(B) all items of income, gain, loss, deduction, and credit shall be divided between the spouses in accordance with their respective interests in the venture, and

''(C) each spouse shall take into account such spouse's respective share of such items as if they were attributable to a trade or business conducted by such spouse as a sole proprietor.

''(2) QUALIFIED JOINT VENTURE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'qualified joint venture' means any joint venture involving the conduct of a trade or business if—

''(A) the only members of such joint venture are a husband and wife,

''(B) both spouses materially participate (within the meaning of section 469(h) without regard to paragraph (5) thereof) in such trade or business, and

''(C) both spouses elect the application of this subsection.''.

(b) NET EARNINGS FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 1402 (defining net earnings from self-employment) is amended by striking '', and'' at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting a semicolon, by striking the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting ''; and'', and by inserting after paragraph (16) the following new paragraph:

''(17) notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, each spouse's share of income or loss from a qualified joint venture shall be taken into account as provided in section 761(f) in determining net earnings from self-employment of such spouse.''.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 211 of the Social Security Act (defining net earnings from self-employment) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting ''; and'', and by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

''(16) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, each spouse's share of income or loss from a qualified joint venture shall be taken into account as provided in section 761(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in determining net earnings from self-employment of such spouse.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 7. DENIAL OF LOWEST CAPITAL GAINS RATE FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR LOWEST RATE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B)—

''(i) the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A)(ii)(II) shall not be less than the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this subsection) be taxed at a rate below 15 percent, and

''(ii) the sum of the amounts determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) shall be an amount equal to the rate of tax specified in paragraph (1)(C) multiplied by so much of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) as exceeds the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this subsection) be taxed at a rate below 15 percent, over

''(II) the taxable income reduced by the adjusted net capital gain.

''(B) INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, an individual is described in this subparagraph if—

''(I) such individual meets the age requirements of section 152(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof), and

''(II) such individual's earned income (as defined in section 911(d)(2)) for the taxable year does not exceed one-half of such individual's support (within the meaning of section 152) for such taxable year.

''(ii) SPECIAL RULES FOR JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return—

''(I) the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse shall be treated as a single individual for purposes of applying subclause (II) of clause (i), and

''(II) the taxpayer shall be treated as an individual described in this subparagraph only if the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse are described in clause (i) (determined after application of subclause (I)).''.

(b) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—Section 55 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR LOWEST RATE.—In the case of an individual described in section 1(h)(12)(B), no amount shall be determined under subsection (b)(3)(B).''.

(c) COORDINATION WITH SUNSET OF PROVISIONS OF THE JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1(h)(12), as added by this section, is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) no amount of qualified 5-year gain shall be taken into account under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) (as in effect after the application of section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

(2) SUNSET OF JGTRRA.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date specified in section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

SEC. 8. SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PENALTIES AND INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1)(A) and (3)(A) of section 6404(g) are each amended by striking ''18-month period'' and inserting ''22-month period''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to notices provided by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his delegate, after the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Subparagraph (B) of section 401(1) of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 is amended by striking ''106.25 percent'' and inserting ''112.75 percent''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues know, we passed overwhelmingly the minimum wage bill. But it got into trouble in the Senate as they attempted to attach an $8.2 billion tax cut.

I shared the problem that we faced with Mr. MCCRERY, and we thought that small business certainly did deserve some assistance, with or without the minimum wage bill. And we talked, and Mr. MCCRERY said, well, if we are going to have a bill, are we going to pay for it? And let's select what we thought would be the best interests of small businesses in view of this dialogue that we had with the Senate.

Our staffs got together, gave us several options, and we agreed that we would increase and extend the small business expense, increase the work opportunity tax credit to include veterans and disabled veterans, protect the current benefit of the FICA tip credit, allow small businesses to use the work opportunity tax credit, and to enjoy the alternative, to exclude alternative minimum tax, and to simplify the tax filing system for businesses that are owned jointly by husband and wife.

We then tried to figure a way to pay for it. And what we agreed to is to make certain that the capital gains tax cut that was dramatically made lower for people in low income, that we would prevent people from transferring the capital stock to their kids who have little or no income and enjoy a benefit that was designed to assist low-income people.

Letters commending our efforts were received, it was supported by the Chamber of Commerce which says that it is going to have a key vote; but since I don't follow them that closely, I don't know what it means; the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Restaurant Association, Equipment Leasing and Finance Association, American Bankers Association, the American Farm Bureau, Federation to Secure the Industry and Financial Markets Association, the National Federation of Independent Business, and the Work Opportunity Tax Credit Coalition.

I urge you to join with me and the ranking minority member in supporting this legislation, which is supported as well by the Small Business Association.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan bill that has been crafted in the Ways and Means Committee, and I want to commend the chairman and his staff for working with me and our staff on the minority side of the committee to craft a bill that really does effectively target tax relief to those businesses who will be most impacted by an increase in the minimum wage.

This bill I think does a much better job of focusing that relief on those businesses than the other body came up with in their version of this legislation.

It is apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will increase the minimum wage sometime this year. And with that in mind, I did my best to work with Chairman RANGEL and his staff to create a soft landing for those businesses that are going to be impacted by that increase in the minimum wage immediately. Mainly, we are talking about restaurant owners, small businesses, those people who have more minimum wage workers on the premises than other businesses. So the provisions in this bill get right to those particular businesses, these provisions do.

The tip credit, for example. The FICA tip credit, Mr. Speaker, provision in this bill is very important for a couple reasons. Number one, if we don't pass a provision like that and the minimum wage is increased, these employers will automatically be mandated to pay an increase in wages. That will be number one. That will hit them right away. But, number two, they will lose a tip credit for FICA taxes paid on the amount between the current minimum wage and the new minimum wage from $5.15 to $7.25. So it will be a double whammy on these small businesses that have these employees that depend on tips for part of their income.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the joint tax scoring sheet on this, it says no revenue effect; because, taken in isolation, this provision has no impact. But if you join the minimum wage increase with this bill, which we all know is going to be done, then this ''no revenue effect'' becomes approximately a $500 million tax cut. So the effect of this bill would be a net tax reduction for businesses.

Now, when we go to conference, if we get to conference and we get a bill, and we know that this impact is going to be there, then under the rules of the House we will have come up with a way to pay for that tax cut. But as it is right now, the net effect of this bill would be a $500 million tax cut.

The other provisions, the work opportunity tax credit is not only extended but it is also expanded to apply to veterans. We think that is a very good expansion of what is already a good provision in the Tax Code to encourage people to hire people who have been on welfare, who have been disabled, and now veterans.

And the other provisions, Mr. Speaker, extended expensing for small businesses. We increase that to $125,000, we increase the phaseout from $400,000 to $500,000. That is going to help small businesses immediately, because some of those have reached the cap for their expensing. But when this passes, they will get an expansion of that amount. So they will get an immediate tax benefit this year.

In addition, we for the first time allow taxpayers to claim these credits against the AMT, so that the AMT doesn't take back what we are giving them in this legislation.

So all in all, Mr. Speaker, these are very effectively crafted provisions to help small businesses who are going to be negatively impacted by an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that so many Members have travel engagements, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. MCKEON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act.

Last month, after the new Majority rushed an unbalanced minimum wage bill to the floor without following regular order and without opportunity for amendment, I spoke from here and explained to my colleagues that I believed it was a colossal missed opportunity. Now, about six weeks later, it's clear that a colossal missed opportunity is exactly what it was.

From the outset, I joined many of my colleagues in insisting on protections for small businesses and their workers as part of a comprehensive minimum wage bill. I thank one of these colleagues, Mr. MCCRERY, for his work on the legislation before us. He joined me prior to our debate last month in introducing comprehensive minimum wage legislation that provides small business protections similar to those found in this bill. As a result of our action here today, when we finally send a final measure to the President, I am confident that it will look a lot more like our bill than it will the Majority's initial, unbalanced proposal.

Small businesses create two-thirds of our Nation's new jobs, and they represent 98 percent of our new businesses. Since they are responsible for so much of our Nation's recent economic growth. they and their workers are counting on Congress to consider how any minimum wage proposal would impact them. And this legislation will help us do just that.

More than ever, Mr. Speaker, momentum remains squarely on the side of those who want to act in a comprehensive way so small businesses and their workers are not left to fend for themselves in the face of a hike in the minimum wage mandate. And today, we're one step closer to sending President Bush a final product that doesn't saddle them with unnecessary burdens at the same time that they are creating most of the new jobs in our in our growing economy. This bill was crafted with that goal in mind, and because of that, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

□ 1645

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this was the product of a bipartisan compromise in the Ways and Means Committee. That is a good thing. I am not here to talk about the merits of the bill.

I am here to talk about the fact that this is a suspension of the rules. Among the things that this rules suspends is the Budget Act, and this bill has two budget points of order that lie against it, section 303 and 311. So we are, in the early days of this majority, bringing a bill to the floor that violates the Budget Act. We haven't written the new budget, and we are violating the current one we have.

As to the new PAYGO system, if the PAYGO rule were in place that we had before, or the PAYGO rule that was advocated by the Democrat minority last year would be in place, this would violate their PAYGO rule. It is convenient that this new, more-watered-down PAYGO doesn't apply to this, but I think the facts should be known that this bill does violate the Budget Act in two important ways.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you, and I shall be brief.

Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and read the bill, I consider it a riddle: When is a tax cut not a tax cut? When it really raises your taxes in the end?

This legislation, as many tax bills, is masquerading as a tax cut, when at the end of the day citizens of this country will see their taxes rise.

The tax cuts in this bill are temporary. The tax increases in this bill are permanent. There are good parts in the bill. Section 179, expensing, is a good part; the tip credit, which was mentioned earlier, a good part.

Portions were left out, as we discussed during the rule, such as deductions for State and local tax deductions should have been in here. But even beyond that, even if they were, it is a bad bill, because it raises your taxes. Business lobby may be out there protecting the tax businesses, who is protecting the individual taxpayer?

Earlier today, we received a flier from NTU, National Taxpayer Union, which said, according to the CBO, H.R. 976 would increase net taxes by providing only temporary tax cuts in exchange for permanent tax hikes.

Furthermore, a memo from RSE indicates similarly. H.R. 976 would permanently increase taxes on some taxpayers, while others would see them go down.

This bill was also scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation. So it is not just my word on it. It is not the word of NTU or RSE. The Joint Committee

on Taxation also concludes this bill would yield a net tax increase over 6 years.

How does this bill hurt the American taxpayer? It hurts the young, and it hurts the small business. It hurts the young who are between the age of 19 and 24, those individuals who are just getting out in the world, starting their own businesses. It hurts the young and the college student, who may not have lobbyists down here in Washington. It hurts them. Small businesses, it hurts them as well because they now have an acceleration in their taxes.

In conclusion, so you can get your flights and what have you to go back to your taxpayers and explain to them why you raised their taxes, since 2003, the gentleman, the ranking member, could probably explain better than I, the tax cuts we have put in place have spurred on the economy, have spurred on the revenue.

Since October of last year to this year, you have seen a 9.7 percent increase in revenue because of true tax cuts. What America's taxpayers need is permanent tax cuts. We do not need permanent tax increases, which this bill will provide.

I encourage a ''no'' vote on the tax increase bill.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, the FICA tip credit provision in this bill is permanent. It is not temporary. It is extremely important, as I explained before, to restaurant owners and the like. So that is one provision, a very important provision, that is made permanent in this legislation. It is not temporary.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Credit Act of 2007. This tax relief will help small businesses continue to grow and hire new workers to improve our economy. I firmly believe small businesses are the backbone of our economy and tax incentives are an important tool in helping maintain a competitive edge in today's business world. By passing this legislation, we are one step closer to implementation of a higher minimum wage.

H.R. 976 would help small businesses invest in new equipment and more easily afford large capital expenses. It extends small business expensing for one year—increasing both the amount small businesses can deduct from their taxes and the number of small businesses that can take these deductions. Qualified property includes farm machinery equipment and attached farm property, such as automatic feeders, barn cleaners, single purpose agricultural structures and livestock, to name just a few. The ability to deduct expenses immediately instead of having to depreciate them over time improves cash flow and allows small businesses and farmers to better match income and expenses.

In addition, the bill would simplify tax filing requirements for businesses owned jointly by husbands and wives, and ensure that small businesses are fully able to claim the Work Opportunity Tax Credit and tip credit against AMT liability.

Again, passing this legislation is critically important to getting the increase in the minimum wage enacted into law. Raising the minimum wage from $5.15 to $7.25 an hour over two years would benefit 13 million Americans including 7.7 million women and 3.4 million parents. Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 976.

This is a smart bill that is good for workers and their employers.

Representing Queens and the Bronx, I serve a large number of people who work full time jobs for the minimum wage, and they deserve a raise.

But their employers, like the small restaurants that dot 74th Street in Jackson Heights should not be hit with a new tax.

This bill will allow congress to start in motion the process of increasing the minimum wage, while protecting important employer tax benefits like enhancing the tip credit and expanding and increasing expensing deductions.

This bill also extends and expands the Work Opportunity Tax Credit to encourage businesses to hire people who were formerly on welfare.

Today, we are showing the American people that the Congress works.

This bill is good for workers and business and I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 976, The Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007.

This bill provides $1.3 billion in tax breaks for small business owners and is one of the final steps toward raising the federal minimum wage from $5.15 per hour to $7.25 per hour.

It has been 9½ years since the last minimum wage increase despite widespread support across the country and within the U.S. Congress. And why? Because of partisan politics, and special interests coming before the people's interests.

The Democratic Congress promised a change in priorities. And as one of our first measures of business, Democrats brought a minimum wage increase to the House floor, which received overwhelming bipartisan support. The other body has followed suit and we must work to resolve our differences, which is why we bring this bill before the House today.

A recent poll showed that 89 percent of Americans favor raising the minimum wage. The American public deserves—and has demanded—that raise. With our immediate consideration of this bill, we will heed that call. Hard-working Americans have waited far too long to receive an honest day's pay for an honest day's work.

The people's time has come. We have pledged to act in the public's best interests and we must do so without further delay. Passage of this rule and H.R. 976 will speed enactment of the long overdue increase in the minimum wage.

The Democratic Congress also pledged to reach across the aisle in a bipartisan manner and address the priorities of all Americans. Our bipartisan effort resulted in the carefully constructed compromise that we have before us today. This bill isn't about partisan politics, it's just good policy.

H.R. 976 will help give hard-working families the pay increase they so richly deserve, and ensure small business owners have every opportunity to succeed and prosper. And it will do so in a fiscally responsible manner that will avoid adding to the legacy of debt being left to our children and grandchildren.

Simply stated, this bill is good for taxpayers, good for business, good for people, and is just good policy.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member MCCRERY for proving that the Ways and Means Committee can work in a bipartisan way to extend needed relief to our nation's small businesses.

I am particularly pleased that this bill—the first to be acted upon by the committee since I became a member—includes a provision that closely mirrors the Veterans Employment and Respect Act, which was the first legislative proposal I introduced upon being elected to Congress in 2005.

Section 2 of the bill before us today extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit to include veterans who have developed a service-related disability and who have been discharged or released since September 11, 2001.

Our military service men and women deserve our utmost respect during their active service, and our support and assistance during the sometimes difficult transition back into civilian life. One key component of a successful transition is the opportunity to gain meaningful employment in the private sector. Incentives designed to encourage employers to hire some of the newest veterans—many of whom are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan—will better enable these men and women to make a smooth return to civilian life.

I offer my appreciation to the Chairman and Ranking Member for including this important provision and for making additional changes to the Work Opportunity Tax Credit that will ensure more businesses are able to take advantage of it. This will positively impact the lives of our disabled veterans and citizens seeking gainful employment after a period of unemployment, welfare assistance, or disability.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, which includes an array of tax cuts and other provisions that will help the small businesses that provide jobs for Americans in all sectors of the economy.

The bill will make it easier for small businesses to invest in new equipment by extending their ability to count such investments as a business expense, increasing from $112,000 to $125,000 the amount that can be deducted from their taxes and expanding the number of small businesses that can take these deductions.

In addition, the bill extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, WOTC—which provides incentives for hiring—and expands it to cover disabled veterans.

It also will enhance the current tip credit for small businesses, by maintaining the current tip credit that small businesses take for the Social Security taxes that they pay on their employees' tips, instead of allowing it to drop with the increase in the minimum wage. This is particularly important for many restaurants in Colorado and across the country.

And it will simplify tax-filing requirements for businesses owned jointly by married couples and ensure that small businesses are fully able to claim the WOTC and tip credit against Alternative Minimum Tax liability.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is an excellent example of the good results that can be achieved when we work together on a bipartisan basis. It has the support of the Administration and has also been endorsed by the national Chamber of Commerce, the National

Association of Manufacturers, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, the National Restaurant Association.

I have also received a letter of support from the American Farm Bureau Federation—which I will insert in the RECORD—noting that passage of the bill will directly benefit many farm and ranch businesses. This means it is particularly important for our rural communities in Colorado.

This is a good bill, and I think it deserves the approval of the House.

FEBRUARY 15, 2007.

Hon. MARK UDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE UDALL: The American Farm Bureau Federation supports passage of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007.

H.R. 976 extends the enhanced provisions of section 179 small business expensing for one year. Beginning in 2007, it increases the maximum amount that can be expensed from $112,000 to $125,000 and the total dollar limit from $450,000 to $500,000.

Section 179 allows small businesses to expense the cost of qualified property in the year that it is purchased in lieu of depreciation. Qualified property includes farm machinery equipment and attached farm property, such as milk tanks, automatic feeders, barn cleaners, single purpose agricultural structures and livestock.

The ability to deduct expenses immediately instead of having to depreciate them over time improve cash flow and allows farm and ranch businesses to better match income and expenses. Extending and expanding small business expensing will offer additional benefits to farm and ranch businesses.

Farm Bureau urges you to vote for passage of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act.

This tax package provides limited, targeted tax relief for small businesses in a fiscally responsible manner. At a little over $1.3 billion it provides a meaningful level of relief, offset by closing a loophole that would allow some upper income tax payers to take advantage of a reduced capital gains tax that was intended to benefit low income Americans.

In addition to being fiscally responsible, it's fully bipartisan. Both Democratic and Republican Members had a chance to provide their input. It was introduced jointly by Chairman RANGEL and Mr. MCCRERY, and it has been co-sponsored by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of the Ways and Means Committee.

I am particularly supportive of extending the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, and expanding the Credit to include veterans who have been disabled since September 11th, which this bill does.

But mostly, I am supportive of going to conference with the other body to pass a minimum wage increase. This legislation will accomplish that. Thirteen million Americans have not had a raise—not even a cost of living adjustment—in 9 years. In a word, a minimum wage increase is overdue.

The current minimum wage is so low that an individual working full time at the minimum wage would make only $10,712—that's 35% below the federal poverty line for a family of three. I urge all of my colleagues to support this responsible tax package so we can move onto conference and providing millions of Americans with the raise they deserve.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007. This bill creates immediate opportunities for small businesses around the country and in western Wisconsin. Small businesses are the engine of America's economy, representing more than 95 percent of all employers, creating half of our gross domestic product, and creating three out of four new jobs nationwide. If the United States is going to continue to have a strong economy, we must give small businesses every opportunity to succeed; H.R. 976 provides the right tax opportunities for positive growth for small businesses.

Additionally, I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member MCCRERY for presenting a bipartisan bill to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the House of Representatives. With their combined leadership, I know my first term on the Committee on Ways and Means will be eventful and successful.

Since coming to Congress, I have consistently supported a range of proposals to help small firms, including giving help to small manufacturers through tax relief and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership; creating a new small business health care tax credit; and putting the government on a ''pay as you go'' basis to restrain deficit spending that raises interest rates and restricts small firms' access to capital.

H.R. 976 follows this tradition by providing $1.3 billion in tax cuts targeted to small business over the next 10 years. This cost, however, is entirely offset by provisions that pay for it. The bill's tax cuts include a one-year extension for deductions on small business expenses, and it increases the amount of such expenses these businesses could deduct. It also extends for one year the tax credit for employers who hire certain disadvantaged workers, and ensures that an increase in the minimum wage would not reduce the current ''tip credit'' for restaurant employers. Most importantly, this bill accomplishes these savings for small businesses within the framework of pay-as-you-go rules.

Most significantly, H.R. 976 includes a provision to help simplify taxes for family farmers. Right now, if a farm owned by a married couple files as a sole proprietorship (instead of a partnership), only one spouse receives credit for paying Social Security and Medicare taxes. This bill allows both spouses to receive credit for the Social Security and Medicare taxes they pay while under a sole proprietorship. Filing for a partnership can be a costly and time consuming process, and this bill allows both spouses the security that comes with Social Security and Medicare benefits, without the extra burden.

Specifically, I know this provision will greatly benefit family farmers in western Wisconsin and around the country. This simplification will allow both spouses running a farm to receive credit for the taxes they pay, and ensures that in the event of a tragedy, or simply in old age, both of them are taken care of.

Small business is critical to economic strength, building America's future, and helping the United States compete in today's global marketplace. I urge my colleagues to vote for this common sense bill so we can support our most important economic driver, the small business.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007. I commend my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee for working in a bipartisan way to reach an agreement on provisions that will not only help small businesses grow and thrive, but will provide small businesses with incentives to hire disadvantaged workers. Not only that, it will not pass any costs onto our children.

The most important thing that will come out of passing this piece of legislation today, is that it will ensure that we finally pass a minimum wage increase. As I have said before, we have waited far too long—10 long years—to give our working poor a pay raise. We should be ashamed of that delay, but I am proud that we are taking that important step to restoring dignity and fairness for our minimum wage earners. This minimum wage increase will help millions of our brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers.

My fight in Congress is the fight against poverty. We must do more for working families, for families who are playing by the rules and still cannot get ahead. I just don't understand how people survive under these circumstances. We cannot stand by and watch millions of people continue to fall into poverty. This minimum wage increase is not the end, but the beginning of our fight against poverty in this nation.

Passing this legislation today will smooth the path to the passage of the minimum wage increase. This bill is also a symbol of how much we can accomplish to help hard working families when we work together, across the aisle—Democrats and Republicans. And I look forward to continued progress in the fight against poverty in the 110th Congress.

Mr. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Small Business Tax Relief Act.

Small businesses are the backbone of our nation's economy, and I am pleased that today we are considering a few commonsense provisions that will lessen the tax burden our small businesses face.

I am especially supportive of the language that will have a direct impact on the restaurants in my district. The bill will allow restaurants in Las Vegas and across the country to continue claiming the full tip credit despite any increase in the federal minimum wage.

I strongly support increasing the minimum wage and was proud to vote in favor of legislation this House passed as part of the Democratic majority's first 100 hours. I am hopeful that passing this bill will help move the process along in order to achieve this important goal.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill H.R. 976, The Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007.

This bill provides $1.3 billion in tax breaks for small business owners and is one of the final steps toward raising the federal minimum wage from $5.15 per hour to $7.25 per hour. It has been 9½ years since the last minimum wage increase despite widespread support across the country and within the U.S. Congress. And why? Because of partisan politics and special interests coming before the people's interests.

The Democratic Congress promised a change in priorities. And as one of our first measures of business, Democrats brought a minimum wage increase to the House floor,

which received overwhelming bipartisan support. The other body has followed suit and we must work to resolve our differences, which is why we bring this bill before the House today.

A recent poll showed that 89 percent of Americans favor raising the minimum wage. The American public deserves—and has demanded—that raise. With our immediate consideration of this bill, we will heed that call. Hard-working Americans have waited far too long to receive an honest day's pay for an honest day's work.

The people's time has come. We have pledged to act in the public's best interests and we must do so without further delay. Passage of this rule and H.R. 976 will speed enactment of the long overdue increase in the minimum wage.

The Democratic Congress also pledged to reach across the aisle in a bipartisan manner and address the priorities of all Americans. Our bipartisan effort resulted in the carefully constructed compromise that we have before us today. This bill isn't about partisan politics, it's just good policy.

H.R. 976 will help give hard-working families the pay increase they so richly deserve, and ensure small business owners have every opportunity to succeed and prosper. And it will do so in a fiscally responsible manner that will avoid adding to the legacy of debt being left to our children and grandchildren.

Simply stated, this bill is good for taxpayers, good for business, good for people, and is just good policy.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 976, the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007. My family has owned small businesses in Tennessee for generations, and I understand the unique challenges these family-operated businesses face in remaining successful and meeting the needs of their communities. We also understand their importance in helping fuel the local and national economies. I am proud of the work we are doing here to support small businesses as they continue to thrive and give them the assistance they need to help raise their workers' wages.

It is fitting that this is the first major tax package to adhere to the new PAYGO rules this House has re-implemented to curb deficit spending, because ''pay as you go'' is a basic principle that every small business owner we are helping here today already follows every day. I am glad that we are following their lead and operating under responsible business values such as PAYGO.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member MCCRERY for the way they have worked together on this bill. I have been a part of the Ways and Means Committee for 10 years, and this is the first major tax bill I know of during that time that has been reported out of our committee by a unanimous, bipartisan vote. I am encouraged by that and hope the bipartisanship will continue as we look forward to the other legislative priorities facing us on the Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, surely the smaller and less complex your business structure, the less complex your tax filings should be. But the tax code is so full of complexity that there is barely any room left for simplicity for even the truly Mom- and Pop-owned business or the couple who is trying to hold on to the family farm or ranch.

I am particularly pleased that this bill includes a provision to help husband and wife co-owned businesses that was taken from a bill that I co-introduced with the now Small Business Committee Chairwoman in the last Congress and reintroduced this Congress. My simplification provision has repeatedly been included in the Taxpayer Advocate's annual recommendations to Congress. Now it will hopefully become a reality. An additional benefit of this provision is to ensure equity for wives in these situations by giving both the husband and the wife credit for paying Medicare and Social Security taxes.

I also support the extension and increase of small business expensing, which allows small businesses to make significant capital investments—such as acquiring computer software or farm equipment—and deduct the total cost from income immediately, rather than depreciating them over extended periods of time. By reflecting the increasing costs of doing business, this provision will allow small business owners to build upon their all-American dreams.

As a result of this bill, many of the small Mom- and Pop-owned farms, ranches, and businesses that I represent in Texas will find tax season a little less taxing and a lot fairer. The Committee has shown restraint in drafting this bill. With the purchasing power of the minimum wage at its lowest level in 50 years, neither it nor these modest reforms to help small businesses should be held hostage to the endless appetite of some for another $8 billion plus in additional tax breaks.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member MCCRERY for proving that the Ways and Means Committee can work in a bipartisan way to extend needed relief to our Nation's small businesses.

I am particularly pleased that this bill—the first to be acted upon by the committee since I became a member—includes a provision that closely mirrors the Veterans Employment and Respect Act. which was the first legislative proposal I introduced upon being elected to Congress in 2005.

Section 2 of the bill before us today extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit to include veterans who have developed a service-related disability and who have been discharged or released since September 11, 2001.

Our military service men and women deserve our utmost respect during their active service, and our support and assistance during the sometimes difficult transition back into civilian life. One key component of a successful transition is the opportunity to gain meaningful employment in the private sector. Incentives designed to encourage employers to hire some of the newest veterans—many of whom are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan—will better enable these men and women to make a smooth return to civilian life.

I offer my appreciation to the Chairman and Ranking Member for including this important provision and for making additional changes to the Work Opportunity Tax Credit that will ensure more businesses are able to take advantage of it and, as a result, positively impact the lives of our disabled veterans and citizens seeking gainful employment after a period of unemployment, welfare assistance, or disability.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think we've done a good job of balancing small business tax incentives with an increase in the minimum wage.

Both workers and employers come out winners. And because the bill is revenue neutral, the taxpayer also wins.

The bill provides a few billion dollars of tax relief in the first few years while businesses are absorbing the minimum wage increase.

These tax benefits include a 1-year extension of the WOTC, Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which is a credit for employers who hire the hard-to-employ.

Eligible workers include those from low-income communities, or those on public assistance, or veterans who simply need a boost in getting back into the workforce.

Our bipartisan bill also doubles the WOTC credit for hiring veterans with service-connected disabilities.

The bill also increases and extends the small business expensing allowance so that small business owners can write-off capital expenditures.

A small business owner buying equipment or new computers can immediately recoup the cost, rather than depreciating the asset over several years.

And the bill allows businesses to continue to take a full ''tip credit'' for their tipped workers. Otherwise, with the increase in the minimum wage, these business owners would lose a significant amount of the tip credit right away.

I applaud the work of Chairman RANGEL and Mr. MCCRERY who drafted this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 976, which will provide tax relief to small businesses, the backbone of our economy.

It is my hope that this revenue-neutral tax bill will be coupled with the $7.25 minimum wage increase this House of Representatives passed in its First 100 hours. We owe it to hard-working Americans to give them a living wage, as well as provide tax relief to small businesses that would allow them to continue to grow and play a vital role in our local economies across the country.

In my hometown of Cleveland, OH, over 95 percent of the businesses are considered small businesses, employing about 58,000 Clevelanders. In the State of Ohio, over 490,000 people are employed by small businesses. These workers and businesses will benefit from the tax benefits in this bill, allowing them to thrive and reinvest in our communities.

Let me praise two key provisions in this bill. H.R. 976:

1. Extends and expands the Work Opportunity Tax Credit. The WOTC provides employers with a tax credit for employing ex-offenders, qualified veterans, TANF recipients, high-risk youth, food stamp recipients, and other targeted groups. The credit helps break down many of the barriers preventing these Americans from getting work. H.R. 976 extends the WOTC, and expands the credit for the benefit of disabled veterans and residents living in empowerment zones, enterprise communities, and renewal communities.

2. Extends the Section 179 small business expensing, and increases from $112,000 to $125,000 (indexed for inflation) the total amount of expensing allowed. The bill also expands the number of small businesses that can qualify for the maximum benefit by increasing the phaseout threshold amount from $450,000 to $500,000.

Let me also discuss another important provision in this tax bill, and that is the enhancement of the tip credit. I was recently approached about this issue by a chef and restaurant owner in my Congressional District, Sergio Abramof. Sergio owns two excellent restaurants: Sergio's in University Circle, and Sergio's Sarava at Shaker Square.

Fortunately, H.R. 976 will allow businesses to continue claiming the full tip credit despite an increase in the Federal minimum wage. That provision will assist workers and restaurants like those owned by Sergio, so I am very pleased that we are including it in this legislation.

H.R. 976 is fair, bipartisan legislation that will allow small businesses to continue to be an economic engine. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 976, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 360, noes 45, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—360

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—45

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Burgess
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Hensarling
Hoekstra
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Mack
McCotter
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Pearce
Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Royce
Sali
Shadegg
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—28

Baird
Berman
Boustany
Calvert
Costello
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
Everett
Flake
Gallegly
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hulshof
LaHood
Latham
LoBiondo
Lowey
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Pence
Smith (TX)
Stark
Udall (NM)
Waters
Wicker

□ 1710

Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. SHUSTER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal leave of absence, I was unable to vote on passage of the Small Business Tax Relief Act, H.R. 976, rollcall vote No. 102. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House Chamber for votes on February 16, 2007, as I was attending the funeral services of my wife's father, who succumbed to his long battle with cancer. If I were present for votes on this day, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 99, "nay" on rollcall No. 100, "nay" on rollcall No. 101, and "yea" on rollcall No. 102.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical emergency, I regrettably missed rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 100: "yea."
Rollcall No. 101: "aye."
Rollcall No. 102: "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, due to the funeral of a family member, I was unable to be present today for votes. I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H. Con. Res. 63, disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq (Rollcall vote 99). Had I been present, I also would have voted "aye" on H.R. 976, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes (Rollcall vote 102).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls No. 100, Previous Question the Rule on H.R. 976, No. 101, the Rule on H.R. 976, and No. 102, Final passage of H.R. 976, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

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

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 976.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2007

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 67, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2007

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 28, 2007.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY H. HOYER AND HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH FEBRUARY 27, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

FEBRUARY 16, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER and the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 27, 2007.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointments are approved.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, February 15, 2007.

The Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am writing to notify you of my resignation from the Committee on the Budget, effective today.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

LOIS CAPPS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107–117, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
Ms. DELAURO, Connecticut
Ms. PRYCE, Ohio.

PENTAGON RED TAPE KEEPS MEDICAL RECORDS FROM DOCTORS OF THE WOUNDED

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today a story appeared in the Washington Post entitled ''Pentagon Red Tape Keeps Medical Records From Doctors of the Wounded.''

The Defense Department is refusing to give the records of people wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan to physicians who are taking care of them in the Veterans Department. It is absolutely unbelievable that there could be that kind of bureaucratic snafu.

Now the Defense Department says, We don't have the authority to give the records on the wounded that are leaving us and going to the Veterans Department.

Absolute bureaucratic nonsense. I have introduced H.R. 1128 with Mr. FILNER, which gives that authority to the Defense Department. I hope that other Members will sign this bill, and that we will pass it by unanimous consent when we return to the House after the Presidents' Day break.

In the next week, there are going to be people who are injured and transferred to the veterans hospitals who can't get their records transferred. How can a doctor take care of somebody if they don't know what happened to them on the battlefield? This is the kind of thing we have to stop if we support the troops.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 2007]

PENTAGON RED TAPE KEEPS MEDICAL RECORDS FROM DOCTORS OF THE WOUNDED

(By Al Kamen)

Department of Veterans Affairs doctors are furious over a recent decision by the Pentagon to block their access to medical information needed to treat severely injured troops arriving at VA hospitals from Iraq and Afghanistan.

The VA physicians handle troops with serious brain injuries and other major health problems. They rely on digital medical records that track the care given wounded troops from the moment of their arrival at a field hospital through their evacuation to the United States.

About 30 VA doctors in four trauma centers around the country have treated about 200 severely wounded soldiers and Marines. The docs had been receiving the complete digital records from the Pentagon until the end of January, using the Pentagon's Joint Patient Tracking Application.

But on Jan. 25, when Shane McNamee, a physician in the Richmond VA Medical Center, tried to get the full records, he couldn't. He sent an urgent e-mail to VA chief liaison officer Edward Huycke.

''My JPTA account has been disabled within last few days,'' McNamee wrote. ''I called the hotline and was told that all VA accounts have been locked. Could not get a good answer why. Anyhow—I have 4 [Iraq/Afghanistan] service members to arrive within the next 2 days. This information is terribly important,'' the doctor wrote.

Thirty-four minutes later Huycke e-mailed back: ''Ok, Shane. Will get on it. Not sure what's up.''

An hour or so later, a senior VA official forwarded McNamee's e-mail to Lt. Col. David Parramore at the Pentagon, saying that McNamee ''needs his access back to JPTA to provide the best possible treatment for soldiers injured in [Iraq/Afghanistan] arriving there in a few days. Can you help?''

Tommy Morris, director of Deployment Health Systems, responded the next morning to Parramore's inquiry, after contacting Ellen Embry, deputy assistant secretary of defense for force health protection. ''I spoke with Embry and no agreements, no data sharing via access to JPTA.''

The access cutoff came after Morris, in a Jan. 23 e-mail, instructed a colleague: ''If the VA currently has access I need a list of persons and I need their accounts shut off ASAP. It is illegal for them to have access without data use agreements and access controls in place by federal regulations and public law.''

There have been meetings between VA and Pentagon officials. The Pentagon declined to comment yesterday. VA officials apparently thought it might have been resolved Monday. But an e-mail Monday from Morris to a co-worker said: ''The leadership has not authorized the VA accounts to be turned back on, in case someone approaches you about this.''

Last week, Sens. Daniel K. Akaka (D–Hawaii) and Larry E. Craig (Idaho)—the chairman and ranking Republican on the Veterans' Affairs Committee—wrote David S.C. Chu, undersecretary of defense for personnel, of their ''deep concern'' about VA trauma center doctors not having access to complete records.

''For those servicemembers suffering from a traumatic brain injury,'' they wrote, ''VA's access to in-theater imaging is an important and valuable tool for tracking their patient's progress since being wounded or injured.'' They suggested the VA doctor be given temporary access to JPTA while the data-sharing questions are worked out.

They're still awaiting an appropriate response. McNamee is still waiting for the records.

THE BERT BRADY HOMECOMING COMMITTEE

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, ABC Nightly News named Bert Brady Citizen of the Week. Here is why. Bert Brady is a 69-year-old veteran. He gets up nearly every day for the last year and heads over to the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport. He is there to do something that was not done for him. He is there to welcome soldiers coming home.

Bert organizes folks to go down with him to the airport and greet the soldiers coming home from the war. Sometimes these greeters number in the hundreds. Most of the citizens are veterans of Korea or Vietnam, but they also include Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, all to say ''thank you'' to the troops.

As Bert pointed out, there was no one there when our soldiers came home from Korea or from Vietnam. These dedicated individuals are making sure no soldier feels they are forgotten when they are returning from this war.

People line up along the paths. They cheer the soldiers as they come through the path, shaking their hands, giving them hugs, telling them thank you, and waving American flags. For our troops that moment is powerful.

When asked why he is so driven, Bert spoke of one soldier who shook his hand and said, ''Mister, I will never forget you. It's the greatest thing that ever happened to me, this homecoming reception.''

So we Americans thank you, Bert Brady.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1715

STOP FAST TRACK

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, for generations Hershey's chocolate has been an American symbol. Soldiers abroad distributed it to smiling children. Across our country people everywhere recognize the distinctive shape of Hershey kisses. Now Hershey's, too, is being outsourced to Mexico, as the great sucking sound of outsourced jobs accelerate in our country.

Yesterday, the Hershey Company announced it was moving 1,500 more manufacturing jobs to Mexico, terminating 1,500 U.S. workers and all the dairy farmers that supply work and product into that company.

Hershey now joins the ranks of Hoover, Stanley, Champion, Ford, Chrysler, Huffy, Zebco, Levi's and Maytag, who have shipped thousands more U.S. jobs to countries where workers toil for starvation wages.

Now President Bush wants to renew more of the same fast-track trade authority, to ship more of these jobs to Mexico and other trade rivals. He wants to sell our economy to the highest bidders in foreign countries.

NAFTA, CAFTA, PNTR and its cousin agreements have broken the middle class. Congress is long overdue to stand up for them. We must take back the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and start creating good jobs in our country again. It is time to stop fast track.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida). 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.

NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in amazement at what can only be described as the utter inflexibility of the Reverend Ian Paisley. Mr. Paisley's dislike of the Catholic population in the north of Ireland is well documented and needs no repeating on the floor of this body. Suffice it to say that John Hume's observation ''if the word 'no' was removed from the English language, Ian Paisley would be speechless'' is an accurate description of Mr. Paisley's ability for thoughtful negotiation and compromise.

What does deserve recounting here, however, are the remarkable strides that have been taken by Sinn Fein in the quest for a just and lasting peace for all the people of Northern Ireland, as well as the hard work and dedication shown by the Taoiseach Bertie Ahearn and Prime Minister Tony Blair in this endeavor.

Prime Minister Blair has not always used the full force of his office to secure peace on the island of Ireland. However, he has shown himself to be a true friend to the Irish people and a strident negotiator for peace, and I am proud to commend him for that. His diligence and the pursuit of peace stands in stark contrast, however, to that of Mr. Paisley.

Mr. Speaker, heroic efforts have been put forth by all parties, republican, nationalist and unionists alike, to address this situation. It began with the signing of the Good Friday Accords in 1998 and the commitment of the IRA to end its armed campaign and commit to the development of purely political and exclusively peaceful means. The IRA then went on to put their arms completely and verifiably beyond use, which was confirmed by the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning.

Then, most recently, Sinn Fein voted in its extraordinary Ard Fheis, or political convention, to support the policing institutions. This includes a police service that has been shown by the independent Police Ombudsman to have engaged in collusion with loyalist paramilitaries, resulting in the death of at least 10 people, both Catholic and Protestant.

Despite all of this, Mr. Paisley has refused to enter into government with Sinn Fein and put the needs of his constituency and that of the citizens of Northern Ireland above those of his own petty hatred and extremist allies.

Mr. Paisley cannot continue to stand in the way of peace and justice for the people of Northern Ireland. The people of the North have waited far too long and sacrificed far too much for him to continue to be a roadblock to peace. Responsible leadership is needed on the unionist side of the North to show that extremism, bigotry and hatred will not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken to this floor many times in the last few years to talk about the situation in Northern Ireland. The progress which has been made is nothing short of remarkable, considering the violence that has plagued this area literally for centuries. But the one constant that those of us who care about a just and lasting peace have seen is Mr. Paisley, increasingly out of touch, afraid of losing his grip on power, and more interested in living with the past than embracing the promise of tomorrow.

It is well past time that Reverend Ian Paisley move along and let the people of Northern Ireland get on with their lives.

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

(Mr. GINGREY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this profound honor to have the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, the People's House.

I would reflect that all week long, starting really on Tuesday morning, we have had a series of marathon debates taking place here, Mr. Speaker, marathon debates that ranged in the area of 12 hours a day, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday until after 1 a.m. this morning, taking up again this morning shortly after 8 o'clock, and then moving on until mid-afternoon, when we finally had a vote on the resolution, the resolution that was offered by the majority, the resolution that in one voice said, we honor the troops, and the

other voice said, but we are opposed to the reinforcements and opposed to the surge that the President had ordered, the surge that is already in motion, the troops, many of them have already been deployed, and it is not possible to back out of this.

So the voice that came, Mr. Speaker, to the people across this world was answered and was heard in a lot of different ways.

On one side of it, the antiwar movement within the United States, the activists, liberal left, the protesters that are, at least if not the people that were in the streets during Vietnam, were descendants of the people that were in the streets during Vietnam, philosophically, if not literally, and in many cases it was both. They heard a message, which is, at every cost, the Speaker's leadership is going to drag our military and pull our Commander in Chief back of their commitment to the Iraqi people in the Middle East.

And the other voice, a voice was heard by a number of American people, stalwart patriots, people who believe in the destiny of America and understand that there is a price to be paid by each succeeding generation because of the decisions that are made by the preceding generations. We are the recipients of the sacrifice of our Founders and of every generation's sacrifice, starting with the shaping of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, those veterans of the Revolutionary War, those who supported the effort in the Revolutionary War, those who shaped the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, those that built the economy, those that built the churches, those that built the schools, those that built the communities that link together, which is this greater American civilization, we are the beneficiaries.

The decisions that they made July 4, 1776, to pick a point we all understand, we benefitted from that decision. And it was a hard decision. And it wasn't a decision that was made without great concern or without great debate. There was. And there was dissension on both sides.

Some of the people that were opposed to freedom, a free nation, were identified as the Tories, the people that aligned with the British. They didn't think it was worth the price. They didn't want to risk the blood. They didn't want to risk the treasure. They thought that they could suffer the indignities and the injustices that were being poured upon them from the crown, and that was more tolerable than the price that would have to be paid for freedom.

But freedom won out. Freedom was established. And they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, and they did so knowing that they might very well lose their lives and their fortunes, but they would never lose their sacred honor. That was the creed that came from the Founding Fathers, and that was just the Revolutionary War. Of course, it was the biggest and most significant.

But, shortly after that, we had another conflict, and one of those conflicts, Mr. Speaker, was one that started out over in the Mediterranean. The hostilities between the United States and the British concluded in 1783. That was when the military victory was won by George Washington, and that was when, also, the protection of the Union Jack that flew over the seas and the oceans was removed from the protection of our Merchant Marine.

So 1783, our Merchant Marine, our ship sailing on the high seas, lost the Union Jack protection, the intimidation of the British Royal Navy, 1783. 1784, American ships were attacked and boarded and pirated, and our sailors were forced into slavery, and the cargos were sold, and the ships were put back into the fleets of the Barbary pirates, the Barbary pirates being the predecessors of the enemy that we have today.

And it is an interesting study in history, Mr. Speaker, to see what unfolded here in the history of the United States when we sent our best diplomats over to the Mediterranean to negotiate with the Barbary pirates. Those were Thomas Jefferson and John Adams.

Now, I have here a copy, Mr. Speaker, this is of the papers of Thomas Jefferson, right here, volume nine. This is dated 1785, November 1, 1785 to 1786. This is the report that Thomas Jefferson returned upon his conclusion of his diplomat mission to the Tripoli pirates.

In a paragraph that he has written to the American commissioners and John Jay he says, soon after the arrival of Mr. Jay in London, we had a conference with the ambassador of Tripoli at his house. This ambassador of Tripoli was a representative of the Islamic Caliphate. And he says, he writes, ''We took the liberty to make some inquiries concerning the grounds of their pretensions to make war upon nations who had done them no injury,'' meaning the United States of America, ''and observed that we consider all mankind as our friends, who had done us no wrong, nor had given us any provocation.''

In other words, the statement that came from Thomas Jefferson and John Adams was, to the ambassador from Tripoli, we consider you friends. We have had no hostilities toward you. We have not provoked you in any way. We are simply sailing our ships on the high seas and providing open commerce and trade like any country would do. Why do you attack us? Why do you kill us? Why do you press our sailors into slavery?

Jefferson answered, The ambassador from Tripoli answered us that it was founded on the laws of their prophet, that it was written in their Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, the authority of the Koran. I continue quoting, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners and that every Muslim who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise.

That is from the negotiations that took place in 1786, and that is from Jefferson's report to John Jay.

Now, here we are, 2006. We are going through this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I am hearing over and over again there is a reason why they hate us. We should understand why they hate us. If we could figure that out, maybe we could change our ways and we could find a way to accommodate our disagreements, because surely there are two sides to every argument.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am here to submit that Thomas Jefferson understood this thing clearly. He understood a principle that I laid out this afternoon in debate called nosce hostem, which is a Latin term. It comes from the Roman legions, and that is Latin for ''know thine enemy''.

The Romans understood, and they were the most successful long-term military legions in history all the time up to that point and maybe in all of history. They had to know their enemy, and they had to persevere, and that is where that term came, nosce hostem, know thine enemy.

Thomas Jefferson understood the same thing.

□ 1730

And, in fact, his curiosity and his compulsion to understand and know the enemy caused him to go out and buy a Koran, and that Koran was part of his opposition research, if you will. And Jefferson's being one of the most curious individuals as a figure in our history and maybe the most learned man of his time, he studied Greek so that he could read the Greek Bible and do the translation himself. He wasn't quite satisfied with just King James. He wanted to do that comparison because he was that much of an intellectual and he had that level of curiosity. He had the same level of intellectual curiosity in understanding our enemy the Barbary pirates; so his study of the Koran, I am confident, concurred with his report back to John Jay that was handed over to Congress, that report that says they believe their path to salvation is in killing us.

So Jefferson persevered in his endeavor to understand our enemy. He studied Koran, understood our enemy, put the report in place, and in that one simple paragraph is an explanation of our enemy today. And there is quote after quote after quote that have been brought forward here by my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the last several days that support that statement. Statements made by Osama bin Laden, statements made by Zawahiri, statements made by other leaders of al Qaeda where they say their religious duty, their responsibility, is to keep attacking infidels; infidels, being defined as unbelievers in their Koran; unbelievers, being those who have not sworn allegiance to Islam.

And you saw that in that quote where he said that they continued to attack us wherever we might be found until we either converted to Islam or pay homage or are beheaded. And historically looking back, most of us recognize when we say ''leathernecks,'' that means the Marine Corps today. That nickname came from the Barbary pirate wars when they went to the shores of Tripoli, and our Marine Corps wore heavy thick leather collars, Mr. Speaker. Those collars were worn to reduce the number of marines that would be beheaded by the swinging swords of the Barbary pirates.

The beheadings of today are not anything new. These are beheadings that go back throughout time, throughout the Crusades, clear back to a thousand years ago, Mr. Speaker. And our enemy believes they are fighting that same war. They carry that same grudge. But furthermore, it is a religious conviction on their part. It is not something that can be negotiated away. And to believe that we could resolve this conflict by negotiations is a myopic and naive position. We cannot. If that were the case, I am going to trust Jefferson would have found a way, Adams would have found a way, all of our negotiators in the past would have found a way. Some of them would have found a way at least.

But we fought the Barbary pirates, and it was a herky-jerky, hit-and-miss, not always successful effort. But we did occupy some land there, and we did force them into submission, and we did get a kind of an agreement to resolve the disputes. But the battles between Western civilization and the Barbary pirates and the radical world of Islam of that era really didn't end until 1830, and I am going to go on record here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, when the French culminated a military operation and occupied Algiers. When they did that in 1830, that was essentially, at least for modern times, the end of the violence. Scattered incidents to be sure, but for the majority the end of the violence between the radical Islamists who were the Barbary pirates of that era up until 1830 and then move us forward to about 1979 when these hostilities started again. They lay dormant. They were essentially in submission. They didn't have many tools to work with. Some of them had been colonized. And during that period of time, they didn't get ahold of governments. They didn't have a place to start. They didn't have an ability transportation-wise to come out here and attack the rest of the world.

But things happened and we moved into the modern world. And when the Cold War was over and there was no longer this titanic struggle between the world's two Superpowers and that power vacuum, in came al Qaeda. In came the Taliban. In came the radicals to fill that void. And the philosophical support became there. The funding was there from oil. The real oil wealth began to pour into those Islamic states in the 1970s. And if you remember the oil cartels of that era, the gas lines here, Jimmy Carter's legacy, the 444 days of 52 American hostages paraded in front of the television, and the only way they were going to be released was to elect a President that they were afraid of. So that is why you saw the split screen of Ronald Reagan taking the oath of office and those 52 hostages being released at the same time. But that became the beginning of this constant battle that we have now with the jihadists of today. And they have been empowered by oil wealth, families that are wealthy, by the religious network of radical Islam.

Now, to help explain this a little bit, Mr. Speaker, I use an analogy here that is something that I have not heard from anywhere else. I look around and I think how do I compare what is going on? How am I to stand up and say I am opposed to the radical Islam, these jihadists, without directly attacking Islam itself? Many times the President has made the statement that Islam is a ''religion of peace.'' I am looking for more evidence of that before I am going to step up and resoundingly endorse that statement, but I am not willing to indict them at this point, Mr. Speaker. I would rather compare it this way: I am going to say the radical Islam, the jihadists, are a parasite that lives on and within the host called Islam.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you think about what that means, a parasite living on and within a host, a parasite will ride on a host, feed off a host, reproduce off a host, drop off and attack other species, but also attack the host species. This goes on over and over again. And I could take you down through some different species of parasites to make my case, but it remains a biological fact that that is what a parasite does.

A parasite doesn't respect its host to the point where it will refrain from killing the host. Sometimes the parasite will kill the host. Think in terms of a tapeworm that will draw all of the nutrients out of the host until the host becomes so scrawny and so disheveled and so weak that the host actually expires. That will happen. There are other parasites that will do the same thing, but there are many parasites that will attack more than one species.

This parasite called radical Islam, these jihadists, attack many species. They attack every species of Homo sapien, for that matter. They attack Jews as their preferred target. They attack Christians as a preferred target. They attack capitalists as a preferred target. And when they can do a two-fer, a Jewish capitalist, a Christian capitalist, a Western civilization representative, secular capitalist, they are all for doing that because they know that that destabilizes the civilization that they abhor.

This parasite called jihadists also attacks Islam itself. Moderate Muslims are killed in greater numbers than anybody else historically over the last 30 or so years because the destabilization that takes place is where they thrive. This parasite called jihad, the jihadist, lives and it grows and it thrives in an anarchy.

So they are seeking to create anarchy. They are attacking the host called Islam, but a host will always provide that food. It will provide the transportation. It provides a home for the parasite. The parasite jihadist, radical Islam, lives within Islam. And so radical Islam goes to the mosques where they preach their hatred and they help sort out those that are truly convicted on the jihad side. The most radical of those are identified by their response, their reaction, and they are connected to and recruited out of the mosques. Many people who go to the mosques are peaceful people. They all aren't. And that is a center where the communication comes through.

The language itself is another tool that helps this parasite called jihadists communicate. So the Arabic language itself is a conduit, Mr. Speaker; a common conduit through the language, a common conduit through the mosque system, a common conduit because of common nationalities and identification with each other. You tie that all together and then you pick the radicals out, and that is how you sort out the species of the parasite jihadists.

But the host hasn't done much to eradicate the parasite from its midst. I haven't seen Islam step up and decide that they are going to eradicate radical Islam from their midst. No. For a number of reasons. One, they are afraid to confront them. They don't know what the price will be. Another one is they are not quite sure they really want to side with the people that are on our side of this argument. Some of them are also dancing in the streets with their radical jihadists when something goes bad for the people on our side, this Western civilization, which I think encompasses the world that the jihadists are opposed to. Western civilization including Christians, Jews, the Judeo Christian ethic, the free market ethic, the liberal democracies that we have that provide freedom for people and give us this flexibility to define our own future. They hate freedom, as the President has said many times, and they attack freedom.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult nut to crack. And I would like to charge Islam with eradicating that parasite in their midst. I do think it is part their responsibility, but I am not hearing them step up to this task. So I am looking forward to the day that that happens, Mr. Speaker, but until it does, we have a war to fight.

We have a task ahead of us, and this task that is ahead of us is a great big, difficult task. And it is far more difficult today, Mr. Speaker, than it was a week ago because of the message that came out of this Chamber all week long, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday,

and this morning up until mid-afternoon, and especially because of the vote; the vote that passed a resolution that said we support our troops and oppose their mission. I mean a third grader can figure out that that logic doesn't fit. You have got to do one or the other, and they are tied together. You don't send your military off and ask them to put their lives on the line for a mission that you don't believe in. And to say to them, ''I am all for you, buddy, but if you get shot over there, if you give your life over there, I can't say that you did it for a good cause because it is a bad cause.'' That is what got said over here.

This is a good cause. This is a just cause, Mr. Speaker. And our troops have been undermined today and yesterday and the day before and the day before that. And now they have got to carry out a mission, and it is a lot harder than it has ever been over there.

And our enemy has been encouraged, Mr. Speaker. They have got the words that have been said over here, these quotes put up. They have got to be all over al-Jazeera, over the Islamic blogosphere. There have got to be people dancing in the streets all over the land where they recruit our enemies because they know what this means. They know what it means because they study history.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have studied history as well. And part of that history is, first of all, the United States of America is a Nation that, up until the conclusion of the Korean War, had never lost a war. We had been successful in every conflict that we had engaged in. And I grew up under that. I grew up with a military father and military uncles on both sides of the family. They sat around a lot and talked. The United States of America, of all the Nations in the world, has never lost a war. And the reason we haven't lost a war is because we believe in freedom.

And you are a lucky young man, STEVE KING, for being born in the United States of America. You could have been born anywhere else, but you were born here. You are a recipient of that freedom that they fought for and each preceding generation had fought for. And I was extraordinarily blessed. I am, Mr. Speaker, but I was raised with a reverence for that freedom and the understanding of the price that was paid for it. And up until that time we had been successful in every conflict. They didn't quite define the Korean War except to say, well, we won that, but nobody talked about that very much.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, because I picked up a book a little while back. I had to do a little searching to find it. And the title of the book is How We Won the War. By General Vo Nguyen Giap. He was a Vietnamese general who commanded their troops throughout the entire period of time that they were in conflict with the United States of America in Vietnam. And his comment in there that caught my eye first was ''It all began when the United States failed to win a clear victory in Korea,'' Mr. Speaker.

If you remember, Korea was resolved in the early 1950s, I think 1952, but when it was resolved, it ended up being on the 38th parallel. We had pushed the Chinese back north of the 38th parallel. We had gone north to the 38th parallel with U.N. troops as well, and pushed back to the 38th. The resolution came, and we shut down the fight on that 38th parallel line, which is pretty much back to the same line before the invasion came from the North Koreans.

□ 1745

So it was fought essentially to a draw, and the line was the same line that the war began on. My father and their generation didn't acknowledge that we failed to win that war. They neither acknowledged or said or even implied that we lost it. I think we fought it to a draw.

But when General Giap took over in Vietnam, Dien Bien Phu came along in the mid-fifties and the French had lost, and President Kennedy ordered our troops into Vietnam in 1963, by my recollection, and the Vietnamese had to look at what was coming at them. This big industrial Nation, this sleeping giant, formerly sleeping giant, there was only about not even two decades after World War II, a huge, powerful industrial, military and economic force in the world, was coming into South Vietnam to help support the freedom fighting people in South Vietnam. He had to come to a conclusion on how they were going to fight so great a nation.

He had seen the French lose their resolve at Dien Bien Phu. They lost their resolve along the way. And he knew something Clausewitz had written about in his book on war years before, when Clausewitz said the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. Will and ability, two factors that are the targets of war.

Now, you can destroy the enemy's ability to conduct war. You can wipe out all their tanks and take all their guns. You can take their swords, knives and hatchets. They can be totally devoid of arms. But if they still have the will to fight, they are going to come at with you with sticks and clubs and fists and boots, if they still have the will. That is what Clausewitz understood. It is a two-section effort when you go to fight a war. You are going after the ability to conduct war, the enemy's ability to conduct war, and you are trying to destroy their will to conduct war.

So as Giap analyzed that, he realized he could never destroy our ability to conduct war. We could always pour more and more munitions into the fight. We could send our ships and planes over and we could always pour more bombs in there and always could bring more soldiers in.

So the strategy was how do you then attack, damage, weaken and destroy the United States' will to conduct war? And the North Vietnamese, General Giap in particular, recognized that their best ally in that war wasn't an AK–47 or a ChiCom grenade. What it was was the anti-war movement in the United States.

So they encouraged that movement, and nurtured it and negotiated with it. And they brought Jane Fonda over there and put her in a gun emplacement in Hanoi, and that encouraged the anti-war movement here in the United States. They sent the photo-op back. There were a number of photo-ops like that.

You heard from the great SAM JOHNSON at this very microphone earlier this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when he talked about how the voices of the anti-war leaders in America were transmitted across loud speakers in the Hanoi Hilton where Sam spent far too many days, 2,500 days in captivity, and how those voices demoralized our POWs in Vietnam.

But General Giap understood, we are destroying the United States' will to conduct war. The frontal assault on the will of the American people was going on relentlessly and persistently, and it says in his book, their best ally was the anti-war movement here in the United States.

So here we are today, Mr. Speaker, and the enemy has been encouraged. There is nothing that came out of that side of the aisle that discouraged the enemy. I can't think of a single word, maybe one speaker, and that would have been a little bit qualified, that would have discouraged the enemy. Over on this side, just hearing SAM JOHNSON, if I were the enemy, my feet would tremble in my sandals.

We have to understand that there are two parts to this war, the ability to conduct war and the will to do so. And we don't conduct wars here in the United States any longer looking at that as two different things we need to assault. We are trying to fight a nicy-nice war with limited targets and rules of engagement that keep our military from doing the job that they could do.

There isn't a strategy to destroy the enemy's will to conduct war. It is just a strategy to destroy the enemy's ability, I should say limit their ability, try to shrink down the arms and funding they have coming in, and try to limit the transportation routes of the insurgents as they infiltrate into Iraq.

That is not enough, Mr. Speaker, but at least we are in a position where we can go forward and win this war if the will of the President and the will of our military can overcome the encouraged and supported will of our enemy, which has been encouraged and supported by many, many voices here on the floor of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I point out also the legacy of Korea and Vietnam. That legacy has already been reflected by one of the leaders of our enemy within Iraq, and this is Muqtada al-Sadr. He is the leader of the Madi militia, and he has been

a thorn in the side of the United States for a long time. I identified him as somebody that had to go a long time ago, at least as far back as early 2004.

I have to say in memory of Charlie Norwood, this man needs a dentist, and wherever he is going to go, Charlie is going to have no chance at him.

But this individual, Muqtada al-Sadr, said over Al-Jazeera TV on the evening of June 11, 2004—I was in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq the next day—Sadr came on Al-Jazeera TV and said in Arabic, with the English crawler underneath, he said, ''If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu.'' Muqtada al-Sadr, June 11, 2004, and that was Al-Jazeera TV.

That voice out of that man. And when I heard that, I concluded, he has read General Giap's book. He understands maybe not what happened in Korea, but he understands what happened in Vietnam. He understands that he has got to continue to fight, to break the will of the American people here, here in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, because the last battle in this war, if the United States doesn't ultimately prevail, will be fought right on this blue carpet, right in this place right here. It won't be fought over there in Iraq, it won't be fought in the Middle East anywhere. It is here.

Here is where our vulnerability is, Mr. Speaker. Here is where the battle needs to be fought, and here is where the battle needs to be won, for our posterity and for the liberty and freedom we have been passed from our Founding Fathers. Sadr knows it.

I will submit this, Mr. Speaker: If we don't prevail in Iraq, and I believe that tactically we have every opportunity to do that, if we don't prevail in Iraq and Jack Murtha gets his way and troops come out of Iraq before there is a clear victory, then this man comes back into power. He is probably done talking about how to get Americans to leave Iraq.

But I can tell you Osama bin Laden will surface, or Zawahri will surface, and I will bring their picture down here to the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I will make a statement then. But I make the prediction now, you will see a picture of either Osama bin Laden or Zawahri or whoever the leader of al Qaeda is, and underneath it I will put the quote from them which will go something like this: If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu, the same way they left Iraq.

And every time we lose our resolve and the legacy becomes the legacy that has been stipulated to us by Muqtada al-Sadr, it gets harder and harder to win the next war, harder and harder to have the will to conduct war, harder and harder to destroy their will, when they know that there is a legacy of us losing our will, us losing our nerve, a legacy of Members of Congress demonstrating a lack of spine, a lack of understanding of history, a lack of commitment to the legacy that has been handed to them and handed to all of us by our founders, Mr. Speaker.

So, I would reiterate, nosce hostem, know thy enemy. War, according Clausewitz, the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. No one can destroy our ability, but we don't have the will to match our ability. And that was proven here today, Mr. Speaker.

And one of the members of the Democrat party said, and I applaud him for saying so, it does our military no good for the people on our side to sit in the corner and boo when they have been ordered into battle. We need to be on their side.

Who would go into the bleachers and boo their home team and think somehow the home team was going to perform better? Who would believe, when you hear the voices that came out of here for the last 4 days, Mr. Speaker, or I go back to the presidential campaign as it went through for 2004, where we heard continually ''wrong war, wrong place, wrong time.'' All we heard from another Senator in Massachusetts, it was all a war cooked up by oil people in Texas.

Voice after voice after voice of quasi-leaders of the United States have spoken, and it has undermined our troops and it has weakened their resolve, and it has empowered and emboldened our enemies. And when they are sitting in a hovel in Iraq making an IED and watching their Al-Jazeera TV, Mr. Speaker, and they hear the voices that came out from C–SPAN from the floor of this Congress, do you think that they make more bombs or less? Do you think they have more or less courage to plant them, more or less courage to attack Americans, more or less resolve to continue the fight, more or less perseverance because of the voices that came collectively from this side of the aisle and this Congress, Mr. Speaker?

We all know the answer to that. The answer is they have more resolve, more persistence; they will make more bombs, they will attack more Americans, and more Americans will die because the booing from this section has encouraged our enemy, and I got to bury some of those soldiers in my district, as do most of us. And that breaks my heart, because I understand it doesn't have to be. It doesn't have to be, Mr. Speaker. It didn't have to be and it doesn't have to be. And others will say, but it is. It is the price of a democratic system and a democratic process. And they say it is patriotic to speak about our disagreements.

So, if one yells fire in a crowded theater and 50 people are trampled to death on the way out and there was no fire, did they abuse their freedom of speech? And don't we know that there is a Supreme Court decision that says your freedom of speech doesn't extend to the right to yell fire in a crowded theater? Verbatim and specifically the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

So how can we give a pass to people whose words cost more lives? And beyond the lives, people's whose words alter our national destiny and make us poorer for it and diminish our potential and affect our future and burden our children and put them at risk, Mr. Speaker? I can't tolerate that.

As I travel over to the Middle East and settle in and talk to the soldiers there on the ground, and I like to do that more than anything else over there, Mr. Speaker. I will walk into a room, maybe a mess hall, climb aboard a C–130. I will say, anybody over here from Iowa? There have been a couple of times there hasn't been. Most of the time there is somebody there from Iowa.

I will sit down, and it is our immediate bond, and I will ask them what is going on here on the ground? What do I need to know? What do you want me to know? And please rest assured I will not identify you or take that information to your officers. This is something for me, because it is my duty to do this kind of oversight.

And I hear continually, I am proud to fight for freedom, I am proud to serve my country, Congressman, but why do we have to fight the United States news media too? Why is there a conflicting message coming out of Congress? Why do we have to take on that part of this battle? We are fighting the enemy over here. We need to know that Congress is behind us.

□ 1800

One of the lieutenant colonels that I travelled over there with made a statement to me in one of those late evenings as we were talking this over deeply and profoundly. I will not use his name either because I have not asked him that I could do so, but I will use the quote.

And he said, Do not save me, pacifists; do not save me. I volunteered for this. I want to be over here fighting for freedom and liberty because I know the world will be a safer place. I want to take this battle on for my children so they do not have to live in fear and they do not have to carry on this fight.

They are all volunteers, and they say do not save me. I will take my chances. I volunteered for this war. I want to save my children from this burden.

Who are we? Who are we to micromanage a war and try to pull our troops out after all that blood and treasure has been invested in freeing Iraq and giving them an opportunity for freedom? Who are we?

I had gold star parents, Mr. Speaker, come into my office a week before I last went to the Middle East. So this would have been the third week in November, and several families had lost a son or a daughter in combat over in Iraq or Afghanistan.

We had a lot of profound discussions in there, and I listened to them. They

had travelled over to Iraq themselves and taken on the risk to go there. They had met with Iraqis. They had been welcomed into the homes of the Iraqis, and the Iraqi people showered them with gratitude for the measure of freedom they have today, even with the insecurities that are part of that, the gratitude for the sacrifice that Americans have given, their lives for Iraqi freedom and American safety and world safety.

And of all the things that were said, one that struck me the most, Mr. Speaker, was a father who had lost his son from California. His name is John. I have forgotten his last name, if I actually ever heard it, and he said, It is different now. You cannot pull out of Iraq. Our sons died there. They gave their lives for the freedom of the Iraqi people, and we are going to have more safety in America because of it? You cannot pull out of there. It is different. That soil is sanctified with the blood of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone to look that man or a father in the eye and say I think I know better, I think we ought to concede, I think we ought to admit and pull out and declare defeat like somebody said this war cannot be won, cannot be won, cannot be won. If I put a word search on there, ''cannot be won'' over and over again, hundreds of times it got said here in the last 4 to 5 days.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that Iraq, 80 percent of the violence is confined within 30 miles of Baghdad. You just look at the area that is there, Baghdad standing kind of alone in the middle. I checked this all out in the World Factbook just because that is where we go for information. Baghdad represents 1/2500th of the land area of Iraq, and we are saying we cannot prevail because 1/2500th of the land area has some people in there that are battling us? 1/2500th, one day of the life of SAM JOHNSON when he was in the Hanoi Hilton, one out of his 25 days, 1/2500th of the land area of Iraq, and we want to say we do not have the will. Every ability in the world, but we want to say we do not have the will to persevere, even though that soil is sanctified with the blood of our sons and daughters.

It will be a disgrace here on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI) who I am sure came down here with his heart full and look forward to whatever he might have to say.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to tip my hat to the good gentleman for his efforts on the floor and for the compelling argument that he has made here.

The idea that our young people, young men and women, have gone to Iraq, gone to Afghanistan, they have spilled their blood there for a purpose that would become meaningless if we withdraw without finishing the job over there, that is something that makes the discussion I think a little different.

All of us are tired of the war. All of us are tired of the casualties that have been inflicted. What we have to do is keep our eye on the ultimate goal, what it is. Is it to quell a disturbance, a dispute that has arisen between different Islamic groups? No, it is not. It can never be.

It has to be the security of the United States. For those folks who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan, for their lives to have meaning, we have to consider what that goal is.

The national security of every person in this country, those interests have to be paramount to everything else that we consider. They have to be paramount to our distaste for the fighting that has gone on. They have to be paramount to every life that has been lost.

Mr. Speaker, for those lives that have been lost to have meaning, it has to be that we will save more lives by their efforts that have been there than if we just pull up stakes and quit. If we do not get that job done, if those radical Islamists are allowed to declare a State, if they have a home, a base from which to operate, we will repeat the events that happened when the Taliban had a home base in Afghanistan.

The recipe is before us. We have seen it before. We will have a repeat of something like 9/11.

The only choice that we have as a Nation is to continue that job over there, to get it finished as best we can. Is there a perfect prescription for that? No, there is not. Is it going to be easy? No, it is not. Will we have more casualties? Unfortunately, we will, and yet we must continue this fight so we will not dishonor those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to this point in the conflict.

I thank the good gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, and I appreciate him coming down here and adding to this dialogue.

I had a chance to collect my thoughts a little bit during that, too, and a number of points that I did not make here.

First, I would like to say the argument is it is a civil war and we should not be involved in a civil war. We have been involved in a number of civil wars, and we will be involved in more civil wars. The same people who say we cannot be involved in a civil war say go into Darfur. Well, that is a civil war.

The same people said we should have gone to Rwanda. I am one of them that thought we should have gone to Rwanda. It was horrible. We could have done something about it, but it was a civil war.

And that list goes on and on, but let me define a civil war so it is a little more clear, Mr. Speaker, to the people that care, and that is, that you will be able to identify a civil war in Iraq when you see the Iraqi military and the Iraqi police force line up and choose up sides and decide they are going to start shooting at each other. They are not doing that. They are keeping order all that they can. They march forward in uniform. They stay together, and that is one thing that says it is not a civil war.

Another one seems to me to be the most obvious and that has not been brought up here, and that is, I know of no entity of the five to eight competing factions within Baghdad that is trying to unseat the elected government of Iraq. It is accepted. The people went to the polls and voted in greater numbers percentage-wise than we do here in the United States, and they elected their leaders. They ratified their Constitution. They elected their leaders, seated their prime minister.

So Iraq is a country that is a sovereign country. No one is trying to unseat the government. It is not a civil war. Yes, there is sectarian strife, but it is not so much to do with religion as it is so much the power vacuum that is going on. It is not a civil war.

We cannot constitutionally micromanage a war. The precedents for that are utterly weak throughout history, even though there was some struggle with that a number of times. But the precedent that remains was here in 1973, after Richard Nixon finished the Vietnamization process, moved our troops out of Vietnam, then a wounded President during the Watergate era was forced into a situation where this Congress shut off all funds from going to Vietnam, and that was on the land of Vietnam, in the skies over Vietnam and the seas offshore Vietnam.

The bill, and I just looked at it again yesterday and I read it a number of times, the bill said none of these funds or any funds heretofore appropriated shall be used on Vietnam, over Vietnam or offshore in Vietnam, which kept all of our military from supporting the South Vietnamese Army which was defending itself after the Treaty of Paris and the resolution of that issue.

Now the North Vietnamese broke the treaty. The South Vietnamese did not have support. They did not have munitions, which we promised them. They did not have air cover, which we promised them. We could not even do a naval bombardment to support them from the seas because this Congress jerked the rug out from underneath that. And the disgrace lies yet in our history books.

SAM JOHNSON also went back to Saigon here just not too long ago, within the last number of weeks, and laid a wreath at the U.S. embassy where we lost 10 to 12 Marines as you saw them being air lifted off the top of the U.S. embassy. Ten to 12 marines does not sound like much. That was the cry and the agony of a Nation, but those 10 to 12 Marines, think in terms of the millions of skulls that are piled in southeast Asia that came in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, the human tragedy.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that none of us could pick up one of those skulls in The Killing Fields, and say this was

a Cambodian skull or a Vietnamese skull or an American skull. And I can tell you, God does not draw the distinction, but he understands what goes on in a conscience of humanity and the conscience of a Nation.

One would think that this Congress, Mr. Speaker, would have learned from that colossal error and be able to stand and have enough resolve when we are in a situation where Baghdad is surrounded, and by the way, Baghdad is not a stronghold. I asked a commanding general at the time of our ground forces within Baghdad, and I said, What is this about a stronghold? Are there places you cannot go? He said we go everywhere we want to go. We go when we want to go there. Sometimes we do not want to squabble. Sometimes we go in there because we want to pick a fight, but there is no such thing as a stronghold. So that resolves that.

I wrote an editorial a while back, Mr. Speaker, and released about December 20 because December 22 was the anniversary of General McAuliff's retort to the Nazis at the battle of Bastone. History will record, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, the 101st Airborne in World War II was surrounded in Bastone. Bastone, a city that had seven highways coming to it, it was the confluence of the transportation and a critical area that had to be held and controlled for whichever side was going to be successful in the Battle of the Bulge.

When the Nazis surrounded the 101st at Bastone and were mercilessly shelling them, they sent a message in that demanded our surrender. General McAuliff's response was, ''Nuts.'' Nuts, Mr. Speaker. Nuts, Nazis. They had to go all kinds of linguists and ask what does this mean? How do you translate this into German? It did not translate very well into German because that was the American spirit that echoed through that word, ''nuts.'' Nuts, we have got you right where we want you. We are going to stay and hold our ground.

They did so, and to this day, the 101st will tell you, they did not really need Patton to relieve them, they would have won anyway. But Patton did come, history shows. They held their ground. Bastone was held. The Battle of the Bulge was turned back and the Nazi regime was destroyed forever because of American courage and American guts and an America that said ''nuts'' when they were surrounded in Bastone.

Mr. Speaker, today, 2,499 parts of 2,500 parts of Iraq are essentially pacified, and are there under our control. Parts of Baghdad essentially are all that is left.

□ 1815

Baghdad surrounded, it is not a stronghold. And if we pull out of there, history will rule us as nuts. Nuts, a weak nation, a weak nation that didn't have the resolve, Mr. Speaker.

I will put one more point in here, and hopefully I can get this done within the time that I have, and that is the straddle that is taking place with this resolution, Mr. Speaker. The straddle that gives the majority side of this thing an argument that they are right, no matter what the results are in Iraq. And that is, the way the resolution reads, they support the troops but oppose the mission.

Then they go on and say, we are going to do a slow bleed. JACK MURTHA says we are going to do a slow bleed and we are going to eliminate the President's ability to conduct these operations in Iraq.

Well, all right. So if the President's plan succeeds and Baghdad is pacified and the government of Iraq grows stronger and more stable, you will hear from over this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, over and over again, ''See,'' they are going to say, ''we were right. It took us to encourage the Iraqi government and the Iraqi military to step up to the plate and do the job. If we hadn't done that, the Americans would have held their hand and been their training wheels forever. They never would have learned to defend their country.'' That will come out of that side if history makes it clear that we are successful in Iraq.

And if we deploy out of there and Iraq turns into what I believe will be a disastrous chaos and cede the Shi'a region of the Iraq to the Iranians, who essentially have significant influence in there now, that would be 70 to 80 percent of Iraq's oil as well. It would give Iran control of the global export quantity of the oil. Iran would then have control of 42.6 percent of the oil that would go on the market, which is absolutely enough to control the market and enrich them fantastically and let them buy their nuclear capability and intimidate everyone in the Middle East and everyone in Europe and intimidate the United States as well. They would not be limited.

That is what happens if we pull out and the catastrophe, not to mention the human catastrophe, not to mention all the skulls that will be stacked up in Iraq like they were stacked up in Southeast Asia to the numbers of 3 million. That is the catastrophe there, Mr. Speaker.

But I am going to compare this. There was only one country that was guaranteed to be on the winning side in World War II, and that was France, because they were on both sides, Mr. Speaker. They were on both sides because you had Charles de Gaulle's freedom fighters, and they had gone into exile into Great Britain and continued their ''Free France'' battle going on. That was part of the effort, and we supported and helped them.

But you also remember there was the Vichy French. The Vichy French jumped right into bed with the Nazis and they staked their claim there, and that was Marshall Petain. And the French, not much of their country was destroyed really in World War II. Paris certainly held together pretty good, and I am glad it did.

But if the Nazis had won and prevailed, the Vichy French would have emerged to the top. And then the French would have said, see, we got on the right side of this war, we avoided a lot of conflict, and Marshall Petain now is our president who is cutting a deal with Hitler. Or, as it turned out, it turned out to be Charles de Gaulle instead.

Straddle the issue, go right down the middle, prepare yourself to be on the victorious or at least be right, no matter what the results.

That is what this resolution does, Mr. Speaker. It allows the majority party and those that voted for this resolution to make the claim that they are right, no matter what happens. And they brought not one word of strategic plan to resolve this issue in Iraq. Not one. In 4 days of debates, not a single plan came out of that side of the aisle, not one.

None came out in the campaigns, either. They never stepped up and said, ''This is what I would do.'' Except some said, ''I would cut and run. I just wouldn't call it that.'' Some of that went on. But, beyond that, there was nothing, except they said we need a strategic plan, we need a better plan.

And one of them came here to the floor and said, ''I used to command a carrier task force offshore of Afghanistan,'' which would be by my look of the map the Arabian Sea. And he says, ''My job now is to come here and plan a strategy to resolve the issue in Iraq.''

And I reflected, Judge Louie Gohmert found himself wanting to legislate from the bench in Texas, so he ran for Congress because he knew constitutionally this was the place to legislate.

But that Member, Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to micromanage a war, should have kept command of his task force and the Arabian Sea. This is no place, Mr. Speaker, to micromanage a war. Our job constitutionally is to fund it, and the Commander in Chief's job is to run it, and we have endorsed his authority to do that.

As these amendments come and these appropriations bills come, one after another in this slow bleed that has been promised, we will know that the constitutional authority doesn't exist to do that. The President has the authority to take the money that has been appropriated and to do intradepartmental transfers and I will say interdepartmental transfers as well to fund the military however he sees fit to protect this Nation.

And if this party sees fit to starve our military and put them at risk, then woe are we. But they have also taken responsibility for the results of this war by this.

So I will say, Mr. Speaker, this resolution that passed here on the floor today, it assists our enemy. It assists our enemy. It assuages our enemy. It

encourages our adversaries. It provides benefit for our enemies. It encourages the bad guys. It provides comfort and charity to the criminals. It encourages and exhilarates our enemy. It provides favor and gifts to the enemy, our foe. It is a handout. It is help to the insurgents. It is relief and reward for the opposition. It is salvation and succor for terrorists. It emboldens and encourages.

This day on this floor of the United States Congress will live in infamy, and I pray it may not be a precedent for the future of America and for our national destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I would make another point, and that is I have decided I will follow General Petraeus, and you have decided you will follow General Pelosi.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BAIRD (at the request of Speaker PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Speaker PELOSI) for today after 3 p.m.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Speaker PELOSI) for February 14, February 15 and February 16 on account of family medical emergency.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 4 p.m. on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 188. An act to revise the short title of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 487. An act to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donations shall not be considered to involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent Resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to mark the significance and importance of the Medal of Honor and to celebrate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor on the anniversary of the first award of that medal in 1863; to the Committee on Armed Services.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on February 15, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.J. Res. 20. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 67, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 67, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 110th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1. Jo Bonner.
2. Terry Everett.
3. Mike Rogers.
4. Robert B. Aderholt.
5. Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr.
6. Spencer Bachus.
7. Artur Davis.

ALASKA

At Large

Don Young.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate

Eni F. H. Faleomavaega.

ARIZONA

1. Rick Renzi.
2. Trent Franks.
3. John B. Shadegg.
4. Ed Pastor.
5. Harry E. Mitchell.
6. Jeff Flake.
7. Raúl M. Grijalva.
8. Gabrielle Giffords.

ARKANSAS

1. Marion Berry.
2. Vic Snyder.
3. John Boozman.
4. Mike Ross.

CALIFORNIA

1. Mike Thompson.
2. Wally Herger.
3. Daniel E. Lungren.
4. John T. Doolittle.
5. Doris O. Matsui.
6. Lynn C. Woolsey.
7. George Miller.
8. Nancy Pelosi.
9. Barbara Lee.
10. Ellen O. Tauscher.
11. Jerry McNerney.
12. Tom Lantos.
13. Fortney Pete Stark.
14. Anna G. Eshoo.
15. Michael M. Honda.
16. Zoe Lofgren.
17. Sam Farr.
18. Dennis A. Cardoza.
19. George Radanovich.
20. Jim Costa.
21. Devin Nunes.
22. Kevin McCarthy.
23. Lois Capps.
24. Elton Gallegly.
25. Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon.
26. David Dreier.
27. Brad Sherman.
28. Howard L. Berman.
29. Adam B. Schiff.
30. Henry A. Waxman.
31. Xavier Becerra.
32. Hilda L. Solis.
33. Diane E. Watson.
34. Lucille Roybal-Allard.
35. Maxine Waters.
36. Jane Harman.
37. Juanita Millender-McDonald.
38. Grace F. Napolitano.
39. Linda T. Sánchez.
40. Edward R. Royce.
41. Jerry Lewis.
42. Gary G. Miller.
43. Joe Baca.
44. Ken Calvert.
45. Mary Bono.
46. Dana Rohrabacher.
47. Loretta Sanchez.
48. John Campbell.
49. Darrell E. Issa.
50. Brian P. Bilbray.
51. Bob Filner.
52. Duncan Hunter.
53. Susan A. Davis.

COLORADO

1. Diana DeGette.
2. Mark Udall.
3. John T. Salazar.
4. Marilyn N. Musgrave.
5. Doug Lamborn.
6. Thomas G. Tancredo.
7. Ed Perlmutter.

CONNECTICUT

1. John B. Larson

2. Joe Courtney.
3. Rosa L. DeLauro.
4. Christopher Shays.
5. Christopher S. Murphy.

DELAWARE

At Large

Michael N. Castle.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate

Eleanor Holmes Norton.

FLORIDA

1. Jeff Miller.
2. Allen Boyd.
3. Corrine Brown.
4. Ander Crenshaw.
5. Ginny Brown-Waite.
6. Cliff Stearns.
7. John L. Mica.
8. Ric Keller.
9. Gus M. Bilirakis.
10. C. W. Bill Young.
11. Kathy Castor.
12. Adam H. Putnam.
13. Vern Buchanan.
14. Connie Mack.
15. Dave Weldon.
16. Tim Mahoney.
17. Kendrick B. Meek.
18. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.
19. Robert Wexler.
20. Debbie Wasserman Schultz.
21. Lincoln Diaz-Balart.
22. Ron Klein.
23. Alcee L. Hastings.
24. Tom Feeney.
25. Mario Diaz-Balart.

GEORGIA

1. Jack Kingston.
2. Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
3. Lynn A. Westmoreland.
4. Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr.
5. John Lewis.
6. Tom Price.
7. John Linder.
8. Jim Marshall.
9. Nathan Deal.
10. Charlie Norwood.
11. Phil Gingrey.
12. John Barrow.
13. David Scott.

GUAM

Delegate

Madeleine Z. Bordallo.

HAWAII

1. Neil Abercrombie.
2. Mazie K. Hirono.

IDAHO

1. Bill Sali.
2. Michael K. Simpson.

ILLINOIS

1. Bobby L. Rush.
2. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.
3. Daniel Lipinski.
4. Luis V. Gutierrez.
5. Rahm Emanuel.
6. Peter J. Roskam.
7. Danny K. Davis.
8. Melissa L. Bean.
9. Janice D. Schakowsky.
10. Mark Steven Kirk.
11. Jerry Weller.
12. Jerry F. Costello.
13. Judy Biggert.
14. J. Dennis Hastert.
15. Timothy V. Johnson.
16. Donald A. Manzullo.
17. Phil Hare.
18. Ray LaHood.
19. John Shimkus.

INDIANA

1. Peter J. Visclosky.
2. Joe Donnelly.
3. Mark E. Souder.
4. Steve Buyer.
5. Dan Burton.
6. Mike Pence.
7. Julia Carson.
8. Brad Ellsworth.
9. Baron P. Hill.

IOWA

1. Bruce L. Braley.
2. David Loebsack.
3. Leonard L. Boswell.
4. Tom Latham.
5. Steve King.

KANSAS

1. Jerry Moran.
2. Nancy E. Boyda.
3. Dennis Moore.
4. Todd Tiahrt.

KENTUCKY

1. Ed Whitfield.
2. Ron Lewis.
3. John A. Yarmuth.
4. Geoff Davis.
5. Harold Rogers.
6. Ben Chandler.

LOUISIANA

1. Bobby Jindal.
2. William J. Jefferson.
3. Charlie Melancon.
4. Jim McCrery.
5. Rodney Alexander.
6. Richard H. Baker.
7. Charles W. Boustany Jr.

MAINE

1. Thomas H. Allen.
2. Michael H. Michaud.

MARYLAND

1. Wayne T. Gilchrest.
2. C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger.
3. John P. Sarbanes.
4. Albert Russell Wynn.
5. Steny H. Hoyer.
6. Roscoe G. Bartlett.
7. Elijah E. Cummings.
8. Chris Van Hollen.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Olver.
2. Richard E. Neal.
3. James P. McGovern.
4. Barney Frank.
5. Martin T. Meehan.
6. John F. Tierney.
7. Edward J. Markey.
8. Michael E. Capuano.
9. Stephen F. Lynch.
10. William D. Delahunt.

MICHIGAN

1. Bart Stupak.
2. Peter Hoekstra.
3. Vernon J. Ehlers.
4. Dave Camp.
5. Dale E. Kildee.
6. Fred Upton.
7. Timothy Walberg.
8. Mike Rogers.
9. Joe Knollenberg.
10. Candice S. Miller.
11. Thaddeus G. McCotter.
12. Sander M. Levin.
13. Carolyn C. Kilpatrick.
14. John Conyers Jr.
15. John D. Dingell.

MINNESOTA

1. Timothy J. Walz.
2. John Kline.
3. Jim Ramstad.
4. Betty McCollum.
5. Keith Ellison.
6. Michele Bachmann.
7. Collin C. Peterson.
8. James L. Oberstar.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Roger F. Wicker.
2. Bennie G. Thompson.
3. Charles W. ''Chip'' Pickering.
4. Gene Taylor.

MISSOURI

1. Wm. Lacy Clay.
2. W. Todd Akin.
3. Russ Carnahan.
4. Ike Skelton.
5. Emanuel Cleaver.
6. Sam Graves.
7. Roy Blunt.
8. Jo Ann Emerson.
9. Kenny C. Hulshof.

MONTANA

At Large Dennis R. Rehberg.

NEBRASKA

1. Jeff Fortenberry.
2. Lee Terry.
3. Adrian Smith.

NEVADA

1. Shelley Berkley.
2. Dean Heller.
3. Jon C. Porter.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Carol Shea-Porter.
2. Paul W. Hodes.

NEW JERSEY

1. Robert E. Andrews.
2. Frank A. LoBiondo.
3. Jim Saxton.
4. Christopher H. Smith.
5. Scott Garrett.
6. Frank Pallone Jr.
7. Mike Ferguson.
8. Bill Pascrell Jr.
9. Steven R. Rothman.
10. Donald M. Payne.
11. Rodney P. Frelinghuysen.
12. Rush D. Holt.
13. Albio Sires.

NEW MEXICO

1. Heather Wilson.
2. Stevan Pearce.
3. Tom Udall.

NEW YORK

1. Timothy H. Bishop.
2. Steve Israel.
3. Peter T. King.
4. Carolyn McCarthy.
5. Gary L. Ackerman.
6. Gregory W. Meeks.
7. Joseph Crowley.
8. Jerrold Nadler.
9. Anthony D. Weiner.
10. Edolphus Towns.
11. Yvette D. Clarke.
12. Nydia M. Velázquez.
13. Vito Fossella.
14. Carolyn B. Maloney.
15. Charles B. Rangel.
16. José E. Serrano.
17. Eliot L. Engel.
18. Nita M. Lowey.
19. John J. Hall.
20. Kirsten E. Gillibrand.
21. Michael R. McNulty.
22. Maurice D. Hinchey.
23. John M. McHugh.
24. Michael A. Arcuri.
25. James T. Walsh.
26. Thomas M. Reynolds.
27. Brian Higgins.
28. Louise McIntosh Slaughter.
29. John R. ''Randy'' Kuhl Jr.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. G. K. Butterfield.
2. Bob Etheridge.
3. Walter B. Jones.
4. David E. Price.
5. Virginia Foxx.
6. Howard Coble.
7. Mike McIntyre.
8. Robin Hayes.

9. Sue Wilkins Myrick.
10. Patrick T. McHenry.
11. Heath Shuler.
12. Melvin L. Watt.
13. Brad Miller.

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large Earl Pomeroy

OHIO

1. Steve Chabot.
2. Jean Schmidt.
3. Michael R. Turner.
4. Jim Jordan.
5. Paul E. Gillmor.
6. Charles A. Wilson.
7. David L. Hobson.
8. John A. Boehner.
9. Marcy Kaptur.
10. Dennis J. Kucinich.
11. Stephanie Tubbs Jones.
12. Patrick J. Tiberi.
13. Betty Sutton.
14. Steven C. LaTourette.
15. Deborah Pryce.
16. Ralph Regula.
17. Tim Ryan.
18. Zachary T. Space.

OKLAHOMA

1. John Sullivan.
2. Dan Boren.
3. Frank D. Lucas.
4. Tom Cole.
5. Mary Fallin.

OREGON

1. David Wu.
2. Greg Walden.
3. Earl Blumenauer.
4. Peter A. DeFazio.
5. Darlene Hooley.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Robert A. Brady.
2. Chaka Fattah.
3. Phil English.
4. Jason Altmire.
5. John E. Peterson.
6. Jim Gerlach.
7. Joe Sestak.
8. Patrick J. Murphy.
9. Bill Shuster.
10. Christopher P. Carney.
11. Paul E. Kanjorski.
12. John P. Murtha.
13. Allyson Y. Schwartz.
14. Michael F. Doyle.
15. Charles W. Dent.
16. Joseph R. Pitts.
17. Tim Holden.
18. Tim Murphy.
19. Todd Russell Platts.

PUERTO RICO

Resident

Commissioner Luis G. Fortuño.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Patrick J. Kennedy.
2. James R. Langevin.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Henry E. Brown Jr.
2. Joe Wilson.
3. J. Gresham Barrett.
4. Bob Inglis.
5. John M. Spratt Jr.
6. James E. Clyburn.

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large

Stephanie Herseth.

TENNESSEE

1. David Davis.
2. John J. Duncan Jr.
3. Zach Wamp.
4. Lincoln Davis.
5. Jim Cooper.
6. Bart Gordon.
7. Marsha Blackburn.
8. John S. Tanner.
9. Steve Cohen.

TEXAS

1. Louie Gohmert.
2. Ted Poe.
3. Sam Johnson.
4. Ralph M. Hall.
5. Jeb Hensarling.
6. Joe Barton.
7. John Abney Culberson.
8. Kevin Brady.
9. Al Green.
10. Michael T. McCaul.
11. K. Michael Conaway.
12. Kay Granger.
13. Mac Thornberry.
14. Ron Paul.
15. Rubén Hinojosa.
16. Silvestre Reyes.
17. Chet Edwards.
18. Sheila Jackson-Lee.
19. Randy Neugebauer.
20. Charles A. Gonzalez.
21. Lamar S. Smith.
22. Nick Lampson.
23. Ciro D. Rodriguez.
24. Kenny Marchant.
25. Lloyd Doggett.
26. Michael C. Burgess.
27. Solomon P. Ortiz.
28. Henry Cuellar.
29. Gene Green.
30. Eddie Bernice Johnson.
31. John R. Carter.
32. Pete Sessions.

UTAH

1. Rob Bishop.
2. Jim Matheson.
3. Chris Cannon.

VERMONT

At Large

Peter Welch.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate Donna M. Christensen.

VIRGINIA

1. Jo Ann Davis.
2. Thelma D. Drake.
3. Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott.
4. J. Randy Forbes.
5. Virgil H. Goode Jr.
6. Bob Goodlatte.
7. Eric Cantor.
8. James P. Moran.
9. Rick Boucher.
10. Frank R. Wolf.
11. Tom Davis.

WASHINGTON

1. Jay Inslee.
2. Rick Larsen.
3. Brian Baird.
4. Doc Hastings.
5. Cathy McMorris Rodgers.
6. Norman D. Dicks
7. Jim McDermott.
8. David G. Reichert.
9. Adam Smith.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Alan B. Mollohan.
2. Shelley Moore Capito.
3. Nick J. Rahall II.

WISCONSIN

1. Paul Ryan.
2. Tammy Baldwin.
3. Ron Kind.
4. Gwen Moore.
5. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr.
6. Thomas E. Petri.
7. David R. Obey.
8. Steve Kagen.

WYOMING

At Large

Barbara Cubin.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Thomas H. Allen, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Allen Boyd, Nancy E. Boyda, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Corrine Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ginny Brown-Waite, Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, Julia Carson, John R. Carter, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, David Davis, Geoff Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Tom Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charles W. Dent, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, Thelma D. Drake, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Rahm Emanuel, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Terry Everett, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Mary Fallin, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Tom Feeney, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Luis G. Fortuño, Vito Fossella, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Gabrielle Giffords, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Paul E. Gillmor, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Raúl M. Grijalva, Luis V. Gutierrez, John J. Hall, Ralph M. Hall, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth, Brian Higgins, Baron P. Hill, Maurice D. Hinchey, Ruben Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, David L. Hobson, Paul W. Hodes, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, Bobby Jindal, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Steve Kagen, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Ron Klein, John Kline, Joe Knollenberg, John R. ''Randy'' Kuhl, Jr., Ray LaHood, Doug Lamborn, Nick Lampson, James R.

Langevin, Tom Lantos, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McCrery, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Michael R. McNulty, Connie Mack, Tim Mahoney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Martin T. Meehan, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, Jeff Miller, Harry E. Mitchell, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Christopher S. Murphy, Patrick J. Murphy, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Devin Nunes, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Solomon P. Ortiz, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Charles W. ''Chip'' Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Earl Pomeroy, Jon C. Porter, David E. Price, Tom Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Rick Renzi, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, John T. Salazar, Bill Sali, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Jim Saxton, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Joe Sestak, John B. Shadegg, Christopher Shays, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis, Mark E. Souder, Zachary T. Space, John M. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Bart Stupak, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, Gene Taylor, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Edolphus Towns, Michael R. Turner, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Diane E. Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Charles A. Wilson, Heather Wilson, Joe Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, Albert Russell Wynn, John A. Yarmuth, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second, third and fourth quarters of 2006, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, FATHER DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 25 AND OCT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Father Daniel P. Coughlin	10/25	10/30	Italy		987.00		[3]				987.00
Committee total											987.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

FATHER DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, Nov. 10, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MARY ELIZABETH WOODWORTH, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 17 AND DEC. 1, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Mary Elizabeth Woodworth	11/17	12/1	Australia		477.00		10,702.28				11,179.28
Committee total					477.00		10,702.28				11,179.28

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MARY ELIZABETH WOODWORTH, Dec. 29, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY FALL MEETING IN QUEBEC CITY, CANADA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 11 AND NOV. 18, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Paul Gillmor	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Hon. John Boozman	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Hon. Ben Chandler	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Hon. John Shimkus	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Hon. Thomas Tancredo	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Hon. John Tanner	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Hon. Thomas Udall	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Kathy Becker	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Dr. Paul Gallis	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 799.81				3,955.92
Susan Olson	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 799.81				3,955.92
Marilyn Owen	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 799.81				3,955.92
Patrick Prisco	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 793.00				3,949.11
Mark Wellman	11/11	11/18	Canada		1,803.49		[3]				1,803.49
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Functions									6,377.62		6,377.62
Miscellaneous									675.96		675.96
Committee total					28,855.85		3,192.43		7,053.58		39,101.86

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PAUL E. GILLMOR, Chairman, Dec. 13, 2006.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY FALL MEETING IN QUEBEC CITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 11 AND NOV. 18, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Paul Gillmor	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. John Boozman	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. Ben Chandler	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49	(3)					1,803.49
Hon. John Shimkus	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. Thomas Tancredo	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. John Tanner	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. Thomas Udall	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. John Tanner	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Hon. Thomas Udall	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Kathy Becker	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Dr. Paul Gallis	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 799.81				3,955.92
Susan Olson	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 799.81				3,955.92
Marilyn Owen	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 799.81				3,955.92
Patrick Prisco	11/11	11/18	Canada		3,156.11		[3] 793.00				3,949.11
Mark Wellman	11/11	11/15	Canada		1,803.49		(3)				1,803.49
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Functions									6,439.12		6,439.12
Miscellaneous									675.96		675.96
Committee total					28,855.85		3,192.43		7,115.08		39,164.36

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PAUL E. GILLMOR, Chairman, DEC. 29, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO URKRAINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 16 AND OCT. 20, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rachael Leman	10/16	10/20	Ukraine		1,264.00		5,127.50				6,391.50
Thomas Ross	10/16	10/20	Ukraine		1,264.00		5,127.50				6,391.50
Committee total											12,783.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Nov. 9, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MALTA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 17 AND NOV. 21, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	11/17	11/21	Malta	323.96	964.19					323.96	964.19
Fred L. Turner	11/17	11/21	Malta	323.96	964.19					323.96	964.19
Committee total										647.92	1,928.38

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Nov. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MACEDONIA, KYRGYZSTAN, AFGHANISTAN AND FINLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 19 AND NOV. 27

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Dreier	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		1,158.34		(3)				1,158.34
Hon. David Price	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		1,158.34		(3)				1,158.34
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		1,158.34		(3)				1,158.34
Hon. Lois Capps	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		1,158.34		(3)				1,158.34
John Lis	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		992.02		(3)				992.02
Rachael Leman	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		992.02		(3)				992.02
Brad Smith	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		992.02		(3)				992.02
Thomas Ross	11/19	11/24	Macedonia		999.02		(3)				992.02
Hon. David Dreier	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Hon. David Price	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Hon. Lois Capps	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
John Lis	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Rachael Leman	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Brad Smith	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Thomas Ross	11/24	11/25	Kyrgyzstan		282.75		(3)				282.75
Hon. David Dreier	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
Hon. David Price	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
Hon. Lois Capps	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
John Lis	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
Rachael Leman	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
Brad Smith	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00
Thomas Ross	11/25	11/26	Afghanistan		75.00		(3)				75.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MACEDONIA, KYRGYZSTAN, AFGHANISTAN AND FINLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 19 AND NOV. 27—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Dreier	11/26	11/27	Finland		511.54		([3])				511.54
Hon. David Price	11/26	11/27	Finland		511.54		([3])				511.54
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	11/26	11/27	Finland		511.54		([3])				511.54
Hon. Lois Capps	11/26	11/27	Finland		511.54		([3])				511.54
John Lis	11/26	11/27	Finland		453.85		([3])				453.85
Rachael Leman	11/26	11/27	Finland		453.85		([3])				453.85
Brad Smith	11/26	11/27	Finland		453.85		([3])				453.85
Thomas Ross	11/26	11/27	Finland		453.85		([3])				453.85
Committee total											15,325.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
([3]) Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Dec. 18, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PORTUGAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 9 AND DEC. 12, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Devin Nunes	12/N	12/12	Portugal		953.07	([3])				722.55 euro	953.07
Hon. Jim Costa	12/9	12/12	Portugal		953.07	([3])				722.55 euro	953.07
Hon. Dennis Cardoza	12/9	12/12	Portugal		953.07	([3])				722.55 euro	953.07
Hon. Maryam Sabbaghian	12/09	12/12	Portugal		953.07	([3])				722.55 euro	953.07
Committee total											3,812.28

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, Jan. 3, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig	7/1	7/2	Austria	Euro	287.00						287.00
	7/8	8/14	Austria	Euro	10,906.00						10,906.00
	8/14	8/27	United States	Dollar			5,820.08				
	8/28	9/30	Austria	Euro	9,471.00						9,471.00
Committee total				20,664.00							20,664.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig	10/15	12/1	Austria	Euro	13,489.00						13,489.00
	12/2	12/5	Belgium	Euro	738.00						738.00
						Euro	92.00				92.00
	12/6	12/31	Austria	Euro	7,221.00						7,221.00
Committee total				21,448.00		92.00					21,540.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 18, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John R. Kuhl	7/30	7/31	Iraq			([3])					
	7/31	8/1	Jordan		289.00	([3])					289.00
	8/1	8/2	Italy		560.00	([3])					560.00
Committee total				849.00							849.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Oct. 18, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Mike Conaway	12/15	12/17	Cuba		280.00	[3]					280.00
Dr. John Goldberg	10/28	11/3	India		1,269.82		7,048.70				8,318.52
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					
	11/29	12/2	Argentina		318.00		4,178.00				4,496.00
Hon. Bob Etheridge	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. Frank Lucas	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. Jerry Moran	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. Mike McIntyre	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. Leonard Boswell	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. David Scott	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Hon. Stephanie Herseth	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Kevin Kramp	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Rob Laren	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Pam Miller	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Bryan Dierlam	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Mike Dunlap	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00	[3]					246.00
	11/28	11/29	Uruguay		116.00	[3]					116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		408.00	[3]					408.00
Committee total					12,239.82		11,226.70				23,466.52

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Frank M. Cushing	7/9	7/13	Italy		1,350.00						1,350.00
Commercial airfare							6,231.17				6,231.17
Elizabeth C. Dawson	7/9	7/13	Italy		1,350.00						1,350.00
Commercial airfare							6,256.17				6,256.17
Elizabeth A. Phillips	7/10	7/13	Italy		1,083.00						1,083.00
	7/13	7/14	Morocco		239.00						239.00
	7/14	7/18	Egypt		929.00						929.00
	7/18	7/22	Jordan		956.00						956.00
Commercial airfare							8,700.40				8,700.40
Carol Murphy	7/9	7/13	Italy		1,286.00						1,286.00
	7/13	7/14	Morocco		239.00						239.00
	7/14	7/18	Egypt		929.00						929.00
Commercial airfare							7,806.02				7,806.02
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	7/13	7/15	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/15	7/15	Luxembourg						198.00		198.00
	7/15	7/17	United Kingdom								
							[3]				
Hon. Henry Bonilla	7/13	7/15	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/15	7/15	Luxembourg						198.00		198.00
	7/15	7/17	United Kingdom								
							[3]				
Hon. John Sweeney	7/13	7/15	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/15	7/15	Luxembourg						198.00		198.00
	7/15	7/17	United Kingdom								
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/16	7/16	France						283.33		283.33
							[3]				
Hon. Robert E. "Bud" Cramer	7/13	7/15	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/15	7/15	Luxembourg						198.00		198.00
	7/15	7/17	United Kingdom								
							[3]				
John Shank	7/13	7/15	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/15	7/15	Luxembourg						198.00		198.00
	7/15	7/17	United Kingdom								
Douglas Gregory	7/13	7/17	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
							[3]				
Gregory Lankler	7/13	7/15	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
	7/15	7/15	Luxembourg						198.00		198.00
	7/15	7/17	United Kingdom								
Misc. Embassy Costs	7/16	7/16	France						283.33		283.33
							[3]				
David Morrison	7/13	7/17	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
							[3]				
Delia Scott	7/24	7/27	Colombia		828.00						828.00
	7/27	7/29	Ecuador		412.00						412.00
Misc. Embassy Costs									1,847.42		1,847.42

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare							1,834.00				1,834.000
Hon. Harold Rogers	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,300.57						1,300.57
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00						1,536.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72						2,122.72
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
							(3)				
Hon. Martin Sabo	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,300.57						1,300.57
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00						1,536.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72						2,122.72
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
							(3)				
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,004.53						1,004.53
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00						1,536.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72						2,122.72
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
							(3)				
Hon. Michael Simpson	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,004.53						1,004.53
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00						1,536.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72						2,122.72
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
							(3)				
Hon. Ed Pastor	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,004.53						1,004.53
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00						1,536.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72						2,122.72
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
							(3)				
Hon. John Carter	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,004.53						1,004.53
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00						1,536.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72						2,122.72
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
							(3)				
Tad Gallion	8/12	8/15	Norway		861.29						861.29
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,386.00						1,386.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		1,863.07				7,359.83		7,350.83
Misc. Embassy Costs										7,359.83	7,359.83
Ben Nicholson	8/12	8/15	Norway		861.29						861.29
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,386.00						1,386.00
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		1,863.07						1,863.07
Misc. Embassy Costs									7,359.83		7,359.83
Hon. Maurice D. Hinchey	8/21	8/24	Canada								
Misc. Expenses									434.11		434.11
Misc. Travel Expenses							589.56				589.56
Greg E. Knadle	8/14	8/16	Germany		656.00						656.00
	8/16	8/19	Italy		1,212.00						1,212.00
Commercial airfare							7,690.00				7,690.00
Douglas Gregory	8/1	8/20	Hawaii		171.67						171.67
	8/2	8/5	Thailand		364.00						364.00
	8/5	8/8	Philippines		741.00						741.00
	8/8	8/10	Japan		348.00						348.00
Commercial airfare							8,420.00				8,420.00
Hon. Don Sherwood	8/6	8/7	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	8/8	8/10	Israel		791.00						791.00
	8/10	8/11	Belgium		400.00						400.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/24	8/25	Estonia		150.00						150.00
	8/25	8/28	Nepal		300.00						300.00
	8/28	8/30	Bhutan		507.78						507.78
	8/30	8/31	India		276.41						276.41
	9/1	9/4	Mongolia		677.67						677.67
	9/4	9/4	Finland		422.00						422.00
Misc. Embassy Costs									5,323.19		5,323.19
Hon. Ander Crenshaw	8/24	8/25	Estonia		150.00						150.00
	8/25	8/28	Nepal		300.00						300.00
	8/28	8/30	Bhutan		531.84						531.84
	8/30	8/31	India		276.41						276.41
	9/1	9/4	Mongolia		677.67						677.67
	9/4	9/4	Finland		422.00						422.00
Misc. Embassy Costs									5,323.19		5,323.19
Craig Higgins	8/24	8/28	Nepal		400.00						400.00
	8/28	8/30	Bhutan		507.77						507.77
	8/30	8/31	India		276.41						276.41
	9/1	9/4	Mongolia		677.67						677.67
	9/4	9/4	Finland		422.00						422.00
Misc. Embassy Costs							(3)		4,475.63		4,475.63
Nisha Desai	8/24	8/25	Estonia		150.00						150.00
	8/25	8/28	Nepal		300.00						300.00
	8/28	8/30	Bhutan		507.78						507.78
	8/30	8/31	India		276.41						276.41
	9/1	9/4	Mongolia		677.67						677.67
	9/4	9/4	Finland		422.00						422.00
Misc. Embassy Costs							(3)		5,323.19		5,323.19
Rob Blair	8/24	8/25	Estonia		150.00						150.00
	8/25	8/28	Nepal		300.00						300.00
	8/28	8/30	Bhutan		507.77						507.77
	8/30	8/31	India		276.41						276.41
	9/1	9/4	Mongolia		677.67						677.67
	9/4	9/4	Finland		422.00						422.00
Misc. Embassy Costs							(3)		5,323.19		5,323.19
Committee total					68,884.31		47,527.32		88,683.22		205,094.85

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Terry Tyborowski	10/16	10/20	France		1,538.00						1,538.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare & rail transportation							8,505.64				8,505.64
Paul Terry	10/15	10/21	Germany		1,600.00						1,600.00
Commercial airfare							7,084.05				7,084.05
Kevin Jones	10/24	10/26	Qatar		555.32						555.32
	10/26	10/27	Afghanistan		277.66						277.66
	10/27	10/29	Kuwait		1,086.00						1,086.00
Commercial airfare							8,778.53				8,778.53
Misc. Transportation Costs							102.00				102.00
Douglas Disrud	10/24	10/26	Qatar		555.32						553.32
	10/26	10/27	Afghanistan		277.66						277.66
	10/27	10/29	Kuwait		1,086.00						1,086.00
Commercial airfare							8,778.53				8.778.53
Misc. Transportation Costs							132.00				132.00
Joshua Hartman	10/24	10/26	Qatar		555.32						555.32
	10/26	10/27	Afghanistan		277.66						277.66
	10/27	10/29	Kuwait		1,086.00						1,086.00
Commercial airfare							8,778.53				8.778.53
Christine Ryan Kojac	10/23	10/25	Austria		674.00						674.00
	10/25	10/29	Belgium		1,600.00						1,600.00
Commercial airfare							7,207.31				7,207.31
Misc. Transportation Costs							115.00				115.00
Elizabeth C. Dawson	10/25	11/1	Belgium		2,800.00						2,800.00
Commercial airfare							6,890.12				6,890.12
Jennifer Miller	10/23	10/25	Austria		674.00						674.00
	10/25	11/1	Belgium		2,800.00						2,800.00
Commercial airfare							7,207.31				7,207.31
Carol Murphy	10/28	10/31	Belgium		1,140.96						1,140.96
	10/31	11/4	United Kingdom		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							7,754.28				7,754.28
Walter Hearne	10/29	10/31	Belgium		760.44						760.44
	10/31	11/4	United Kingdom		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							7,754.28				7,754.28
Frank Cushing	10/28	10/31	Belgium		1,140.96						1,140.96
	10/31	11/4	United Kingdom		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							7,754.28				7,754.28
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	11/28	12/1	Italy		1,668.82						1,668.82
	12/1	12/3	Austria		1,177.10						1,177.10
Hon. Kay Granger	11/28	12/1	Italy		1,668.82		(3)				1,668.82
	12/1	12/3	Austria		1,177.10		(3)				1,177.10
Douglas Gregory	11/28	12/1	Italy		1,668.82						1,668.82
	12/1	12/3	Austria		1,177.10						1,177.10
							(3)				
Hon. Roger F. Wicker	11/26	11/28	Brazil		246.00						246.00
	11/29	11/29	Uruguay		116.00						116.00
	11/29	12/3	Argentina		1,250.00						1,250.00
							(3)				
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00						450.00
							(3)				
Hon. Mark Steven Kirk	12/12	12/15	Kuwait		309.00						309.00
	12/15	12/16	Afghanistan								
	12/16	12/19	Pakistan		35.00						35.00
							(3)				
	12/17	12/19	Israel		107.00						107.00
Committee total					34,236.06	86,841.86					121,077.92

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DAVID R. OBEY, Chairman, Jan. 25, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to United Kingdom With CODEL Young, July 13–17, 2006:											
Hon. Ken Calvert	7/13	7/17	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie	7/13	7/17	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Hon. Robin Hayes	7/13	7/17	United Kingdom		669.00						669.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Belgium, Israel, August 6–11, 2006:											
Hon. Jeff Miller	8/6	8/8	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	8/6	8/7	Iraq		0.00						
	8/8	8/10	Israel		791.00						791.00
	8/10	8/11	Belgium		400.00						400.00
Douglas Roach	8/6	8/8	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	8/6	8/7	Iraq								
	8/8	8/10	Israel		791.00						791.00
	8/10	8/11	Belgium		400.00						400.00
Visit to Thailand, Japan, August 7–17, 2006:											
Jeannette James	8/11	8/13	Thailand		464.00						464.00
	8/13	8/14	Guam								
	8/15	8/17	Japan		800.00						800.00
Commercial Transportation							9,028.61				9,028.61
Jenness Simler	8/11	8/13	Thailand		464.00						464.00
	8/13	8/14	Guam								
	8/15	8/17	Japan		800.00						800.00
Commercial Transportation							9,028.61				9,028.61
Debra Wada	8/11	8/13	Thailand		464.00						464.00
	8/13	8/14	Guam								
	8/15	8/17	Japan		800.00						800.00
Commercial Transportation							9,028.61				9,028.61
Delegation Expenses	8/11	8/13	Thailand		188.91						188.91
Visit to Sweden, Denmark, Greece, The Netherlands With CODEL Duncan, August 16–27, 2006:											
Hon. Solomon Ortiz	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00						904.00
	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00						1,149.00
	8/22	8/24	Greece		728.00						728.00
	8/24	8/27	The Netherlands		1,173.00						1,173.00
Visit to United Kingdom, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, August 21–27, 2007:											
Stephanie Sanok	8/21	8/22	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
	8/23	8/24	Pakistan		309.00						309.00
	8/24	8/24	Afghanistan								
	8/24	8/25	Tajikistan								
Commercial Transportation.											
	8/25	8/27	Pakistan		618.00						618.00
							9,469.43				9,469.43
Regina Burgess	8/21	8/22	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
	8/23	8/24	Pakistan		309.00						309.00
	8/24	8/24	Afghanistan								
	8/24	8/25	Tajikistan								
	8/25	8/27	Pakistan		618.00						618.00
Commercial Transportation.											
							9,469.43				9,469.43
Delegation Expenses	8/23	8/27	Pakistan		573.74						573.74
	8/24	8/24	Afghanistan								
Committee total					17,435.65		46,024.69				63,460.34

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[3] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Oct. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Israel and Jordan, October 8–10, 2006:											
Roger Zakheim	10/8	10/10	Israel		351.00						351.00
	10/9	10/9	Jordan								
Visit to Germany, Romania, Bulgaria, Italy, the United Kingdom, October 18–28, 2006:											
Lynn Williams	10/19	10/20	Germany		117.00						117.00
	10/20	10/21	Romania	152.00							152.00
	10/21	10/21	Bulgaria								
	10/21	10/24	Italy	1,121.00							1,121.00
	10/24	10/26	Germany	334.00							334.00
	10/26	10/28	The United Kingdom	226.00							226.00
Commercial Transportation							6,666.66				6,666.66
B. Ryan Vaart	10/19	10/20	Germany	117.00							117.00
	10/20	10/21	Romania	152.00							152.00
	10/21	10/21	Bulgaria								
	10/21	10/24	Italy	1,121.00							1,121.00
	10/24	10/26	Germany	334.00							334.00
	10/26	10/28	The United Kingdom	226.00							226.00
Commercial Transportation							6,666.66				6,666.66
Visit to Qatar, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Iraq, October 24–30, 2006:											
Kevin Coughlin	10/24	10/26	Qatar		833.00						883.00
	10/26	10/26	Afghanistan								
	10/27	10/29	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial Transportation							8,778.53				8,778.53
John Kruse	10/24	10/26	Qatar		833.00						833.00
	10/26	10/26	Afghanistan								
	10/27	10/29	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial Transportation							8,778.53				8,778.53
Visit to Italy, Codel Hyde, October 21–28, 2006:											
Hon. Joel Hefley	10/25	10/28	Italy		775.00						775.00
Hon. Madeleine Z. Bordallo	10/25	10/28	Italy		775.00						775.00
Visit to Djibouti, Yemen, Kenya, United Kingdom, October 29–November 4, 2006:											
Stephanie Sanok	10/30	10/30	United Kingdom								
	10/31	11/2	Djibouti		782.00						782.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	11/1	11/1	Yemen								
	11/2	11/3	Kenya		288.00						288.00
Commercial Transportation							15,085.32				
William Natter	10/30	10/30	United Kingdom								
	10/31	11/2	Djibouti		782.00						782.00
	11/1	11/1	Yemen								
	11/2	11/3	Kenya		288.00						288.00
Commercial Transportation							11,756.32				11,756.32
Mark Lewis	10/30	10/30	United Kingdom								
	10/31	11/2	Djibouti		782.00						782.00
	11/1	11/1	Yemen								
	11/2	11/3	Kenya		288.00						288.00
Commercial Transportation							12,487.32				12,487.32
Alexander Kugajevsky	10/30	10/30	United Kingdom								
	10/31	11/2	Djibouti		782.00						782.00
	11/1	11/1	Yemen								
	11/2	11/3	Kenya		288.00						288.00
Commercial Transportation							12,487.32				12,487.32
Roger Zakheim	10/30	10/30	United Kingdom								
	10/31	11/2	Djibouti		782.00						782.00
	11/1	11/1	Yemen								
	11/2	11/3	Kenya		288.00						288.00
Commercial Transportation							12,467.32				12,467.32
Visit to Italy, Austria, Codel Young, November 27–December 3, 2006:											
Loretta Sanchez	11/28	12/1	Italy		1,668.82						1,668.82
	12/1	12/3	Austria		1,177.10						1,177.10
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan, Israel, With General Schoomaker, December 21–27, 2006:											
Hon. Jim Marshall											
Commercial Transportation							4,211.82				4,211.82
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, United Kingdom, December 23–27, 2006:											
Hon. Michael K. Conaway	12/24	12/25	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	12/25	12/26	Iraq								
	12/26	12/27	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
Hon. Ike Skelton	12/24	12/25	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	12/25	12/26	Iraq								
	12/26	12/27	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
Hon. Robert W. Degrasse	12/24	12/25	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	12/25	12/26	Iraq								
	12/26	12/27	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
Committee total					20,607.92		99,385.80				104,908.40

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jo Bonner	7/31	8/1	Jordan		289.00						289.00
	8/1	8/2	Italy		560.00						560.00
Committee total											849.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM NUSSLE, chairman, Oct. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 11, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Bob Inglis [3]	8/16	8/26	Israel				(4)				
	8/16	8/26	Jordan				(4)				
	8/16	8/26	Iraq				(4)				
	8/16	8/26	Sudan				(4)				
	8/16	8/26	Italy				(4)				
	8/16	8/26	Lebanon				(4)				
	8/16	8/26	Cypress				(4)				
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa [3]	8/16	8/27	Sweden				(4)				
	8/16	8/27	Denmark				(4)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	8/16	8/27	Greece				(4)				
	8/16	8/27	Albania				(4)				
	8/16	8/27	The Netherlands				(4)				
Susan Ross	7/25	8/06	China				9,270.75				
Richard Stombres	7/25	8/06	China				9,270.75				
Committee total							18,541.50				18,541.50

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Waiting for the Department of State to provide detailed expenditure and itinerary reports for each of the countries visited.
[4] Military air transportation.

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Inglis	8/16	8/26	Israel		492.86				445.69		
			Sudan		1,127.09		1,322.61		503.02		
			Italy		902.14						
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa	8/16	8/27	Denmark		1,522.33		558.74		606.19		
			Athens		1,066.45				448.89		
			The Netherlands		2,097.11		630.17		3,032.16		
			Dublin.								
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LIZ HOLLIS, Jan. 22, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kurt Bilas	11/11	11/17	Kenya		1,728.00		7,480.57				9,28.57
Committee total											9,208.57

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Thomas Duncan	7/29	8/6	China		1,955.13		9,270.75				11,225.88
Hon. Melvin L. Watt	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00		(4)				326.00
	8/11	8/13	Phillippines		244.00		(4)				244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00		(4)				306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(4)				214.00
Hon. Al Green [3]	8/17	8/19	Israel				(4)				
	8/19	8/20	Jordan				(4)				
	8/20	8/20	Iraq				(4)				
	8/21	8/23	Sudan				(4)				
	8/23	8/24	Cyprus				(4)				
	8/23	8/23	Lebanon				(4)				
	8/24	8/24	Rome				(4)				
	8/24	8/25	London				(4)				
Committee total											12,315.88

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Reimbursed the U.S. Treasury for all per diem.

[4] Military air transportation.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Oct. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 25 AND OCT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50			[3]			775.50
Committee total											775.50

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Dec. 12, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Hon. Maxine Waters	12/09	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00		[3]				285.00
Committee total											1,340.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

———Jan. 30, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher Shays	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		7,263.33				7,567.33
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Margaret Daum	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		6,988.33				7,292.88
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Nick Palarino	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		6,988.33				7,292.33
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Robert Kelley	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		6,988.33				7,292.33
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Committee total					3,436.00		28,228.32				31,664.32

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY A. WAXMAN, Chairman, Jan. 25, 2007.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Nick Palarino	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		8,331.09				8,635.09
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Margaret Daum	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		6,988.33				7,292.33
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Hon. Christopher Shays	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		7,263.33				7,567.33
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Robert Kelley	11/27	11/29	Turkey		304.00		6,988.33				7,292.33
	11/29	12/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	12/1	12/2	Jordan		289.00						289.00
Hon. Jon Porter	12/24	12/25	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	12/26	12/27	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
Committee total					4,372.00		29,571.08				33,943.08

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY A. WAXMAN, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jim Gibbons	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00		[3]				311.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00						1,408.23

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare											1,097.23
Hon. Donna Christiansen	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00		(3)				311.00
Hon. Rob Simmons	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00		(3)				311.00
Deron McElroy	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00		(3)				311.00
Mark Hogsett	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00		(3)				311.00
Thomas Finan	7/15	7/16	Canada		311.00		(3)				311.00
Committee total					2,177.00		1,097.23				3,274.23

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PETER T. KING, Chairman, Oct. 23, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lara Almeh	7/5	7/10	Israel		1,735.00		8,321.09				10,056.09
Douglas Anderson	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(3)				214.00
Michael Beard	7/2	7/10	Hungary		2,168.00		5,343.94				7,511.94
	8/21	8/22	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
	8/22	8/24	Libya		3,550.00						3,550.00
	8/24	8/27	Israel		1,191.00						1,191.00
	8/27	8/31	Hungary		2,168.00						2,168.00
	8/31	9/1	Romania		608.00						608.00
	9/1	9/6	Hungary		271.00						271.00
	8/22	9/6					9,107.89				[4] 9,107.89
Carol S. Bevan	9/2	9/4	Netherlands		690.98						690.98
	9/4	9/5	Belgium		400.00						400.00
	9/5	9/6	Germany		428.00						428.00
	9/2	9/6					7,065.92				[4] 7,065.92
Melanie Bixby	8/21	8/22	China		215.13						215.13
	8/22	8/26	Mongolia		382.00						382.00
	8/26	8/31	Morocco		1,020.00						1,020.00
	8/21	8/31					9,842.10				[4] 9,842.10
Ted Brennan	8/5	8/8	Colombia		660.00		(3)				660.00
	8/28	8/30	Spain		740.00						740.00
	8/30	9/2	Portugal		311.22						311.22
	8/28	9/2					4,017.28				[4] 4,017.28
Candace Bryan Abby	8/30	9/2	Portugal		324.00		6,344.82				6,668.82
Edward Burrier	8/8	8/14	Israel		2,370.00		4,629.02				6,999.02
Hon. Dan Burton	9/22	9/24	Nicaragua		463.00		1,926.00				2,389.00
Nicolas Cook	7/7	7/16	Liberia		2,718.00		9,158.59				11,876.59
Frank Cotter	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(3)				214.00
Janice Cotter	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(3)				214.00
Ted Dagne	7/28	7/29	Kenya		288.00						288.00
	7/29	7/31	Sudan		536.00						536.00
	7/31	8/2	Kenya		576.00						576.00
	8/2	8/5	Democratic Republic of Congo		1,059.00						1,059.00
	8/5	8/9	Ethiopia		1,132.00						[4] 9,606.62
	7/28	8/9					9,606.62				
Phaedra Dugan	8/8	8/13	Philippines		1,359.00		6,787.00				8,146.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	7/29	8/4	French Polynesia		1,000.00		5,200.31				6,200.31
	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(3)				214.00
	9/18	9/19	Tonga		125.00						125.00
	9/19	9/20	Western Samoa		260.75						260.75
	9/18	9/20					5,212.69				[4] 5,212.69
Jim Farr	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(3)				214.00
	9/26	9/27	Italy		464.00		6,368.82				6,832.82
Hon. Jeff Flake	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		(3)				214.00
Barton Forsyth	8/5	8/6	United Arab Emirates		594.10						594.10
	8/6	8/9	Afghanistan		0						0
	8/9	8/11	Saudi Arabia		266.75						266.75
	8/5	8/11					7,378.03				[4] 7,378.03
	8/19	8/20	Thailand		119.50						119.50
	8/20	8/23	Bhutan		438.00						438.00
	8/23	8/26	Nepal		471.00						471.00
	8/19	8/26					7,378.03				[4] 7,378.03
Hon. Elton Gallegly	8/13	8/16	Ireland		1,446.00						1,446.00
	8/16	8/18	United Kingdom		807.99						807.99
	8/18	8/23	Ireland		1,356.00						1,356.00
	8/13	8/23					6,586.55				[4] 6,586.55
Kristen Gilley	8/25	8/26	Cyprus		327.00						327.00
	8/26	8/28	Israel		694.00						694.00
	8/25	8/28					5,791.20				[4] 5,791.20
Dennis Halpin	7/28	7/30	South Korea		620.00		4,963.30				5,583.30
	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Hon. Henry Hyde	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Jonathan Katz	7/25	7/27	Israel		788.00		4,628.25				5,416.25
David Killion	8/19	8/20	Thailand		182.00						182.00
	8/20	8/23	Bhutan		438.00						438.00
	8/23	8/26	Nepal		471.00						471.00
	8/19	8/26					8,552.37				[4] 8,552.37
Kay King	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		81.00						81.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Robert King	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Sheila Klein	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Hon. Thomas Lantos	7/2	7/10	Hungary		2,168.00		5,343.94				7,511.94
	8/21	8/22	United Kingdom		530.00						530.00
	8/22	8/24	Libya		3,550.00						3,550.00
	8/24	8/27	Israel		1,191.00						1,191.00
	8/27	8/31	Hungary		2,168.00				[5] 753.22		2,921.22
	8/31	9/1	Romania		608.00						608.00
	9/1	9/6	Hungary		217.00						217.00
	8/21	9/6					9,107.89				[4] 9,107.89
Robert Lawrence	7/8	7/12	Liberia		1,208.00		6,162.70				7,370.70
	8/14	8/18	Colombia		904.00		1,785.00				2,689.00
	9/11	9/15	Haiti		1,140.00		1,173.00				2,313.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	8/13	8/15	Canada		358.39		361.17		[5] 995.00		1,714.56
John Lis	7/8	7/12	Liberia		1,208.00		6,162.70				7,370.70
	8/14	8/18	Colombia		904.00		1,785.00				2,689.00
	9/11	9/13	Haiti		570.00		1,173.00				1,743.00
Noelle Lusane	7/28	7/29	Kenya		288.00						288.00
	7/29	7/31	Sudan		536.00						536.00
	7/31	8/2	Kenya		576.00						576.00
	8/2	8/3	Democratic Republic of Congo		353.00						353.00
	7/28	8/3					8,884.62				[4] 8,884.62
Pearl-Alice Marsh	8/20	8/22	South Africa		409.00						409.00
	8/22	8/25	Zimbabwe		775.00						775.00
	8/20	8/25					10,454.44				[4] 10,454.44
Greg McCarthy	8/8	8/13	Philippines		762.00						762.00
	8/13	8/14	Japan		696.00						696.00
	8/8	8/14					8,230.55				[4] 8,230.55
Ryan McCarthy	8/5	8/6	United Arab Emirates		617.25						617.25
	8/6	8/9	Afghanistan								
	8/9	8/11	Saudi Arabia		266.75						266.75
	8/5	8/11					7,378.03				[4] 7,378.03
John Mackey	7/3	7/8	Colombia		1,380.00		2,074.00				3,454.00
	8/5	8/10	Colombia		2,421.65		980.42				3,402.07
	8/28	8/30	Spain		790.00						790.00
	8/30	9/2	Portugal		423.00						423.00
	8/28	9/2					5,513.28				[4] 5,513.28
Alan Makovsky	8/21	8/24	Libya		3,050.00						3,050.00
	8/24	8/30	Israel		2,382.00						2,382.00
	8/30	9/2	Egypt		3,415.12						3,415.12
	8/21	9/2					8,171.08				[4] 8,171.08
Hon. Gregory Meeks	8/5	8/8	Colombia		960.00		[3]				960.00
Richard Mereu	7/3	7/6	Serbia		1,020.00		5,762.01				6,782.01
Francis Miko	8/14	8/18	Colombia		904.00		1,949.00				2,853.00
	9/11	9/15	Haiti		1,140.00		1,173.00				2,313.00
Thomas Mooney	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Carol Mitchell	7/2	7/4	Lebanon		417.50		457.45				874.95
Paul Oostburg-Sanz	8/21	8/22	China		210.00						210.00
	8/22	8/26	Mongolia		395.00						395.00
	8/26	8/31	Morocco		1,018.00						1,018.00
	8/21	8/22			9,842.10						[4] 9,842.10
Hon. Donald Payne	7/28	7/29	Kenya		288.00				[5] 174.78		462.78
	7/29	7/31	Sudan		536.00						536.00
	7/31	8/2	Kenya		576.00						576.00
	8/2	8/5	Democratic Republic of Congo		1,059.00						1,059.00
	8/5	8/9	Ethiopia		1,132.00						1,132.00
	7/28	8/9					10.009.62				[4] 10,009.62
Hon. Ted Poe	9/2	9/4	Netherlands		690.98						690.98
	9/4	9/5	Belgium		400.00						400.00
	9/5	9/6	Germany		428.00						428.00
	9/2	9/6					7,334.42				[4] 7,334.42
Patrick Prisco	9/26	9/27	Italy		464.00		6,368.82				6,832.82
Nuzhat Rahman	9/17	9/20	Afghanistan		138.50		400.00				538.50
Robin Roizman	8/14	8/18	Colombia		753.00		1,321.00				2,074.00
Hon. Edward Royce	8/8	8/14	Israel		2,370.00		4,628.25				6,998.25
Sue Schiesser	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Doug Seay	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Gregory Simpkins	8/22	8/22	United Kingdom		310.38						310.38
	8/23	8/25	Zimbabwe		462.00						462.00
	8/22	8/25					9,936.10				[4] 9,936.10
	9/22	9/24	Kuwait		792.00		6,420.19				7,212.19
Thomas Sheehy	8/8	8/14	Israel		2,370.00		4,629.02				6,999.02
Paula Sheil	8/13	8/16	Ireland		883.51						883.51
	8/16	8/18	United Kingdom		986.00						986.00
	8/18	8/23	Ireland		1,356.00						1,356.00
	8/13	8/23					6,586.55				[4] 6,586.55

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher Smith	9/22	9/24	Kuwait		792.00		6,420.19				7,212.19
Ismail Soliman	7/2	7/4	Lebanon		562.25		501.40				1,063.65
Theodore Van Der Meid	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00		3,532.12				3,838.12
Connie Veillette	8/14	8/18	Colombia		904.00		1,785.00				2,689.00
	9/11	9/15	Haiti		1,140.00		1,173.00				2,313.00
Mark Walker	8/5	8/8	Colombia		960.00		[3]				960.00
	9/22	9/24	Nicaragua		463.00		1,462.00				1,925.00
Brian Wanko	8/5	8/8	Colombia		960.00		[3]				960.00
	9/22	9/24	Nicaragua		462.00		1,462.00				1,924.00
Todd Washam	8/19	8/20	Thailand		119.50						119.50
	8/20	8/23	Bhutan		438.00						438.00
	8/23	8/26	Nepal		471.00						471.00
	8/19	8/26					8,572.37				[4] 8,572.37
Lynne Weil	8/21	8/22	China		208.00						208.00
	8/22	8/26	Mongolia		392.00						392.00
	8/26	8/31	Morocco		1,028.00						1,028.00
	8/21	8/31					9,698.26				[4] 9,698.26
Hillel Weinberg	7/30	8/6	China		2,032.37		9,250.79				11,283.16
Hon. Robert Wexler	7/25	7/27	Israel		788.00		4,628.25				5,416.25
	8/1	8/2	Singapore		482.55						482.55
	8/2	8/6	Indonesia		979.00				[4] 4,046.52		5,025.52
	8/1	8/6					6,743.06				6,743.06
Judy Wolverton	8/9	8/11	South Korea		326.00						326.00
	8/11	8/13	Philippines		244.00						244.00
	8/13	8/14	Singapore		306.00						306.00
	8/15	8/17	Fiji		214.00		[3]				214.00
Peter Yeo	8/20	8/21	Thailand		182.00						182.00
	8/21	8/23	Bhutan		292.00						292.00
	8/23	8/26	Nepal		471.00						471.00
	8/20	8/26					8,652.37				[4] 8,652.37
Committee total					137,719.22		359,806.88		[5] 5,969.52		503,495.62

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Round trip airfare.
[5] Delegation costs.

HENRY HYDE, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 30 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lara Alameh	11/24	11/25	United Arab Emirates		432.50						432.50
	11/25	11/28	Afghanistan		225.00						225.00
	11/28	11/29	United Arab Emirates		432.50						432.50
	11/24	11/29					8,145.94				[4] 8,145.94
Douglas Anderson	10/17	10/19	Thailand		436.00						436.00
	10/19	10/20	Laos		64.00						64.00
	10/20	10/22	Thailand		436.00						436.00
	10/17	10/22					6,448.00				[4] 6,448.00
Michael Beard	11/30	12/3	Denmark		1,149.00						1,149.00
	12/3	12/4	The Netherlands		402.00						402.00
							6,766.49				[4] 6,766.49
Frank Cotter	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Janice Cotter	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Hon. William D. Delahunt	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		[3]				450.00
Hon. Eliot L. Engel	12/9	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00		[3]		[5] 5,427.63		5,712.63
James Farr	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Hon. Jeff Flake	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		[3]				450.00
Bart Forsyth	11/27	12/1	Switzerland		1,476.00		6,370.34				7,846.34
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry	11/9	11/13	France		1,036.57		1,637.84				2,674.41
Kirsti Garlock	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		[3]				450.00
Kirsten Gilley	10/17	10/19	Thailand		436.00				[5] 329.35		765.35
	10/19	10/20	Laos		64.00						64.00
	10/20	10/22	Cambodia		411.00						411.00
	10/22	10/23	Thailand		218.00						218.00
	10/17	10/23					6,824.66				[4] 6,824.66
Yevgeny Gurevich	11/10	11/11	Kazakhstan		265.00						265.00
	11/12	11/14	Kyrgyzstan		649.00						649.00
	11/14	11/16	Kazakhstan		1,332.00						1,332.00
	11/10	11/16					9,131.05				[4] 9,131.05
Hon. Henry Hyde	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Jonathan Katz	11/29	12/1	Italy		1,447.00		5,838.56				7,285.56
David Killion	11/27	12/1	Switzerland		1,476.00		7,083.80				8,559.80
Julie Kim	11/20	11/23	Macedonia		225.00						225.00
	11/23	11/24	Kosovo		107.00						107.00
	11/20	11/24					6,234.16				[4] 6,234.16
Sheila Klein	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Hon. Tom Lantos	11/30	12/3	Denmark		1,149.00				[5] 2,063.41		3,212.41
	12/3	12/4	The Netherlands		402.00						402.00
	11/30	12/4					6,766.49				6,766.49
Robert Lawrence	10/16	10/20	Ukraine		2,043.72		5,147.50				7,191.22
Hon. Barbara Lee	12/9	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00		[3]				285.00
John Lis	10/16	10/20	Ukraine		2,043.72		5,147.50				7,191.22
Greg McCarthy	11/7	11/8	Germany		374.00						374.00
	11/8	11/11	France		542.00						542.00
	11/7	11/11					8,119.76				[4] 8,119.76
James McCormick	10/17	10/19	Thailand		436.00						436.00
	10/19	10/20	Laos		64.00						64.00
	10/20	10/22	Cambodia		411.00						411.00
	10/22	10/23	Thailand		218.00						218.00
	10/17	10/23					6,872.66				[4] 6,872.66

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 30 AND DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
John Mackey	10/26	10/29	Russia		1,284.67						1,284.67
	10/29	11/3	United Kingdom		865.00						865.00
	10/26	11/3	Round Trip Airfare				7,700.12				7,700.12
	12/15	12/19	Paraguay, Brazil		485.00						485.00
	12/19	12/20	Argentina		220.00						220.00
	12/20	12/21	Uruguay		171.00						171.00
	12/15	12/21					7,895.31				[4] 7,895.31
Alan Makovsky	11/18	11/19	Switzerland		369.00		7,295.53				7,664.53
Hon. Betty McCollum	12/21	12/29	Laos		1,141.00						1,141.00
	12/29	12/30	Thailand		268.00						268.00
	12/21	12/30				4,513.00					[4] 4,513.00
Hon. Gregory W. Meeks	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		[3]				450.00
Paul Oostburg Sanz	12/15	12/17	Cuba		350.00		[3]				350.00
Hon. Donald M. Payne	12/9	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00						285.00
Hon. Ted Poe	12/18	12/19	Belgium		556.00						556.00
	12/19	12/20	Denmark		1,253.00						1,253.00
	12/20	12/22	The Netherlands		775.00						775.00
	12/18	12/22					6,374.74				[4] 6,374.74
Patrick Prisco	10/25	10/28	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
James Ritchette	10/25	10/28	China		996.00		10,831.38				11,827.38
Sue Schiesser	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Doug Seay	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Hon. Adam Smith	10/1	10/5	Peru		1,152.00		3,816.00				4,968.00
Cliff Stammerman	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		[3]				450.00
	12/9	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00		[3]				285.00
Jason Steinbaum	12/9	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00		[3]				285.00
Mark Walker	12/15	12/19	Paraguay, Brazil		485.00				[5] 4,894.00		5,379.00
	12/19	12/20	Argentina		220.00						220.00
	12/20	12/21	Uruguay		171.00						171.00
	12/15	12/21					7,895.31				[4] 7,895.31
Brian Wanko	12/9	12/10	Dominican Republic		280.00		[3]				280.00
	12/10	12/11	Haiti		285.00		[3]				285.00
	12/15	12/19	Paraguay, Brazil		485.00						485.00
	12/19	12/20	Argentina		220.00						220.00
	12/20	12/21	Uruguay		171.00						171.00
	12/15	12/21					7,895.31				[4] 7,895.31
Hon. Diane E. Watson	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
	11/26	11/28	Egypt		556.00						556.00
	11/28	12/29	South Africa		1,346.63						1,346.63
	11/26	12/9					9,520.78				[4] 9,520.78
Hillel Weinberg	10/10	10/14	China		1,088.00						1,088.00
	10/14	10/19	India		1,680.00						1,680.00
	10/10	10/19					9,780.56				[4] 9,780.56
	10/24	10/26	Germany		556.00		4,653.45		[5] 1,350.00		6,559.45
	10/26	10/30	Italy		465.00		[3]				465.00
	11/17	11/19	Switzerland		538.00		6,358.30				6,896.30
Hon. Robert Wexler	11/29	11/30	Italy		887.00		5,838.78				6,725.78
Judy Wolverton	10/25	10/30	Italy		775.50		[3]				775.50
Committee total					52,552.31		196,903.32		14,064.39		263,520.02

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Round trip airfare.
[5] Indicates delegation costs.

TOM LANTOS, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Caroline G. Lynch	8/28	8/30	Spain		790.00		4,017.28				4,807.28
	8/30	9/2	Portugal		399.00						399.00
Returned currency											–418.24
Committee total											4,788.04

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Sept. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND JAN. 1, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 25, 2007.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND JAN. 1, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 25, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Todd Willens	07/3	07/12	Peru		1,040.00		8,918.00				9,958.00
Committee total					1,040.00		8,918.00				9,958.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD POMBO, Chairman, Oct. 23, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. G7**x**											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

NICK J. RAHALL, Chairman, Jan. 26, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Phil Gingrey	8/12	8/15	Norway		1,004.53		[3]		2,629.38		3,633.91
	8/15	8/18	Russia		1,536.00		[3]		1,865.44		3,401.44
	8/18	8/21	Sweden		2,122.72		[3]		2,865.01		4,987.73
Hon. Tom Cole	7/31	08/1	Jordan		289.00		[3]				289.00
	08/1	8/2	Italy		560.00		[3]				560.00
Christopher Caron	7/31	8/1	Jordan		289.00		[3]				289.00
	8/1	8/2	Italy		560.00		[3]				560.00
Eileen Harley	7/31	8/1	Jordan		289.00		[3]				289.00
	8/1	8/2	Italy		560.00		[3]				560.00
Committee total					7,210.25				7,359.83		14,570.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, Oct. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. James P. McGovern	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		[3]				450.00
Committee total					450.00						450.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Daniel Lipinski	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		[3]				904.00
	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		[3]				1,149.00
	8/22	8/24	Greece		728.00		[3]				728.00
	8/24	8/26	Netherlands		1,173.00		[3]				1,173.00
Hon. Brian Baird	8/24	8/25	Estonia		150.00		[3]				150.00
	8/25	8/28	Nepal		300.00		[3]				300.00
	8/28	8/30	Bhutan		200.00		[3]				200.00
	8/30	8/31	India		100.00		[3]				100.00
	9/1	9/4	Mongolia		300.00		[3]				300.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	9/4	9/4	Finland		200.00		([3])				200.00
Committee total					5,204.00						5,204.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Furnished by Department of Defense.

BRIAN BAIRD, Chairman, Oct. 19, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sherwood Boehler	10/25	10/31	Italy		775.50	([3])					775.50
Hon. Lincoln Davis			Cuba		400.00	([3])					400.00
Hon. Lynn Woolsey	12/8	12/10	Dominican Republic		337.74	([3])					
	12/10	12/11	Haiti			([3])					337.74
Committee total					1,513.24						1,513.24

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BART GORDON, Chairman, Jan. 10, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN API. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Matthew Szymanski	4/9	4/21	China		3,066.00		10,154.63		[3] 370.67		13,591.30
Sean Deverey	4/9	4/15	China		1,492.000		7,248.70				8,740.70
Rich Beutel	4/9	4/15	China		1,492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70
Matthew Szymanski	5/27	6/1	Egypt		1,445.00		3,280.55		[3] 371.00		4,725.50
	6/1	6/4	Jordan		819.00						819.00
Sean Deverey	5/27	6/1	Egypt		1,445.00		3,280.55		[3] 371.00		4,725.00
	6/1	6/4	Jordan		819.00						819.00
Rich Beutel	5/29	6/3	China		1,773.00		7,233.74				9,006.70
Committee total											51,148.54

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Amount returned.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Oct. 11, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
J. Matthew Szymanski	8/7	8/7	Kenya		245.00						245.00
	8/7	8/10	Tanzania		847.60						847.60
	8/10	8/14	South Africa		1,066.00						1,066.00
	8/15	8/16	Morocco		577.50						577.50
Brian Jaskot	8/7	8/7	Kenya		245.00						245.00
	8/7	8/10	Tanzania		847.60						847.60
	8/10	8/14	South Africa		1,066.00						1,066.00
	8/15	8/16	Morocco		577.50						577.50
Sean Deverey	8/7	8/7	Kenya		245.00						245.00
	8/7	8/10	Tanzania		847.60						847.60
	8/10	8/15	South Africa		1,332.00						1,332.00
Per diem return for group		8/15	Morocco		1,569.75						
J. Matthew Szymanski (Airfare Total)							19,794.17				19,794.17
Brian Jaskot (Airfare Total)							19,794.17				19,794.17
Sean Deverey (Airfare Total)							17,663.76				17,663.76
Richard Beutel	7/30	8/5	China		929.00		9,270.75				10,199.75
Sean Deverey	7/30	8/5	China		1,092.00		9,270.75				10,362.75
Brian Jaskot	7/30	8/5	China		1,092.00		9,270.75				10,362.75
Chris Szymanski	7/30	8/5	China		1,092.00		9,270.75				10,362.75
Matthew Szymanski	7/30	8/5	China		1,092.00		9,270.75				10,362.75
Per diem returned for group					1,285.59						1,285.59
Hon. Nydia Velazquez	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00	([4])					904.00
	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00	([4])					1,149.00
	8/22	8/24	Greece		728.00	([4])					728.00
	8/24	8/27	Netherlands [3]		1,173.00	([4])					1,173.00
Committee total											117,898.31

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] One night in The Hague/second in Amsterdam.
[4] Military air transportation.

DONALD A. MANZULLA, Chairman, Oct. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rich Beutel	11/11	11/15	China				6,908.42		1,152.00		8,060.42
Brian Jaskot	11/11	11/15	China				6,908.42		1,152.00		8,060.42
Chris Szymanski	11/11	11/14	China				6,908.42		865.00		7,773.42
Matthew Szymanski	11/11	11/14	China				8,825.42		865.00		9,690.42
Total return per diem $1,176.24.											
Hon. Steve King							7,737.03				9,027.03
Sean Deverey							7,737.03				9,027.03
	11/23	11/24	Germany		848.00						
	11/24	11/24	Kuwait		812.00						
	11/25	11/25	Iraq								
	11/26	11/26	Qatar								
	11/27	11/27	Afghanistan		150						
	11/28	11/28	United Arab Emirates		770						
Returned 630.00											
Committee total											51,638.74

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Jan. 2, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Kuhl	8/1	8/2	Iraq		165.00		(3)				165.00
	8/2	8/3	Jordan		289.00		(3)				289.00
	8/3	8/4	Italy		560.00		(3)				560.00
Hon. John Duncan	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. Spencer Bachus	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. Bob Filner	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. Henry Brown	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Fraser Verrusio	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Jimmy Miller	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
John Anderson	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Jim Coon	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Jennifer Esposito	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00		(3)				904.00
Hon. John Duncan	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. Spencer Bachus	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. Bob Filner	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. Henry Brown	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Fraser Verrusio	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Jimmy Miller	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
John Anderson	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Jim Coon	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Jennifer Esposito	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00		(3)				1,149.00
Hon. John Duncan	8/17	8/19	Denmark		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. Spencer Bachus	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. Bob Filner	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. Henry Brown	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Fraser Verrusio	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Jimmy Miller	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
John Anderson	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Jim Coon	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Jennifer Esposito	8/17	8/19	Greece		728.00		(3)				728.00
Hon. John Duncan	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Spencer Bachus	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Bob Filner	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Henry Brown	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Fraser Verrusio	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Jimmy Miller	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
John Anderson	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Jim Coon	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Jennifer Esposito	8/19	8/22	Netherlands		1,173.00		(3)				1,173.00
Hon. Charles Boustany	9/1	9/3	Cyprus		640.00						640.00
	9/3	9/4	Israel		397.00						397.00
	9/4	9/5	Germany		328.00						328.00
Committee total					53,781.00						53,781.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Oct. 20, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jerry Moran	12/15	12/17	Cuba		450.00		(3)				450.00
Committee total					450.00						450.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Devon Siebert	8/15	8/19	Germany & Luxembourg		984.00						984.00
Mike Brinck	8/15	8/19	Germany & Luxembourg		984.00						984.00
Geoffrey Collver	8/15	8/19	Germany & Luxembourg		984.00						984.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	8/17	8/19	Sweden		904.00						904.00
	8/19	8/22	Denmark		1,149.00						1,149.00
	8/22	8/24	Greece		728.00						728.00
	8/24	8/27	Netherlands		1,173.00						1,173.00
Hon. Steve Buyer		8/14	United States		4.80						4.80
	8/15	8/16	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/16	8/16	Iraq								
	8/16	8/17	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/17	8/17	Iraq								
	8/17	8/19	Germany		138.93						138.93
	8/19		United States		4.80						4.80
Hon. John Boozman		8/14	United States		4.80						4.80
	8/15	8/16	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/16	8/16	Iraq								
	8/16	8/17	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/17	8/17	Iraq								
	8/17	8/19	Germany		138.93						138.93
	8/19		United States		4.80						4.80
Hon. John Salazar		8/14	United States		4.80						4.80
	8/15	8/16	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/16	8/16	Iraq								
	8/16	8/17	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/17	8/17	Iraq								
	8/17	8/19	Germany		138.93						138.93
	8/19		United States		4.80						4.80
Kelly Craven		8/14	United States		4.80						4.80
	8/15	8/16	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/16	8/16	Iraq								
	8/16	8/17	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/17	8/17	Iraq								
	8/17	8/19	Germany		138.93						138.93
	8/19		United States		4.80						4.80
Jeffrey Phillips		8/14	United States		4.80						4.80
	8/15	8/16	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/16	8/16	Iraq								
	8/16	8/17	Kuwait		265.39				10.32		275.71
	8/17	8/17	Iraq								
	8/17	8/19	Germany		149.15						149.15
	8/19		United States		4.80						4.80
Jeffery Weekly		8/14	United States		4.80						4.80
	8/15	8/16	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/16	8/16	Iraq								
	8/16	8/17	Kuwait		265.39						265.39
	8/17	8/17	Iraq								

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	8/17	8/19	Germany		136.35						136.35
	8/19		United States		4.80						4.80
Committee total					10,989.50				10.32		10,999.82

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STEVE BUYER, Chairman, Oct. 25, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———Jan. 16, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 13 AND AUG. 11, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	7/14	7/15	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	7/15	7/16	Baghdad								
	7/16	7/17	Bosnia		220.00						220.00
Hon. Nancy Johnson	8/6	8/8	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	8/7	8/7	Qatar								
	8/8	8/10	Israel		791.00						791.00
	8/10	8/11	Belgium		400.00						400.00
Hon. Clay Shaw	8/6	8/8	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	8/7	8/7	Qatar								
	8/8	8/10	Israel		791.00						791.00
	8/10	8/11	Belgium		400.00						400.00
Committee total					4,632.00						4,632.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, Oct. 20, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Frederick Flietz	7/3	7/5	Europe		1,060.00						
	7/5	7/8	Europe		1,011.00		9,350.00				
Commercial arcraft							7,688.06				
Larry Hanauer	7/3	7/5	Europe		1,060.00						
	7/5	7/8	Europe		1,011.00						
Commercial arcraft							7,688.06				
Riley Perdue	7/4	7/6	Middle East		578.00						
	7/6	7/8	Europe		329.16						
Commercial arcraft							7,600.42				
Donald Stone	7/4	7/6	Middle East		578.00						
	7/6	7/8	Europe		329.16						
Commercial arcraft							7,620.42				
Brian Morrison	7/4	7/6	Middle East		578.00						
	7/6	7/8	Europe		329.16						
Commercial arcraft							7,620.42				
Michael Meermans	8/5	8/12	Australia		1,376.25						
Commercial arcraft							10,917.06				
Christopher Donesa	8/5	8/12	Australia		1,376.25						
Commercial arcraft							10,917.06				
Hon. Darrell Issa	8/8	8/9	Africa		556.00						
	8/10	8/11	Middle East		234.00						
	8/11	8/12	Europe		938.00						
Commercial arcraft							7,452.09				
James Lewis	8/8	8/9	Africa		556.00						
	8/10	8/11	Middle East		234.00						
	8/11	8/12	Europe		938.00						
Commercial arcraft							7,452.09				
George Pappas	8/20	8/21	Middle East		950.00						
	8/25	8/26	Middle East								
	8/22	8/23	Middle East		909.20						
	8/24	8/25	Middle East		283.00						
Commercial Aircraft							8,726.65				
David Abruzzino	8/20	8/21	Middle East		950.00						
	8/25	8/26	Middle East								
	8/22	8/23	Middle East		909.20						
	8/24	8/25	Middle East		283.00						
Commercial Aircraft							8,726.65				
Hon. Michael Rogers	9/1	9/3	Middle East		618.00						
Commercial Aircraft							8,459.84				
Hon. Michael Ennis	9/1	9/3	Middle East		618.00						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial Aircraft							8,689.14				
Hon. Peter Hockstra	7/22	7/24	Middle East		772.00						
	7/24	7/25	Europe		223.00						
							(3)				
James Lewis	7/22	7/24	Middle East		772.00						
	7/24	7/25	Europe		223.00						
							(3)				
Committee total											128,576.28

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PETER HOEKSTRA, Chairman, Oct. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

VERNON J. EHLERS, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHUCK GRASSLEY, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2007.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

612. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2007-13) — received December 21,2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

613. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — In-Service Benefits Permitted to be Provided at Age 62 by a Pension Plan [Notice 2007-8] — received December 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

614. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2006-111] received January 3, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

615. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Cash Balance and Other Hybrid Defined Benefit Pension Plans [Notice 2007-6] received January 3, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 700. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects (Rept. 110–15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 569. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants; with an amendment (Rept. 110–16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 584. A bill to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Education in Washington, DC, as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building; with amendments (Rept. 110–17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 544. A bill to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the ''Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 110–18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 478. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the ''Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 110–19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 399. A bill to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 110–20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 430. A bill to designate the United States bankruptcy courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Conrad Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse''; with amendments (Rept. 110–21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 429. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 110–22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 800. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to provide for mandatory injunctions for unfair labor practices during organizing efforts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COBLE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. STARK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WELLER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1110. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1111. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to ensure that every uninsured child in America has health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. DRAKE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individuals relief from the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 1113. A bill to expand the research, prevention, and awareness activities of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to inflammatory bowel disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1114. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey, to conduct a study on groundwater resources in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 1115. A bill to amend section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional options regarding the designation of the person to receive the death gratuity paid with respect to a member of the Armed Forces who dies without a surviving spouse, but who is survived by a minor child; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 1116. A bill to require that the payment rate used to make any direct payments with respect to wheat for the 2008 through 2012 crop years be $1.20 per bushel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. STARK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 1117. A bill to repeal title II of the REAL ID Act of 2005, to reinstitute section 7212 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which provides States additional regulatory flexibility and funding authorization to more rapidly produce tamper- and counterfeit-resistant driver's licenses and to protect privacy and civil liberties by providing interested stakeholders on a negotiated rulemaking with guidance to achieve improved 21st century licenses to improve national security; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 1118. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to enhance criminal penalties for drug trafficking offenses relating to distribution of heroin, marihuana, and methamphetamine and distribution to and use of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HARE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1119. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to revise the congressional charter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Incorporated, to authorize associate membership in the corporation for the spouse of a recipient of the Purple Heart medal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 1120. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require recipients of universal service support for schools and libraries to protect minors from commercial social networking websites and chat rooms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H.R. 1121. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits through fiscal year 2012, to extend paygo for direct spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H.R. 1122. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to simplify annual concurrent resolutions on the budget and to budget for emergencies; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1123. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1124. A bill to extend the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HAYES (for himself, Mr. MICA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 1125. A bill to modify the age-60 retirement standard for certain pilots and, for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 1126. A bill to reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 1127. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to allow United States manufacturers that use products subject to countervailing or antidumping duty proceedings or use domestic like products to participate in those proceedings as interested parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1128. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide medical personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs with access to information provided in the joint patient tracking application for the treatment of individuals at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs for injuries sustained while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 1129. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an arterial road in St. Louis County, Missouri; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1130. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to extend the authority to withhold from public availability a financial disclosure report filed by an individual who is a judicial officer or judicial employee, to the extent necessary to protect the safety of that individual or a family member of that individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1131. A bill to establish a commission to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the American Civil War; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide waivers relating to grants for preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1133. A bill to provide for the energy independence of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 1134. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. WALSH of New York):

H.R. 1135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that installment sales treatment shall not fail to apply to property acquired for conservation purposes by a State or local government or certain tax-exempt organizations merely because purchase funds are held in a sinking or similar fund pursuant to State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 1136. A bill to abolish the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the House of Representatives, establish an Independent Ethics Commission, and provide for the transfer of the duties and functions of the committee to the Commission; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1137. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase to $2,000 the amount of the Medal of Honor special pension under that title and to provide for payment of that pension to the surviving spouse of a deceased Medal of Honor recipient; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WATT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 1138. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the ''J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1139. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design and construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, and other uses from the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, Santa Ana River, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1140. A bill to authorize the Secretary, in cooperation with the City of San Juan Capistrano, California, to participate in the design, planning, and construction of an advanced water treatment plant facility and recycled water system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 1141. A bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1142. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that disability of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by certain conditions is presumed to result from the performance of such employee's duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1143. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1144. A bill to waive the non-Federal share of the cost of certain disaster assistance provided in connection with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 1145. A bill to establish the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1146. A bill to end membership of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 1147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain provisions applicable to real estate investment trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 1148. A bill to establish the Food Safety Administration to protect the public health by preventing food-borne illness, ensuring the safety of food, improving research on contaminants leading to food-borne illness, and improving security of food from intentional contamination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1149. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect federally funded public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHULER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1150. A bill to establish the Commission on Economic Indicators to conduct a

study and submit a report containing recommendations concerning the appropriateness and accuracy of the methodology, calculations, and reporting used by the Government relating to certain economic indicators; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1151. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the number of Iraqi and Afghan translators in the United States Armed Forces who may be provided status as special immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 1152. A bill to reserve a small percentage of the amounts made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the farmland protection program to fund challenge grants to encourage the purchase of conservation easements and other interests in land to be held by a State agency, county, or other eligible entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SALI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1153. A bill to prohibit Federal funding or other assistance for mandatory human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1154. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the exclusion from medical assistance under the Medicaid Program of items and services for patients in an institution for mental diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1156. A bill to provide grants to eligible consortia to provide professional development to superintendents, principals, and prospective superintendents and principals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1157. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1158. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the two-year waiting period for divorced spouse's benefits following the divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1159. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for full benefits for disabled widows and widowers without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in widow's and widower's insurance benefits by reason of delayed retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1161. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to credit prospectively individuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1162. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the 7-year restriction on eligibility for widow's and widower's insurance benefits based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1163. A bill to reduce childhood obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1164. A bill to amend the Hate Crime Statistics Act to require the Attorney General to acquire data about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on gender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1165. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish additional authorities to ensure the safe and effective use of drugs, to establish whistleblower protections for certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 1166. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to extend the same level of increased flexibility to all rural local educational agencies under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1167. A bill to increase public safety and reduce the threat to domestic security by including persons who may be prevented from boarding an aircraft in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1168. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to extend the firearm and ammunition prohibitions applicable to convicted felons to those convicted in a foreign court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 1169. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify Federal requirements under such Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 1170. A bill to address problem gambling; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1171. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise rules to provide for the comparable treatment and expanded use of qualified money market funds for broker-dealer financing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 1172. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress regarding the requirements applicable to the inscription of veterans' names on the memorial wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 1173. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue a consumer product safety rule to prevent injuries to users of vending machines and entrapment by small children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require public reporting of health care-associated infections data by hospitals and ambulatory surgical centers and to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a pilot program to provide incentives to hospitals and ambulatory surgical centers to eliminate the rate of occurrence of such infections; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California):

H.R. 1175. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 1176. A bill to provide discretionary authority to an immigration judge to determine that an alien parent of a United States citizen child should not be ordered removed, deported, or excluded from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 1177. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend and improve protections for sole community hospitals under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit a physician assistant, when delegated by a physician, to order or provide post-hospital extended care services, home health services, and hospice care under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1179. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to management of elk in Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1180. A bill to assure that development of certain Federal oil and gas resources will occur in ways that protect water resources and respect the rights of the surface owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 1181. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require congressional approval of certain loans by the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow section 1031 treatment for exchanges involving certain mutual ditch, reservoir, or irrigation company stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1183. A bill to require the President to transmit to Congress a report on contingency plans regarding possible developments in Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 1184. A bill to increase community service by students at risk of education failure and thereby reduce youth and gang violence; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 1185. A bill to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1186. A bill to promote global energy security through increased cooperation between the United States and India in diversifying sources of energy, stimulating development of alternative fuels, developing and deploying technologies that promote the clean and efficient use of coal, and improving energy efficiency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 1187. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary and the Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 1188. A bill to strengthen the Nation's research efforts to identify the causes and cure of psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, expand psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis data collection, study access to and quality of care for people with psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1189. A bill to preserve the right to habeas corpus; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Anne Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. SPRATT):

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Gian Carlo Menotti and recognizing the success of the Spoleto Festival USA in Charleston, South Carolina, which he founded; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Luis A. Ferre; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Celiac Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SPACE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 85th Anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA), a leading association for the Nation's 1.3 million American citizens of Greek ancestry, and Philhellenes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's labor movement, supporting the designation of a National Labor History Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should resume normal diplomatic relations with Taiwan (the Republic of China), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for additional research into the chronic neurological condition hydrocephalus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. MICA):

H. Res. 172. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 173. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H. Res. 174. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Res. 175. A resolution honoring the Institute of the Sisters of Mercy for 175 years of ministry, service, and efforts toward helping individuals, especially women and children, overcome challenges that keep them from living full and dignified lives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 176. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Res. 177. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Financial Services in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H. Res. 178. A resolution commending the Consortia of Administrators for Native American Rehabilitation for the many contributions it has made in Indian country through collaborative working relationships, State rehabilitation agencies, tribal health and social service programs, Capacity Building Projects, Federal service agencies, the

United States Department of Education, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas (for herself, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. COOPER):

H. Res. 179. A resolution expressing support for a National Foster Parents Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 180. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Leo T. McCarthy and expressing profound sorrow on his death; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Res. 181. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. PUTNAM):

H. Res. 182. A resolution commending and congratulating Virginia State University on the occasion of its 125th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WATT, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 183. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp commemorating the Fisk Jubilee Singers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio:

H. Res. 184. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H. Res. 185. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the creation of refugee populations in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf region as a result of human rights violations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H. Res. 186. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Clean Beaches Week and recognizing the considerable value of American beaches and their role in American culture; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H. Res. 187. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCRERY):

H. Res. 188. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 189. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day'' should be established; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H. Res. 190. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 191. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H. Res. 192. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Small Business in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Res. 193. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 22: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. POE, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 23: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 35: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 37: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 39: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 42: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 44: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 65: Mr. EVERETT and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 66: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 82: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. HARE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 89: Mr. GORDON, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 99: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 111: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 119: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 137: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 146: Mr. POE.

H.R. 147: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 197: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 243: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 260: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 271: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 289: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SALI, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 315: Mr. LATHAM and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 321: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 325: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 332: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 346: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 353: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 369: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 380: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 410: Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 418: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 423: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 446: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 486: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 503: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 507: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 508: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HARE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 510: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 524: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KIND, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 539: Mr. HARE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 543: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 549: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 550: Mr. TERRY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 551: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 556: Mr. PASCRELL and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 563: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 567: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 579: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 584: Mr. HARE and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 589: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 608: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 618: Mr. MICA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 635: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 638: Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 643: Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 644: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 649: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 657: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 661: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 662: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 667: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 670: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 676: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 678: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 684: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 687: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 688: Mr. HOLT and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 692: Mr. HARE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 694: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 695: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 698: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 711: Mr. HARE and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 715: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 723: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WEINER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 727: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 731: Mr. BOREN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 748: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 752: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 760: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 776: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 782: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. KILPATRICK, and MR. KAGEN.

H.R. 787: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 790: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 797: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 801: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 806: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 808: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 811: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 821: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 841: Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 857: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 861: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 871: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 872: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 876: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. POE.

H.R. 884: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 894: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. REYES, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 896: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 898: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 900: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 909: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 912: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 916: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 917: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 920: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 923: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 926: Mr. HILL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 936: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 939: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 947: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 948: Mr. UPTON and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 958: Mr. UPTON and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 964: Mr. UPTON and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 969: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 971: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 980: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HARE, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 981: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 995: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 997: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 998: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1004: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1014: Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1017: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1038: Mr. STARK and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1043: Mr. BONNER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1051: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 1071: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1090: Mr. WELLER and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1097: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 1099: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1105: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. WYNN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.J. Res. 18: Ms. DEGETTE.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. BARROW and Mr. WELLER.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. TIERNEY.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. TANCREDO.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. WELLER.

H. Con. Res. 53: Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 18: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H. Res. 41: Mr. HALL of New York.

H. Res. 42: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HARE, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 53: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Res. 101: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 105: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WYNN.

H. Res. 111: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 118: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 119: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 135: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 136: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H. Res. 138: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 143: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 146: Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 147: Ms. FOXX.

H. Res. 149: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 158: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. GINGREY.

H. Res. 162: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. DUNCAN.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *110th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2007 *No. 30*

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable JON TESTER, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, who taught us it is more blessed to give than receive, as we prepare to celebrate President's Day, thank You for the great gift of leadership. Make this wonderful ability to mobilize people toward shared objectives become the strength of our legislative branch.

May our Senators find the correct balance that leads to true influence. Give them the wisdom to prefer listening to speaking and learning to teaching, as they seek to make bipartisan progress. Remind them that in leadership what they do speaks more profoundly than what they say.

As they strive to represent You and country, empower them to make pleasing You and faithfully serving others their top priorities. Infuse them with the serenity to accept the things they cannot change, the courage to change the things they can, and the wisdom to know the difference. We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JON TESTER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 16, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JON TESTER, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TESTER thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the time until 12:30 will be divided equally between me and the Republican leader. Then at 12:30 the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to—well, they will be in 30-minute blocks of time. We will alternate back and forth between the respective sides, the majority controlling the first 30 minutes beginning at 12:30.

Yesterday a cloture motion was filed to proceed. That cloture vote will occur tomorrow at 1:45. There will be no rollcall votes during today's session of the Senate.

I would say, for the information of Senators who are watching this, that I am not going to use my 15 minutes, so if a Democrat wants to come and speak, they can have my 15 minutes.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 641

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 641 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title for a second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 641) to express the sense of Congress that no funds should be cut off or reduced for American troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or their ability to complete their assigned missions.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 shall be equally divided and controlled by the two leaders.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if I understand the order of business, it is that Members may speak until 12:30, with equally divided time for the remaining 25 minutes; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much.

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as we gather in the Senate for this session today, there will be no recorded votes, but an important vote is scheduled to take place across the Rotunda. We know what that vote is about. It is about a war that is now in its fourth year, a war that has lasted longer than World War II.

We were told recently that advisers to the President told him that at this stage of the war, there would be as few as 5,000 American troops in Iraq maintaining the limited interests that will remain for the United States. The reality is so much different. Over 130,000 Americans troops are still there for the fourth year of this war. We are activating Guard units, Reserve units, and redeploying those in active military

Printed on recycled paper.

with a frequency we have not seen since the great wars we faced in our past. We are asking sacrifices from these men and women in uniform and their families far beyond what was anticipated when the President 4 years ago convinced a majority of the House and Senate to vote to go to war.

The cost of this war, in human terms, is devastating: 3,132 of America's best and bravest soldiers have died. Over 23,000 have returned seriously injured. Many will come back and need help in reconstructing their lives, their families, their homes, their businesses. They have paid a sacrifice, all of them, and we owe them all a great debt of gratitude for their service to our country.

The President has decided the next stage of the war is to increase the number of American troops who will be cast into the midst of this civil war. It has been characterized as a civil war now by our national intelligence agencies. In fact, they say it is far worse than civil war. The report they have given to Congress, the National Intelligence Estimate called the situation:

Worse than a civil war because it is compounded by a domestic insurgency, foreign terrorism, and rampant crime.

Through hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, we have learned that the fundamentals of a civil society do not exist in Iraq today. The basics—police protection, enforcement of the law, prosecution of criminals, incarceration of those who have been found guilty—all of these things are at issue in this country. Yet the President believes we should invest more and more American lives in that war. I believe that is a tragic error. That is my opinion. It is being debated in the House of Representatives, and they will reach a conclusion this afternoon, likely the same conclusion I have, that this is a wrong strategy.

It has been an interesting and historic debate in the House. Members have been allowed the time to stand and speak their minds and speak from the heart about this grave challenge we face in America. What we are asking for on the floor of the Senate is the same opportunity as the House of Representatives. We believe that this, characterized as America's greatest deliberative body, should not avoid the responsibility of debate. We believe this policy of the President, which is being discussed and debated across America in towns large and small, should be discussed and debated on the floor of the Senate.

The press made note this morning that the Senate is going to meet in a rare Saturday session. Well, we may be coming together on Saturday to do our job, but people across America are coming together on Saturdays to do their jobs, and our soldiers are going to war on Saturday to do their job. We will have a chance tomorrow, early in the afternoon, to decide whether the Senate will take up this same debate; whether the American people will have a chance, through their elected Senators, to speak on this issue, this life and death issue.

I am hoping we will have a better result than we did 2 weeks ago. We brought this matter up before the Senate. We asked to have a debate. In fact, we said: We will take—on the Democratic majority side, we will allow two Republican amendments to be offered, one from Senator WARNER of Virginia, which questions the President's policies; the other from Senator MCCAIN of Arizona, who believes that the escalation is a good policy—a sharp contrast, a real choice, an honest, straightforward debate leading to a yes or no—and that was rejected because, you see, the other side does not want us to come down to that basic, fundamental question. They want us to go into a debate about so many other issues, albeit important issues but not directly related to this policy.

Yesterday, the majority leader in the Senate, HARRY REID of the State of Nevada, offered again to the Republican side the basic choice, a straightforward choice. We will bring to the floor the resolution that is presently being debated in the House of Representatives which objects to the escalation of forces, and we will allow Senator MCCAIN, who has an opposite view, who wants to send more troops into Iraq, we will allow those two to be considered and Members to make a choice. I don't think you could ask for anything fairer. But unfortunately, the minority, the Republican minority insisted they wanted to add two or three more amendments into the mix.

Well, clearly, that takes the focus off the most important issue; that is, should we send more American soldiers into this wretched civil war in Iraq today. I think we need to face that responsibility and face that vote. Now, some will step back and say: Wait. If the Democrats are in the majority, why don't they debate this issue?

Well, the rules of the Senate are interesting. They are designed to protect a minority. They give the minority in America and the minority in the Senate a voice which it may not have in other places. So under the rules of the Senate, it takes 60 Members to vote to move forward to debate an issue—60. We have 50, with Senator JOHNSON recuperating; they have 49. So in order to move to a debate, we need 10 Senators to cross this aisle and join us, cooperate with us, on a bipartisan basis, so we can move forward on this debate. Tomorrow will be the test.

Now, I have heard some Senators on the other side say: We are not even going to show up tomorrow. We are not going to be here. I hope that is idle chatter and doesn't reflect their intentions.

I believe the vote tomorrow is critically important. We are summoning Democratic Senators from all across the United States, literally. Some are making personal sacrifices, having flown home, believing we had ended the session, and flying back, many of them all-night flights, to be here. They understand the importance and gravity of this vote. I certainly hope the Members on the other side feel the same way. This is an important vote. It is not just another procedural vote. America will notice who is here tomorrow and who votes, and America will notice, after this historic debate in the House of Representatives, whether we meet our important constitutional responsibility.

A lot of people argue they have given up on Government. Government doesn't mean much to them anymore, and they don't have a great high regard for the people who are in Government. Some of these folks have stopped voting. They don't get involved. They go about their normal lives and say: Those politicians, you know, they talk a lot and they don't do much.

Well, this is a time when I think we can dispel some of this feeling across America that we are irrelevant and not part of things. If we can't take the time to spend on the floor of the Senate, as people are across America, debating this war, then we have lost our way. We have to bring this matter before the American people in the right way. We are fighting for a democracy in the Middle East. We are fighting for a democracy in Iraq. Democracy is the open debate of public issues. Will we have that same debate on the Senate floor? That question is in the hands of the Republican minority. They will decide tomorrow whether we move forward on this debate.

Now, there is one group in this town who does not want this debate to move forward; let's be very honest about it: the President and the White House. It is an embarrassment to have your policy rejected and repudiated by bipartisan votes in the House and Senate, and it is rare. It hardly ever happens. So to spare the embarrassment to the White House—the political embarrassment—some are trying to stop this debate in the Senate. But I have to say I think this issue goes far beyond which politician ends up with bragging rights. That has nothing to do with it. This has to do with the lives and fortunes of our servicemen and their families and this great Nation and our foreign policy.

At a time when we need to gather allies around the world to fight this war on terrorism, when we need to bring nations together to join us as they did after September 11 to stop the spread of terrorism, we need to understand this debate on Iraq is right on point. It is a debate which affects hundreds of thousands of soldiers and their families, and it affects all of us as Americans.

I sincerely hope the Republican minority will have a change of heart, will join us in supporting this debate tomorrow. I believe we will find tomorrow, with this vote, that a bipartisan majority of the Senate wants to move forward with a debate. If it doesn't

reach the number of 60, then technically this debate cannot move forward. I use the word ''technically'' because in honesty, that will not be the end if we do not muster 60 votes. This matter is going to come before the Senate again and again and again.

For 4 years in this war, Congress, controlled by the other party, has been virtually silent on the issue of this war and the wisdom of our policy. Those days are over. In the last few weeks we have been in session, we have had over 30 hearings by committees that have asked the hard questions about this policy, about protecting our troops, and about where we are going to go forward in the future. Those questions will continue to be asked by committees. They will continue to be addressed in the Senate. When we move to the next item of legislation, we will undoubtedly have amendments relative to this war in Iraq. This debate will not end.

I sincerely hope those on the other side of the aisle will join us. I hope they understand what is at stake. It is not just 21,000 more soldiers putting their lives on the line for America; it is a question of our foreign policy and protecting this Nation and making sure we keep our commitment to our country to keep it safe.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 30 minutes each and the time to be alternated between the two sides, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the war in Iraq is the most important issue of our time. The American people know that our soldiers are serving nobly under extraordinarily difficult circumstances and that far too many of them are making the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Citizens are calling on us—begging us—to address this issue with the seriousness and the urgency it deserves.

The House of Representatives will vote later today on a major resolution supporting our troops and opposing the escalation of the war. It will be a historic vote and a clear response to the American people's clarion call for change. The Senate will have a chance to do so soon as well. The voices of the American people are growing louder and louder, and the need for us to act could not be clearer.

Under the President's current policy, the war continues to impose an enormous human toll on our soldiers, their families, and their loved ones. Our men and women in uniform have served with great courage and honor for nearly 4 years—longer than it took to win World War II. More than 3,000 of our forces have been killed and more than 23,000 wounded. The casualties keep mounting. Last fall was the deadliest period since the war began. Mr. President, 287 American soldiers were killed in October, November, and December. Already, 118 have been killed since the President announced the surge, and the numbers keep rising.

The toll in Massachusetts has been heavy. Just last week, CPT Jennifer Harris of Swampscott, MA, was killed when her helicopter went down north of Baghdad. She was the first woman from our State to make the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq, and our hearts and prayers go out to her family and loved ones.

So far, 65 Massachusetts members of our forces have given the last full measure of devotion to our country. The youngest was 19, the oldest was 46. They died far from their homes in Bedford and Bristol, Lawrence and Lowell, Plymouth and Pittsfield, Weymouth and Woburn, and other towns and cities across the State. They were fathers, sons, a daughter, brothers, and friends. Each of them represents a life cut short in service to our country.

More than 3,000 families across America share in such heartbreak. Their loved ones have died in Iraq, and we mourn their loss. We honor their service, and we pray that God's grace and mercy may ease the anguish of those they have left behind.

Citizens of Massachusetts have answered their country's call from the first days of the Republic, and those we honor today are members of that noble company. Each knew they were going into harm's way. They faced dangers in Iraq that vast numbers of our troops had never seen before, such as suicide bombers and improvised explosive devices.

We mourn the loss of these heroes. We honor their sacrifice and extend our deepest condolences to their families. Words cannot ease the grief of losing a loved one, but I hope the families may find comfort in the words of Abraham Lincoln in the famous letter he sent to a bereaved mother during the Civil War. He wrote:

Dear Madam, I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and the lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

The consequences of the decisions we make here in Congress profoundly affect our military, their families, and the communities they have left. We have an obligation to our soldiers to make sensible decisions that will not place them needlessly in harm's way.

We in Massachusetts feel especially deeply the loss of the 65 soldiers who have died in Iraq: SGT Justin W. Garvey; PFC John D. Hart; SPC Christopher J. Holland; SGT Pierre A. Raymond; CPL Brian Oliveira; LCpl Travis Reid Desiato; LCpl Dimitrios Gavriel; SGT Andrew Farrar; 1LT Brian McPhillips; SSG Joseph P. Belavia; LCpl John J. Vangyzen IV; SGT Kurt D. Schamberg; CPT John W. Maloney; SPC Ray M. Fuhrmann II; 1SG Alan N. Grifford; PVT Michael E. Bouthot; SPC Daniel R. Gionet; SGT Gregory A. Belanger; PFC Kerry D. Scott; SGT Daniel J. Londono; CPL David Marques Vincente; LCpl Jeffrey Charles Burgess; LCpl Alexander Scott Arrendodo; 1LT Travis John Fuller; CPT Benjamin Sammis; CWO2 Stephen M. Wells; SPC Matthew Boule; CWO Kyran E. Kennedy; CPT Christopher J. Sullivan; LCpl Shayne Cabino; LTC Leon G. James, II; CPT Joel E. Cahill; LCpl Michael Ford; CPL Scott Procopio; LCpl Patrick Gallagher; CPL Donald E. Fisher II; SPC Gabriel T. Palacios; SGT Benjamin E. Mejia; SGT Glenn R. Allison; GySgt Elia Paietta Fontecchio; LCpl Andrew Zabierek; LCpl Nickolas David Schiavoni; SPC Daniel F. Cunningham; LCpl Gregory E. MacDonald; SPC Peter G. Enos; PFC Norman Darling; PVT Cory R. Depew; SSG Joseph Camara; SGT Charles Caldwell; PFC Markus J. Johnson; SPC David J. Babineau; CPL Paul N. King; LCpl Geoffrey R. Cayer; SGT Mark R. Vecchione; SSG Clint J. Storey; SPC Edgardo Zayas; LCpl Eric P. Valdepenas; SPC Jared J. Raymond; LCpl Edward Garvin; LT Joshua Booth; SPC Matthew J. Stanley; SGT Gregory Wright; SFC Keith Callahan; SGT Alexander H. Fuller; and CPT Jennifer Harris.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chart I have be printed in the RECORD. It is a chart of their hometowns and where they died in Iraq.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name	Location of death	Relationship to MA
Sergeant Justin W. Garvey	Tel Afar, Iraq	Mother from Townsend.
Private First Class John D. Hart	Taza, Iraq	Lived in Bedford.
Specialist Christopher J. Holland	Baghdad, Iraq	Mother in Lunenburg.
Sergeant Pierre A. Raymond	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Lived in Lawrence.
Corporal Brian Oliveira	Al Anbar, Iraq	Lived in Bristol.
Lance Corporal Travis Reid Desiato	Fallujah, Iraq	Lived in Bedford.
Lance Corporal Dimitrios Gavriel	Fallujah, Iraq	Parents in Haverhill.
Sergeant Andrew Farrar	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Weymoth.
First Lieutenant Brian McPhillips	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in Pembroke.
Staff Sergeant Joesph P. Belavia	Karbala, Iraq	Lived in Wakefield.
Lcpl John J. Vangyzen IV	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Bristol.
Sergeant Kurt D. Schamberg	Iraq	Father in Melrose.
Captain John W. Maloney	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Lived in Chicopee.
Specialist Ray M. Fuhrmann II	Samarra, Iraq	Lived in Attleboro.
First Sergeant Alan N. Grifford	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in West Wareham.
Pvt. Michael E. Bouthot	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in Fall River.
Specialist Daniel R. Gionet	Baghdad, Iraq	Father in Lowell.
Sgt. Gregory A. Belanger	Al Hallia, Iraq	Parents from MA.
Private First Class Kerry D. Scott	Iskandirayh, Iraq	Mother in Worcester.
Sergeant Daniel J. Londono	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in Dorchester.
Corporal David Marques Vicente	Hit, Iraq	Lived in Methuen.
Lance Corporal Jeffrey Charles Burgess	Al Fallujah, Iraq	Lived in Plymouth.
Lance Corporal Alexander Scott Arrendodo	Najaf, Iraq	Lived in Randolph.
First Lieutenant Travis John Fuller	Korean Village, Iraq	Lived in Granville.
Captain Benjamin Sammis	Central Iraq	Raised in Rehoboth.
Chief Warrant Officer Two Stephen M. Wells	Habbinayah, Iraq	Parents in North Egremont.
Specialist Matthew Boule	Iraq	Raised in Dracut.
Chief Warrant Officer Kyran E. Kennedy	Tikrit, Iraq	Parents in Boston.
Captain Christopher J. Sullivan	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in Princeton.
Lance Corporal Shayne Cabino	Al Karmah, Iraq	Lived in Canton.
Lt. Col. Leon G. James II	Ar Rustamiyah, Iraq	Mother in Longmeadow.
Capt. Joel E. Cahill	Dawr, Iraq	Lived in Norwood.
Lance Corporal Michael Ford	Al Anbar, Iraq	From New Bedford.
Cpl. Scott Procopio	Al Anbar, Iraq	Lived in Saugus.
Lance Cpl. Patrick Gallagher	Al Anbar, Iraq	Mother and father live in MA.
Corporal Donald E. Fisher II	Kirkuk, Iraq	Lived in Brockton.
Specialist Gabriel T. Palacios	Ba'qubah, Iraq	Father from Lynn.
Sergeant Benjamin E. Mejia	Marez, Iraq	Lived in Salem.
Sergeant Glenn R. Allison	Baghdad, Iraq	Mother in Pittsfield.
Gunnery Sergeant Elia Paietta Fontecchio	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Milford.
Lance Corporal Andrew Zabierek	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Chelmsford.
Lance Corporal Nickolas David Schiavoni	Al Karmah, Iraq	From Haverhill.
Specialist Daniel F. Cunningham	Iraq	Lived in Revere.
Lance Corporal Gregory E. MacDonald	Iraq	Parents from MA.
Specialist Peter G. Enos	Bayji, Iraq	Lived in Plymouth.
Pfc. Norman Darling	Iraq	Lived in Watertown.
Private Cory R. Depew	Mosul, Iraq	Father in Haverhill.
Staff Sergeant Joseph Camara	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in New Bedford.
Sgt. Charles Caldwell	Iraq	Lived in Attleboro.
Pfc. Markus J. Johnson	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Springfield.
Spc. David J. Babineau	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in Springfield.
Cpl. Paul N. King	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Tyngsboro, Mass.
LC. Geoffrey R. Cayer	Habbinayah, Iraq	Fitchburg, MA.
Sgt. Mark R. Vecchione	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Eastham, MA.
Staff Sergeant Clint J. Storey	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Wife/daughter in Palmer, MA.
Spc. Edgardo Zayas	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in Dorchester, MA.
Lance Corporal Eric P. Valdepenas	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Seekonk, MA.
Specialist Jared J. Raymond	Taji, Iraq	Swampscott, MA (mother).
LCPL Edward Garvin	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Malden, MA.
Lt. Joshua Booth	Fallujah, Iraq	Fiskdale, MA.
Specialist Matthew J. Stanley	Taji, Iraq	Father and Wife in MA.
Sgt. Gregory Wright	Muadadivah, Iraq	Father in Boston. MA.
Sgt. 1st Class Keith Callahan	South of Baghdad	Mother in Woburn.
Sgt. Alexander H. Fuller	Baghdad, Iraq	Wife in Centerville.
Captian Jennifer Harris	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Swampscott, MA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

IRAQ

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, first let me thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his moving and sobering words but even more importantly for his leadership and tremendous clarity on this issue over these last few critical years.

Mr. President, we are approaching the 4-year anniversary of one of the greatest foreign policy mistakes in our country's history. In March 2003, with the prior authorization of Congress, the President took this country to war in Iraq. Almost 4 years later, virtually every objective observer and, more importantly, the American people as a whole agree that the President's policy has failed. Even the President acknowledges that his plan has not worked, though his solution is not a new plan but a troop escalation. Of course, sending more troops to implement what is essentially the same flawed strategy makes no sense. The American people agree that it makes no sense, and most of my colleagues agree that it makes no sense.

So the question becomes, with a President unable or unwilling to fix a flawed policy that is jeopardizing our national security and our military readiness, what should we in Congress do about our country's involvement in this disastrous war? Do we do nothing and hope the President will put things right, when he has shown time and time again that he is incapable of doing so? Do we simply tell the President that we are unhappy with the way the war is going and that we hope he will change course or do we take strong, decisive action to fix the President's mistaken, self-defeating policies?

It is pretty clear which course of action I support. I think it is a course of action the American people called for in the November elections. It is the course of action our national security needs, so we do not continue to neglect global threats and challenges while we focus so much of our resources and our efforts on Iraq. It is the course of action that will support—that will actually support—our brave troops and their families.

We must end our involvement in this tragic and misguided war. The President will not do so; therefore, Congress must act. So far, Congress has not lived up to that responsibility. Instead of taking strong action in the Senate, instead of considering binding legislation that fixes the President's flawed Iraq strategy, we tied ourselves into knots last week in a convoluted and misguided effort to achieve a consensus that would have essentially reaffirmed congressional authorization for continuing our military involvement in Iraq. Of course, here I am referring to the resolution proposed by the senior Senator from Virginia. This resolution was portrayed, at least at first, by members of both parties as an important symbolic rebuke of the President's Iraq policy. In fact, it really was not a rebuke at all. In parts, it reads like a reauthorization of the war, rejecting troop redeployment and specifically authorizing ''vigorous operations'' in a critical region in Iraq.

Now, when debate on the Warner resolution was blocked, we had a chance

to get things right. And I am glad our majority leader, Senator REID, has chosen to bring up the resolution being debated in the House today expressing support for the troops and, simply, opposition to the so-called surge. Now, this body—the Senate—should go on record in opposition to, or support of, the President's plan.

I will vote to allow the debate on the resolution to take place. And I hope I will have the opportunity to actually vote for the resolution.

I have yet to hear any convincing argument that sending 21,500 more troops to Iraq will bring about the political solution that is needed to end violence in that country.

The President's decision to send more troops is based on two flawed assumptions. It assumes, first, that the presence of even more of our servicemembers will help Iraqi troops improve security in Baghdad and, second, that with improved security, Iraqi politicians can then achieve national reconciliation. The recent declassified NIE, or National Intelligence Estimate, shot holes in both of those assumptions. It said that Iraqi security forces ''will be hard pressed in the next 12–18 months to execute significantly increased security responsibilities'' and ''even if violence is diminished, given the current winner-take-all attitude and sectarian animosities infecting the political scene, Iraqi leaders will be hard pressed to achieve sustained political reconciliation in the time frame of this Estimate.''

Obviously, those were direct quotes, not me characterizing the NIE. In other words, in the best case scenario, U.S. forces provide a little security that Iraqi forces can't sustain on their own and that Iraqi politicians won't use to settle their entrenched differences. That doesn't sound to me like a plan for success.

Some of my colleagues, even those who don't support sending more troops to Baghdad, have spoken in favor of continued and even increased U.S. military operations in Al Anbar Province. Some of them even suggest that our troops should be directly combating an insurgency there. This, apart from everything else, is a recipe for disaster. Al Anbar Province is where a majority of U.S. troops have been killed in Iraq. The insurgency there, as well as general opposition to the U.S. presence and to the Shiite-dominated Government in Baghdad, is fueled by the Sunnis' political and economic grievances. Conducting targeted missions to take out terrorists makes sense, but using U.S. troops to put down an insurgency doesn't. Maintaining or, worse yet, increasing a substantial U.S. presence in a primarily Sunni area without a political solution means nothing less than a continuation of unending and self-defeating policies in Iraq. Clearly, the President's decision to send more troops makes no sense. But I have to say that simply passing a nonbinding resolution criticizing it makes no sense, either, if we just stop there. So we need to go further, and we need to do it soon.

Let me remind my colleagues, when the voters rejected the President's Iraq policy in November, they weren't rejecting an escalation. That option wasn't even on the table then. Who was talking about an escalation during that campaign? Certainly, the Presiding Officer knows well what was being discussed. They were rejecting the President's policy of trying to achieve a political solution in Iraq with a massive and unlimited military presence. After delaying action for a couple of months, the President just plain ignored overwhelming public sentiment, the advice of Members of both parties, and the views of the military and foreign policy experts when he proposed an escalation. The administration turned its back on the American people.

We in Congress should not follow suit. We have a responsibility to our constituents and to our men and women in uniform. If no one will listen to and act on the will of the American people, then there is something seriously wrong with our political system. After almost 4 years of a disastrous policy, we must bring our troops out of Iraq. To do otherwise is to ignore public outrage over the war and to ignore the many other pressing national security priorities we are neglecting in favor of a myopic focus on Iraq. The American people recognize there is no U.S. military solution to Iraq's civil war. And as long as we focus disproportionate attention and resources on Iraq, we will not be able to counter the full range of threats we face in places such as Afghanistan and Somalia and many other places around the world. So Congress must use its power. It must use its power of the purse to safely redeploy our troops from Iraq.

Let's not be intimidated by the intentionally misleading rhetoric of the White House and its allies when they try to prevent any discussion at all of real action by the Congress to end the war. This isn't about cutting off funds for troops; it is about cutting off funds for the war. Every Member of Congress agrees that we must continue to support our troops and give them the resources and the support they need. By setting a date after which funding for the war will be terminated, as I have proposed, Congress can safely bring our troops out of harm's way. That is how you get them out of harm's way, by getting them out of there.

There is plenty of precedent for Congress exercising its constitutional authority to stop U.S. involvement in armed conflict. Last month, I chaired a Judiciary Committee hearing entitled ''Exercising Congress's Constitutional Power to End the War.'' Without exception, every witness, those called by the majority and the minority, those who have had a career more focused on the executive branch than the legislative branch—all of them did not challenge the constitutionality of Congress's authority to end the war.

Lou Fisher of the Library of Congress is acclaimed as one of the foremost experts on the President's war powers. In fact, he literally wrote the book on this topic. He testified that Congress does not simply have the power, he said it has the responsibility to exercise it, when needed.

He said:

> . . . is the continued use of military force and a military commitment in the Nation's interest? That is the core question. Once you decide that, if you decide it is not in the national interest, you certainly do not want to continue putting U.S. troops in harm's way.

The argument that cutting off funding for a flawed policy would hurt the troops and that continuing to put U.S. troops in harm's way supports the troops makes no sense. By ending funding for the war, we can bring our troops safely out of Iraq.

Walter Dellinger of Duke Law School made this point when he testified about my proposal. He said:

> There would not be one penny less for the salary of the troops. There would not be one penny less for the benefit of the troops. There would not be one penny less for weapons or ammunition. There would not be one penny less for supplies or support. Those troops would simply be redeployed to other areas where the armed forces are utilized.

Instead of allowing the President's failed policy to continue, Congress can and should use its power of the purse to end our involvement in the Iraq war, safely redeploying the troops while ensuring, as do I in my bill, that important counterterrorism and training missions are still carried out. We should be coming up with a strategy for a postredeployment Iraq and the region that is squarely within the context of the global fight against al-Qaida. That means replacing a massive and unsustainable and unlimited military mission with a long-term strategy for mitigating the mess left behind by this war. With such a strategy, we can redirect substantially more resources and attention to the fight against al-Qaida and other affiliated or sympathetic international terrorist organizations.

As long as this President goes unchecked by Congress, our troops will remain needlessly at risk and our national security will be compromised.

Let me tell my colleagues, regardless of what happens with this resolution, this is just a first step—worthwhile but just a first step. And the first step must be followed by stronger steps, and it must be done quickly. I intend to keep pushing until the Senate votes to end our involvement in the Iraq war, and eventually this will happen because this is what a strong majority of the American people want. Congress may be able to put off its day of reckoning temporarily, the administration can continue down the same failed path a while longer, but all of us ignore the will of the American people at our peril. So let's have this debate. Let's do it openly and honestly. Let's not pretend anyone wants to deny our troops

the equipment and resources they need. Let's not suggest that opposing the President's strategy is unpatriotic and that it would give aid and comfort to the enemy, that it would somehow weaken the resolve of our troops. Those claims are outrageous. They are offensive, and they are untrue. Do my colleagues believe the American people gave aid and comfort to the enemy when they rejected the President's Iraq policy in November? Are the overwhelming majority of our constituents who oppose this war trying to undermine our troops? Of course not. So how could anyone suggest that Congress actually acting on the will of the American people undermines the troops or emboldens the enemy?

Our troops are undermined by a policy that places them in harm's way unnecessarily. And our enemy, our true enemy, al-Qaida and its allies, is emboldened by a U.S. strategy that neglects global challenges and instead focuses on a single country. It is unfortunate that those who wish to defend this strategy would resort to these kinds of charges.

Let's do the job of the Senate and have full, open debate and votes on fixing our Iraq policy. Let's not pretend that such a debate would harm our national security. Let's not tell ourselves that it is up to just the President to fix the horrible situation his failed policies have created. It is our responsibility to act, too. Congress made the tragic mistake of authorizing this war over 4 years ago. Now Congress also has the job of bringing it to a close so we can refocus on the terrorists and other global threats that have been neglected way too much over the past 4 years.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, when the roll is called tomorrow on the motion for cloture with regard to the resolution the House is expected to pass tonight on Iraq, I will vote no. I will vote against cloture. I will do so not because I wish to stifle debate. The fact is that debate has occurred, it is occurring now, and it will continue to occur on our policy in Iraq.

I will vote against cloture because I feel so strongly against the resolution. It condemns the new plan for success in Iraq. I support that plan. It does something that, from all of the research my staff and I have done, including asking the Library of Congress, we have found no case in American history where Congress has done what this resolution does, which is, in a nonbinding resolution, oppose a plan our military is implementing right now. Congress has expressed nonbinding resolutions of disapproval before a plan of military action has been carried out.

Congress has obviously taken much more direct steps, authorized to do so by the Constitution, to cut off funds for a military action or a war in progress. But never before has the Congress of the United States passed a nonbinding resolution of disapproval of a military plan that is already being carried out by American military personnel. I believe it is a bad precedent, and that is why I will do everything I can to oppose it. In the immediate context, that means I will vote against cloture.

Mr. President, more broadly, we are approaching an important moment in the history of this institution and of our Republic, a moment I fear future historians will look back to and see the beginning of a cycle that not only damaged the remaining possibilities for success America has in Iraq but, more broadly, established political precedents that weaken the power of the Presidency to protect the American people over the long term.

The nonbinding resolution before us today, we all know, is only a prologue. That is why the fight over it, procedural and substantive, over these past weeks has been so intense. It is the first skirmish in an escalating battle that threatens to consume our Government over many months ahead, a battle that will neither solve the sprawling challenges we face in Iraq nor strengthen our Nation to defeat the challenges to our security throughout the world from Islamist extremists—that is to say, in our war against the terrorists who attacked us.

We still have a choice not to go down this path. It is a choice that goes beyond the immediate resolution that will be before the Senate, a chance to step back from the brink and find better ways to express and arbitrate our differences of opinion. I hope we will seize the moment and take those steps.

Mr. President, as we meet in this Chamber today, the battle for Baghdad has already begun. One of our most decorated generals, David Petraeus, whom this Senate confirmed 81 to 0 a few weeks ago, has now taken command in Baghdad.

Thousands of American soldiers have moved out across the Iraqi capital putting their lives on the line as they put a new strategy into effect. We can now see for ourselves on the ground in Iraq, in Baghdad, where it matters what this new strategy looks like. And we can see why it is different from all that preceded it.

For the first time in Baghdad, our primary focus is no longer on training Iraqi forces or chasing down insurgents or providing for our own force protection, though those remain objectives. Our primary focus is on ensuring basic security for the Iraqi people working side by side with Iraqi security forces, exactly what classic counterinsurgency doctrine tells us must be our first goal now.

Where previously there were not enough troops to hold the neighborhoods cleared of insurgents, now more troops are either in place or on the way. Where previously American soldiers were based on the outskirts of Baghdad unable to secure the city, now they are living and working side by side with their Iraqi counterparts on small bases that are being set up right now throughout the Iraqi capital.

At least six of these new joint bases have already been established in the Sunni neighborhoods in west Baghdad, the same neighborhoods where a few weeks ago jihadists and death squads held sway. In the Shiite neighborhoods of east Baghdad, American troops are also moving in with their Iraqi counterparts, and Moqtada al-Sadr and his Mahdi Army are moving out.

We do not know if this new strategy for success in Iraq will work over the long term, and we probably will not know for some time. The Mahdi Army may be in retreat for the moment, but they are not defeated. They have gone to ground, and they are watching. Our hope, of course, is that our determination and that of the Iraqi Government will lead them now to devote themselves to politics instead of death squads, but only time will tell.

The fact is any realistic assessment of the situation in Iraq tells us we must expect there will be more attacks and there will be more casualties in the months ahead as the enemies of a free and independent Iraq see the progress we are making and adapt to try to destroy it with more violence.

The question they will pose to us, which is the question that is posed every time a fanatic suicide bomb goes off and that person expresses their hatred of everyone else more than love of their own life by ending their own life, is: Will we yield Baghdad, Iraq, the Middle East, our own future to those fanatical suicide bombers?

We must also recognize we are in a different place in Iraq from where we were a month ago because of the implementation of this new strategy. We are in a stronger position today to provide basic security in Baghdad, and with that, we are in a stronger position to marginalize the extremists and strengthen the moderates, a stronger position to foster the economic activity that will drain the insurgency and the militias of their public support, a stronger position to press the Iraqi leaders to make the political compromises that everyone acknowledges are necessary.

John Maynard Keynes famously said:

When the facts change, I change my mind.

In the real world, in the past month, the facts in Iraq have changed, and they are changing still. I ask my colleagues to allow themselves to wait and consider changing their minds as further facts unfold in Iraq. The nonbinding resolution before us is not about stopping a hypothetical plan. It is about disapproving a plan that is being carried out now by our fellow

Americans in uniform in the field. In that sense, as I have said, it is unprecedented in congressional history, in American history.

This resolution is about shouting into the wind. It is about ignoring the realities of what is happening on the ground in Baghdad. It proposes nothing. It contains no plan for victory or retreat. It is a strategy of ''no,'' while our soldiers are saying ''yes, sir,'' to their commanding officers as they go forward into battle. And that is why I will vote against the resolution by voting against cloture.

I understand the frustration, the anger, and the exhaustion that so many Americans, so many Members of this Congress feel about Iraq, the desire to throw up one's hands and simply say ''enough.'' And I am painfully aware of the enormous toll of this war in human life and of the mistakes that have been made in the war's conduct. But let us now not make another mistake. In the midst of a fluid and uncertain situation in Iraq, we should not be so bound up in our own arguments and disagreements, so committed to the positions we have staked out that the political battle over here takes precedence over the real battle over there.

Whatever the passions of the moment, the point of reference for our decisionmaking should be military movements on the battlefields of Iraq, not political maneuverings in the Halls of Congress.

Even as our troops have begun to take Baghdad back step by step, there are many in this Congress who have, nevertheless, already reached a conclusion about the futility of America's cause there and declared their intention to put an end to this mission, not with one direct attempt to cut off funds but step by political step.

No matter what the rhetoric of this resolution, that is the reality of this moment. This nonbinding measure before us is a first step toward a constitutional crisis that we can and must avoid. Let me explain what I mean by ''a constitutional crisis.'' Let us be clear about the likely consequences if we go down this path beyond this nonbinding resolution.

Congress has been given constitutional responsibilities, but the micromanagement of wars is not one of them. The appropriation of funds for war is. I appreciate that each of us has our own ideas about the best way forward in Iraq. I respect those who take a different position than I. I understand many feel strongly that the President's strategy is the wrong one, but the Constitution, which has served us now for more than two great centuries of our history, creates not 535 Commanders in Chief but 1, the President of the United States, who is authorized to lead the day-to-day conduct of war.

Whatever our preponderance of this war or its conduct, it is in no one's interest to stumble into a debilitating confrontation between our two great branches of Government over war powers. The potential for a constitutional crisis here and now is real, with congressional interventions, Presidential vetoes, and Supreme Court decisions.

If there was ever a moment for nonpartisan cooperation to agree on a process that will respect both our personal opinions about this war and our Nation's interests over the long term, this is it.

We need to step back from the brink and reason together, as Scripture urges us to do, about how we will proceed to express our disagreements about this war. We must recognize that while the decisions we are making today and we are about to make seem irretrievably bound up in the immediacy of this moment, and the particular people now holding positions of power in our Government, these decisions will set constitutional precedents that will go far beyond the moment and these people.

President Bush has less than 2 years left in office, and a Democrat may well succeed him. If we do not act thoughtfully in the weeks and months ahead, we will establish precedents that future Congresses, future Presidents, and future generations of Americans will regret.

Right now, as the battle for Baghdad begins, this institution is obviously deeply divided. However, we should not allow our divisions to lead us to a constitutional crisis in which no one wins and our national security is greatly damaged.

We are engaged, as all my colleagues know, in a larger war against a totalitarian enemy, Islamist extremism, and terrorism that seeks to vanquish all the democratic values that is our national purpose to protect and defend.

Whatever our differences in this Chamber about this war, let us never forget those great values of freedom and democracy that unite us and for which our troops have given, and today give, the last full measure of their devotion.

Yes, we should vigorously debate and deliberate. That is not only our right, it is our responsibility. But at this difficult junction, at this moment when a real battle, a critical battle is being waged in Baghdad, as we face a brutal enemy who attacked us on 9/11 and wants to do it again, let us not shout at one another but let us reach out to one another to find that measure of unity that can look beyond today's disagreements and secure the Nation's future and the future of all who will follow us as Americans.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am so honored to be on the floor with Senator JOE LIEBERMAN today and to listen to his remarks, frankly, to stand in the shadow of his leadership on this issue because he has been that, a bipartisan leader, recognizing, as he so appropriately has spoken, the leadership role that a Congress should take at this time in our Nation's history. And he has said it well. It is not one of micromanagement. It is not one of 535 generals all thinking we can act and think strategically about the engagement currently underway in Baghdad.

It is our job, I would hope, to stand united in behalf of the men and women we send there in uniform to accomplish what we so hope and wish they will be able to accomplish, and that is the stability of Iraq, the allowing of the Iraqi people to once again lead their country and to take from it the kind of radical Islamic fascism that is well underway and dominating the region.

Let me make a few comments this afternoon that clearly coincide with what Senator LIEBERMAN has spoken to. This is not, nor should it ever become, a partisan issue. I think his presence on the floor this afternoon speaks volumes to that. This is not a partisan issue. This is a phenomenally important national and international issue for our country to be engaged in that, frankly, few countries can engage in the way we have and with the kind of energy and strength we have brought to it.

The majority leader has put us in a very precarious situation, one that is clearly divisive. Frankly, I can say things as a Republican that maybe my colleague cannot say.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: At the hour of 1:30, is there an order for another Senator to be recognized?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. And who is that Senator?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Can my colleague finish up in 1 minute? I want to try to accommodate my colleague.

Mr. CRAIG. I will be relatively brief. I was instructed to be here at 1:15, but I think we have had a runover of time; is that not correct?

Mr. WARNER. I was not here.

Mr. CRAIG. Can we inquire of the Chair?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority has 30 seconds remaining, and then time reverts to the majority. The majority has granted the Senator from Virginia the time.

Mr. CRAIG. His time is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia has 30 minutes, until 2 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG. May I ask the Senator how much time he planned to consume?

Mr. WARNER. Well, I have to jump a plane, but how much time does my colleague wish?

Mr. CRAIG. I will take no more than 5 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. If my colleague can make it 3 minutes, then I think my

colleague from Missouri is anxious to catch his plane also.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if I could impose and ask for 2 minutes, so that Senator CRAIG and myself will consume a total of 5 minutes on this side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am so honored to be on the floor with Senator JOE LIEBERMAN today and listen to his remarks, and frankly, to stand in the shadow of his leadership on this issue. Because he has been that, a bipartisan leader recognizing, as he so appropriately has spoke, the leadership role that a Congress should take at this time in our Nation's history. And he has said it well, it is not one of micromanagement, it is not 1 of 535 generals all thinking we can act strategically and tactically about the engagement currently underway in Baghdad and elsewhere across Iraq.

It is our job, I would hope, to stand united in behalf of the men and women we send there in uniform to accomplish what we so hope and wish they will be able to accomplish and that is the stability of Iraq and the greater Middle East and allowing the Iraqi people to lead their country and remove from it the kind of radical Islamic fascism that is well underway and dominating the region.

Let me make a few comments this afternoon that clearly coincide with what Senator LIEBERMAN spoke to. This is not, nor should it ever become, a partisan issue and I think Senator LIEBERMAN's presence on the floor this afternoon speaks volumes to just that, that this is not a partisan issue. This is a phenomenally important national and international issue for our country to be engaged in. Frankly, few countries can engage in this struggle in that way we have, and with the kind of energy and strength that we have brought to it.

The majority leader has put us in a very precarious situation, one that is clearly divisive. Frankly, I can say things as a Republican that maybe my colleague cannot say. I believe that the majority leader is playing politics on the issue of calling up a nonbinding resolution, while blocking the minority from calling up a different resolution. My good friend Senator GREGG has introduced a bill, a bill that I have cosponsored, that would express our full support for our soldiers in harms way and give them a much needed guarantee that they will continue to receive the funding they need to continue to function in their critical mission. As I said, the majority leader refuses to allow us a vote on this bill, and I think that is plain wrong.

Let me make it very clear, it is not the Republicans stalling or shutting down debate on the issue of Iraq. In fact, it is just the opposite. I have spoken twice in the last 2 weeks about this issue because I believe it is very critical, both to my constituency in Idaho, but also to our great Nation and the world. The majority claims that they want full and fair debate on this issue, yet they refuse to allow us to bring our own voice to this issue, and our own resolutions. How can we have a full and fair debate and vote on the floor of the Senate if we are being held hostage by the majority leader?

No State goes untouched by what we do here today and no man or woman in uniform goes untouched. Twenty Idahoans have given their lives in Iraq, and each of their sacrifices is sacred and honored, not just by their families and friend but by all. Most recently, SPC Ross Clevenger and PVT Raymond Werner of Boise, and SGT James Holtom of Rexberg were killed in Iraq in an IED attack. They, like all those who have fallen to enemy hands, served in a heroic and gallant way for a cause they believed in and a cause that we believe in. That is the cause of freedom.

Senator LIEBERMAN said it well, for us to send one of our top generals and top military minds in GEN David Petraeus to Iraq and say by a unanimous vote that we support him and believe in his abilities, but at the same time we do not support his mission, what are we saying as a Congress? What kind of message are we sending to our men and women in uniform when we speak in that manner? I think it is wrong to send this message and I will vigorously oppose that message.

If the majority leader and his Democratic colleagues believe so strongly that our mission in Iraq is so flawed, then why do we not see them bringing to the floor a bill to cut off funding for our troops on the ground in Iraq? As I mentioned earlier, the answer to that is a political answer, not a substance issue. Many Democrats have already called for cutting off funding and demanding an immediate withdrawal from Iraq, yet we have not seen those bills being taken up on the floor of either chamber. However, there are rumors that Members will choose to use the upcoming Iraq supplemental funding bill to force the President to take the advice of these congressional generals, rather than using the advice of our military experts and commanders to execute our mission and secure Iraq.

The reason I do not support such an immediate withdrawal of our troops, or cutting funding off for our troops in gun fights right now in the streets of Baghdad, is simple. I believe in our mission and I believe that our soldiers are the most capable in the world. The only enemy that can defeat American soldiers on the battlefield is the low morale of the American people. A resolution condemning their actions and their mission in Iraq is just the kind of defeat that could embolden our enemies and harm our soldiers.

As every one of my colleagues knows, the reinforcements we are debating are already in motion. In fact, the President's plan to stabilize Baghdad and Anbar Province are already showing signs of success. The Iraqi government is closing down their borders with Syria and Iran, a critical decision that will limit the number of foreign fighters and enemy weapons from entering Iraq, weapons that are being used to kill American soldiers.

Lastly, I would say that our presence in Iraq does not just affect Iraq. The greater Middle East and the security of world are at stake. Are we going to turn a blind eye to Iraq and allow it to become a safe haven for terrorists the way that Afghanistan was under the Taliban regime? I certainly will do all that I can as a U.S. Senator to prevent that from happening because it is in our national interests to defeat our enemies abroad before they can strike us again here at home.

RURAL SCHOOL FUNDING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me speak to you briefly regarding another critical issue and that is the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self-Determination Reauthorization Act.

When we return after our Presidents Day recess, it is vital we re-engage in a critical issue for timber dependent school districts in Idaho and across our country. This bill once referred to as Craig/Wyden, helped many rural school districts move through a difficult time in their history and school children now find themselves in a very difficult situation. As you may know, many rural schools in this country have funding tied directly to timber harvest from our public lands. For several reasons, we haven't harvested timber at our historical rate and our rural schools in those particular counties have suffered.

I am working in a bipartisan way with my colleagues from Montana, Oregon, Washington, California, New Mexico and of course Idaho. We all see the importance of continuing this funding to some extent. I am committed, as is Senator WYDEN, to ensuring the success of the bill that bears our name.

It is my intent, as well as others, to redefine the formula. Our key dates to shape this critical issue are the Energy and Natural Resources hearing scheduled for March 1; as well as the emergency appropriations supplemental debate tentatively scheduled for the middle of March.

The timing is at a critical point. Our timber-dependent county officials and school districts are wrestling with budgets that are tied to this funding. I say today, clearly, failure is not an option.

I yield the floor.

IRANIAN WEAPONS AND IRAQ RESOLUTIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator BOND.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Virginia, truly a Virginia gentlemen and a good friend and a leader. I am most grateful.

I join with my colleague from Idaho in saying Senator LIEBERMAN's statement is one of a true statesman, one we all ought to take to heart. I commend it and I will make that required reading for anybody who asks about this issue.

Three quick points. I was asked yesterday by the media why the drumbeat on Iran. Simple answer: Iran is providing the EFPs, the explosively formed penetrators that are killing more and more Americans. We have tried, by diplomatic pressure, to get Iran to stop. Now we have even caught a leader of the Quds Force, the Iranian elite special forces unit, that reports directly to the ayatollah. They are there. The Iranians' special forces are there.

Some say, well, maybe the top leaders don't know. But how many folks believe your special forces are going to go someplace, have the devices that only Iran can make, and the top leaders not know anything about it? That is why the drumbeat on Iran. We ought to take out the Iranian fighters and stop the weapons coming in.

Secondly, on this resolution, it not only downgrades General Petraeus and says that although we confirmed you unanimously, we don't believe in your mission, but it also says to our allies, the neighboring countries that have been brought in on this new strategy—a new strategy that General Petraeus is implementing—that they shouldn't bother to come in and help us stop the deterioration in Iraq, which could lead to chaos and a takeover, and it also says to the enemy we are not going to be there.

I am taking an intel trip and will not be here for the vote. I am strongly opposed to cloture on this. So by being absent, I will deny those seeking the 60 votes my vote, and I strongly urge my colleagues who are here to vote no.

IRAQ

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to address the issue of the Iraq resolutions.

Tomorrow at 1:45, I will vote for cloture, and I do that for reasons that I will set forth. I, like many of us, have to leave early this afternoon. I have consolidated all my State obligations and speeches between now and late tonight so I may return for the vote.

I want to go back and retrace the history of this debate. When I returned from Iraq, with several other Senators, and Senator LEVIN with me, at that time I was chairman of the Armed Services Committee and he was ranking. I indicated to the Nation by way of a press conference that I felt the situation was going sideways; that our strategy was not working.

Initially, in the days following that, I was highly criticized for those remarks. Eventually, however, others began to recognize the situation as I had, and, indeed, the President, when he was asked publicly if he supported the observations that I had made, said yes. I commend the President for immediately swinging into full gear his whole administration to study intensively the matters with regard to the current strategy. It included work by the Baker-Hamilton group, which I think played a very constructive role.

In the resolution which I prepared, with the assistance of Senator BEN NELSON and Senator COLLINS, we make direct reference to that. I bring up that background because the President then, on January 10, announced his intention to go forward with a changed strategy. The President, in that speech, specifically said:

> If Members have improvements that can be made—I repeat—if Members have improvements that can be made, we will make them. If circumstances change, we will adjust.

Now, that was an open invitation to Members of Congress and others to address this very important plan laid down by the President. Our group, my 2 colleagues who worked with me, Senator LEVIN joining us later, and a half dozen others, some 8 or 10, up almost to 12, joined in an honest forthright way in accepting the President's offer. That is how this started. In drawing up our resolution, we were careful to say, yes, we had different views, but we urged the President to consider all options—I repeat all options—other than the utilization of 21,500 individuals to go into that situation.

Specifically, our resolution charges the Iraqi military with taking the lead, with taking the brunt. I reiterate, the Iraqis should be taking the full measure of responsibility for this Baghdad campaign. Therein rests this Senator's primary concern with the President's plan. I say that because our American GIs have fought bravely, courageously, and we have had sacrifice and loss of life and limb, and in no way have they failed in the attempt to try to help the Iraqi people achieve their freedom, achieve their Government through elections, and to become a sovereign Nation. Now it should fall upon the over 300,000 Iraqi troops, police, and other security officials to bring about the cessation of this violence in Baghdad.

The Iraqis are far better qualified by virtue of their understanding of the language. They have a far better understanding of what is it that is bringing about this sectarian violence. These are the very people we liberated and gave them back their sovereign land and who are now fighting themselves, Sunni upon Shia, Shia upon Sunni, with wanton murder and criminal activity. Our forces do not understand the language. It is hard for those here in this Chamber to go back and look at the origins of the difference between the Sunni and Shia, which go back some 1,400 years. Our troops shouldn't be in there trying to decide do we shoot at a Sunni or do we shoot at a Shia. That should be the responsibility of the Iraqi forces. That is the principal reason I found differences with the President.

Our leaders, the RECORD will reflect, have tried to reconcile the differences between our two sides. The last time I didn't support cloture. I did that to support the institution of the Senate, because this Senate stands apart from the House, and stands apart from legislatures all over the world because of the right and the freedom to debate and for all to bring forth their ideas. We are behind that now. So far as I know, the leaders have done their best and we were not able to achieve agreement, and now, procedurally, we are faced with the situation of a House resolution, which will be voted on in an hour or more, and will then be considered by the Senate. For that purpose, I will vote cloture.

We supported the President in our resolution. As I read the House resolution, it does not reject the President's initiative to have a diplomatic component to his plan. The House resolution does not reject the economic aspect of what the President puts in his plan. So I say to my colleagues that what comes before us does not reject outright the President's program. It directs itself to that military operation, much as we did in S. Con. Res. 7, and says respectfully that we urge the President to consider all options, options that were set forth in testimony before the Armed Services Committee by General Abizaid, when he said we don't need any more troops; by General Casey, when he was up for confirmation and he said he thought we only needed two brigades, not five brigades.

So it is against that background that I think our group has come forth in response to the President's invitation and stated our case in a very respectful way. This matter we will address, the House resolution, I do not believe rejects the entire plan of the President. The components of diplomacy and the components of economics are there. It is only the question of how we employ our forces. I say the burden falls on the Iraqi security forces.

I will submit for the RECORD a New York Times story which appeared this week outlining an operation in which we had 2,500 Americans and less than 100 Iraqi forces turned up to participate. I asked about this yesterday when questioning the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, as to what their idea of the plan had been, and it was represented to us that there were to be joint forces, a joint command.

Certainly this is an early report, and I cannot speak to the authenticity of the article, but I have invited the Department of Defense to comment on it. It indicates to me that the Americans are bearing the brunt, not the Iraqi forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Press, Feb. 16, 2007]

WARNER QUESTIONS CREDIBILITY OF BUSH PLAN

(By David Lerman)

The Democratic chairman and former Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee questioned the credibility of President Bush's new security plan for Baghdad Thursday, citing news reports of an overwhelmingly American-led operation despite administration promises to let Iraqi forces take the lead.

Virginia Sen. John Warner, a senior Republican, used a committee hearing to call attention to a New York Times report that the first major sweep of the Iraqi capital under the new security plan used only 200 Iraqi police and soldiers, but 2,500 Americans.

Warner, who has warned against sending more Americans to combat a low-grade civil war, expressed surprise that the first major security sweep of Baghdad under the new plan would be conducted by so few Iraqi forces. Defense officials had stressed in recent weeks that U.S. troops would be deployed in phases over coming months—with time allowed to measure the commitment of the Iraqi government to beef up its own security.

''I was led to believe that as we moved out in phases, that things would be in place,'' Warner said. ''This is astonishing.''

Warner, who sponsored a resolution opposing Bush's planned surge of 21,500 more American troops, added, ''That falls far short of the public representation made by the administration that this would be a joint operation and that Iraqis would take the lead and we would be in a support role.''

Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich., the committee chairman, said he was dismayed at the reported reliance on U.S. forces, saying it ''runs counter to what we were told the surge would be and how it would be handled.''

Gen. Peter Pace, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, described the new security plan as an Iraqi-led operation during an appearance before Levin's committee earlier this month.

''We will not be out front by plan,'' Pace said of U.S. forces. ''The Iraqis would be the ones going door-to-door, knocking on doors, doing the census work, doing the kinds of work that would put them out in front for the first part of the—if it develops—firefight. Our troops would be available to backstop them and to bring in the kind of fire support we bring in. But it would not be one Iraqi and one U.S. soldier.''

Instead, the security sweep that unfolded Wednesday in three mostly Shiite neighborhoods of northeastern Baghdad was largely an American operation, the New York Times reported from the Iraqi capital.

Gen. Peter Schoomaker, chief of staff of the Army, and Gen. James T. Conway, the Marine Corps commandant, told Warner Thursday they were not familiar with the details of the described security sweep. But Conway added, ''It is counter to what I understand to be the plan as well.''

The public criticism of White House war strategy by two of the Senate's leading voices on defense policy came as the House prepared to vote today on a non-binding resolution opposing Bush's troop surge. Senate Democratic leaders, meanwhile, announced plans to hold a rare Saturday session to vote on whether to consider the same measure after weeks of procedural wrangling.

While the largely symbolic resolution is virtually guaranteed to pass the Democrat-controlled House, the surge in troops is already under way.

Whether it succeeds in quelling the mix of sectarian and insurgent violence in Baghdad as promised could shape public attitudes on Iraq far more profoundly than any vote in Congress.

At the Pentagon late Thursday, Pace defended the progress of Iraqi forces in providing more security. He cited an operation about three weeks ago on Baghdad's Haifa Street, in which the Iraqi army faced down Sunni insurgents, and another in Najaf in which Iraqi forces battled against a Shia stronghold.

''To date, in the operations that have taken place since the prime minister has announced that he wants to have a very balanced approach to the problem, his armed forces have done just that,'' Pace said.

Of the three Iraqi brigades scheduled to be moving into Baghdad, he said, two have moved in and the third is moving this month.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time between now and 2:05 be divided equally between myself and the Senator from Montana.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I ask that I be given sort of a 2-minute notice before the division.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will be notified.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia whom I think has been unbelievably thoughtful, unbelievably patient and courageous in this effort. I had the privilege of traveling with him to Iraq, together with Senator STEVENS. I could see the thought that he was giving then to the ways in which he was visually perceiving that it wasn't working the way it was promised. There is no stronger advocate for our Armed Forces. There is nobody who understands the military better, having just finished a tour as the chair of the Armed Services Committee. I really think the administration should bend over backwards to listen to this Senator who speaks with a voice of great reasonableness. He is greatly respected in the Senate. I thank him for his courage, for being willing to stand up on this issue.

The Congress, all of us, come here with a new responsibility in a sense. The last election could not have been more clear. People all across the country registered their disapproval of the policy that was being executed in Iraq. In fact, the Iraq Study Group report was awaited with enormous anticipation by everybody as an opportunity to bring everybody together and think this through anew and find a way to get a legitimate, across-the-aisle, Republican/Democrat, joint effort in the best interests of our country. I regret to say that the best efforts of former Secretary of State Jim Baker; the former Attorney General, Chief of Staff of the President, Ed Meese; another former Secretary of State, Larry Eagleburger; a former leader in the United States Senate and moderate from the State of Wyoming, Al Simpson; and a former Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry—just to name a group of those who were on the Iraq Study Group—that their efforts were just cast aside. Every recommendation they made was left on the sidelines.

Today we find the President adopting a policy which runs counter even to the advice of his own generals. Rather than listen to the advice, they change the generals and they put people in who would pursue a different policy. General Casey comes back, General Abizaid departs, and the policy goes on.

This institution has a solemn obligation to vote on this issue. It should not be procedurally delayed, and it should not be played around with. The fact is, the American people asked us to accept responsibility for something for which we already have some responsibility because we voted as an institution to empower the President to be able to send troops to Iraq, though many of us who voted for that resolution never voted for the President to abuse the power he was given by ignoring diplomacy, rushing to war, and forgetting to do the planning that they had promised they would do.

Our troops have done their duty. Our troops have served with remarkable courage under the most difficult circumstances. They have a right, together with the American people, to expect that this Congress does its duty. That does not mean avoiding a simple vote. If you are in favor of sending the troops, you have an opportunity tomorrow to register that vote, say you are in favor, stand up and be counted; if you are opposed you should vote no—as the House will do in a short period of time.

Whatever procedural games are played on the floor of the Senate will never erase the perception by the American people of the responsibility that we ought to be exercising. They understand that this is the time and this is the place and they expect us now to execute our responsibility. We owe it to the troops. For all those who come to the Senate floor and talk about supporting the troops, responsibility for the troops, what would be fair for the troops, don't demoralize the troops—there is nothing more demoralizing, I will tell you, as a former troop myself, than having a policy that doesn't work; sending you out on missions which don't have the kind of purpose that you believe can succeed. You send these guys out in these vehicles, waiting to be blown up by an IED, knowing as they hold their breath that they don't have an adequately armored vehicle to be able to withstand it, and they go out and come back and turn to each other and say: What did we accomplish? What did we do? Did we secure a territory? Did we change minds? Did we actually hold onto some advantage gained by driving through a city in that kind of a dangerous situation?

Sending an additional 20,000 of our troops in the middle of a raging civil war is not a sensible policy on any

number of levels. I believe, as a matter of larger strategy, raising the stakes by sending 20,000 additional troops and saying at the same time, publicly, ''This is it, this is our big move, if this doesn't work we don't know what,'' is an unbelievable invitation to those who make mischief to make more mischief. And what's more, the very people who keep saying, ''Don't set a date, don't set a timeline,'' set a timeline on this very deployment because they have come to us and said this is only going to be for a few months. So they announce a timeline on the very escalation that they say is supposed to make the difference and advertise: If you are one of the bad guys, just wait those 3 months. That is what they can do, knowing it is only 3 months.

I think there is a smarter strategy. I think there is a better way to be successful in Iraq, and it involves holding Iraqis accountable and setting legitimate benchmarks for what they ought to be doing. It is incredible to me that some people on the other side would obstruct a debate on the most fundamental issue confronting our country today. We are sent here to be a great deliberative body, and they don't want to deliberate. They don't want to make a decision. They think somehow they can just walk away and avoid responsibility for voting on the question of this escalation.

The majority leader has said they will have every opportunity to vote on that in a short period of time. Every amendment they want to bring they will have an opportunity to bring. We can have, in the meantime, a real vote on Iraq.

Since the end of last month when we started talking about talking about Iraq, 60 American troops have died in Iraq. There is a fellow by the name of Kevin Landeck, whom I just learned yesterday was killed on February 2 by an IED. Kevin Landeck comes from Wheaton, IL. He was a member of a Ranger unit over there. I have a wonderful photograph, a digital photograph on my computer of Kevin and a bunch of his other troops standing on a stairwell celebrating Christmas. The Christmas stockings are all hanging from the stairwell. I am proud that our office—Mary Tarr in our office particularly—has led an effort to help send packages to those troops regularly. Our office sends them boxes full of goodies, at Christmastime particularly—the stockings.

Sadly, Kevin has given his life in the ultimate act of patriotism, a courageous young man, admired by his fellow soldiers. That happened during the time that we couldn't even debate this issue on the floor of the Senate, during a time that the Senate avoided its responsibility.

We have every right to expect that the people who were elected to protect Kevin Landeck and the rest of those troops get this policy right—for their parents, for them, and for all of us.

I believe the only way we are going to do that is, ultimately, to be able to set a target date which gives the President the discretion to keep troops there to complete the training. What other purpose is there to be there? We give the President that discretion. We give him the discretion to leave troops necessary to chase al-Qaida. We give him the discretion to be able to leave troops necessary to protect American forces and facilities. What other purpose would there be, after 4 years, to have us there but to finish the training of the Iraqis and to provide an emergency buffer against Iran and others?

But you don't need to be on patrol in Baghdad, carrying the brunt of a civil war on a daily basis in order to provide that. You can be over the horizon. You can be deployed in garrison. You can be rear deployed. There are any number of ways to protect American interests in the region, and I am tired of our colleagues on the other side suggesting that a policy that clearly advantages America's position in the region, changes the dynamics, shifts responsibility to the Iraqis, and ultimately protects our troops is somehow a policy of abandonment. It is not. It is a policy for success. And it is to be measured against the current policy, which is an invitation to more jihadists.

Our own intelligence agencies are telling us we are building the numbers of jihadists. We are inviting more terror. The world is more dangerous. Iraq is less united. Iran is stronger. Hezbollah is stronger. Hamas is stronger. This is a failed policy, and when a policy is failing, day after day, leaders have an obligation to stop and get it right.

I believe that requires us to have a summit, bring the nations together to solve the issues between the stakeholders and ultimately resolve what our troops are powerless to resolve. A civil war is a struggle for power. We have to resolve that at the diplomatic and negotiating table.

So I strongly believe it is not enough for Congress simply to go on record opposing the President's reckless plan. Congress has an obligation to provide a responsible exit strategy that preserves our interests in the region, retains our ability to protect the security of the United States, and honors the sacrifice our troops have made.

Eight months ago in the Senate, 13 of us stood up against appeals to politics and pride and demanded a date to bring our troops home, to make Iraqis stand up for Iraq and fight a more effective war on terror. But while we lost that roll call, I still believe it was the right policy to put in place, to demand accountability, and to leverage action.

Now, I am more convinced than ever that a combination of serious, sustained diplomacy and the enforcement of benchmarks for progress by the Iraqi government, leveraged by a 1-year deadline for redeployment of U.S. troops, is the best way to achieve our goal of stability in Iraq and security in the region.

That is why I will again introduce legislation that offers a comprehensive strategy for achieving a political solution and bringing our troops home within 1 year. We have to find a way to end this misguided war, and I believe this legislation is the best and most responsible way forward.

Let me emphasize that this strategy does not mean abandoning Iraq in 1 year: in fact, it gives the President the discretion to leave the minimum number of U.S. troops necessary to complete the training of Iraqi security forces, go after terrorists, and protect U.S. facilities and personnel.

This 1-year deadline is not arbitrary. It is consistent with the Iraq Study Group's goal of withdrawing U.S. combat forces from Iraq by the first quarter of 2008—it's consistent with the timeframe for transferring control to the Iraqis set forth by General Casey, and the schedule agreed upon by the Iraqi government itself. Even the President has said that, under his new strategy, responsibility for security would be transferred to Iraqis before the end of this year. It is the opposite of arbitrary. The President has said it, our generals have said it, the Iraq Study Group has said it.

Some say those of us who oppose the President's failed policy in Iraq do not offer an alternative—nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation offers a comprehensive military and diplomatic strategy that incorporates key recommendations of the Iraq Study Group—including many that some of us here have long been advocating—to provide us with the best chance to succeed: holding a summit with all of Iraq's neighbors, including Iran and Syria—creating an international contact group—enforcing a series of benchmarks for meeting key political objectives—shifting the military mission to training Iraqi security forces and conducting targeted counterterrorism operations—and maintaining an over-the-horizon presence to protect our interests throughout the region.

It is time for Iraqis to assume responsibility for their country. We need a timetable which forces Iraqi politicians to confront reality and start making the hard compromises they have resisted thus far. Instead, they are using America's presence as a security blanket. Americans should not be dying to buy time for Iraqi politicians hoping to cut a better deal. We should be working to bring about the compromise that is ultimately the only solution to what is happening today in Iraq. And Iraqi politicians have repeatedly shown they only respond to deadlines—a deadline to transfer authority, deadlines to hold two elections and a referendum, and a deadline to form a government.

Without hard deadlines, our best hopes for progress in Iraq have been repeatedly dashed. When Prime Minister Maliki took power in May, General Casey and Ambassador Khalilzad said the new government had 6 months to make the political compromises necessary to win public confidence and

unify the country. They were right, but with no real deadline to force the new government's hand, that period passed without meaningful action—and we are now seeing the disastrous results.

In fact, for 4 years now, we have been hearing from this administration that progress is right around the corner. We have been hearing the Iraqis are near a deal on oil revenues, that they are making progress towards reconciliation—but we still haven't seen any results.

That is why we must give teeth to the benchmarks agreed upon by the Iraqi government for national reconciliation, security and governance. Meeting these benchmarks is crucial, but without any enforcement mechanism, they are little more than a wish list. That is why this legislation supports the Iraq Study Group proposal to make U.S. political, military, or economic assistance conditional on Iraqis's meeting these benchmarks.

A deadline is also essential to getting Iraq's neighbors to face up to the realities of the security needs of the region. None of them want to see Iraq fall apart. That should be the basis for cooperation in stabilizing Iraq, and yet a sense of urgency has been lacking. This deadline will make clear the stakes and hopefully focus their minds on helping the Iraqis reach a political solution.

We cannot turn back the clock and reverse the decisions that brought us to this pass in Iraq and the Middle East. We cannot achieve the kind of clear and simple victory the administration promised the American people again and again even as Iraq went up in flames. But we can avoid an outright defeat. We can avoid creating the chaos we all say we want to avoid. We can avoid a victory for our adversaries by taking a clear-eyed approach to identifying specifically what we can and cannot accomplish in Iraq.

With a new Congress comes a new responsibility: to get this policy right. That starts with preventing the President from going forward with this senseless escalation. And it has to end with an exit strategy that preserves our core interests in Iraq, in the region, and throughout the world. Only then will we have honored the sacrifices of our troops and the wishes of those who sent us here. Only then will we have done our duty.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I think it is clear that the American people want the Senate to have a debate on this issue. There is no doubt about that. I very much hope that enough Senators, when we vote tomorrow, will vote to invoke cloture so we can do just that, have a debate. I think for the Senate to not vote to invoke cloture would be very irresponsible. I cannot for the life of me imagine why the Senate would not conduct that vote. I very much hope when we have that vote tomorrow that 60 Senators, more than 60 Senators vote in favor of cloture so the Senate can address one of the most fundamental issues that I think is on Americans' minds.

I was going to go to Iraq tonight because I wanted to see firsthand what is going on. I wanted to talk to troops, talk to commanders. I wanted to talk to not only the American personnel but also the Iraqis. I wanted to determine, the best I could, the degree to which Prime Minister Maliki and the Iraqis are able to stand on their own two feet and do what they are supposed to do; that is, govern and run their own country. I am not going to go over tonight, obviously. I want to be here tomorrow and cast my vote so we can start debating. That is the right thing to do.

Based upon what I see in the newspapers, what I see on television, based upon the comments of my colleagues who have recently been to Iraq, I am very disturbed. To put it simply, Iraq is a mess. It is a mess because the United States, to some degree, started it by invading the country and opened up Pandora's box and got the Shias and the Sunnis and the Kurds all stirred up. Now they are fighting each other.

We did a good thing by toppling Saddam Hussein. That was the right thing to do. But we did not think through the consequences. We did not understand what we were doing as a country. We did not have an exit strategy. We did not know what the consequences of occupation would be.

Certainly, the United States, with its very superior Armed Forces, can very easily occupy Iraq—Baghdad. In fact, the occupation was probably a little easier than many people anticipated. But when you go back and talk to generals, talk to defense personnel, talk to analysts, they all—many of them, many of them are very clear in saying that they advised the Pentagon not to go ahead and do this until we knew what we were doing once we got there. It would be a big mistake, many said, to proceed unless we knew what we were doing.

Put simply, there was just no exit strategy. There was none whatsoever. I have read so many reports and quotes of so many generals advising us to not go into Iraq until we knew what we were doing that I am appalled, frankly, at how unprepared the United States was when it went in.

All Americans, if they have any second thoughts about that statement I just made, they, too, would be appalled if they would read those same statements. They are all in the record. They are all in the public domain. I strongly urge people to read them and look at them.

The key here, as has been stated by the Senator from Virginia, the senior Senator from Virginia, is: Can the Iraqis stand up on their own two feet? It is my belief that they are not standing up on their own two feet. Clearly, the continued civil war's death toll indicates that Iraq is not taking control of the situation. There are so many reports that the Iraqi Army is unfit and that they are not doing the job. There are questions about how well it is trained or is being trained. Clearly the answer is, it is not being trained. They are not doing a good job.

My view is it doesn't make much sense to throw more troops, a modest number of more troops, at a failed policy. That is what it comes down to. The Iraqis aren't taking care of themselves, and if they aren't taking care of themselves, why should we take care of them? We have lost so many American lives, so many Montanans, young men and women who have been killed over there, and it makes no sense, in my judgment, to keep doing this.

That is why I think we should vote on this resolution on Monday and, secondly, why I think the resolution should pass. We should not continue a failed policy. I don't know very many people who think the policy is working. Most think it has failed. So let's, as the U.S. Senate, make that statement.

What do we do now? If it has failed, what do we do? I don't think anybody has a simple answer. There is no real silver bullet here. But I do think we need to give the Iraqis a set date and say to them: We are going to get out of here on this set date, and you need to know that. My fear is, if we don't do that, they are just going to keep thinking the United States is going to keep sending more troops and keep taking care of them. It is human nature for them to do so, to think that. That is why I believe we should give them a definite date we will start bringing our troops home.

I also think we have to engage other countries in the region. We are not doing a good job of doing that. This administration says: Well, we can't talk to Iran; we shouldn't do that. We can't talk to Syria; we shouldn't do that. I don't understand that. It seems to me, if you want a solution, you have to talk to people. You have to talk to people who are involved. We are talking to the Saudis, we are talking to the Jordanians, the Israelis, and others in the region. That is good. But two very key players are Iran and Syria.

In life, we talk to our friends, but we should also talk to our enemies. We don't have to agree with our enemies, but we should talk to them. When you start talking to people with whom you have disagreements, after a while you learn there may be a common assumption or two. After a while you might learn something that indicates there is progress. There might be a little bit of daylight once you start talking to somebody. You certainly aren't going to learn anything unless you talk to them. The stakes are so high and the consequences are so great, I strongly urge the administration to start talking to people. So what if the public policy was that we were not going to do that in the past. Don't be stubborn. Don't be too proud. Do what is right.

Just try to talk to the people in the region so we can find some common solutions.

I know it is not going to be easy. It will be very difficult. But I know of no other alternative—no other alternative—but to give them a date and say: we are out of here; by this certain date we are going to start repositioning troops elsewhere in the region. We should tell them that so they sober up more—not just Prime Minister Maliki but the other principals in the country—and realize they have to start getting their act together. As I said, we need to have some very serious negotiations with groups in the region and also with countries in the region so we can manage the situation as best we possibly can.

This is one of the most serious issues I have confronted since I have been in the Senate in the last several years, and I commend my colleagues for addressing it so seriously. It is the right thing to do. But it is also the right thing to do to start debating this issue in the Senate. I think we will be doing the country a great service if we do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that for the next 30 minutes, I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes and that Senator KYL be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes and Senator THOMAS be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the resolution, S. 574, the Senate will vote in relation to tomorrow. This resolution states simply that:

> No. 1, Congress and the American people will continue to support and protect the members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving or who have served bravely and honorably in Iraq; and No. 2, Congress disapproves of the decision of President George W. Bush announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional U.S. combat troops to Iraq.

Mr. President, the first paragraph of that resolution is a commendable one and one every Member of this body should support, and will. However, the second paragraph is simply inconsistent with a vote every Member has already made and should be opposed by every Member of this body. Therefore, the resolution as a whole should be opposed.

Exactly 3 weeks ago, on January 26, the Senate unanimously approved GEN David Petraeus for his fourth star and to be commander of multinational forces in Iraq. No Senator opposed his nomination. In my 12 years in the Congress, I do not think I have seen Members of Congress express any higher confidence or support for a nominee for any position than they have for GEN David Petraeus. I have not heard anyone criticize him, and rightly so.

In his nomination hearing, when asked about his opinion of the President's plan for Iraq that he now has the responsibility of executing, General Petraeus said:

> I believe this plan can succeed if, in fact, all of those enablers and all the rest of the assistance is in fact provided.

General Petraeus supports this plan. Now, the same Senate that voted unanimously to confirm General Petraeus is going to vote on whether they agree with the plan he supports and that they confirmed him to execute. That vote has not been taken yet, so obviously we don't know the outcome.

Some people would like to mislead the American people into thinking that Republicans are opposed to debating Iraq and the various resolutions in Iraq. In fact, Republicans welcome that debate, and that is why many of us are here today. However, Republicans rightfully oppose the Democrats' dictating what resolutions can be considered.

If Senators truly disapprove of this decision, they should be willing to vote for or against a resolution that clearly expresses their convictions, and that is exactly what Senator GREGG's resolution does. However, Democrats are not willing to do that. Senator GREGG's resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that:

> No funds should be cut off or reduced from American troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or ability to complete their assigned missions.

If Senators truly do not support the mission we are sending General Petraeus and our men and women in uniform to carry out, then they should be willing to have an up-or-down vote on the Gregg resolution.

For the record, let me restate my position on the proposed troop increase. Several weeks ago, President Bush addressed the situation in Iraq before the American people, and everyone was anxious to hear his plans for a new strategy. It is clear that Americans want a victory in Iraq; however, they do not want our presence there to be open-ended. I agree, and most importantly, I believe it is time for the Iraqi Government to step up and take responsibility. They need to take control of their country, both militarily and politically. I believe the Iraqis must deliver on their promises.

I come from a strong and proud military State, home to 13 military installations, and our service men and women have answered the call of duty and performed courageously. No one questions our troops' performance and unwavering commitment, and we will continue to support them. Many of our troops, including the 3rd Infantry Division based at Fort Stewart, GA, and Fort Benning, GA, are preparing to head overseas, some for their third tour of duty in Iraq, as we speak today.

The President's decision to send additional combat brigades to Baghdad and Anbar Province in western Iraq is aimed at defeating the insurgency in those areas and increasing stability for the Iraqi people. However, we must also see an increased commitment from the Iraqis. This is also part of the new strategy, and I am committed to holding the administration and the Iraqis accountable in this area. Those of us in Congress have a responsibility to ask questions and seek answers on behalf of the American people when our strategy and tactics are not getting the job done.

I have expressed my concern and frustration with progress on the part of the Iraqis not only to the President and the White House advisers but to our military leadership testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee as well. In my conversations with the White House and with the Department of Defense leadership, I have made it clear that my support of any increase in troops is conditioned upon those troops being sent on a specific mission and upon the completion of that mission that they should be redeployed.

I firmly believe that just a large increase in troops without having a specific mission will only increase insurgent opposition and that a withdrawal of U.S. forces at this time would be detrimental to Iraq's security and extremely dangerous for American soldiers. That particular issue has been affirmed by every single individual in the U.S. military testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Failure in Iraq will result in expanded and intensified conflict in the Middle East, and that kind of instability is clearly not in the best interests of America or the international community.

Now that the President has taken serious steps to admit his mistakes, take responsibility, and revise the strategy, Americans do seek positive results. It has been said by many of my colleagues, as well as many of my own constituents, that the situation in Iraq requires a political and not a military solution. I strongly agree with that position. However, it is not possible, in my opinion, to have a political solution or to make political progress if citizens are afraid to leave their homes for fear of being shot or kidnaped or if they are afraid to let their children go to school because it is unsafe to do so. Some level of order and stability must be in place before a political solution can take hold.

In America, we take order and stability for granted because we are blessed to live in a country that is extremely safe, secure, and stable. However, Iraq is not the same as the United States. They do not live in a secure and stable society, and order and stability must be in place before there can be

any hope for a long-term political solution. The additional troops we are sending are meant to create that order and stability, particularly in Baghdad. Unfortunately, the Iraqi military and Government is not yet mature enough to do that job themselves, so we are partnering with them to help them succeed.

There is nothing easy or pretty about war, and this war is no exception. This war has not gone as well as any of us had hoped. Additionally, the President's new plan, which is already being carried out in Iraq, is not guaranteed to work. However, it is my firm conviction that the President's plan deserves a chance to succeed, and we in the Congress should do all we can to help it succeed. The Reid resolution does not do that. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture on the motion to proceed to the Reid resolution tomorrow. The resolution opposes the President's plan without offering any alternative. It opposes the mission which the Senate has unanimously confirmed General Petraeus to carry out.

I urge a vote against the implementation of cloture tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, speaking to this resolution, I wish to be clear that it had been my intention to cast a ''no'' vote to proceeding to this nonbinding resolution. The majority, of course, has to muster 60 votes in order to proceed on that particular resolution.

I believe my time will be more productive fulfilling a commitment I have made to lead a trip to Iraq. Without disclosing when or precisely where we will be in the Middle East, I will tell my colleagues that I will be able to personally deliver a message not only to our troops of support of the American people for their mission but also hopefully to deliver a message directly to the Prime Minister of Iraq that we expect him to continue to fulfill the commitments he has made to carry out this new strategy, which has signs of success already, and to learn directly, firsthand from our commanders and troops on the ground, their assessment of how this new mission is proceeding. What the Congress needs to do is to provide assistance and to be able to bring home a report unfiltered through the media of precisely where the conditions stand right now.

While I would have voted no, in effect, I will be voting no by my presence in Iraq.

There are three reasons I oppose the resolution to move forward with this particular nonbinding resolution. First of all, we have been debating almost nonstop this subject of Iraq, now, for several weeks—both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. So there has been no lack of debate.

Rest assured that Republicans are committed to continuing this debate for as long as the American people believe it is productive. We welcome debate. We also welcome something else: The opportunity to express ourselves in a meaningful way, not simply on a nonbinding resolution. We have no objection to voting on this nonbinding resolution as long as we can also vote on something that is actually more meaningful than that, and that is a resolution that demonstrates we will not withdraw support for our troops. We aim to support them in their mission.

Having been precluded, blocked, for being able to have a vote on that resolution, what we are saying is that we should move forward with the debate, but until the majority leader is willing to provide Members a vote on the resolution for support of the troops, we should not be voting on other resolutions.

I think this is time for Democrats to take a stand. Either you support the troops in the battlefield or you don't, none of this sort of slow bleed and nonbinding resolution debate. The nonbinding resolution obscures your true position. It seems to me, if you merely seem to tell the President you don't like what he is doing, you have plenty of opportunities to do that, but a resolution can have a very deleterious effect on the morale of our troops, on our enemies who see it as a sign of weakness, and perhaps on our allies who wonder if we see the mission through.

If you are serious about stopping this effort because you believe it has failed or cannot succeed, obviously you need to do what Congress has the ability to do and that is vote no on the funding of the troops.

Instead, what we have been told is that in the House of Representatives, after this first step of the nonbinding resolution, there will be a second step, this slow-bleed strategy, a concept that says Congress will begin to micromanage how troops are deployed in the field and around the world and equipment provided to them, and that will determine whether any will receive Congress's continued support.

We cannot condition our support for the troops. They need to know that when we send them into harm's way, they will have everything they need from reinforcements to equipment. This sort of slow-bleed strategy that has been announced over in the House of Representatives is extraordinarily dangerous and deleterious to our mission.

First of all, it seems to me there are some signs of success. This is the first reason I would have voted no on the resolution. We do need to give the new strategy the President has announced a chance to succeed.

There are plenty of stories, and I will have them printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, about some initial successes—the Shiite militia leaders appearing to leave their strongholds in Baghdad in anticipation of our plan to increase our activities there.

The powerful Shiite cleric, Moqtada al-Sadr has left Iraq, spending his time in Iran away from the danger that might await him if he stayed in Baghdad.

In Al Anbar Province in the west, the tribal sheiks have now significantly begun to align themselves with the United States, as a result of which we have been able to recruit hundreds more police officers who were not possible to recruit in the past.

A real sign is the fact that Sunni and Shiite Arab lawmakers have announced plans to form two new political blocs in Iraq. The Iraqi military is taking a significantly, more robust role, now ordering tens of thousands of residents to leave homes—these are the so-called squatters—that they are occupying illegally, and, instead, saying they will have the original owners of those homes come back. This is important because the people who have been displaced or dispossessed primarily are Sunnis. The Shiite militias came in and kicked them out and allowed squatters in their home.

It is highly significant the Iraqi Government has said, through a LTG Aboud Qanbar, who is leading this new crackdown, that they are going to close the borders with Iran and Syria, they are going to extend the curfew in Baghdad, set up new checkpoints and reoccupy the houses that have been occupied by the illegal Shiites.

Another significant change, they actually raided a Shiite mosque which was a center of illegally armed militias, kidnapping, torture and murder activities and a place where a good deal of weapons had been stored. This, in the past, had not been done. But it is now being done, all as a part of Maliki's commitment to change the rules of engagement and to commit himself to support politically the victories that had been occurring on the ground militarily but which were fleeting because when you capture people and put them in jail, if the politicians get them out of jail the next day, you have gained nothing. We need to give it a chance.

I referred to former Representative Hamilton of the Hamilton-Baker Commission, who said in testimony:

> So I guess my bottom line on the surge is, look, the president's plan ought to be given a chance. Give it a chance, because we heard all of this. This that you confirmed . . . the day before yesterday, this is his idea. He's the supporter of it. Give it a chance.

Second, we need to support this mission and oppose the nonbinding resolution opposed to it because it would send a horrible message not only to our troops and military leaders but to our allies and to our enemies.

General Petraeus, whom I mentioned a moment ago, at his confirmation hearing got this question from Senator LIEBERMAN.

> Senator LIEBERMAN: You also said in response to a question from Senator McCain that adoption of a resolution of disapproval . . . would not . . . have a beneficial effect on our troops in Iraq. But I want to ask you, what effect would Senate passage of a resolution of disapproval of this new way ahead

that you embrace—what effect would it have on our enemies in Iraq?

Lieutenant General PETRAEUS: Sir, as I said in the opening statement, this is a test of wills, at the end of the day. And in that regard . . . a commander of such an endeavor would obviously like the enemy to feel that there's no hope.

Senator LIEBERMAN: And a resolution—a Senate passed resolution of disapproval for this new strategy in Iraq would give the enemy some encouragement, some feeling that—well, some clear expression that the American people are divided.

Lieutenant General PETRAEUS: That's correct, sir.

Soldiers believe the same thing. From ABC News, on February 13, they asked Army 1SG Louis Barnum what they thought of the resolution. They had strong words. Here is what one said:

Makes me sick. I'm a born and raised Democrat—it makes me sad.

On the NBC nightly news, January 26, interview of three of our soldiers.

SPC Tyler Johnson said:

Those people are dying. You know what I am saying? You may support—'oh, we support the troops' but you're not supporting what they do, what they share and sweat for, what they believe for, what we die for. It just don't make sense to me.

SSG Manuel Sahagun:

One thing I don't like is when people back home say they support the troops but they don't support the war. If they're going to support us, support us all the way.

There was in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, February 15, a poignant communication from an Army sergeant whose name is Daniel Dobson. He said:

The question has been posed to me recently what congressional resolution hurts troops morale the most. No doubt we would be happy to come home tomorrow. But the thought is bittersweet. Most servicemembers will tell you the same thing: There is no honor in retreat . . . and there is no honor in what the Democrats have proposed. It stings me to the core to think that Americans would rather sell their honor than fight for a cause. Those of us who fight [for peace] know all too well that peace has a very bloody price tag.

The American people believe this as well. FOX News, according to an opinion dynamics poll in the last couple of days, 47 percent of the American people say it is more likely to encourage the enemy and hurt troop morale compared with 24 percent who think it would make a positive difference to the policy of the United States toward Iraq.

So we better be careful what kind of message is sent through a so-called nonbinding resolution. It would not change the course of what we are doing on the ground in Iraq, but it can certainly affect our enemy and the morale of our troops and our allies.

I conclude by saying it seems to me it would be a huge mistake to proceed to vote only on a resolution which is acknowledged by its proponents as being merely a first step toward a second step of reducing and ultimately removing support for the troops whom we have sent into harm's way. Far better it would be for us to continue this debate at the conclusion of which we would vote on another resolution which would explicitly express our support for our troops and their mission.

To expound in further detail, I oppose this resolution and would vote ''no'' on taking it up without considering other resolutions first, because it would put a halt to the progress which has begun to occur in Iraq since the President announced new strategy. Some examples:

SHIITE MILITIAS LEAVE SADR CITY

Shiite militia leaders already appear to be leaving their strongholds in Baghdad in anticipation of the U.S. and Iraqi plan to increase the troop presence in the Iraqi capital, according to the top U.S. commander in the country. ''We have seen numerous indications Shia militia leaders will leave, or already have left, Sadr City to avoid capture by Iraqi and coalition security forces,'' Army Gen. George W. Casey, Jr. said in a written statement submitted to the Senate Armed Services Committee as part of his confirmation hearing today to be Army chief of staff.

MOQTADA AL-SADR LIVING IN IRAN

The powerful Shiite cleric Moqtada al-Sadr has left Iraq and has been living in Iran for the past several weeks . . . With fresh American forces arriving in Baghdad as part of the White House plan to stabilize the capital, officials in Washington suggested that Mr. Sadr might have fled Iraq to avoid being captured or killed during the crackdown.

SUNNIS BATTLE AL QAEDA IN AL ANBAR

Before tribal sheiks aligned themselves with U.S. forces in the violent deserts of western Iraq, the number of people willing to become police officers in the city of Ramadi—the epicenter of the fight against the insurgent group known as al-Qaeda in Iraq—might not have filled a single police pickup. ''Last March was zero,'' said Maj. Gen. Richard C. Zilmer, the Marine commander in western Iraq, referring to the number of men recruited that month. With the help of a confederation of about 50 Sunni Muslim tribal sheiks, the U.S. military recruited more than 800 police officers in December and is on track to do the same this month. Officers credit the sheiks' cooperation for the diminishing violence in Ramadi, the capital of Anbar province.

SUNNIS AND SHIITES MOVE AWAY FROM SECTARIANISM

Sunni and Shiite Arab lawmakers announced plans [January 31] to form two new blocs in Iraq's parliament they hope will break away from the ethnic and religious mold of current alliances and ease sectarian strife. But though both blocs said they hoped to eventually draw in members of all ethnic and religious groups, one initially will be made up entirely of Shiite Muslim politicians and the other of Sunni Muslims.

IRAQ MILITARY TAKING A LEADING ROLE

The Iraqi government on Tuesday ordered tens of thousands of Baghdad residents to leave homes they are occupying illegally, in a surprising and highly challenging effort to reverse the tide of sectarian cleansing that has left the capital bloodied and balkanized. In a televised speech, Lt. Gen. Aboud Qanbar, who is leading the new crackdown, also announced the closing of Iraq's borders with Iran and Syria, an extension of the curfew in Baghdad by an hour, and the setup of new checkpoints run by the Defense and Interior Ministries, both of which General Qanbar said he now controlled.

IRAQI SECURITY FORCES RAID SHIITE MOSQUE

A U.S. military spokesman on Thursday hailed a joint American-Iraqi raid on Baghdad's leading Shiite Muslim mosque as proof that the Baghdad security plan is being applied evenly against all sides of the country's sectarian divide. In a statement released Thursday, the U.S. military said the mosque was raided ''during operations targeting illegally armed militia kidnapping, torture and murder activities.'' It said the mosque had been used ''to conduct sectarian violence against Iraqi civilians as well as a safe haven and weapons storage area for illegal militia groups.'' Sunni Muslims have reported being held and beaten in the mosque, but little had been done about it before. The Supreme Council's armed wing, the Badr Organization, has been accused of kidnapping and torturing Sunnis. The statement said U.S. forces guarded the area around the mosque while Iraqi soldiers entered it with the cooperation of its security guards.

BAKER AND HAMILTON HAVE URGED THE SENATE TO CAPITALIZE ON THIS PROGRESS

Hamilton: So I guess my bottom line on the surge is, look, the president's plan ought to be given a chance. Give it a chance, because we heard all of this. The general that you confirmed 80–to-nothing the day before yesterday, this is his idea. He's the supporter of it. Give it a chance.

Baker: And let me . . . read from the report with respect to this issue of the surge, because there are only two conditions upon our support for a surge. One is that it be short-term and the other is that it be called for by the commander in Iraq. President Bush said this is not an open-ended commitment. Secretary Gates said this is a temporary surge and . . . General Petraeus is the guy that's to carry it out and he was the person that originally recommended it.

I also oppose this resolution because I believe it would send a horrible message to our troops and our military leaders, our allies and our enemies.

The majority leader has said that he doesn't think the resolution ''matters'' substantively, and that the politics are all that is important. He said:

Well, it doesn't matter what resolution we move forward to. You know, I can count. I don't know if we'll get 60 votes. But I'll tell you one thing: There are 21 Republicans up for reelection this time.

I believe, contrary to the opinion of the Majority Leader, that the nonbinding words in this resolution do matter. Here's why.

General Petraeus Believes the resolution hurts his Mission.

This is from Petraeus' confirmation hearing:

Senator LIEBERMAN. You also said in response to a question from Senator McCain that adoption of a resolution of disapproval, . . . would not . . . have a beneficial effect on our troops in Iraq. But I want to ask you, what effect would Senate passage of a resolution of disapproval of this new way ahead that you embrace—what effect would it have on our enemies in Iraq?

Lieutenant General PETRAEUS. Sir, as I stated in the opening statement, this is a test of wills, at the end of the day. And in that regard . . . a commander in such an endeavor would obviously like the enemy to feel that there's no hope.

Senator LIEBERMAN. And a resolution—a Senate-passed resolution of disapproval for this new strategy in Iraq would give the enemy some encouragement, some feeling that—well, some clear expression that the American people were divided.

Lieutenant General PETRAEUS: That's correct, sir. Soldiers believe the resolution undermines them.

ABC News, Feb. 13:

ABC News recently asked Army sergeants in Ramadi what they thought of the resolution, and they had strong words.

''Makes me sick,'' said First Sgt. Louis Barnum. [I'm] born and raised a Democrat—it makes me sad.''

''I don't want to bad mouth the president at all. To me[,] that is treason,'' said SGT. Brian Orzechowski.

From NBC Nightly News, January 26:

Specialist Tyler Johnson:

Those people are dying. You know what I'm saying? You may support—''Oh, we support the troops,'' but you're not supporting what they do, what they share and sweat for, what they believe for, what we die for. It just don't make sense to me.

SSG Manuel Sahagun:

One thing I don't like is when people back home say they support the troops but they don't support the war. If they're going to support us, support us all the way.

SPC Peter Manna:

If they don't think we're doing a good job, everything that we've done here is all in vain.

From Fort-Worth Star Telegram, February 15, 2007:

Army SGT Daniel Dobson:

The question has been posed to me recently what congressional resolution hurts troop morale the most. No doubt we would be happy to come home tomorrow. But the thought is bittersweet. Most service members would tell you the same thing: There is no honor in retreat . . . and there is no honor in what the Democrats have proposed. It stings me to the core to think that Americans would rather sell their honor than fight for a cause. Those of us who fight for [peace] know all too well that peace has a very bloody price tag.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC BELIEVES THAT THE RESOLUTION UNDERMINES THE TROOPS

From FOX NEWS quoting an opinion dynamics poll:

47 percent say it is more likely to encourage the enemy and hurt troop morale, compared with 24 percent who think it would make a positive difference to U.S. policy toward Iraq.

Finally, this resolution is but the first step in a ''slow bleed'' strategy, and should be rejected for that reason as well.

Democrats claim that they just want an up or down vote on this resolution to send a message to the President, but I fear that the real plan is much more expansive. If this resolution passes, votes to cut off support for our troops and micromanaging the war won't be far behind.

In the other Chamber, Representative MURTHA has made it clear that he intends to bleed our troops of support for their mission in Iraq. Speaking about his resolution, MURTHA said: ''They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment, they don't have the training and they won't be able to do the work. There's no question in my mind.''

Speaker PELOSI essentially endorsed this slow-bleed strategy, according to reports in The Poltico this morning.

Those who believe that this vote is a simple gesture, and that it will be the last word on the ''surge'' from this body, then why did Senator FEINGOLD say on the floor just this morning that the Warner resolution is a ''first step''? Please listen to these additional quotes from some of my Democratic colleagues:

This is from the Foreign Relations Committee, January 24, 2007:

Senator BIDEN: But there's also one other thing, and I commit to everyone today, and I will end with this: that unless the President demonstrates very quickly that he is unlikely to continue down the road he's on, this will be only the first step in this committee. I will be introducing—I know Senator DODD may today introduce and another may—I know Senator OBAMA, Senator KERRY, probably all of you have binding, constitutionally legitimate, binding pieces of legislation. We will bring them up.

On ''Meet The Press,'' January 28, 2007:

Mr. Russert: Do you believe that it's inevitable Democrats will cut funding for the war off?

Senator SCHUMER: Well, we'll certainly ratchet up the pressure against President Bush. The bottom line is that this escalation, for instance, is so poorly received, not just by Democrats, but by all of the American people. Our first step will be this sense of the Senate resolution. But it's only the first step.

From Speaker PELOSI, February 13, 2007:

A vote of disapproval will set the stage for additional Iraq legislation which will be coming to the House floor.

If our Democratic colleagues don't intend to make this resolution the ''first step'' in a campaign to cut off funding for our operations in Iraq, then why won't they allow a vote on the Gregg resolution?

In summary, debate? Yes. But votes that are meaningful—not just on a critical non-binding resolution but on a commitment of support for our troops and their mission as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. I certainly agree it would be a mistake to send any message that we are not in support of our troops and, indeed, that is what voting on one message would do. Certainly, there are different views in the Senate and legitimately so. We recognize that. That is the way it is in Congress.

I resist a little bit the idea that has come up on the other side of the aisle that we have not talked about this, we have not debated it. I say we have talked about it, we have talked about it for several months. We have debated it. There is clearly a difference of view. Most everyone has the same idea that the situation must be changed and must be improved there. No one argues with that.

The issue is that we can back off and deny the support we have for what we have accomplished or we can move forward with the President, who has a change in plan. That is something we need to remember. We are not talking about simply continuing to do the same thing. We have new leadership there, we have some new strategies there, we have some ideas as to what might be done.

Our troops continue to do an incredible job, but it has not gone as well as we would like. Therefore, it is appropriate that we make some changes. In order to make some changes, it is probably necessary to change the arrangement we have, change the numbers so we can do something and to begin again to devise a movement that will get us out of there in a relatively short time.

Our military leaders know that. They accept that. Their plans embrace that idea that we have to do something different, that we have to start coming to some transition and conclusion. The President also has acknowledged this.

It is not simple. None of us like war. None of us like to have our troops at risk, there is no question about that. But the fact is there exists a terrorism threat to the United States, somewhat centered in this area. The fact is, we need to complete the task and to be able to turn some stability over to a government in Iraq that can move forward.

The United States cannot complete this mission alone. And the Iraqis, of course, must keep their commitment to do more than they have. Fortunately, we are seeing some movement in that direction. We are seeing the support building, and we need to continue to press for that with the surrounding countries.

The President has made it very clear to the Iraqi President that our support is not open-ended. I hope we continue to do that.

The administration has installed new leadership. We have had good performance there, but we need to be moving in a somewhat different direction, a change from what we are doing. That is the plan. That is what it is all about.

I am a little discouraged that we act as if we have not talked about it, we act as if we have not made a move upon it, and now we have a nonbinding resolution. But as the previous speaker said, we also need to offer more than one amendment. There are different options. We have to recognize the Senate is close in numbers, and we have some differences. We have to have an opportunity to talk about different things. Hopefully, that is what this is all about.

It is peculiar political posturing to sound off with sense-of-the-Senate resolutions on the heels of having unanimously confirmed the general who is going over there to take over. He has a plan. It would be discouraging to him, I am sure, to learn we are sending him over there, but we are not going to do the things he needs to do. It is important for folks to understand this plan does not involve just sending troops and put a bandaid on the problem. We have commitments from the Iraqi Government to step up security and reconciliation efforts. We need to make

decisions from where we are now at this point in the fight to move in a somewhat different direction.

One thing is for sure. We are not moving the ball by just talking from the sidelines. Here we have an opportunity to do that—not a never-ending commitment but one to make some changes, complete this task. However, of course, it is a little premature to be debating a nonbinding resolution but, nevertheless, we have different views and that is where we are, and that is fine. But I think, in fairness, politically, we do need to have the opportunity to act on more than just a single amendment so we can have some chance to talk about other items that have an impact on Iraq.

The resolution will only serve to score political points and undermines our efforts to achieve a positive result in what we are seeking to do. So I am concerned today with respect to this process, but we can make it work. And we need to make it work. Here we are. Let's make sure we have an opportunity to make it balanced, we have an opportunity to talk about both sides, we have an opportunity to talk about some of the other kinds of opportunities.

The majority will not let the minority offer amendments, and they should. This is not a one-sided debate, and there are certain items we need to discuss.

Leader MCCONNELL has made more than one good-faith effort to meet the majority in the middle of the aisle, and we, I hope, will continue to do that. We must do that. We have proposed to give the majority the votes they want if they will simply give us the votes we would like to have. That seems to make a great deal of sense.

So we are in sort of a procedural tie-up on something for which we know there are differences on the policy, clearly, and we will simply have to work on that. And we have to recognize the responsibility and the commitment the President has made and the plan he has to change things there so we can go forward. So we need to give the troops and the Iraqis the opportunity to work more to change the situation there.

So the purpose of this whole exercise, of course, is to put a government in place in Iraq so they can take care of themselves, for us to be able to remove our being there and our commitment there. I think we have a chance to do this. So I hope if we are going to move, we have a chance to move on more than one opportunity and one resolution. And I think that will be the case.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I come before the body today to let my colleagues know I intend to vote for cloture on the single and simple resolution that will be before this body tomorrow afternoon.

When one looks at the content of what is included in this resolution, it is very simple. In its simplest terms, it says, firsts and foremost, we support our troops. We support our troops. Who in this body would disagree with that statement?

Secondly, it makes another statement, another important but very simple statement, and that is that we disagree with the President's plan to add an additional 21,500 troops into Iraq. We disagree with the President's plan.

That is a simple resolution. We should be able to bring that resolution to this floor. We should be able to have it debated. And we should be able to have an up-or-down vote on that resolution.

I wish it were otherwise. I wish that, in fact, we were debating the various resolutions that have been suggested that we debate on this floor by the majority leader in the last week, where he has offered the minority leader on the Republican side the opportunity to come in and debate the Warner resolution, the McCain-Lieberman resolution, as well as this resolution, and a number of different configurations which have been offered to the minority party.

But the reality today is this Chamber, through the minority party, wants to stop a vote on any resolution relating to Iraq. They simply want to stop a vote. What we need to do as a Chamber, in my view, is to move forward with the deliberation of the great Senators who are a part of this Senate and have a robust debate on Iraq that sets forth the different alternatives that have been presented and come to some kind of conclusion that gives direction to America and to this country on how we ought to move forward in Iraq.

I wish we were here in part debating the Warner-Levin resolution because when you think about the content of the Warner-Levin resolution, in that resolution you also find what I believe is the best of what we have to offer. You have a thoughtful proposal that says, yes, we disagree with the President, but we also have a new direction in which we believe we ought to march forward in Iraq. That bipartisan resolution, that was largely drafted by Senator WARNER and Senator NELSON and Senator COLLINS, of which I am a cosponsor, is a way forward. It is a way to describe a new direction for us as we move forward in Iraq.

I also wish we were here today and tomorrow, and even into next week, debating the resolution which has been brought forward by my dear friends, Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator MCCAIN. They have a different point of view than other Members of this body. They have a different point of view than Senator WARNER and I do with respect to how we ought to move forward in Iraq. But, nonetheless, they are people of good faith who have a point of view that ought to be debated in this body, and we ought to have a vote on it.

Unfortunately, the procedural mechanisms which have been put forward by the minority party will keep us from actually debating that particular resolution and having a debate and a vote on that resolution.

I believe the ultimate goal we all have in this Chamber is we want to have peace in Iraq, and we want to have a peaceful Middle East. But I also believe that unless we are able to find some way of working together in a bipartisan manner, that key ingredient of how we find a peaceful avenue in Iraq and in the Middle East is going to elude us.

For sure, today is simply one of the opening chapters of the great debate we will have in this Chamber in the weeks and months, perhaps even in the years, ahead with respect to how we move forward in Iraq and how we move forward in the Middle East. Without a sense of bipartisanship, we will not be able to find that unity which is an essential ingredient for us to be able to move forward.

It dismays me we have not been able to find the bipartisanship to get us to the 60-vote threshold so we can move forward and have a robust debate on this issue that will be before the body tomorrow, as well as other issues and resolutions that would be brought forward by my colleagues.

As I speak at this time, the House of Representatives—just right down the hallway from where I stand right now—is about ready to begin a vote—a vote—on this very simple resolution. And again, its simplicity defies any logic as to why we would not want to vote on it in the Senate. It is very simple: We support our troops, and we disagree with the President's proposed escalation of troops by 21,500.

It is right that we are here this afternoon and into Saturday debating the vote on that simple resolution. That resolution addresses the most critical and important issue before our Nation today. I deeply regret the Senate has been prevented from voting on a similar resolution, and that is why I will vote for cloture on this resolution tomorrow. I believe the Senate has an obligation—it has an obligation—to debate and to vote on the issue that is most important to America today.

For me, my constituents in Colorado know where I stand. I am a cosponsor of the bipartisan resolution which Senator WARNER and Senator NELSON and Senator COLLINS and others have worked on for some time. That resolution states in clear terms that the Senate disagrees with the President's plan to send more troops to Iraq. And, at the same time, that resolution truly offers a new way for us to move forward with this seemingly intractable problem we face in that part of the world.

I have referred to the Warner resolution as a new way forward, a new plan, a plan C, if you will, because it finds a middle ground between the President's plan A, which is to escalate the military effort in Iraq, and plan B, which is pushed by some American citizens in

each one of our offices every day who say we should immediately leave Iraq—we should immediately leave Iraq. From my point of view, the bipartisan resolution we came up with offers a new direction forward.

Our bipartisan group believes what we need to do is to have a new strategy in Iraq, one based on demanding long-overdue compromises from the Iraqi Government, vigorous counterterrorism activity, continued support of our troops in the field, protecting the territorial integrity of Iraq, and a very robust and enhanced diplomatic effort in that region and in Iraq itself.

The new way forward reflected in the Warner resolution is based on a number of key principles, as follows:

First, the central goal of the American mission in Iraq should be to encourage the Iraqi Government to make the political compromises that are necessary to foster reconciliation and to improve the deteriorating security situation in Iraq.

Second, the American military strategy should be focused on maintaining the territorial integrity of Iraq, denying terrorists a safe haven, promoting regional stability, bringing security to Baghdad, and training—and training—and equipping the Iraqi forces.

These are important principles, and they continue.

Third, we say what we would like to see happen in Iraq is that the United States should engage the nations in that region to develop a regional peace and reconciliation process.

Fourth, we believe the United States should continue to engage in a strong counterterrorism activity, chasing down al-Qaida wherever al-Qaida might be.

Fifth, the American mission in Iraq should be conditioned upon the Iraqi Government meeting certain benchmarks, including ensuring an equitable distribution of oil revenues in that country.

And sixth, Congress should not eliminate or reduce funds for troops in the field because the brave men and women fighting this war need our support while they are in harm's way.

I believe plan C offers us the right way forward. It is my hope that resolution ultimately would be adopted by a large bipartisan group of Senators in this body.

I would like to discuss in further detail a couple of the key elements, at least in terms of how I see it, on how we move forward, on how we improve the security situation along Iraq's borders, and the need for an enhanced and much more robust diplomatic effort.

I believe the territorial integrity of Iraq, security along Iraq's borders, and, for that matter, security in the region is linked with the need for a renewed and vigorous diplomatic push.

The bipartisan Iraq Study Group stated in very simple terms:

> The United States must build a new international consensus for stability in Iraq and the region. In order to foster such a consensus, the United States should embark on a robust diplomatic effort to establish an international support structure intended to stabilize Iraq and ease tensions in other countries in the region.

In addition, the public portion of the National Intelligence Estimate—which was a consensus document produced by the 16 agencies comprising the national intelligence community—mentioned three things which could ''help to reverse the negative trends driving Iraq's current trajectory.'' It is important to note that each of these three strategies proposed by the NIE are fundamentally diplomatic and political, as opposed to military.

They are, first of all, a recommendation that the broader Sunni acceptance of the current political structure and federalism be brought about; secondly, that significant concessions by Shia and Kurds are required to create space for Sunni acceptance of federalism; and, third, a bottom-up approach is needed to help mend the frayed relationships between the tribal and religious groups.

The two most important documents produced on the Iraq war over the past 6 months, the Iraq Study Group report and the public portions of the NIE, recommend a renewed diplomatic and political effort as a keystone for security inside Iraq and in the region.

This is no surprise when you consider the situation along the borders of Iraq. To the east, we know of the damage Iran can potentially cause by crossing the relatively porous border in order to promote the Shia cause. Not only that, but Iran has steadfastly ignored the U.N.'s demand to halt their nuclear activities. To the south and west, Saudi Arabia might eventually decide to intervene on the side of the Sunnis, should the situation further deteriorate. To the north and west, of course, is Syria, which has a largely uncontrolled border with Iraq, across which foreign fighters and arms and terrorists cross even today as I speak. To the north is Turkey, which is watching the situation in Iraq and might decide to intervene in order to prevent an independent Kurdistan. Finally, Jordan, to the west, is feeling the strain of the massive influx of Iraqi refugees into their country, which could have a destabilizing effect on a country which is such an important ally of the United States.

Given the potential crisis on Iraq's east, west, north, and south borders, given the complex and conflicting interests the parties in the region face, and given the difficulty of imposing a military solution on this expanding, deteriorating puzzle, it is imperative to embark on a renewed and robust diplomatic and political effort in the manner outlined in the Warner resolution. That effort, in my view, must include the following:

First, it must include talks with each of the key players in the region. I agree with the Iraq Study Group report which stated that:

> The United States should engage directly with Iran and Syria in order to try to obtain the commitment to constructive policies toward Iraq and other regional issues. In engaging Syria and Iran, the United States should consider incentives, as well as disincentives, in seeking constructive results.

This does not mean direct talks will necessarily succeed quickly or even succeed at all. But it does mean the United States should use every available carrot and stick, every diplomatic tool we have to try to stabilize the region.

Second, the United States and those who share a vision of a peaceful Middle East should organize an international conference to help the Iraqis promote national reconciliation and stronger relations with their neighbors.

Third, we should heed the advice of the Iraq Study Group and promote the creation of an Iraq international support group which would include each country that borders Iraq and other key countries in the region. That support group would work to strengthen Iraq's territorial and sovereign integrity and would provide a diplomatic forum for Iraq's neighbors, many of whom have competing and conflicting interests to negotiate.

We may very well engage Iraq's neighbors and find we cannot achieve common ground. But I believe that refusing to talk to our adversaries on principle simply because they are our adversaries has done us no good. Indeed, in our history, Presidents from both parties and of different ideological stripes, from Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan, have actively engaged countries and leaders with whom they strongly disagreed, and they did so because it was in the American national interest. In fact, even this administration diplomatically engaged a member of the so-called ''axis of evil,'' North Korea. And while this process was long and laborious, it appears to have borne fruit. I believe we are at a similar moment in Iraq, when a strong and tough diplomatic effort may offer our last best chance to achieve a measure of peace and stability for Iraq and for the region.

For that reason, I believe we should follow the advice of the Iraq Study Group, the authors of the National Intelligence Estimate, and the advice of Senators from both sides of the aisle in pursuing a new direction in Iraq. There are no guarantees of success, but we must make every effort to succeed before it is too late.

I want to make a statement relative to why I think it is such an important time for us to be involved in this debate. It was not that long ago when I went with two of the most distinguished Senators in this body to Iraq and Afghanistan and spent time in both countries with both Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN. For all of us who are Members of this body, there are no two Senators whom we hold in higher esteem. They truly are Senators whom I would call ''a Senator's Senator'' because they have the respect of

their colleagues. They have the wisdom they have accumulated through their service to our country over decades, and they are always attempting to do what is best for the American interest. I remember in Baghdad having conversations with both Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN and how they described how things had changed from the initial invasion to the time we were there in the heavily fortified Green Zone in Baghdad and as we traveled around the country.

Since that time, Senator WARNER and others have been back there. As we have heard in this Chamber, the distinguished Senator from Virginia talked about how 3 or 4 months ago, he described the situation in Iraq as drifting sideways. Today that situation is not only drifting sideways but it continues to deteriorate. So no matter how much our troops have done, the sacrifice they have made, the sacrifices their families have made, things have not only drifted sideways, they continue to deteriorate. The President's proposal, which is at the heart of this debate, has to do with whether we should send 21,500 more troops into harm's way. We should all ask the question whether that is something we shouldn't support, and we should have an opportunity to vote on that concept in this Chamber. We should have an opportunity to vote on that concept in this Chamber before the President moves forward with the escalation effort.

In my view, and part of the reason I joined Senator WARNER and Senator NELSON and others in their resolution, I don't believe it will work. I believe when we look at Operation Going Forward Together in June and Operation Going Forward Together 2 in August, they demonstrate that a surge of this kind will, in fact, not work. Indeed, the Iraq Study Group found that between the months of June and the time they issued their report, violence had escalated in Baghdad by 43 percent. So we have tried a surge twice, and it has failed. Now the President is saying we ought to go ahead and do yet another surge. I believe a simple resolution we can vote on that makes a simple statement that we support our troops and we oppose the escalation of the military effort in Iraq in the way the President has proposed is the right thing for us to vote on. It is the most important question of our time. It is appropriate for us to be spending this Friday and Saturday, and, if it so takes, all of next week, instead of going back to our respective States and working during the Presidents holiday to debate this issue, which is such a defining issue of our time. This is a defining issue for the 21st century, not only for Iraq but for the Middle East, for the war on terror which we wage around the globe; this is the defining issue, and it is appropriate for us to be having this discussion on the floor today. Hopefully, we will have an opportunity to move forward into the debate on this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 574. I will vote in opposition to moving forward on that resolution because I don't believe it offers me the opportunity to express what I believe this body should be doing on the war on terror and the war in Iraq and for our men and women in harm's way. I want to take a minute to explain as well as I can why I believe so strongly and so passionately in that regard.

Ironically, 30 minutes before I came to the Chamber, I got a press release from the Department of Defense announcing that deployment of over 1,000 members of the 3rd ID stationed at Fort Stewart, GA has been accelerated from June to March of 2007. Those soldiers will shortly be leaving our great State on their way to be deployed in Baghdad, specifically as a part of the President's mission to secure and hold and to build.

I can't be certain of this, but I imagine some of those soldiers are probably watching television today in Hinesville, GA. They might even be watching C–SPAN. They might even hear these remarks. So I make them in the belief and with the hope that they are listening, as well as those soldiers in Baghdad and Balad and Tallil who are watching their monitors in the mess hall or the command post, as well as those who are our enemies, those who would do us harm, those who are the reason we are in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

It is not right to send a mixed message in a nonbinding resolution while our men and women are deploying in defense of this country and at the order of the President, our Commander in Chief. The result of that is to send a message of doubt to our men and women and a message of hope to our enemy. We can have our differences—and anybody who watches the debate on this floor knows, we certainly have our differences—but there should be no difference or equivocation in the support of our men and women in harm's way and our men and women now on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan.

For a minute I want to talk about how deeply I believe in our options, because we only have two. The first is an opportunity for success. That is what the President has chosen. This surge, criticized by some, is even a part of the Hamilton-Baker report where they addressed a potential surge in their report. The President, after listening to many of us and to his commanders and, certainly to General Petraeus, has decided to deploy these troops to go into Baghdad, to go into Anbar, to secure it; and then, with the help of the Iraqi soldiers, to hold; and then, with the help of USAID, the State Department, and the world community, to build and to have a platform and a foundation upon which political reconciliation will take place. Every one of us knows that, ultimately, reconciliation will make the difference in whether our hopes and dreams for the Iraqi people and the hopes and dreams they have for themselves will, in fact, take place.

I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee. I sat through 28 hours of testimony from countless experts, one after another. Most of them had mixed feelings on the surge. Some were unalterably opposed. Some said it may work. Some said it would work. They had differences of opinion, as we do. But in 28 hours of testimony, from expert after expert, from Madeleine Albright to Henry Kissinger, from think tank after think tank, from JACK MURTHA and Newt Gingrich—Newt a former Speaker of the House; JACK certainly outspoken on this issue in the House—every one of them agreed on one fact: A redeployment of our troops or a withdrawal would lead, at the very least, to thousands of deaths and more likely the slaughter of tens of thousands and maybe even millions of people in Iraq and possibly beyond in the Middle East.

Withdrawing, repositioning, turning our back is a recipe for disaster. And the world knows how important our success is. I spent last weekend in Munich, Germany, at the World Security Conference, where Vladimir Putin and the Iranian Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister spoke. We met with Chancellor Merkel of Germany and representatives from Bulgaria, Estonia, and Japan. Do you know what is so eye opening to me? With rare exception, each one expressed their appreciation for what the United States of America and our allies are doing, and their hope and prayer is we will succeed. They know what we know: We are in the ultimate war between good and evil. Iraq is but a battle in the war on terror that will move to other places. If we ever give comfort or hope to our enemy that we may turn and come home, leave the battlefield, leave them to their own volition, then we know it is the beginning of the end for the peaceful societies and the democracies of this world.

Chancellor Merkel of Germany—a country where popular opinion is very much against the war—announced her commitment of more Tornadoes to be deployed to Afghanistan. We have 46,000 troops there—23,000 Americans and 23,000 from countries around the world—pursuing to keep that fledgling democracy secure as the Taliban makes one last effort.

The enthusiasm of the world is in support of the United States and our men and women in harm's way. I think that enthusiasm should take place on the Senate floor in the United States of America as well. My vote tomorrow of ''no'' on the motion to proceed will not be a desire to cut off debate. It will, in fact, be a desire to elevate the debate. I think every side that is represented on this Senate floor ought to be a side that is spoken. I personally prefer the Gregg amendment and do not prefer and would not vote for the resolution

of the Senator from Nevada, which is the same resolution now being debated on the floor of the Senate. I think I ought to have an opportunity to express to the thousand members of 3rd ID leaving to go to Iraq, to the men and women in Iraq who are listening, and to the constituents I have in the State, regardless of which side of the issue they are on—the Senate deserves a right to debate all of the valid points of the questions that confront us in Iraq.

I know earlier in a speech given on the floor the content was primarily a recitation of the names of those who have died in uniform in Iraq from the United States of America. I don't take the position I take lightly, nor do I not think for a moment about the sacrifice that has already been made by men and women from my State—from PFC Diego Rincon, the first Georgian to lose his life fighting in Iraq—Diego, by the way, was not a United States citizen when he died, and we gave him citizenship posthumously because of the commitment he made to this country—to LT Noah Harris, from Elijay, GA, who was a cheerleader at the University of Georgia on 9/11. He was so moved by what happened that he jumped into ROTC in his junior year and pursued a commission in the United States Army, received it, and went to Iraq. He died fighting for what he believed this country was all about: to stand up to the agents of terror and those who would use it to pursue their cause. Also, there was SGT Mike Stokely, a brave American who died in pursuit of freedom and peace in Iraq, and the hundreds of other Georgians who have been wounded or sacrificed their lives. They should not die in vain. They went for the reason that they believed volunteers are important to them and their country. They volunteered and made that commitment knowingly and willingly. They deserve the chance to pursue this effort for success in Baghdad and Anbar with enthusiasm from our Senate and our Government. From me, they have that.

When we read a list of those who lost their lives, we have to remember how long the list is of those who live today because our men and women in the Armed Forces, in wars past and in war today, fight for security and peace and fight for us to live.

We saw on 9/11 the manifest horror tyranny and terror can bring, and we will see it again if we lose our resolve to pursue it wherever it takes us—Afghanistan, Iraq, or places yet known to us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, with the confidence and pride in the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces and my willingness to fully support an opportunity for success rather than a recipe for disaster.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I understand I have 15 minutes within which to make my remarks; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 8 minutes remaining at this time. It would take consent to extend that time.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed and make my remarks in 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, some weeks ago—and I mentioned this in my remarks during the debate we were having on the resolutions with regard to Iraq and the war—I said several weeks ago I had the privilege of attending and speaking at a farewell dinner in honor of LTG David Petraeus and his wife Holly at the Command and General Staff College of the United States Army at Fort Leavenworth, KS. And, of course, now General Petraeus is in Iraq and involved in the new mission as prescribed by the President and the subject of great debate not only here but in the House of Representatives, which is voting as I speak on their resolution in regard to this matter.

It was quite an evening of tribute in behalf of the general who has become admired and beloved serving as commanding general of the Army's Intellectual Center in Leavenworth, KS. Throughout the evening I had the opportunity to again visit with David Petraeus, his feelings about his new mission, his impressive knowledge with regard to this most difficult war in Iraq, the history of the region, his understanding with regard to the nature of past wars, his understanding of insurgency in past wars and the insurgency we now face in Iraq.

While at the Command and General Staff College, he wrote the Army's new manual on counterterrorism. Let me say, as a former marine, as the Presiding Officer is as well, I helped write a similar manual years ago for the U.S. Marine Corps. So I find this man unique in his knowledge and his command ability. But when I was asked to make remarks after the dinner—they would always invite a Senator to make some remarks and, unfortunately, sometimes that turns into a speech—I was glad I said what I said, and virtually everybody in that room told me I had said what they cannot say. Those who wear their officer rank on their shoulders or their enlisted stripes on their sleeves in most cases do not comment on policy decisions or politics, no matter how strongly they feel. They follow orders, and they serve their country. But I believe my remarks to the general and his officer corps and the veterans of many previous wars are pertinent to the issue we face in this debate.

Before I express my views, I want to stress that I regret we are at a stalemate in this body. Obviously, they are not in the other body, in terms of a vote at least, on this issue of vital national security. I think most in the Senate wish we could debate this issue with comity, with cooperation, and, yes, in a bipartisan fashion. And I think the American people who are concerned, obviously frustrated and angry about the war, would certainly appreciate that, but that is not the case. This issue, very unfortunately, is wrapped around a partisan and political axle.

Our good friends across the aisle insist that we debate and vote on one of three nonbinding resolutions—there may have been an agreement on maybe one more vote—in regard to the war in Iraq, and that is all. They wish to debate and vote on the House resolution which is now being debated in the other body and about to come to a conclusion, or the Warner resolution, which I think are very similar, and then call it a day because both resolutions support the troops but not the mission.

This is the rub for many of my colleagues and myself, and it is about as far as the majority wishes to wade in the waters of withdrawal at this time. I realize if we were to consider other votes, it would be more pertinent to the issue, especially the amendment by Senator FEINGOLD, and that would be wading in the water a little deeper than they would want to at this particular time.

Others of us wish to debate and vote on the McCain resolution—I hope we can do that—and the Gregg resolution and, as far as I am concerned, the Feingold resolution. I oppose the Feingold resolution, but I admire his forthrightness and his courage. But we are being denied that opportunity.

Most perplexing to me is that those who are covering this debate within the media—and it is never a good idea to say anything that could be possibly defined as critical of the media. I note there are none or there may be two, but, obviously, everybody is watching the vote on the House side.

Having said that, how on Earth can we describe this situation by writing headlines and 15-second news sound bites saying Republicans, like myself, have voted to stifle debate? I want to debate. Let's have a debate. Let's have a full debate and vote on the House resolution and/or the Warner resolution—vote on both of them—but let us also debate and vote on resolutions offered by Senators MCCAIN, GREGG, and FEINGOLD. I will vote for Senator MCCAIN's resolution. I will vote along with Senator GREGG. I would not vote for Senator FEINGOLD's resolution but, again, I think his resolution is probably the most determining in terms of effect, and he should get a vote.

We are not stifling or shutting down debate; our colleagues in the majority

are. Either we are not capable of explaining what I believe is a very simple proposition or some in the media cannot discern what is obvious. This is like playing baseball, although it isn't like playing baseball—that is a poor allegory, but it is the one I have chosen—playing baseball with one strike and then you are out. You say: Wait a minute, usually in a baseball game you get three strikes. What happened to the three strikes? Where are my other two strikes? Where are my other resolutions that I want to debate, that I want to support because they are pertinent to this, certainly as much as the others? They are nonbinding as well. And the umpire—in this particular case the distinguished majority leader—says: Back to the dugout, Senator ROBERTS, I am sorry. We run this ball game. You don't have any further strikes.

I have information that the House has just passed the House resolution 246 to 182. That is a pretty solid vote. So, obviously, we will be getting to vote on that resolution, and I hope we will get to vote on these other resolutions.

In my remarks at the Command and General Staff College, I told General Petraeus we had not been personally acquainted over a long period of years, but in our short span of time, I certainly came to know him well. I have had several stimulating and enjoyable conversations with him over a wide range of issues, most especially the British experience in Iraq from 1921 to 1931, the example of Lawrence of Arabia. Lawrence of Arabia wrote ''The Small Warfare Manual,'' and he wrote ''The Pillars of Wisdom.'' As I indicated, the U.S. Marine Corps had similar manuals, one called a ''Manual on Antiguerrilla Operations,'' which I participated in, and now the manual the general has written.

It seems we cannot get it right with regard to insurgencies. The same things we write in these manuals we have to be careful about and pretty well play out the problems, to say the least, that make it very difficult.

Anyway, with regard to General Petraeus, he is exactly the right man for the right job at the right time. He knows this. He has been to Iraq. He was successful in his second tour. He is going back. I hope and pray he will be successful in his third effort. Our brave young men and women in uniform deserve nothing but the very best leadership, and they are getting it.

But I think it is a paradox of enormous irony that the Senate confirmed David Petraeus without a dissenting vote—not one, not one Senator—a vote of confidence that is unique, certainly given today's controversy and turmoil and the times. Yet at the same time, the same Senators who gave their vote of confidence are now in the business of what I call—I don't mean to perjure them—''confetti'' resolutions supporting the general and the troops but not the mission they are undertaking now. That to me is unprecedented for the Senate. I think it is remarkable, and I have said many times that these resolutions—and it has been said many times—are nonbinding. They have no legislative impact. They are so-called sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. For those who do not pay attention to the parliamentary procedure around here, that means they are meaningless except for the message you want to send, and that can be important to the Executive, i.e., to President Bush and the folks back home.

With all due respect, we have long crossed the message Rubicon with regard to sending mixed messages to our allies, our troops, the American people, the media and, yes, our adversaries. Words have consequences and, rest assured, our adversaries will read to try and figure out, analyze every word of the resolution just passed in the House and perhaps the one, maybe two resolutions we can pass in this body, hopefully three or four, and try to figure it out. I suspect they will be absolutely flummoxed in trying to discern the sense in reading a resolution that states support for the troops and our new commander, with new rules of engagement, with a limited timeframe for achieving and reporting benchmarks of progress, but that opposes the mission. That is a mixed message, and it should cause quite a bit of head scratching among the 31 different terrorist organizations that are planning various attacks around the world and even on the United States. My real concern is that the Senate is not considering or even talking about the probable consequences of these actions, let alone our responsibilities should they happen.

I want to make it very clear I do not question the intent or purpose or patriotism of any Senator, regardless of whatever resolution they are proposing voting for. I do question the judgment and the law of unintended effects. Bluntly put, with all this debate with regard to nonbinding resolutions, we appear like lemmings splashing in a sea of public concern, frustration, and expressing anger over the war in Iraq.

In this regard, I don't know of anybody in this body or anybody in America who does not want our troops home at the earliest possible date, and stability in Iraq, if possible. If possible—and that is a real question here. That is not the issue.

When all of this confetti settles, the end result of all this frenzy will be: ''General, you and the troops have our solid support—but we don't support your mission. However, press on and good luck.''

I think that message is remarkable. This is not a profile in courage. This is not the Senate's finest hour. If we are going to debate and vote on nonbinding resolutions, let us at least consider resolutions that will send a clear message or which can be of useful purpose. In that regard, we should consider the McCain resolution. It lists benchmarks of progress that General Petraeus has told Senator MCCAIN and me would be useful in his discussions with Prime Minister Maliki, and certainly the Gregg resolution that supports spending for our troops in harm's way. I think that is the precedent we have to set. That is the killer in this debate, along with the Feingold resolution, because my colleagues across the aisle do not want to vote on the Gregg resolution, let alone the Feingold resolution.

Senator FEINGOLD has a resolution which certainly does something. I don't agree with his resolution, but he is at least very forthright and sends a clear message, and he is a good Senator.

As the former chairman of the Intelligence Committee in the Senate, let me again stress what is not happening in the Congress or the media, and has received very little public attention regarding this challenge we face in Iraq. No one is talking about the consequences of what will happen if we simply withdraw or redeploy. And we may just do that, because I do not believe this war can or should be sustained if we do not see progress in the next 6 months. If General Petraeus doesn't come back and tell us there has been measurable progress, where we can see it, feel it, and touch it, we have some serious policy decisions to make. We need to be thinking about a policy of containment as opposed to intervention if this latest mission does not work.

I would also point out that most of the time deadlines for withdrawal are either in the nonbinding resolutions or they mirror exactly the time period General Petraeus has told the Armed Services Committee he would follow in reporting whether this new effort is making any progress, pretty much along the lines of the benchmarks that are in the McCain resolution. So the obvious question is: Who can better make that judgment, General Petraeus in theater or Senators here on the floor?

We have not discussed the difficult policy decisions that may confront us if it becomes necessary to redeploy, what that mission might be if we redeploy, where are we going, what is the mission going to be, or even how to withdraw.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I have about 4 minutes left. If I could ask unanimous consent that Senator DORGAN allow me that privilege, I would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to that, provided that the 30 minutes which was to have started for our side at 3:30 will be extended for the full 30 minutes following the completion of the presentation.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will try to finish as fast as I can. I apologize. I arrived late. I asked for 15 minutes, and I thought I could get it done in 15 minutes. Obviously, ''Roberts-ese'' is expanding that time period. I will try to finish as fast as I can.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 30 minutes begin following the presentation of Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. As I indicated, Mr. President, we have not discussed the difficult policy decisions that will confront us if it becomes necessary to withdraw or redeploy, what that mission would be, or even how to withdraw. The reality is what we will do when certain consequences would take place. These are the possible, if not probable, consequences we should be confronting and debating and explaining to the American people and ourselves and in the media, even if some may have a deaf ear.

First. A dramatic increase in sectarian violence quickly escalating to a civil war—and I mean a real civil war—and a humanitarian disaster far more devastating than what is happening now. Shia versus Shia, Shia versus Sunni. What do we do? Thousands of Iraqis have already become refugees and left the country.

Second. Given a civil war and struggle for control, we can expect an incursion of Sunni troops from other Mideast countries—I want to make it very clear about that: other Mideast countries—to prevent an Iranian takeover of Iraq and the very real possibility of an Iraq led by Muqtada al-Sadr, whose street appeal could endanger their own Governments. I am talking about other Mideast countries. When that happens, the war becomes regional. What do we do?

Third. We can expect an Iraq certainly dominated by Iran, thus completing a Shia crescent with Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. Today, countries such as Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt are talking about building their own nuclear programs, given Iran's nuclear ambitions and progress. Iran has just refused inspectors from the IAEA. With the possibility of Shia Muslims and Sunni Muslims each working to achieve nuclear capability and weapons, what does Israel do? What do we do?

Fourth. Iraq will become a safe haven for terrorists. This time it is for real. What do we do?

Fifth. In their eyes, with the defeat of the ''Great Satan'' only months away, as expected—a clear signal by this body and perhaps inevitable—terrorists around the world are already emboldened, waiting us out and planning more attacks; that is, if you believe what they say.

Read Afghanistan and the Taliban and the spring offensive. Will we soon be in the business of passing nonbinding resolutions about Afghanistan?

Sixth. We can expect a perceived, if not real, lack of American resolve in the eyes of adversaries and potential adversaries around the world resulting in additional national security threats.

Read Putin and Belarus and Iran, and his recent remarkable speech at Munich in Germany at the NATO security conference. Kim Jong Il. We are making some progress with North Korea right now, but he does have a penchant for missile launches on the 4th of July.

Read Hugo Chavez—31 countries in the southern command. He is the new Castro, nationalizing his oil production and directly involved in five different countries. What do we do?

The point is that globally and over the long term this is not a Bush issue or a Democratic or a Republican issue, or even how you feel about Iraq or the war. Even as we argue about whether we debate and vote on one resolution or three or four, I hope, there are terrorist organizations and their second-generation affiliates—guided and inspired—are plotting attacks against the United States and throughout the world. It is obvious we can't sustain the status quo in Iraq, but while we debate on how to proceed, these folks are not giving up.

The irony is that should the President wake up in the morning and say, well, the House has voted for this resolution, they are not for this new mission, and the Senate is about to, and they may or may not do that, so I am going to terminate it, I am going to end it, then we are back to square one, back to a stalemate, back to the status quo. That, to me, doesn't make sense.

Given the fact there were at least five successful attacks that killed Americans—and others that, thank goodness, were not successful—before President Bush came to office and before military action in Iraq—given the fact this threat will face the next President and future world leaders, surely we can figure out it makes no sense to fight each other when the terrorists then and now and in the future do not kill according to party affiliation, nationality, race, age, or gender.

We do not need a Republican approach to national security and the war. We do not need a Democratic approach to national security and the war. We need, however, an American approach to our national security and the war and to our individual freedoms. This is a time to engage in honest dialog, to work together and think through and agree on the strategy that will defeat our enemies and make the American people safe. And yes, bring our troops home but in a way that we don't have to send them back.

So I say to the leadership, with all due respect, let us end this nonbinding business and get these confetti resolutions behind us. We have all had a chance now to discuss the war and we need to vote on I think at least four resolutions, and then come together with a bipartisan commitment—a difficult and perhaps impossible task but, I believe, a task that must be undertaken for the sake of our national security.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time and I thank my colleagues across the aisle for permitting me to finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding we were speaking in 30-minute segments and that the Senator from Kansas was allowed a little extra time to finish his remarks, which by my reckoning was about an additional 10 minutes. I want to clarify, and if a unanimous consent request is necessary, I will make that request, that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed to speak until 10 after the hour; and then, at 4:30, the next Democratic speaker would be recognized. So I think we would be back on the schedule that was spoken to earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, thank you very much, and if the Senator from North Dakota will yield for a few minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield to Senator DURBIN.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, an historic vote was announced in the House Chamber moments ago. By a vote of 246 to 182, the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan rollcall vote, has approved the resolution relative to the President's call for escalation of the number of troops serving in Iraq. That resolution is fewer than 60 words in length, and I believe it should be read into the RECORD. This is a resolution which we are hoping to bring to the Senate floor tomorrow so that the debate can begin in this Chamber. It reads:

> Congress and the American people will continue to support and protect the members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving or who have served bravely and honorably in Iraq; Congress disapproves of the decision of President George W. Bush announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq.

It is unembellished, it is straightforward, and it states a position. Those who agree with this resolution, as I do, should be heard. Those who disagree and believe we should escalate the number of troops in this war have a right to be heard as well. That is the nature of this institution. It is the nature of our democracy.

For the Republicans to continue to threaten a filibuster to stop the debate in the Senate so that Members of the Senate cannot come forward and express themselves and vote on this issue is wrong. It is unfair. It is inconsistent with the reason we ran for office. We were asked by the people kind enough to entrust us with this responsibility to face the issues of our times, to address those issues in a responsible manner, to have a civilized debate on the

floor of the Senate, and to take a vote and take a stand. We are expected to do that.

We are not expected to waffle and weave and avoid the obvious. This is the issue of the moment. It is the issue of our time. With over 130,000 American soldiers' lives on the line, it is unacceptable that the minority would stop us from debating this issue. It is unacceptable to our troops and to their families who wait anxiously to know what their fate will be. It is unacceptable to the rest of the Nation, which expects the Senate to be a full partner in congressional debate.

It takes 60 votes to bring a measure to the floor in the Senate. On the Democratic side, with one absence by illness, we have 50. We need the cooperation of the Republicans to even debate the issue. They have made it clear in pronouncements on the floor and in press conferences they are going to stop this debate at any cost. They are prepared to filibuster this measure so we cannot have a debate and a vote on this critical issue. That is wrong. It is inconsistent with the reason we ran for office and the reason this institution exists.

We have to face the obvious. Since the decision was made by the United States of America to give President Bush this authorization of force, we have seen horrible results.

Mr. President, 3,132 of our best and bravest soldiers have given their lives, thousands have been seriously injured, hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money have been spent in pursuit of this war, with no end in sight. Our soldiers did their job and did it well—deposed a dictator and gave the Iraqis an opportunity for the first time in their history to stand and govern themselves and guide their nation into the future.

Instead, we have seen this situation disintegrate into a civil war, and we have watched our soldiers caught in the crossfire of a battle that started 1,400 years ago among followers of the Islamic faith. That is not what America bargained for. That is why the majority of the American people believe we need to change course, we need a new direction, and we need to bring our troops home. We need to tell the President that the escalation of this war and the escalation of the troops is the wrong policy at this moment in history.

For this Senate to speak, we need to engage in a debate, a debate which leads to a vote. There are choices before us. This choice, which I support, tells the President we disagree with his policy. It joins with the House of Representatives, which made the same decision on a bipartisan basis. We have offered to Senator MCCAIN, a Republican from Arizona, an opportunity to bring his position forward in support of adding more troops in Iraq. That is the fair parameter of a good debate. But sadly the Republican minority has said they will deny us that opportunity.

I hope those who believe it is important for the Senate to engage in this debate will contact their Members of the Senate as quickly as possible and let them know the vote tomorrow at 1:45 in the afternoon here on the Senate floor is a historic vote, a vote of great importance. Every Member should be here. Every Member should vote. Every Member should understand the nature of this institution. The reason we serve is to give voice to the people we represent on the issues of our time. There is no more compelling and timely issue than this war in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the words of my colleague from Illinois. This debate we are trying to have is actually a debate about a debate. This must be the only place, the only real estate in the United States of America in which, rather than having a debate about the war and strategy, we are having a debate about whether we should debate it. It is pretty unbelievable.

This is called the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is an unbelievable privilege for me to be here. I came from a very small town of about 300 people, a high school class of 9. I am here in the greatest deliberative body in the world. I am enormously proud to be here. But I came here not to avoid debate but to engage in debate, to talk about this country and its future.

There is an old saying: When everyone is thinking the same thing, no one is thinking very much. There is a desire in this Chamber by some who have spoken that we all be thinking the same thing about these issues, that we all support President Bush and whatever his strategies might be and wherever he might take us. This Congress has a constitutional role to play, and the constitutional role is not to decide to come to the floor from Monday through Friday to support the President of the United States, it is to come to the floor of the Senate to support this country and its interests as best we see those interests.

Some long while ago, I went to a veterans hospital on a Sunday morning and I presented medals to a veteran. His name was Edmund Young Eagle. He was an American Indian. He had fought in the Second World War, had gone all around the world, had fought in northern Africa, fought at Normandy, fought across Europe, and came back to live on the Indian reservation. He never married, never had very much. He loved to play baseball. But he had kind of a tough life. At the end of Edmund Young Eagle's life, this man who served his country, at the end of his life he was dying of lung cancer. He was in the veterans hospital in Fargo, ND, and his sister called and said her brother Edmund Young Eagle had proudly served his country and had never received the medals for his service in the Second World War.

Would you get him his medals, she asked?

I said, Of course I will.

So I achieved getting the medals he earned but never received from the Pentagon, and I went to the VA hospital on a Sunday morning to present medals to Edmund Young Eagle, a Native American, one of those first Americans who served this country and then went home and lived quietly.

When I went to his room that morning, Edmund Young Eagle was very sick. I didn't know it at the time, but he would die within a week or so. We cranked up the hospital bed for Edmund Young Eagle so he was in a sitting position, and I pinned his World War II medals on his pajama tops and told him that his country was grateful for his serving our country in the Second World War.

This man, very sick, looked up at me and said: This is one of the proudest days of my life.

This man who lived in a spartan way, never having very much but served this country with honor, felt great gratitude at the end of his life for a country recognizing what he had done for us. That is the life of a soldier, someone who commits himself or herself to answer their country's call without question. So many have done it.

I will attend a funeral this week of a young man killed in Iraq. I received a call this morning from a mother, the mother of a soldier who spent a year in Iraq and returned with very difficult circumstances—post-traumatic stress, all kinds of difficult emotional problems—who just this week received the alert notice that his reserve unit will likely be called up again.

This is about war. It is about commitment. It is about our soldiers. It is about our country and our future. Some say we should not talk about that, we should not debate it. If that is the case, this is the only real estate, this is the only room in America where it is not being discussed and debated. It is being debated in the homes, in the restaurants, in the gymnasiums, in the schools, in the office. It ought to be debated here as well. This has a profound impact on our country and its future.

Make no mistake about it, our military has won every battle it has fought. Our military will win the battles they fight. But winning military battles does not win the war in Iraq. We disapprove of President Bush's plan to deepen our escalation in Iraq because it is a military response to a problem that must be resolved through diplomacy and through negotiation. The civil war and the violence in Iraq is only going to stop when there is genuine reconciliation between groups in Iraq.

Let's think through what we have done in Iraq. Through our soldiers' blood and our Treasury, we sent troops to Iraq. The Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein, is dead. Good riddance, I say. We have unearthed mass graves in Iraq showing that hundreds of thousands of

Iraqis were murdered by a dictator. But Saddam Hussein was executed. The country of Iraq was able to vote for its own new Constitution. The country of Iraq voted for its own Government. That is very substantial progress.

But the next step has not shown much progress. The next step is this: Do the Iraqi people have the will to provide for their own security? This is their country, not ours. Iraq belongs to them, not us. The question is, Do the Iraqi people have the will to provide for their security? If they do not, this country cannot and will not be able to do that for any length of time. That is the question. Do they have the will to take back their country?

Iraqi leaders are going to have to make very difficult decisions, political decisions in some cases which may undermine their own power and their own base of support. But it is the only way this is going to be resolved. The sectarian violence that exists in Iraq today can trace its roots in some cases back to the year 700 A.D. This violence is not going to dissipate soon unless there is reconciliation between the factions. This requires Iraqi troops to fight their ethnic and religious allies who are part of the insurgency as well as fight their opponents. It requires Iraqi security, Iraqi police, and Iraqi troops to provide for the security of the whole country of Iraq.

The resolution we want to debate is a resolution which does not say we don't support our troops. Clearly we support our troops. We support our troops with everything we believe is necessary for their safety and security and for them to do their jobs the way we expect them to do their jobs. This Congress, every man and every woman, supports America's troops and prays for their safe return.

This resolution says we support our troops but we do not agree with President Bush in his desire to deepen our involvement in Iraq. Some come to the floor of the Senate and say: Your position on this emboldens the enemy. It is a message to embolden the enemy. It sends the wrong message to our troops.

It is neither of those. It is a message from the Congress of the United States to the President, and that message is we do not support his proposal to deepen our involvement in the war in Iraq.

A blue ribbon commission was put together, of some of the best thinkers, foreign policy and military thinkers in our country, headed by James Baker and Lee Hamilton, very distinguished Americans. That group included former Secretaries of State and military leaders and some outstanding thinkers. They worked for months, many months, to develop a plan. We all understand the alternatives are not good in Iraq. We understand that. If there were an easy way to deal with this, believe me, it would have been dealt with. In many ways, we found a box canyon in Iraq, and it is hard to get out of a box canyon.

The Baker-Hamilton report represented a consensus of some of the best thinkers in our country, having worked months on this problem. The President chose to ignore that report. The President says he is the decider.

You know, the Constitution says something about that as well. I agree with my colleagues that we can't have 100 or 535 commanders in chief. I understand that. But I also understand that the Constitution has a role for the Congress. Only the Congress can declare war—only the Congress. Yes, the President is Commander in Chief, but only the Congress can declare war. Only the Congress has the power of the purse.

The question is, What do we do about what is now happening in Iraq? No other country that I am aware of, in what the President has called the coalition of the willing, has decided they are going to deepen their involvement or expand their troops to Iraq. No other country. Even Great Britain, the strongest supporter of President Bush's Iraq policy, has refused to increase their troop strength in Iraq. In fact, the British news reports say that Britain intends to have all or most of its troops withdrawn by the end of 2007. None of our allies, old or new, of which I am aware, have decided the proper approach at this point, given the sectarian involvement in Iraq, is to deepen their involvement and increase their troop strength in Iraq.

The President is saying we should surge some additional troops to Iraq. We have done that before. In early 2004, we surged 20,000 additional troops. A similar one happened in the fall of 2005. Most recently, last summer the President announced that thousands of additional troops would be surged into Baghdad. What happened as a result of that was the violence increased, and deaths and injuries to American troops went up. So we have seen some examples of a surge, and the examples have not been very helpful. In fact, it has been counterproductive.

This map is a map of the city of Baghdad—about 4 million to 6 million people, about 250 square miles. We have people in this city who have grievances that go back 1,300 and 1,400 years. The Shia and the Sunni religious split occurred in the seventh century, and they have clashed frequently since then.

This country is not put together by natural borders. This country was put together by a pen and paper, by a decision 90 years ago of how to draw the borders of this country. This was a diplomatic decision, that this should be the country of Iraq.

Let me describe what is happening now in this city. We have areas that are Shia areas and Sunni areas, and now we have areas that are turning Shia and turning Sunni. In many ways, you will see from this map the dramatic evidence of violence in this capital city of Iraq. It is getting worse, not better.

I mentioned that some of the hatred goes back 1,400 years. But a more recent example, in a story I was reading about Iraq, a Shiite was recently driven from his home and farm by the Sunnis who killed his brother and nephew, and he was so bitter and angry, he said, ''A volcano of revenge has built up inside. I want to rip them up with my teeth.'' It is this hatred which fuels a civil war and the atrocities that occur nearly every day.

Saturday, February 3, saw the deadliest single suicide bombing since the war began nearly 4 years ago, with 130 people killed and more than 300 wounded. It was the fourth major attack against a densely populated Shia area in less than 3 weeks. On the Thursday before, twin suicide bombers struck a market jammed with people—60 killed, 150 wounded. Again, 60 killed, 150 wounded; spraying body parts so far that police were scouring rooftops late in the night for body parts. A few days before that, 75 people killed in Baghdad's Shia neighborhoods in multiple bombings; 160 wounded. The day before that, 3 car bombs detonated within minutes of each other at the vegetable market. More than 1,000 Iraqis were killed in the last week of January. We are told there were 3,000 killed in the last 3 weeks. Unbelievably, it seems to me, they pick up bodies in the middle of the morning in Baghdad from the night's carnage with holes drilled in their kneecaps, holes drilled in their skulls. These are unbelievable signs of torture. These are acts of unimaginable violence committed against others. No one is safe, nowhere is safe, and this violence pervades nearly every aspect of daily life.

The question I think the President proposes with his suggestion of a surge of an additional 20,000 or 21,000 troops in Baghdad poses is: Will additional troops in Baghdad on street corners, going door to door, embedded with the troops, with the security of the Iraqi Government, stem the violence? The answer is likely no. We have seen this attempted previously and it did not stem the violence; the violence increased.

Let me make another point I think is important. No one has made, I think, the point that this troop escalation, whatever it is, is temporary. The United States troops are leaving Iraq. The question is when, not if. At some point, United States troops will leave Iraq. The question is: Will we leave in a time that gives us the opportunity to turn the country of Iraq back to the Iraqi people and say, this is your job to provide for your security.

Let me talk about the National Intelligence Estimate. The National Intelligence Estimate was done with 16 intelligence agencies. They spent the last 5 months analyzing the situation in Iraq, reviewed by the head of the CIA, the head of the intelligence units at the Pentagon, State Department, Justice Department, and the Director of National Intelligence, our most senior intelligence official. Some of it is top secret, but some was released publicly. Let me read something:

Even if violence is diminished, given the current winner-take-all attitude and sectarian animosities affecting the political scene, Iraqi leaders will be hard-pressed to achieve sustained political reconciliation in this time frame.

Continuing to quote:

Iraq's neighbors are influenced by the events within Iraq, but the involvement of these outside actors is not likely to be a major driver of violence or the prospect for stability because of the self-sustaining character of Iraq's internal sectarian dynamics.

That is a fancy way to describe the civil war.

I might say the last National Intelligence Estimate was done was in 2004 and it detailed 3 possible outcomes for Iraq over the next 18 months, which at the time would put us in the fall or winter of 2006. The worst-case scenario for the previous NIE was a civil war. Well, that is what the 2007 National Intelligence Estimate says has now happened. That is right; what is going on in Iraq now is the worst-case scenario of the previous National Intelligence Estimate.

Let me make a couple of other points, if I might. General Abizaid just over 2 months ago came to the Congress and here is what he said:

I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the Corps Commander, General Dempsey, and I said, ''In your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq? And they said no.''

This is our top military commander testifying to the Senate just over 2 months ago: They said no.

Now, here is why General Abizaid said the commanders did not believe they should have additional troops brought into Iraq:

The reason is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future. The only way Iraq works in the future is for the Iraqis to take more responsibility for that future. That is what General Abizaid said. He was right then; he is right now. This is the testimony heard by the Senate just over 2 months ago. Interestingly enough, as a side note, just 2 weeks ago—3 weeks ago, John Negroponte, the head of the intelligence in this country at that time said this in open testimony to the Senate:

The greatest terrorist threat to America is al-Qaida and its network around the world.

The greatest terrorist threat to our country is al-Qaida and its network around the world, and he said they operate from a ''secure hideaway'' in Pakistan. If that is the case, if the greatest terrorist threat to our country is al-Qaida operating from a ''secure hideaway'' in Pakistan, and that comes from the head of our intelligence service in this country in open testimony to the Senate, if there are 21,000 additional American troops available to surge somewhere, why on Earth would we not choose to move those troops through Afghanistan near to Pakistan to eliminate the leadership of al-Qaida, the greatest terrorist threat to our country? I do not understand the priorities coming from the administration. There has to be a change. We all understand that. We know Iraq is a different place. The various sects, tribes, religions, in some cases do not speak to each other, and in many cases don't trust each other. In other cases, they hate each other, and in too many cases, they kill each other.

That is what must change. It is why reconciliation is the key. It is why more U.S. troops are not going to make a difference.

Does anyone believe that if we go back 4 years and the President brought a proposition to the floor of the Senate and said: Look, we have a civil war in Iraq. What we ought to do is send more American troops to the middle of that civil war, or at least begin sending American troops to the middle of that civil war because we don't believe after 3 years of training that the Iraqi people are prepared to provide for their security, does anybody believe we would think it a good strategy to send additional troops to the middle of a civil war? I don't believe so.

I understand there are very different opinions here in this Chamber, and I respect them. I wouldn't diminish anyone in this Chamber for holding any views on this subject. I understand their passions. I share their passions. But I don't understand this: I don't understand how it is that this great body has to spend days debating whether we will have a debate. This is, after all, a debate about the motion to proceed. This isn't a debate about Iraq or Iraq strategy; it is about whether we can proceed to a motion on that subject. It is a debate about whether we can debate. If there is any space left in this country in which this debate should take place, it ought to be this space on this floor, this real estate. This is the great deliberative body. I do not for the life of me understand a vote against cloture that says: No, we believe the United States should not debate this issue. This is an issue the American people care a great deal about, and it is long past the time, in my judgment, for us to have this debate.

We are all united, I think, in loving this country. We want what is best for this country. We want to protect the American troops. We want our country to succeed. All of us want all of those things. I don't believe anybody who says we are undermining this or that or anything of that sort. All that is nonsense. This country deserves from this Senate a thoughtful, serious, real debate about what is happening that affects every part of American life, and that is the struggle we are involved in with respect to Iraq. The American people deserve this debate, and I hope that tomorrow when we have a vote on the motion to proceed, we will have the opportunity to proceed from that motion to a debate on the underlying petition that is on the floor of the Senate with respect to the subject of the war in Iraq.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time was I allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has until 4:30.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this morning I got up and I went to get on an airplane and the plane was delayed because of mechanical issues. Then I got the word that the leader said we should come vote on questions being discussed, just as I heard now.

I am here to participate in a charade. This is nothing but a charade. It is a nonbinding resolution. We are coming back to vote on Saturday on a nonbinding resolution that the American public doesn't support. As a matter of fact, as I read in The Hill newspaper and as I see on the front page, there is the majority leader's photograph and a story about how the majority is trying to embarrass the 21 of us who are up for election in 2008. I think the majority—current majority, former minority—ought to look at that paper. Inside it, after giving the majority leader credit for this charade, is a poll. It is an online poll, and this was a question: Does debate on a nonbinding Iraq resolution help or harm Americans? Harm: 57 percent; help, 43 percent.

Nothing at all will be accomplished tomorrow, even if we got cloture. We would vote on a nonbinding resolution that is an embarrassment to the troops that are wearing our uniforms in Iraq. What we should be doing is voting on cloture on a series of votes which would include Senator GREGG's resolution or amendment that declares our support for our troops.

The reason we face this situation today is the new majority, with one vote—a majority of one vote—went over to the House and negotiated a resolution—a nonbinding, nothing resolution—and brought it over here and said: You are going to vote on this resolution and nothing else. If we do this, we become a lower body of the House. The House, in responding to the Rules Committee, had no chance to offer any amendments to that bill. Over here, the majority leader says: You cannot offer any amendments to this because I am the leader.

Well, it is time we showed this leader the processes of the Senate are here for the purpose of allowing debate. The House represents the population of a whole series of congressional districts. We represent our States. The national viewpoint is settled in the Senate. This is the place where debate is supposed to take place and it should not be limited.

If we voted for cloture on this resolution tomorrow, we would not be allowed to vote on the Gregg amendment. The Gregg amendment:

Expressing the sense of Congress that no funds should be cut off or reduced for American troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or their ability to complete their assigned missions.

What is wrong with that? Why won't the leader let us vote on that? You

know why? Because it would carry. It would carry. Because Senators on that other side of the aisle know they must support the forces in the field.

Senator GREGG's amendment goes on to say:

Whereas under Article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, the President is the ''commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States'', and in such capacity the President has the command of the Armed Forces, including the authority to deploy troops and direct military campaigns during wartime.

Whereas under Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the power of the purse specifically as it relates to the Armed Forces, and in such capacity Congress has the responsibility to fully and adequately provide funding for the United States military forces, especially when they are at war and are defending our Nation; and

Whereas the United States military forces are in harm's way and are protecting our country, Congress and the Nation should give them all the support they need in order to maintain their safety and to accomplish their assigned missions, including the equipment, logistics, and funding necessary to ensure their safety and effectiveness, and such support is the responsibility of both the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch of Government.

Senator GREGG goes on to say this:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

And they have to concur if we send it back to them—

That it is the sense of Congress that Congress should not take any action that will endanger United States military forces in the field, including elimination or reduction of funds for troops in the field, as such action with respect to funding would undermine their safety or harm their effectiveness in pursuing their assigned missions.

It is nothing but a charade to say an amendment that does nothing should not have a resolution such as this attached to it. That is our purpose. That is our job. It is our constitutional responsibility to support the forces in the field.

I am ashamed the Senate is taking action to prevent the voting on a resolution, once again, establishing the principle. Our duty is to support our forces in the field.

I have a chart to show, but it is difficult for many to understand why we need surge forces. This whole concept we are talking about is safety. Senator GREGG's resolution deals with safety of our forces. This is a chart that shows the Iraqi Army and national police with lead responsibility for counterinsurgency operations in their areas.

In May of 2006 this was their deployment, fairly small. By February of 2007, this is their deployment. We are now in the process of going forward on the new plan to deal with the fact that we have trained a great many of these forces now, but they have not been moved into the areas of real combat, and those are the white spaces on this chart. The whole idea now is to start moving these forces into those areas.

By the way, the hot spots are also on arterial highways in Iraq. This demonstrates where it is. The white areas are occupied by American forces and coalition forces. We want to give them a chance now to move them into those areas. As such, forces will be moving all over this country. In that period of time, these additional surge forces are necessary in order to provide the safety for the people whom they are going to be moving. They are our forces, they are their forces. Secretary Gates has said he does not think they will be there too long. He made a point to make that statement. They will come out as soon as they are no longer needed. Safety is a problem.

To those people who say: Let's get ready to withdraw, if we try to withdraw right now, there would be mass murder in this country. Think of what happened to the Russians and the Soviets when they tried to get out of Afghanistan—and multiply it by factors of 10 to 20. We are spread out all over this place and so are the Iraqis because that was the problem, we were providing for the defense until they were ready to move in and take care of their defense.

This is a chart that shows the current position of forces in Iraqi Freedom. We can see various operations, Japanese and coalition forces, including the British, around the periphery. We are there, in Baghdad, on the major highways. We are in the white spaces on the chart. To get the Iraqi forces in there, we have a new scheme where we will have Iraqi brigades—not divisions but brigades—with an embedded battalion in each brigade move in. Our people will be along with them to make sure their training is carried out and they do the job of defending themselves.

As a practical matter, in order to do that, we need the increased safety of movement in this country. I fully support the plan. It was an Iraqi plan improved on by Secretary Gates, the President, and his staff. Very clearly, the whole program is so they can provide the basic defense for themselves in areas where there is key opposition.

Assume the other side, the side who wants to withdraw, would get approval of the Congress and had some way to mandate the President to withdraw forces. The first thing that would have to be done would be to move the Iraqi forces in there where they can defend themselves and hold back the insurgents currently combatting our forces.

I am not a general, I am not even an armchair general, but I have been around wars for almost all my life now starting out when I was 19. I have seen a great many wars, and I have seen a great many problems with war. Coming back from overseas, I talked to some of my friends and I decided I was going to become an aeronautical engineer to try to find out what caused wars. I hate wars. But I know my duty is to support the military and to support those people carrying out our constitutional mandate to provide for the common defense of this country.

In my opinion, this is the common defense of our country. We have taken on the task of trying to stop a movement that could very well destroy the world. I do believe we should stop these incessant debates on resolutions that mean nothing. Why would we spend all this time and come back on Saturday in order to vote on a nonbinding resolution that would not do a thing? It would not do a thing at all for anyone in that conflict, not one thing. It is nothing but a charade, a charade. It embarrasses me to have to say that. The whole reason for it, pick up The Hill newspaper, back to where I started, to provide a challenge to the 21 Members, Republicans, up for election in 2008, 3 on that side of the aisle. The whole idea is to try to see if we cannot force them to come back on Saturday in order to say to our State constituents: They were not here to vote. I am here to vote. I happened to get off the airplane because I was pretty irritated when I read that story. I am still irritated.

I remember Steve Syms in 1986, when everyone was trying to embarrass people up for election, he said: I am going home and I am going to talk to my constituents, and he did not get sucked back into the debates such as this. He was reelected.

What these people do not know is, we are going to stand up and speak up. We are going to call a spade a spade. This is a charade. I have not been home since January. And I got off that plane to come back and complain about this. I have a right to go home once in a while. I live 4,500 miles from here. As a matter of fact, I am stopping off on my way home to see a very sick relative before I get to Alaska on Monday. Leadership is leadership, and I have been in leadership in this Senate. I was not elected leader, but that is another story. As a practical matter, I have seen leaders come and I have seen leaders go. My friend from Nevada has been my friend for a long time. I am saying I am not going to be embarrassed to come out and say this is nothing but a charade. We should not come back tomorrow to vote on a nonbinding resolution to see if we would vote on a resolution that doesn't tell the story that America wants us to tell, and that story is we support our forces in the field, we support what they are doing. We want them to do what we said we would do, move the forces in that are now trained in Iraq. Let them show how they can defend themselves and we then pull out our embedded battalions and we will be in a position to figure out what is the long-term plan now for this new democracy we have helped establish.

What does this nonbinding resolution do to people in the field? What does it do to the Iraqis? What is it selling them? People are telling me now we should find some way to take the money the President has asked for, the supplemental, and to use it for something else—not to use it to support the people in the field.

There is what is called the Food and Forage Act of the United States. I hope the Senate understands that act. I have been involved in defense appropriations now for over 25 years. The President of the United States has the authority to take money from wherever it is to support forces in the field. We will never abandon our people in the field. We will support them in every way possible. That is why the current majority does not want to vote on the resolution of Senator GREGG. They do not want to be put in a position of saying no to Senator GREGG because if they vote, if they support that resolution, they are continuing the concepts that have been embodied in my life and in the Senate's life as long as I have known it. That is, we support our forces in the field. We are not going to divert money they need for their support, and we are not going to waste our time on nonbinding resolutions that do not do anything to help anybody.

We have a lot of things we could be working on, immigration, energy, global climate change. What are we doing? We are spending our time coming back on Saturday to debate whether we should vote on a bill that was started in the House of Representatives, with not one amendment, and brought over here, not one amendment, and expresses a point of view that the American public does not approve of.

I hope we can get to a debate one of these days, and people will stay around after they make comments such as I heard before I came in. I guarantee, in my heart and in my mind, I know what it means to be in uniform, what it means to be in a position to feel it is necessary to have support at home.

I spent some time last night talking to Colin Powell, one of the famous generals of this country, and reminded him once when we were talking years ago, he told me about the time when he was sent into Laos as a young captain with about 12 days' rations and how when you get up on the morning of the 12th day and realize a drop mission is coming to give you your rations for the next 12 days, how you realize what it means to rely on people, to understand that people in the United States are behind their military, to know you can eat those rations because the supplies are going to come in when they are supposed to come in. That is support to people in the field.

Another concept I speak of is our people have a doctrine that hardly any armies or military in the world has had—we never abandon our forces in the field. What these people are doing now if you listen to them on this other resolution, they are saying, we are going to take and divert this money and put it somewhere else. Not this Senator. If they need that money over there to carry out the commands of the Commander in Chief, I am going to support it. The Senate should support it. We should stop this business of trying to embarrass people who are up for election and demanding they come back and vote on Saturday.

This recess was announced a month ago. Those who live a long distance from here rely on that. The Senate has to start keeping its commitments to our Members whether they are up for election or not.

This is political posturing at its worse. I will be here to vote tomorrow to represent some of those people who could not get back. I stayed to vote so I could come and say this: Political posturing has no place in the Senate of the United States.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on December 23, 1783, George Washington, having successfully led the Continental Army to victory in the Revolutionary War, appeared before the Continental Congress and resigned his commission as commander of the Armed Forces.

It was a quietly pivotal action in the history of our young country, an event so important in shaping the Nation that it is one of only eight moments in our history deemed worthy enough of gracing the walls of the Capitol rotunda.

A painting of Washington's historic act hangs not far from this Chamber alongside more well known moments in American history such as the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the Battle of Bunker Hill.

The precedent that Washington set on that December day was as revolutionary as it was clear: In the United States of America, the power to make and execute war will be held not by the military but instead by peacefully elected leaders sitting in a legislative body.

Washington understood that the will of the people—the will of the American people—shall be the guiding hand of government, even on questions of war and peace.

I wonder how President Washington would feel, I wonder what he would say to each of us today. First, I think he would be very proud of what has happened this afternoon in the House of Representatives, where they came together, after lengthy debate, to state their opinions about the most pressing issue of war, the war in Iraq. I am very proud that we saw the House of Representatives vote 246 to 182 to say, first, that they support the troops and, secondly, that they do not support the escalation of the war in Iraq.

Regardless of how each person voted today in the House, they took that vote. They were willing to stand up and be counted and give their opinion. I believe the majority of the American people—and their will, their belief—was represented in this vote today of 246 to 182.

What has happened in the Senate? Well, first of all, I commend our majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, for his perseverance, for his continuing effort to reach across the aisle with the minority leader to find a way to do the same thing the House has done. He has put forward numerous proposals, and, as late as yesterday, very simply and in a straightforward way, offerred us the opportunity to vote on a resolution opposing the escalation and one that supports the President's escalation. What could be more fair? What could be simpler? Yet we continue to see the minority block the efforts to bring us to a vote.

For over 2 weeks now, I have watched the Republican leadership engage in legislative games and political posturing to avoid taking a vote on the most pressing issue of our time, the war in Iraq. They say they support it, but they will not vote on a resolution, up or down, whether or not to support the President's escalation. I believe it is because they do not like what they know the outcome will be if we are able to have that vote. They have turned their backs on their responsibility to the people who elected them and to our troops because they may lose a vote.

Four years ago, 23 of us stood on the floor of the Senate and lost a vote. It was a vote to go to war. It was a vote to give the President the authority to go to war in Iraq. It was a tough vote. We knew we were not going to win that vote, but we all—those for and against—made a determination and voted because we are elected officials, charged with overseeing the U.S. Armed Forces, and we had a responsibility to voice our opinions for the record on the question of war.

I have stood on the floor of the Senate time and time again to voice my opposition to this President's proposals of escalation—more of the same, calling it a different strategy, and yet doing the same thing over and over again. Sending more Americans into combat without a strategy for success will not improve the situation on the ground in Iraq. And it will not bring our men and women in uniform home any sooner.

Only the Iraqis can secure Iraq. Only the Iraqis can secure Iraq. We have heard that from generals and military experts and the Iraq Study Group and learned colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The American troops cannot be seen as a substitute for Iraqi resolve. Why would we go further down the path that has led us to this point? Why would we repeat our previous mistakes and call it a new strategy?

Unlike the President, all of us and our counterparts in the House will go home over recess and on weekends and face our constituents, our neighbors. We see them and talk to them at church, in the line at the bank, at our kids' schools, in the grocery store, and at countless events and meetings as we travel throughout our States.

And we are here because they elected us to be their voice.

This is not Washington, DC's, war. We may set policy here, we may make speeches here, and we may take votes here, this is America's war.

The men and women putting their lives on the line in Iraq every day are from our smallest neighborhoods and our biggest cities, from farm communities and factory towns, from places many of us have never heard of and few of us will ever go. Flint, Howell, West Branch, Hemlock, La Salle, Port Huron, Ypsilanti, Muskegon, Ann Arbor, Byron, Flushing, Bay City, Canton, Paw Paw, Lake Orion, Saginaw, Sand Creek—these are only some of the dozens of communities in my home State of Michigan that have given up a son or a daughter to this war.

We sit in this historic Capitol and argue over whether we should dignify this war with a simple vote, while these and other communities across the country bury their loved ones, while high schools hold vigils for alumni laid to rest too young, while churches comfort parishioners who have lost sons and daughters and husbands and wives and fathers and mothers.

We are the voice of these communities, of these towns and cities and counties. We were elected with their sacred trust to come here, to Washington, and to speak out for them, to make our mark for them on the issues that face this country. There can be nothing more important than the issue of war.

By continuing to stonewall a vote on this resolution, the Republican minority has stripped all of America of their voice in this debate. They have said to the people who elected us that this issue—the issue of an escalation of war—is not important enough for their elected representatives to consider.

Too often in the white noise of politics we lose sight of the responsibility we bear. We get bogged down in the politics of partisanship and lose sight of why we were elected. We owe it to the American people to take this vote. This is the most serious issue of our time. There is nothing more important or more pressing than our Nation being at war. It is the responsibility of the Congress to engage in shaping policy concerning the war on behalf of the American people.

Let me take a few moments to remind everyone what is really at stake. While some posture and jockey for legislative position, lives are on the line this moment and every moment the war goes forward. It doesn't matter if you support or oppose the war. Anyone involved in slowing a vote on this resolution should be ashamed. Our military has not failed us at any turn in this endeavor. But we are failing them as a body by failing to lead. What is at stake?

On January 21, the Grand Rapids Press published the following account on the war in Iraq:

The first roadside bomb four months ago knocked a front tire off Kyle Earl's Humvee, rang his head like a bell and made his ears bleed.

The second bomb a couple of weeks later blew out the front tires and took out the transmission but, again, spared Earl serious injury.

The third one, on Oct. 17, was his last.

With the headlights out for security and wearing night-vision goggles, the 20-year-old Marine lance corporal from Cedar Springs was driving the lead Humvee returning from a night patrol in Iraq's Al Anbar province near the border with Syria. He and a Marine manning the Humvee's machine gun saw it at the same time: a hump in the road ahead, a sure sign of a buried improvised explosive device (IED).

Earl instantly made the calculation: If he swerved, the trailing Humvee carrying the company commander would hit the IED, so ''I drove right into it, knowing it was probably going to kill me,'' he said.

He ran over the hump, igniting three 155-mm artillery shells and five propane tanks. The flash, amplified by the night-vision goggles, was brighter than anything he'd ever seen. A fireball shot through the cab, and shrapnel pierced his right leg, arm and face. The shock wave felt like someone had placed him inside a plastic bag and sucked out all the air.

Still, he remained conscious, as the Humvee rolled off the road and came to a stop. Blood streamed from his eyes, ears and nose. He reached for his 9 mm handgun, but noticed something about the size of his palm on it. He picked it up and examined it, unaware it was a chunk of his flesh, ripped from his right forearm.

He smelled something burning and realized he and the Humvee were on fire. He rolled out onto the ground as his fellow Marines kicked him to extinguish the flames.

We are here because of that lance corporal. He and his comrades, the men and women serving, deserve our best—our best judgment, our best decisions, our best funding, our best strategy for them.

On November 16, 2006, the Detroit Free Press gave us this insight into life on the ground in Iraq:

''A few days ago, from out of a crowd of kids, one of them threw a grenade and it went off under the vehicle, and my executive officer's door was peppered,'' said Lance Cpl. Michael Rossi, a 28-year-old student majoring in urban planning at Wayne State University who lives in Detroit. ''A crowd of kids, and one of them threw a grenade.''

''Out here,'' he said, ''nobody is safe.''

On January 5, the editorial page of the Flint Journal paid its respects to one of Flint's fallen sons:

It's touching and laudable that the father of Marine Cpl Christopher Esckelson would want the family of a fellow Marine to understand the full heroics these men displayed in Iraq combat that claimed both their lives.

They are among more than a dozen local military men whom the Iraq war has claimed, with each succeeding loss being no less painful to an area that has supplied an ample measure of these patriots.

Of course, the grief is much greater for the families who knew the men in so many other wonderful ways. Those memories undoubtedly will be recalled during services for Miller and Esckelson Saturday and Sunday, respectively.

All of us have stories of the men and women who have served heroically and lost their lives, men and women who have come home and need our assistance now as veterans while in our hospitals and will forever carry a remembrance of this war through lost limbs and other health conditions. They deserve a vote on whether we believe this strategy for them and their colleagues is the right strategy. They deserve this. They expect us to stand up and speak out and work as hard as we can to get it right.

Too often on the floor of this Chamber and too often in politics, we use words such as ''bravery'' and ''toughness'' and resolve.'' We describe votes as ''tough.'' We describe speeches as ''brave.'' The men and women serving in combat know the real meaning of these words. They go about their dangerous duty with the pride of professionals. They live and work under the shadow of violence, never knowing what might be facing them around the next corner, and they do it with stoic resolve that reflects their character and their training. They do not have the luxury of picking and choosing when and where to fight. They go where their country sends them and stand shoulder to shoulder with their brothers and sisters in arms and face whatever is thrown at them. What we consider heroic, they consider doing their job.

Their sacrifices deserve and demand leadership, our leadership, collectively. We owe to it them and to every person we were elected to represent to vote on this resolution, to take a stand about how this war will proceed. It is our job. It is time to stop stalling and face our responsibility, a responsibility that pales in comparison to that which is taken every day by our troops in Iraq.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I would like to state my support of the vote we will take tomorrow. Last week, I expressed my support for the bipartisan Levin-Warner resolution which was denied a vote by the full Senate due to procedural motions. Ten days later, we find ourselves in a similar situation.

Our colleagues in the House have spent the last 4 days debating the current course of action in Iraq, and they have completed a vote on final passage today. At the same time, the Senate has continued to engage in partisan bickering and political gamesmanship. The House found a way, it found a bill, and it took a vote. We have a bill, and we need to debate it.

At bottom, this debate is not about whether one is a Republican or Democrat; it is about the legislative branch exerting its proper constitutional oversight by deliberating on the most vital and challenging issue of our day. I would urge my colleagues to think about the vote that took place in 2002 authorizing the use of force in Iraq and about what happened afterward. This was not a party-line vote. I was not a

Member of this body, and I do personally believe it was an erroneous vote, at least in its outcome, but at the same time, most importantly, we should look at the lack of respect shown by the administration after the vote. This lack of respect was a clear signal that the true issues dividing us in this Government are more related to the relations between the executive and legislative branches than between our respective parties.

The administration has failed the country again and again in the conduct of this war. At the same time, it repeatedly claims that it holds the power, regardless of the input of the Congress, to continue to push our military people to the limits of their endurance, while avoiding the diplomatic options crucial to resolving the situation in Iraq which inevitably evolved from our invasion and occupation.

I have heard discussion today about the consequences of withdrawal. No one on this side is advocating a precipitous withdrawal, but the consequences that are being described—increased terrorism, the empowerment of Iran, the loss of prestige of the United States around the world, and economic distress in our country—are, quite frankly, the exact conditions many of us were warning about if we invaded in the first place. The question is not how we withdraw or should we withdraw. Some day, we are going to withdraw. Inevitably, we are going to withdraw. The question is the conditions we leave behind when we do so.

I have long advocated that an integral part of our strategy in Iraq must include engagement with all of Iraq's neighbors, including Iran and Syria. As Iraq's neighbors, they are stakeholders in both the future of Iraq and the need for stability in the region. As we seek to decrease our presence in Iraq and increase our ability to fight terrorism and address strategic challenges elsewhere in the world, we must bring those two countries to the table. An overwhelming majority of those who recently testified before hearings at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee agree with that assessment.

I have heard today the name of General Petraeus invoked several times as evidence of this body's support for the administration's current policy. I voted for General Petraeus. A vote for General Petraeus is not a vote for this administration's policy or its strategy or its, quite frankly, lack of strategy. That vote was to support the qualifications of an individual to command troops in Iraq. That was a military vote, not a political vote. If the strategy were to change, as I hope it will, I have full confidence that General Petraeus is capable of overseeing that policy as well. We must see evidence of a new diplomatic effort from this administration before we, as a Congress, not as Democrats and Republicans, ratify the expanded use of our military.

On that note, it should be emphasized that despite comments today about the fact that the Baker-Hamilton group supported a temporary military surge in its report, it did so only in consonance with a robust regional diplomatic surge which was supposed to begin more than 2 months ago.

Many Republicans seem to be implying that we must support all of this administration's actions or, by inference, we don't support the troops. The issue is not whether we support the troops; it is whether we agree on the political issues to which they are being put. This effort demands clear direction from the top. It depends on the extent to which this Government is capable of forging a regional consensus regarding Iraq's future. This administration has refused to do so. It is not in the interest of our troops to continue sending them in harm's way without a clear strategy that will bring closure to this endeavor.

I believe very strongly that our political representatives should be careful in claiming to speak politically for our troops. Our military is a mirror of our society, and so are its political views. We have heard a lot of anecdotal evidence today—TV clips, newspaper interviews with individuals. But anecdotal evidence notwithstanding, poll after poll shows that our troops are just as concerned about this policy as is the public at large.

I have one poll from a year ago, a Zogby poll, that says that 72 percent of the people then stationed in Iraq believed the war should have ended by the end of 2006. This includes 7 out of 10 of our Regular Army soldiers and a vast majority—nearly 60 percent—of our marines. These are people who have done their job. They know what their military job is, but they have the same questions about the political policies as do the rest of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to print the Zogby poll in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[February 28, 2006]

U.S. TROOPS IN IRAQ: 72 PERCENT SAY END WAR IN 2006

Le Moyne College/Zogby Poll shows just one in five troops want to heed Bush call to stay ''as long as they are needed,'' While 58 percent say mission is clear, 42 percent say U.S. role is hazy, Plurality believes Iraqi insurgents are mostly homegrown, Almost 90 percent think war is retaliation for Saddam's role in 9/11, most don't blame Iraqi public for insurgent attacks, Majority of troops oppose use of harsh prisoner interrogation, and Plurality of troops pleased with their armor and equipment.

An overwhelming majority of 72 percent of American troops serving in Iraq think the U.S. should exit the country within the next year, and more than one in four say the troops should leave immediately, a new Le Moyne College/Zogby International survey shows.

The poll, conducted in conjunction with Le Moyne College's Center for Peace and Global Studies, showed that 29 percent of the respondents, serving in various branches of the armed forces, said the U.S. should leave Iraq ''immediately,'' while another 22 percent said they should leave in the next six months. Another 21 percent said troops should be out between six and 12 months, while 23 percent said they should stay ''as long as they are needed.''

Different branches had quite different sentiments on the question, the poll shows. While 89 percent of reserves and 82 percent of those in the National Guard said the U.S. should leave Iraq within a year, 58 percent of Marines think so. Seven in ten of those in the regular Army thought the U.S. should leave Iraq in the next year. Moreover, about three-quarters of those in National Guard and Reserve units favor withdrawal within six months, just 15 percent of Marines felt that way. About half of those in the regular Army favored withdrawal from Iraq in the next six months.

The troops have drawn different conclusions about fellow citizens back home. Asked why they think some Americans favor rapid U.S. troop withdrawal from Iraq, 37 percent of troops serving there said those Americans are unpatriotic, while 20 percent believe people back home don't believe a continued occupation will work. Another 16 percent said they believe those favoring a quick withdrawal do so because they oppose the use of the military in a pre-emptive war, while 15 percent said they do not believe those Americans understand the need for the U.S. troops in Iraq.

The wide-ranging poll also shows that 58 percent of those serving in country say the U.S. mission in Iraq is clear in their minds, while 42 percent said it is either somewhat or very unclear to them, that they have no understanding of it at all, or are unsure. While 85 percent said the U.S. mission is mainly ''to retaliate for Saddam's role in the 9-11 attacks,'' 77 percent said they also believe the main or a major reason for the war was ''to stop Saddam from protecting al Qaeda in Iraq.''

''Ninety-three percent said that removing weapons of mass destruction is not a reason for U.S. troops being there,'' said Pollster John Zogby, President and CEO of Zogby International. ''Instead, that initial rationale went by the wayside and, in the minds of 68 percent of the troops, the real mission became to remove Saddam Hussein.'' Just 24 percent said that ''establishing a democracy that can be a model for the Arab World'' was the main or a major reason for the war. Only small percentages see the mission there as securing oil supplies (11 percent) or to provide long-term bases for US troops in the region (6 percent).

The continuing insurgent attacks have not turned U.S. troops against the Iraqi population, the survey shows. More than 80 percent said they did not hold a negative view of Iraqis because of those attacks. About two in five see the insurgency as being comprised of discontented Sunnis with very few non-Iraqi helpers. ''There appears to be confusion on this,'' Zogby said. But, he noted, less than a third think that if non-Iraqi terrorists could be prevented from crossing the border into Iraq, the insurgency would end. A majority of troops (53 percent) said the U.S. should double both the number of troops and bombing missions in order to control the insurgency.

The survey shows that most U.S. military personnel in-country have a clear sense of right and wrong when it comes to using banned weapons against the enemy, and in interrogation of prisoners. Four in five said they oppose the use of such internationally banned weapons as napalm and white phosphorous. And, even as more photos of prisoner abuse in Iraq surface around the world, 55 percent said it is not appropriate or standard military conduct to use harsh and

threatening methods against insurgent prisoners in order to gain information of military value.

Three quarters of the troops had served multiple tours and had a longer exposure to the conflict: 26 percent were on their first tour of duty, 45 percent were on their second tour, and 29 percent were in Iraq for a third time or more.

A majority of the troops serving in Iraq said they were satisfied with the war provisions from Washington. Just 30 percent of troops said they think the Department of Defense has failed to provide adequate troop protections, such as body armor, munitions, and armor plating for vehicles like Hum Vees. Only 35 percent said basic civil infrastructure in Iraq, including roads, electricity, water service, and health care, has not improved over the past year. Three of every four were male respondents, with 63 percent under the age of 30.

The survey included 944 military respondents interviewed at several undisclosed locations throughout Iraq. The names of the specific locations and specific personnel who conducted the survey are being withheld for security purposes. Surveys were conducted face-to-face using random sampling techniques. The margin of error for the survey, conducted Jan. 18 through Feb. 14, 2006, is +/ − 3.3 percentage points.

Mr. WEBB. Another poll, of December 29, 2006, by the Military Times, the most credible military newspaper in America, indicates that barely one-third of our service members approve of the way the President is handling the war. In fact, only 41 percent of our military now believes the United States should have gone to war in Iraq in the first place.

I ask unanimous consent that this poll be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Military Times Poll, Dec. 29, 2006]

DOWN ON THE WAR

(By Robert Hodierne)

The American military—once a staunch supporter of President Bush and the Iraq war—has grown increasingly pessimistic about chances for victory.

For the first time, more troops disapprove of the president's handling of the war than approve of it. Barely one-third of service members approve of the way the president is handling the war, according to the 2006 Military Times Poll.

When the military was feeling most optimistic about the war—in 2004—83 percent of poll respondents thought success in Iraq was likely. This year, that number has shrunk to 50 percent.

Only 35 percent of the military members polled this year said they approve of the way President Bush is handling the war, while 42 percent said they disapproved. The president's approval rating among the military is only slightly higher than for the population as a whole. In 2004, when his popularity peaked, 63 percent of the military approved of Bush's handling of the war. While approval of the president's war leadership has slumped, his overall approval remains high among the military.

Just as telling, in this year's poll only 41 percent of the military said the U.S. should have gone to war in Iraq in the first place, down from 65 percent in 2003. That closely reflects the beliefs of the general population today—45 percent agreed in a recent USA Today/Gallup poll.

Professor David Segal, director of the Center for Research on Military Organization at the University of Maryland, was not surprised by the changing attitude within the military.

''They're seeing more casualties and fatalities and less progress,'' Segal said.

He added, ''Part of what we're seeing is a recognition that the intelligence that led to the war was wrong.''

Whatever war plan the president comes up with later this month, it likely will have the replacement of American troops with Iraqis as its ultimate goal. The military is not optimistic that will happen soon. Only about one in five service members said that large numbers of American troops can be replaced within the next two years. More than one-third think it will take more than five years. And more than half think the U.S. will have to stay in Iraq more than five years to achieve its goals.

Almost half of those responding think we need more troops in Iraq than we have there now. A surprising 13 percent said we should have no troops there. As for Afghanistan force levels, 39 percent think we need more troops there. But while they want more troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, nearly three-quarters of the respondents think today's military is stretched too thin to be effective.

The mail survey, conducted Nov. 13 through Dec. 22, is the fourth annual gauge of active-duty military subscribers to the Military Times newspapers. The results should not be read as representative of the military as a whole; the survey's respondents are on average older, more experienced, more likely to be officers and more career-oriented than the overall military population.

Among the respondents, 66 percent have deployed at least once to Iraq or Afghanistan. In the overall active-duty force, according to the Department of Defense, that number is 72 percent.

The poll has come to be viewed by some as a barometer of the professional career military. It is the only independent poll done on an annual basis. The margin of error on this year's poll is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

While approval of Bush's handling of the war has plunged, approval for his overall performance as president remains high at 52 percent. While that is down from his high of 71 percent in 2004, it is still far above the approval ratings of the general population, where that number has fallen into the 30s.

While Bush fared well overall, his political party didn't. In the three previous polls, nearly 60 percent of the respondents identified themselves as Republicans, which is about double the population as a whole. But in this year's poll, only 46 percent of the military respondents said they were Republicans. However, there was not a big gain in those identifying themselves as Democrats—a figure that consistently hovers around 16 percent. The big gain came among people who said they were independents.

Similarly, when asked to describe their political views on a scale from very conservative to very liberal, there was a slight shift from the conservative end of the spectrum to the middle or moderate range. Liberals within the military are still a rare breed, with less than 10 percent of respondents describing themselves that way.

SEEING MEDIA BIAS

Segal was not surprised that the military support for the war and the president's handling of it had slumped. He said he believes that military opinion often mirrors that of the civilian population, even though it might lag in time. He added, ''[The military] will always be more pro-military and pro-war than the civilians. That's why they are in this line of work.''

The poll asked, ''How do you think each of these groups view the military?'' Respondents overwhelmingly said civilians have a favorable impression of the military (86 percent). They even thought politicians look favorably on the military (57 percent). But they are convinced the media hate them—only 39 percent of military respondents said they think the media have a favorable view of the troops.

The poll also asked if the senior military leadership, President Bush, civilian military leadership and Congress have their best interests at heart.

Almost two-thirds (63 percent) of those surveyed said the senior military leadership has the best interests of the troops at heart. And though they don't think much of the way he's handling the war, 48 percent said the same about President Bush. But they take a dim view of civilian military leadership—only 32 percent said they think it has their best interests at heart. And only 23 percent think Congress is looking out for them.

Despite concerns early in the war about equipment shortages, 58 percent said they believe they are supplied with the best possible weapons and equipment.

While President Bush always portrays the war in Iraq as part of the larger war on terrorism, many in the military are not convinced. The respondents were split evenly—47 percent both ways—on whether the Iraq war is part of the war on terrorism. The rest had no opinion.

On many questions in the poll, some respondents said they didn't have an opinion or declined to answer. That number was typically in the 10 percent range.

But on questions about the president and on war strategy, that number reached 20 percent and higher. Segal said he was surprised the percentage refusing to offer an opinion wasn't larger.

''There is a strong strain in military culture not to criticize the commander in chief,'' he said.

One contentious area of military life in the past year has been the role religion should play. Some troops have complained that they feel pressure to attend religious services. Others have complained that chaplains and superior officers have tried to convert them. Half of the poll respondents said that at least once a month, they attend official military gatherings, other than meals and chapel services, that began with a prayer. But 80 percent said they feel free to practice and express their religion within the military.

Mr. WEBB. I believe very strongly that we should leave our military people out of these political debates. I am not using these figures to advance the Democratic Party's point. I believe it is inappropriate for the other party to use our military people in a way that might insulate them from criticism over the woeful failures of this administration's policy. The American people's confidence in this administration is at rock bottom. Many rightly believe they were misled on the reasons for going to war.

The administration's credibility has suffered—rightly so—also with respect to its intentions for dealing with Iran. I do not believe one can speak of our responsibility on these immediate issues without stating clearly our concerns about the entire region, and especially the administration's position regarding its constitutional authority to use military force outside of Iraq.

The administration's view of its Presidential authority to conduct unilateral military action against other

countries, and particularly with Iran, was documented in President Bush's signing statement accompanying the original authorization for the use of force against Iraq in October 2002. I urge my colleagues to examine this language. In part, it states:

My signing this resolution does not constitute any change in the long-standing positions of the executive branch on either the President's constitutional authority to use force to deter, prevent, or respond to aggression or other threats to U.S. interests.

In other words, if one were to read that carefully, this administration is stating that it has the authority to use force to respond to threats to our interests. What is an ''interest''?

I have raised this language with the Secretary of State, as well as with the Deputy Secretary. My question was whether this administration believes that it possesses the authority to conduct unilateral military activity against Iran in the absence of a direct threat and without the approval of the Congress. I have not received a clear answer from either of them on that point. That is troubling.

This administration and its supporters must understand the realities that are causing us, as a Congress, to finally say enough is enough. After 5 years of misguided policy, ineffective leadership, and diminished U.S. stature around the world, the Congress must show the way to reclaiming the moral high ground and exert its proper oversight role more forcefully.

For these reasons, I support the pending Iraq resolution before us, and I will vote for cloture. I urge my fellow Senators to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I was a Member of the Senate when we voted to authorize the use of force against Iraq. It was not just a rapid, quickly done deal, we talked about it for months. We talked about primarily the 16 or 17 resolutions that Saddam Hussein had failed to comply with that he agreed to with the United States and the United Nations; that he was setting about systematically to break out of the box of the embargo placed on him because he failed to comply with those resolutions.

We were flying, if you remember, aircraft over Iraq on a regular basis, and they were shooting missiles at us, trying to bring down our aircraft. We were dropping bombs on them on a weekly basis. This was the context of the debate that we entered into.

At the end, a great deal of emphasis was placed on the question of weapons of mass destruction by the President and others. But for most of us, I think it was a strategic American decision based on the fundamental questions: Were we going to give up? Were we going to let the embargo elapse? And would Saddam Hussein be able to continue to say—actually say with conviction and some honesty—that he had won the 1991 gulf war? He said he won the war. He never complied with the agreements that he entered into and, as a result, we entered this conflict.

The initial invasion went far better than most of us believed possible, than many predicted—those who supported the war and those who did not. The aftermath has been much more troubling and difficult. I have been one of those who shared General Abizaid's view of let's keep the number of our troops as low as we can, let's push as hard as we can to train and bring on the Iraqi forces, and let's let their government be responsible for its own activities as soon as possible. But I have to be honest, it has been more difficult than most of us would have thought. We now have many soldiers there in dangerous circumstances. So I am concerned about that. I respect anybody who is concerned about that.

I am not here to say I know you are wrong, that I know this is the only way and the only right policy, and I guarantee you it will be successful. I want to say that in the beginning. We have some difficult choices to make, and I respect people who don't agree.

I am not able, however, to justify a resolution that appears to be designed to embarrass the President, appears to be contradictory to our Nation's policy, that would indicate to our adversaries and enemies that we are divided. I cannot see that as a positive step for us. I am inclined to agree with the view of General Petraeus. He finished at the top of his class at West Point. He was No. 1 in his class at the Command and General Staff College. He got his Ph.D. at Princeton. He was in Mosul, right after the initial invasion, commanding the 101st Airborne Division. He was a Ranger, a soldier, a fabulous leader. I saw him in operation when some of the Alabama National Guard members had felt they were not being fully utilized right after they got to Mosul. I told General Petraeus, and he said:

Let's go over and meet them.

He told them:

You are part of our effort. I will be bringing you right away the Screaming Eagle patch and you are going to put it on and be one of ours. There won't be any difference in the Guard and Reserve.

That was such an example of leadership, I thought. Later, he showed how they captured Uday and Qusay under his command. He showed how they formed the government. He had a Sunni, Shia, Christian, and a Kurd on the city council. He formed a court system. He was a fabulous leader and everybody recognized that. He finished his tour and came back.

We realized that we needed to spend more effort and be more effective in training the Iraqi Army. So we sent him over there. We asked him to go back. He went back to specifically be in charge of training the Iraqi security forces. During that time, he got to know virtually every major Iraqi military leader. He knows them personally and he worked with them and with most of the Iraqi leadership. He said he didn't know Prime Minister Maliki, but he knows most of them.

After some 15 months at that, well over 2 years in Iraq, he came back home and he was placed in charge of writing the doctrine for the U.S. Department of Defense on how to confront and defeat an insurgency operation, the so-called Counterinsurgency Manual. It is a real serious document. A lot of people don't know this, but there are ways—proven ways—to confront and defeat insurgency operations. In fact, one military historian recently pointed out that very few insurgency operations ultimately become successful. They can cause great distress for substantial periods of time, but they usually fail. There is a fairly significant number—70, 80, 90 percent—that fail, according to this report. So this manual that he painstakingly put together had incredible subtleties in it about how to handle various situations because every situation is different. What might be true in the Kurdish north may not be true in Bosra, the Shia south, or in the Sunni west. Every part of the Sunni and Shia and Kurdish areas are different themselves. Their tribes and their heritage and their religious sects are different. You have to handle them all differently.

President Bush asked General Petraeus to help formulate a plan to be successful in Iraq. He committed to him five additional brigades, over 20,000 soldiers. That is a bitter pill to me. I was very pleased—and I spoke out when some were critical—and in favor of General Casey over a year ago saying he hoped to be able to bring troops home. He brought some home. He asked for more at different times. What happened? Well, violence began to pick up substantially in Baghdad. The Sunni and al-Qaida terrorists saw the country beginning to come together, and they decided to make a devilish decision, and that decision was to deliberately provoke a sectarian conflict. They began to attack the Shia in the marketplaces and they attacked their holy mosque at Samarra. They blew up that mosque and killed people. It began to work. Shia militias began to grow and strengthen and develop, feeling they were not being protected by the government. They began to kill Sunnis, and people would find bodies that had been killed execution style. It was a very grim thing to happen. It still is going on to a substantial degree.

But I believe that this can be reversed. I cannot guarantee that, but I believe it can be reversed with the leadership of the United States, with increased effort on behalf of the Iraqi military and the country of Iraq, that they can begin to reverse this trend. I will just cite that recently General Conway testified at a hearing. He commanded the Marines in the western part of Fallujah and during some of the toughest fighting. Now commandant of

the Marine Corps, he testified a few days ago. I told him about the visit Senators LEVIN, WARNER, PRYOR, and I made to Iraq last fall. The briefing that we had gotten by the Marines in the Ramadi area really concerned me. Some of the information they gave—and the Presiding Officer and I traveled over there, and I know he cares about these issues. That briefing was one of the more troubling things I had heard in visiting there five times, as I have. He pointed out how, in just a matter of weeks, that made a dramatic change; that 12 out of 16 tribal leaders in that area have gotten fed up with al-Qaida and their murdering ways, their parasitic ways, and their domination. And they have made agreements with the U.S. military. We are helping them create their own law enforcement entities, hiring their young people, and they are resisting al-Qaida. There has been a dramatic change in the toughest area, the Sunni area, the area where most of al-Qaida has been. So that is good.

I say to my colleagues that can happen in Baghdad. Don't think that because things have been very difficult in the last year they cannot begin to get better. General Petraeus has stepped up. We are going to increase our forces. The Iraqis are going to increase their forces. I think the Iraqis know this may be their last chance to save this country as a decent and progressive country that treats people fairly and equally. I think they are beginning to wake up to that fact—I hope so. They are moving substantial numbers of troops in there. They are not as good as the American troops in many ways. They have a lot of difficulties. We know that. But they have taken more casualties than we have, and they continue to sign up. We have an opportunity, I believe, to make a difference.

If this effort does not succeed and we do not begin to notice that more progress has been made, that the Iraqis do not meet certain benchmarks we have called on them to make, then we do need to review our policy. I have to say it. What we will do then, I am not sure. But we need to be smart about it. We don't need to be aberrational or spasmodic in how we face those challenges.

What happened on the floor of the Senate is not something that I think has brought credit to this body. After approving General Petraeus to go to Iraq 94 to 0, after making clear we intend to fund the policy the President, as Commander in Chief, is executing, our soldiers are executing, and soldiers have been sent over there as part of this surge—some have already gotten there as part of this surge—it became a goal of the majority leader, Senator REID, and the Democratic leadership, apparently, to vote on a resolution that disapproved it, that criticized the President, I guess to make happy some of the people out there who oppose this war so deeply, some with great passion and legitimate concerns and some with fevered brow who believe we are over there trying to steal Iraqi oil. But that crowd is out there. They want a resolution that is critical of the President and this policy.

Our leader, the Republican leader, said: You can have that vote, that will be all right, let's have that vote, but Senator MCCAIN has a different view. Senator MCCAIN's view is we need to set some benchmarks for the Iraqis and we need to support the President. Senator GREGG said it is most important when troops are in harm's way, when they are placing their lives at risk for us, that we tell them we are going to support them financially. Oh, no, we can't vote on those amendments. We are only going to vote on the one we want.

This resolution, by the way, should have come, by historical tradition and rules of the Senate, out of the Armed Services Committee, but it didn't come out of the Armed Services Committee. Why didn't it come out of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member? Because it doesn't have the votes. It wouldn't have passed out of the Armed Services Committee. So what Senator REID did is, he filed it as a bill instead of a resolution. He filed it and, under rule XIV, brought it to the floor and determined that no other amendments could be accepted or even voted on, only his view should be voted on. And they carefully calculated, I am sure, to make sure they had over 50 votes, so they would be able to pass one resolution that was deemed an attack on the President and a rejection of the policy we are now funding and is being executed by our soldiers who are far more worthy, in my view, of maturity and respect than a Congress that gets itself tied up in this kind of mess.

I think most of us on this side—even some Republicans and some Democrats who supported the resolution—have refused to vote for cloture to bring it up for a vote because they think Senator MCCAIN's and Senator GREGG's resolutions deserve a vote too. Senator MCCAIN said: I would just be satisfied if you vote on Gregg if you don't vote on mine.

I would like to vote on both of them, and I am not afraid to vote on the Democratic resolution. I would vote on all three of them. I am not afraid to talk about this war or to talk about the resolutions. But somehow the media has adopted the Democrat's talking points and suggests Republicans don't want to debate and vote on the issue. That is not true. How many times do we have to say that? I don't think what I said is inaccurate. If it is, I would like to be corrected on the fundamental debate in which we find ourselves.

But what I wish to say to my colleagues is we are, at this very moment, in reality, financially supporting the policy with which they disagree. Advice and suggestions from business, athletics, church, and families needs to be welcome, but naysaying after a decision is reached is nearly always destructive, in my opinion. People have to pull together once a decision is reached. We only have one Commander in Chief. We have the absolute power to shut off every dime going to Iraq and bring our troops home immediately. That is the constitutional power this Congress has. But while we are executing this effort in Iraq, we only have one Commander in Chief. And for the life of me, I can see no advantage to our Nation, to our foreign policy or to our soldiers in a resolution that disagrees with the President's plan, a plan to which we have our soldiers committing their lives this very moment.

Congress should either support it or stop it. But, of course, we all know the awesome responsibility that voting for a precipitous withdrawal out of Iraq would entail because stopping the funding for Iraq is real, just like funding Iraq is real, just like voting for General Petraeus is real. It is not positioning, it is not an expression of concern or an effort to distance oneself from a war that over three-fourths of us in this Senate voted for but has now become very difficult.

The President studied the Baker-Hamilton report, he met with his commanders in Iraq and in the United States, and he met with retired officers, elder statesmen. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace, started a bottom-up review of our Iraq policy in August. I called him about that time to raise some questions and urge that he do that. He said: Senator, I have started that already. After all of this evaluation and receipt of ideas for improvement, both public and private, our President, the one given the power to decide such issues in our system, made his call. He changed his policy. Perhaps he should have done it earlier. I think this kind of review would have been more appropriate earlier.

The President has gone through a deliberative process, though, and made his decision, and I have decided the right response for me, as a Member of this Senate trying to serve the national interest, is to support that policy, at least for the immediate future, and to support those who will execute it—our military personnel.

Others may disagree. An official expression of disagreement, though, about a policy we authorized and we are now funding and our soldiers are executing does not meet, I believe, high standards of responsibility to which a great Senate should adhere. Please remember also that what we do is not contained just in these Halls. I am not persuaded there can be any effect, other than a pernicious one, on those allies and other nations that are assisting us in our efforts. Nor do I see how the threat of an imminent withdrawal could cause the Iraqi Government and the leaders of the various sects and groups to be more willing to reach an accord than would be achieved if we continue assistance in restoring

order, particularly in the nation's capital. I don't know. I don't think so myself. If it was so, I would be persuaded. If that would be the result of a rapid withdrawal, that they would all get together and reach an accord, then I would support it because I don't think we need to be an occupying force in Iraq. But this is not what our generals tell us. It is not what we have heard from the intelligence community.

Some people said: I talked to a retired general; that is what he said. Maybe that is what he said. Maybe that retired general is right. The people we are hearing about are not saying this is any kind of panacea, to pull out, and there is going to be harmony and compromise reached all at once.

In fact, many are saying the violence in Baghdad is so significant that if we allow it to continue to grow, it makes it harder for the warring factions to get together and reach an accord.

Still, despite the difficulties, our experts in public and private conversations believe there is hope for stability with this new policy in Iraq, this new surge. They give that evaluation with full and realistic evaluations of all the challenges we face. The new Iraqi permanent Government has only been formed for 8 months, maybe 9 months now. That Government has only been up for 8 or 9 months. The forces of violence, oppression, and extremism have attacked it full force. They are determined to bring it down. But it still stands, and it has made new commitments to taking the necessary steps toward security and progress.

This is a test for them, no doubt. Maybe they will fail. Maybe they would not meet the commitments they have made. But perhaps not. Perhaps this fragile Government and the Iraqi Army working in new and better ways with General Petraeus and our forces together can be successful, as our experts tell us is possible and realistic.

I, thus, have concluded this Congress should fund this new strategy, not adopt a resolution that has any tendency whatsoever to lessen the chance of that strategy being successful.

Finally, I do not see how a congressional resolution that disagrees with, or one that rejects the President's new policy will have any other effect than to reduce the morale of our soldiers.

Right out here a couple of days ago, I talked with a group from Hartsville, AL. The man pulled me aside and said his son was an infantry officer at Fort Benning. He said: Senator, I want you to know one thing. When you make your decisions, don't think they don't know what is going on. He said: ''They are watching you like a hawk.''

We have a responsibility to them. Yes, we have a responsibility to say pull out if we have to pull out, if that is the thing to do—and I don't think it is yet; I think we have a chance for success. If that is our decision, so be it. But when we send them over there, they should be supported. They should have no doubt that we are going to be with them.

We are waging a war against violent extremists who bomb markets, who behead people who disagree with them, who murder, who kill, who destroy teachers because they teach young girls how to read and write. So this is a complex effort. It is an important effort that to date has protected our homeland from further attack.

We didn't choose this duty. It has fallen to us. By working together, I believe we can achieve more in Iraq than many people think.

And I will say this, while we are being very serious about the challenges we face. I have had personal meetings with Secretary Gates, the new Secretary of Defense, and an extended meeting with GEN Peter Pace, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and I had a good long conversation with General Petraeus, the new commander in Iraq, and Admiral Fallon, who is going to be the Central Command, commander. I have asked them, and each one of them stated to me that they fully understand their responsibility to give us their best military advice, and if at any time this conflict in Iraq becomes untenable, if at any time they conclude that putting more soldiers into harm's way will not be successful and will not achieve the aims which we are seeking there, they will tell us.

I asked Peter Pace that in an open hearing, and he said: ''Yes, sir, Senator, I understand that.'' Secretary Gates cut in and said: ''Senator, I fully understand that, and I feel like that is my number one responsibility.'' I asked General Petraeus that, and he said the same. And I asked him if he believed he could be successful. Remember, this is the man who spent over 2 years in Iraq. He is the best of the best. He has written a manual on how to confront and defeat an insurgency. His answer to whether he can be successful, in sum, was: ''Senator, I do, and I wouldn't be going over there if I didn't think I could be.''

I know people are worried about this conflict. I am worried about it. I talked to a widow yesterday, whose fabulous husband was killed in Iraq, and I don't take it lightly at all. But we are a nation that has been attacked and we have a responsibility to defend our just national interest, and our just national interest would be greatly served by a prosperous, free, democratic Iraq, where terrorists do not find haven and which is not subverted by hostile forces. We have a national interest in that, as well as a humanitarian interest.

I think we need to give General Petraeus a chance. I think we may find that progress in Baghdad can occur, even when it is dark, as it did in Al Anbar Province a few months ago. I was feeling pretty discouraged about what was happening there, but great progress has been made in the last few weeks there. It is time for us to stick together.

I don't think this resolution is good. If we are going to vote on it, we ought to vote on the Gregg resolution and we ought to vote on the McCain resolution. Because only together will that convey to the world, our allies, and our soldiers the real feelings and insights of this Congress. As I have said from the beginning, I don't favor any resolution. We have done what we have to do. We sent General Petraeus and we sent money to execute the policy. I don't know why we have to have a resolution at all.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the motion to invoke cloture to proceed to S. 574 so the Senate can undertake a full, vigorous, and honest debate on the future course of American policy for the war in Iraq.

As we speak about and debate the war, let us never forget our troops in battle, those troops in battle on the streets in Baghdad, in Anbar Province, or other areas of Iraq. We also remember, as we debate this issue, their families and their sacrifice. Finally, today, and in all the days we debate this critically important issue to our country, we honor the sacrifice of those soldiers and marines who gave, as President Lincoln said at Gettysburg, ''the last full measure of devotion to their country.'' We pray for them today and always, and we pray for ourselves that we may be worthy of their valor.

At this time in the Senate we are confronted with two simple questions: First, does the Senate agree with President Bush's plan to escalate our military involvement in Iraq by deploying some 21,000 more troops? Second, will the Senate vote tomorrow to allow debate to go forward?

Just those two questions confront us today and tomorrow. There will be further debate about our policy in Iraq in the weeks and months ahead, but for the next few days it is those two questions.

As I have stated before, I oppose this escalation, but I also support debating it. The grave question of war must always be—always be—the subject of vigorous debate, especially in the Senate. As a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a State that has lost 150 young men and women in combat, I have a solemn obligation to speak out about the escalation.

Many of these brave Americans from Pennsylvania come from small towns such as Rockport and Connellsville and Beaver Falls, and from cities such as Bethlehem and Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. I have an obligation to speak out against those policies that only increase the likelihood that even more of

Pennsylvania's sons and daughters will die or be grievously wounded on behalf of a flawed strategy.

I had hoped, like many in this Chamber, we could have moved forward with the debate on Iraq 2 weeks ago. The American people don't understand why the Senate isn't debating this war when all of America expects us to do so. Perhaps a rare Saturday vote will help this body realize the importance as this debate moves forward.

We owe it to the troops, their families, and to those who have loved and lost someone dear to them in this war to debate our Iraq policy and to clearly express our opposition to the President's escalation. The American people have clearly voiced their strong support and their desire for their elected representatives to address this issue. The elections last November turned in large part on the failure of the previous Congress to engage in adequate oversight of the administration and ask the tough questions when it came to the execution of the war. Debating is essential to good oversight.

We know that recent polls conducted across America reveal Americans consider the war as one of the two most important problems facing our Nation. An overwhelming 63 percent of respondents in a recent national poll expressed concern that the Senate had been unsuccessful to date in attempts to hold a debate on the war in Iraq. We have an obligation to act, and that begins with a full debate.

S. 574 is short but eloquent. It respects and honors our troops who are serving or who have served with distinction in Iraq, and it communicates our disapproval of the President's escalation of the war. It mandates—mandates—additional reporting requirements so there is transparency with regard to military, political, and diplomatic operations in Iraq. This resolution deserves our support because it sends the right message to the President to change course in Iraq.

In the first 5 weeks of this new Congress, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have listened carefully to more than 25 witnesses over the course of a dozen hearings, some 50 hours of testimony from generals and other military experts, diplomats and foreign policy experts, the cochairmen of the Iraq Study Group, and so many others. I have asked tough questions, and I have listened to statements and questions from my colleagues, some of whom have had decades of experience in foreign affairs and the oversight of military operations. After all these hearings, I am even more certain that this escalation is the wrong strategy.

The National Intelligence Estimate—we know it by the acronym NIE—released in January on Iraq's prospects for near-term stability paints a dire picture. The unclassified version describes a growing sectarian-based polarization, ineffective security forces with questionable loyalties, and an all-but-certain rise in communal violence in the coming months. The National Intelligence Estimate clarifies that Iraq's violence today is primarily driven by ''the self-sustaining character of Iraq's internal sectarian dynamics.''

Reading the key judgments of the NIE, I can only conclude that political reconciliation between the respective leaders of Iraq's varied populations is the best way and probably the only way to reduce the violence and to begin to create a stable state that is not a threat to its neighbors. Escalating military conflict by inserting additional U.S. troops in Iraq is not the answer.

As Chairman BIDEN remarked during the Foreign Relations Committee's deliberations on a related resolution, this effort is not inspired by a desire to embarrass or isolate President Bush. Rather, it is an attempt to demonstrate to the President that his approach is flawed and will not result in the outcome he seeks. The President is still searching for a military solution when, in fact, it is time for a political solution led by the Iraqis themselves. Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki himself declared last November, ''The crisis is political, and the ones who can stop the cycle of aggravation and bloodletting of innocents are the politicians.''

What we need is not just a political strategy; we need sustained and vigorous diplomatic engagement that I would argue has been lacking. The President and his senior officials have failed to make the case that the so-called new way forward in Iraq is, in fact, new or promises significant changes needed to achieve real victory. Instead, the President's escalation strategy risks repeating mistakes already made. It inserts more American troops into the crossfire of growing sectarian conflict, and it ignores the urgent need to reorient the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq toward those objectives which offer our best chance to leave behind a secure and stable Iraq.

In spite of all the rhetoric from the White House in recent weeks, I believe, and many in this Senate believe, that the President's policy is more or less more of the same: Stay the course. The United States today has approximately 137,000 troops in Iraq, growing by the day and by the week. Sending an additional 21,000 troops will not fundamentally change the current dynamic in Iraq.

The reality is that more American troops is not the answer in Iraq. General Abizaid, the outgoing U.S. Central Command commander, testified in November that the unanimous opinion of his top subordinates was that more American troops would only perpetuate the dependence of Iraqi troops and would not offer a positive solution. No matter how many troops we send, they cannot provide lasting security on the streets of Baghdad or other Iraqi cities. Only fully equipped, trained, and dedicated Iraqi military and police forces—those who do not pick and choose sides among sectarian groups—only they can provide the type of permanent security that will enable the Iraqi political and civilian life to emerge and the nation to embark on a path to reconciliation.

We heard from former Congressman Lee Hamilton during our Foreign Relations Committee hearings. He noted in his testimony before that committee that the money, time, and attention we are devoting to escalating the level of U.S. forces in Iraq must not detract from what should be a primary mission for the United States: training Iraqi security forces to enhance their capability to take the lead and allow U.S. forces to redeploy out of that country.

Congressman Hamilton and so many others have placed the primacy on the question of training. Instead, by adopting the President's strategy, I fear we are sending an additional 21,000 troops without a more focused mission and lacking a solid plan to accomplish it.

I fear we are still investing too much trust in the Maliki government, a regime that has failed to demonstrate it is acting on behalf of all Iraqis and may be focused only on one sectarian group. I fear American forces will continue to serve as a bull's-eye target for those resentful of a prolonged U.S. occupation in Iraq. In short, I fear, and many in this Senate fear, we are sending more American men and women into Iraq without a new blueprint for victory and without the essential political, diplomatic, and international groundwork required to succeed.

The President has based his troop escalation on the hope—the risky hope, I would argue—that this time the Maliki regime will carry through on its commitments and deliver the required Iraqi forces to help U.S. forces secure neighborhoods throughout Baghdad and, more important, then remain to allow reconstruction to proceed and normal life to return. Yet the record is not encouraging. In Operation Together Forward, Prime Minister Maliki had pledged six battalions, but only two were sent. Some of those Iraqi units suffered subsequent serious attrition rates. Many of those forces have been infiltrated by the very sectarian militias they are now being asked to disarm.

We are already seeing troubling signs in the initial stages of this latest escalation. The New York Times, January 22, the Washington Post, USA Today, and so many other news articles which I will not repeat here today have talked about the problems with Iraqi security forces showing up late or not showing up at all, not serious about their mission, not trained, not focused, and frankly not helping enough in terms of helping American forces. Americans are dying because of that incompetence. The fact remains that it is very difficult to rely on Iraqi forces when you have to ask them to deploy outside of their normal areas of operation and their ethnic strongholds.

I also retain real doubts when the President insists that this time, this

time it will be different, that Mr. Maliki now means it when he says Iraqi forces will truly crack down on all troublemakers, whether they are Shia or Sunni. The Government of Iraq has promised repeatedly to assume a greater share of security responsibilities, disband militias, consider constitutional amendments, and enact laws to reconcile sectarian differences and improve the quality of essential services for the Iraqi people. Yet, despite those promises, little has been achieved by the Iraqis.

Moreover, I am skeptical of this escalation of U.S. troops because we have seen it before. We have seen it before, tried over and over again. Operation Together Forward in 2006 represented a similar escalation; 12,000 additional U.S. troops were introduced into the city of Baghdad, only to see U.S. and Iraqi casualties spike considerably without a sustained reduction in sectarian violence. We have seen similar efforts to ''flood the zone'' with additional U.S. troops in places such as Fallujah and Ramadi, only resulting in temporary gains. If more troops have not worked in the recent past, why should we have any reason to believe it will work this time?

I am concerned, as are so many others, about the dual-chain-of-command concept that is being introduced as part of this escalation. Recently, Prime Minister al-Maliki's commander in the region and the capital itself has been trying to carry out part of this strategy. At the same time, there will be a separate or parallel U.S. command headed by MG Joseph Fil, Jr. Both commanders will have ultimate control over their own national troops, but this ''partnered'' command could create serious complications if there are disputes between U.S. and Iraqi military forces over specific operations. A unified chain of command is one of the hallmark principles that have long governed deployment of U.S. forces abroad.

Finally, I oppose this escalation strategy because I fear it will only exacerbate the longstanding strains on our Nation's military overall. Seven years ago, President Bush declared that his predecessor was leaving office with a military in decline. He alleged that the previous administration had not adequately funded our Armed Forces while simultaneously deploying those forces in excessive engagements around the world. It is one of the most tragic ironies that this President is himself now stretching our military to a genuine breaking point, as he pursues a misguided strategy in Iraq.

The Washington Post recently published an important article documenting the impacts of this proposed troop escalation. According to the Post, the Army and Marine Corps already lack thousands of necessary vehicles, armor kits, and other equipment needed to supply the extra forces. Diverting 21,000 troops from other essential missions around the world will only further deteriorate the readiness of our overall ground forces, making it more difficult to respond quickly and decisively in the event of other military contingencies, and raise the likelihood of greater U.S. casualties.

Our Nation's military is facing a genuine crisis. The war in Iraq has exacted a heavy toll—in casualties, first and foremost, but also in terms of combat equipment that undergirds our fighting men and women. Our National Guard and Reserve troops in particular are paying a heavy price. Army data shows that the Army National Guard units today only have, on average, 40 percent of their required equipment—40 percent. National Guard combat brigades are being involuntarily mobilized, and reservists are being sent back to the command theater on a repeated basis.

Representative JOHN MURTHA, a decorated marine from my home State of Pennsylvania, painted a distressing picture of our military's readiness—or I should say lack thereof—during recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As he noted:

> At the beginning of the Iraq war, 80 percent of all Army units and almost 100 percent of active combat units were rated at the highest state of readiness. Today, virtually all of our active duty combat units at home and all of our guard units are at the lowest state of readiness, primarily due to equipment shortages resulting from repeated and extended deployments in Iraq.

Chairman MURTHA then went on to cite recent House testimony from a senior Pentagon official that our country was threatened because we lacked readiness at home.

I welcome, as so many do, the President's intention to expand our military—permanently elevating the Army and Marine Corps' Active-Duty ranks over the next 5 years. But that is only a long-term solution. Our current forces are badly overextended, and an escalation in strategy in Iraq will only worsen that condition. Our Nation faces growing challenges around the world. We must ensure that our military forces receive adequate training, are fully equipped, and retain the necessary flexibility to quickly respond to contingencies wherever they may arise. Pouring more troops into Iraq does not make those requirements any easier to meet.

Just listen to the bipartisan Iraq Study Group on this matter:

> America's military capacity is stretched thin; we do not have the troops or equipment to make a substantial sustained increase in our troops presence.

The Iraq Study Group goes on to say:

> Increased deployments to Iraq would also necessarily hamper our ability to provide adequate resources for our efforts in Afghanistan or respond to crises around the world.

So says the Iraq Study Group.

For all these reasons, I am proud to stand here today in support of a bipartisan effort to send the President a message that the troop escalation in Iraq is the wrong choice for our Nation. Instead, our Iraq strategy should emphasize a new direction, encouraging Iraqi leaders to make political compromises that will foster reconciliation and strengthen the unity of the Government, laying the groundwork for an improved security situation, and redeploying our military forces in Iraq so they can focus on maintaining that nation's territorial integrity. We also must deny al-Qaida and other terrorists a safe haven, conduct counterterrorism operations, promote regional stability, and, most important, train and equip Iraqi forces to take the lead in security and combat operations. The President's escalation strategy of throwing more U.S. troops into Iraq's burgeoning civil war undercuts and detracts from each of these objectives: A campaign of escalation is incompatible with securing a new and better direction in Iraq. For those who argue that supporting this resolution only offers criticism but does not offer specific alternatives, I urge you to listen to what I and others have said in these days and what we will say in the next couple of days especially.

We have heard from the opponents about what this all means. I will not go into their opinions today. But I will say this: Every Member of this Chamber in both parties honors our troops, no matter which way we stand on escalation. We honor their sacrifices—the sacrifices they and their families make on a daily basis. But we must examine—we have an obligation to examine our national policies which we are asked to carry out and to be supportive of or in opposition to. If we disagree with the broad strategic direction in which the President is taking our Nation, it is our duty to speak out. To remain silent or passive in the face of an approach we believe is misguided and not in the national interests is an abdication of the responsibilities of our offices.

Our military forces and their loved ones have paid a heavy price for this mission in Iraq. As I have noted before, at least 150 Pennsylvanians have given their lives, with hundreds more suffering from serious and lifelong injuries. PFC Ross A. McGinnis of Knox, PA, was one of those killed in action. He was 19 years old. He died of injuries on December 4, 2006, after a grenade was thrown into his vehicle in Baghdad. Private McGinnis has been nominated by his commanders for the Medal of Honor. He was manning the gunner's hatch when a grenade was thrown into his humvee. He could have jumped out to save himself, but he threw himself on the grenade to save the lives of his crew members. We must always remember this debate we must have must not have a focus on abstract policy matters. This has real implications for our men and women in the Armed Forces. We cannot forget the lessons and the life of Private McGinnis or any of the more than 3,000 Americans who have died during this conflict. Our troops are deserving of our support and the support of all the American people.

Mr. President, I conclude with this: A troop increase will only endanger more young Americans in Iraq without any clear hope of success. For that reason, I support honest and open debate on the merits of the President's plan and an opportunity for the Senate to declare its views. I will vote to allow this important debate to proceed, and I will vote in favor of S. 574.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I must say I am disappointed the Democratic leadership continues to preclude the Senate from debating and amending the insufficient resolution sent over from the House of Representatives. This denies the Senate from robustly debating other alternatives, including the bipartisan Warner resolution.

The strategy is to avoid controversial procedures that split the Democratic caucus regarding cutting off funding for the troops and capping the deployment of troops in Iraq. We have the same kind of split to a degree in the Republican caucus. The Warner resolution represents a negotiated agreement that reflects a bipartisan approach to the war and deserves to be debated and voted upon.

This is the second piece of legislation this week that Democratic leaders have brought to the Senate floor straight from the House with no amendments for debate allowed, and I think this is setting a dangerous precedent and frustrates the role the Constitution envisions for the Senate.

I will continue to back the minority's right to bring up amendments and participate in real debate, even if I don't agree with those ideas. I tried to support that when we were in the majority. The American people want Congress to play a role in the way this war is being handled. The first step is to demand a better plan, and we owe the people more than 10 lines in the House Resolution. You can't even begin to address a real solution to a complex situation in 10 lines.

I wish to emphasize to my colleagues that there are 15 cosponsors of the Warner resolution, 6 of whom are Republicans and 9 are Democrats. The resolution has the support of the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, JOSEPH BIDEN, who has been here for many years—a very wise individual. It has the support of the Democratic chairman of the Armed Services Committee, CARL LEVIN. It also has the support of the No. 2 ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CHUCK HAGEL. I mention this because I wish to stress that the Warner resolution is believed to be a fair and reasonable resolution that is broadly supported by both Republicans and Democrats. I believe, if given the opportunity, that resolution will attract over 60 votes of the Senate.

That is why tonight I wish to share some of my thoughts about our current situation in Iraq. I wish to stress that had we received better, more comprehensive prewar intelligence and done our homework about what would be needed after the military offensive, we could have entered Iraq adequately prepared to win the war and secure the peace. We would have been more adequately prepared. Both the administration and Congress should have recognized that by removing Saddam Hussein from office, we would shift the balance of power within the country from Sunni to Shiite and change the contour of the region. Our intelligence errors, our lack of troop preparation, and the bungling of the initial efforts on the ground, specifically disbanding the Army and isolating former Baathists—in spite of advice from people such as GEN Jake Garner and others—is unacceptable. And today, we are paying the price for that, which means all of us have to pay a lot more attention to every decision and plan we endorse from here on out.

I cannot support the proposed troop surge. In spite of meetings at the White House, two with the President, private-session briefings as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and a meeting with General Petraeus for over 40 minutes, I am not convinced the additional troops who are proposed is the best means toward success in Baghdad. That is why I have decided to support the Warner resolution.

A military solution is not sufficient to win the peace in Iraq. As I will get into it, Iraq faces political problems, a power struggle, and primal hate between the fighting sects. More troops alone cannot solve these problems. That being said, I continue to have the highest praise for the generals and, more importantly, for their troops who have remained steadfast in their efforts to secure Iraq. I am grateful to those who have served and continue to serve our Nation in a time of need. I am especially indebted to those who made the ultimate sacrifice and whose families have suffered and who will grieve and those whose lives have been changed forever, as well as some 25,000 men and women who have been wounded over there, 13,000 of them not able to go back into the service.

Winning this war, securing peace in Iraq and stability in the region requires a comprehensive approach and the use of different tools, the most important of which is the will of the Iraqis. At this point, I am afraid we have focused disproportionately on the military component of this war, and we have not adequately stressed the nonmilitary arm of our strategy.

Moving forward in Iraq, we must focus on strengthening our nonmilitary or political tactics. That is why now, more than ever before, I am concerned about Iraq's willingness to bring an end to the violence. As the Warner resolution states:

> The responsibility for Iraq's internal security in halting sectarian violence must rest primarily with the government of Iraq and Iraq security forces.

I recently met with a young man from Ohio out of Bethesda who had completed three tours of duty in Iraq and who was wounded by an IED. I asked him what he did. He said: My main goal, Senator, every day was to keep my men alive and keep peace in the neighborhood.

We have to ask ourselves: How long can we continue to do this? Even if the surge is successful, how long will we have to stay before the Iraqis can handle the situation themselves? Even when I talked with General Petraeus, he did a good job in Mosul—they secured the neighborhoods—but when the Iraqis came in and they left, they lost it. How many American lives will be lost in what is best described as a civil war between Sunni and Shiite that has 1,400 years of Sunni domination over Shiite at its root? More of our Members of the Senate should read about the history of Iraq and the people who are there.

After many closed-session briefings with the National Security Council, four meetings at the White House, including two with the President, and as I mentioned, 40 minutes with General Petraeus, and after hearing hours of witnesses testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I can feel confident saying it is time for the Iraqi people and their leadership to stand up to the sectarian violence between Sunni and Shiite. They need to recognize that all Iraqis and the future of the Nation of Iraq is threatened by this constant bloodshed, and their future is in their hands, not our hands.

U.S. Central Commander GEN John Abizaid, who the President relied upon to lead the ground campaign in Iraq, testified to Congress on November 15:

> I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the Corps commander and General Dempsey. We all talked together. And I said, ''In your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq?'' They all said no. The reason is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future.

That is General Abizaid. If we don't follow the advice of our generals and other military people I have talked to, we run the risk of helping one side at the expense of another, and the Sunnis could interpret our offensive as part of a larger effort to do the dirty work of the Shiite. And don't you think the Sunnis would not spin it that way.

The reality we face today is that an overwhelming majority of the Muslim population in Iraq, be they Shiite or Sunni, look upon us as infidels and occupiers. They do. And our presence there is exploited every day by our enemies. In fact, one poll claimed 60 percent of the people in Iraq said it is OK to kill Americans. While we cannot even begin to capture what is happening in the hearts and minds of the Iraqis with one poll, it sends a striking

message about what additional troops might face there.

We have to consider the reliable information we have that suggests the surge could ignite an even more aggressive countersurge, in which every martyr—every martyr—in the country is drawn to Baghdad to defeat the infidels, as the Sunnis were drawn to Mecca on Ramadan. We could see a terrible situation there, and I don't want—I wish to make clear I am not analogizing the Sunnis going to Mecca on Ramadan. I am saying it would bring lots of people into Baghdad.

The fact of the matter is we cannot stop the sectarian violence with combat brigades and more forces alone. Implementing martial law in Iraq would be impossible because of the sheer number of Iraqi citizens and our commitments elsewhere around the globe. At this point, we wouldn't begin to have enough forces.

Mr. President, the only way to bring stability to Iraq is by addressing a number of serious political problems that lie at the root of this violence. Before the war, Iraq was united by Saddam's reign of terror, as Slobadan Milosevic kept everybody under his control or, before him, Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. When he was removed from office, the major power struggle ensued, and it is not surprising. In fact, it should have been expected. In fact, as we later found out, many academics and intelligence officers did predict this. In the aftermath of Saddam's regime, many different sects and local leaders realized a power shift was taking place, and they wanted to come out on top. They knew the greatest source of potential power is in oil. That is why the critical component of the political solution must be to reach a decision on how the oil can be distributed to all sects and communities in Iraq. It is absolutely critical that Prime Minister Maliki moves quickly—tomorrow—to pass the legislation that guarantees that all Iraqis will benefit from oil. If he can do this, it will show the sects how the power in Iraq will be dispersed in the future.

Recently, I met with the Foreign Minister, Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey. The Foreign Minister agreed that the oil situation is the most important issue today and the one that will have profound impact on the long-term stability of Iraq. This must be a component of the overall national reconciliation plan to unite Iraqis and give them confidence in their Government.

A second key political priority must be the reintegration of the Sunni Baathists into society. When we went into Iraq, we cut the Baathists out of the military and security forces. The result of the policy was they had nowhere to go. They were frightened about their futures. They could not feed their families. They were angry. They were resentful. So they went to the streets. Before long, they became part of the problem, joining with militias and other fighters to resist the Shia government. So a major political priority must be to develop a plan to reintegrate the former Baathists and it needs to happen now. It is essential that the Iraqi Government work toward provincial elections so there is more equal representation of the different sects.

The third vital component of our nonmilitary strategy must be greater regional diplomacy. We must work to encourage Iraq's neighbors to get involved in containing the violence. Specifically, these neighboring countries have the ability to put pressure on the different sects and local leaders to help unite the Iraqi Government. They have the ability to pass debt relief, participate in border control, and help avoid a potential refugee problem. I don't think people realize that there have been over 3.5 million refugees who have come out of Iraq.

In December 2006, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group issued their recommendations for a successful United States strategy in Iraq. A core component of their proposal was that the United States act immediately to undertake a ''diplomatic offensive'' consisting of ''new and enhanced diplomatic and political efforts in Iraq and the region.'' The recommendation called on the administration to engage the international community, the Arab League, traditional United States allies in the Middle East, and all Iraq's bordering neighbors in order to address regional conflicts and jointly bring stability to Iraq. They advised the administration to work quickly to convene a regional conference—it has not happened—which would complement the Iraq Compact undertaken by the United Nations. We need to embrace the study group's recommendations on this issue and act now to increase diplomatic engagement with the international community.

Without a broad political strategy, our military objectives, no matter what the tactic, will be pursued in vain. These political elements must be the focus of our plan in Iraq. And that said, I agree there is a military component here, as well. I want to be very clear that I do not support a military withdrawal from Iraq nor do I support disengagement from the Middle East.

As we debate this issue, we must consider our broader national security interests in the Middle East. We are only focusing on Iraq. We have to start thinking about the whole greater Middle East area. Despite one's views about the current situation in Iraq, it is in our country's vital security interest to pursue a strategy of diplomacy and military action in the region. To put it simply, the stakes are too high for us to sit on the sidelines. We must remain active players in the Middle East to maintain regional stability, to protect vital energy supplies, and to guarantee peace and security at home.

We have had long-standing economic and military interests in the Middle East and we were involved in the region long before we decided to challenge Saddam Hussein for his defiance of the U.N. Security Council. But today, with conflicts brewing in Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, between Israel and the Palestinian territories, it is even more critical we remain steadfast in our commitment. Despite what one might believe about the President's strategy in Iraq, we cannot confuse debate over tactics with the nonnegotiable need to remain engaged in the Middle East.

Currently, the greatest threat to the stability in the Middle East is the possibility of failure in Iraq which threatens to destabilize the region and poses a critical national security risk to the United States. A premature withdrawal from Iraq will signify in essence that we are abandoning the region in its entirety. Our departure could greatly damage, if not sever, relationships with key allies, resulting in dire political and social consequences throughout the world.

The long-term security interests of the United States will be best served by a peaceful Iraq that can sustain, govern, and defend itself. That is why we must figure a way forward and why we cannot withdraw from Iraq.

The National Intelligence Estimate which was just released underscores the danger of withdrawal, stating succinctly:

> If coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq, intensify Sunni resistance to the Iraq government, and have adverse consequences for national reconciliation.

They conclude that the immediate withdrawal of United States troops likely would lead the Iraq security forces to unravel, encourage neighboring countries to engage openly in the conflict, and lead to massive civilian casualties and population displacement. It is also very likely, were the United States to pull out of Iraq prematurely, al-Qaida would use Iraq as a training ground to plan future attacks, and this escalation of violence could ultimately prompt Turkey to launch a military incursion of its own. These are outcomes we cannot afford to risk.

I will refer to a few of the experts whom I have met or who have testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in recent weeks.

Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger testified that ''withdrawal is not an option'' and continued that:

> An abrupt American departure would greatly complicate efforts to stem the terrorist tide far beyond Iraq: Fragile governments from Lebanon to the Persian Gulf would be tempted into preemptive concessions. It might drive the sectarian conflict in Iraq to genocidal dimensions, beyond levels that impelled U.S. interventions in the Balkans.

Think of that. It might drive sectarian conflict in Iraq to genocidal dimensions beyond levels that impelled United States intervention in the Balkans.

The new Ambassador from Jordan sat next to me at the prayer breakfast, and we started talking about Iraq and the Middle East. He told me that if you do not handle this right, we could see a schism between the Sunni and Shiite that extends from Malaysia to Indonesia.

Another reason I back the Warner resolution is it does not in any way threaten to reduce or jeopardize critical funding for United States troops serving in Iraq. In fact, the resolution states explicitly:

> Congress should not take any action that will endanger the United States military forces in the field, including the elimination or reduction of funds for troops in the field, as such an action with respect to funding will undermine their safety or their effectiveness in pursuing their assigned missions.

A decision to cut funding would be a serious, irreversible mistake.

Last month, this Senate confirmed General Petraeus as the commanding general of the multinational force in Iraq without a dissenting vote. He is carrying out the orders of the President. It is critical that General Petraeus get the resources and equipment he believes are necessary to complete the mission and keep his forces safe in the field. I spoke to General Petraeus and I told him to make sure to ask for what he needs to be successful. He is concerned about receiving the equipment and other nonmilitary resources he will need to be successful, such as contributions of the State Department and other agencies. We cannot send our forces into the field without the necessary equipment. We did this at the beginning of the war. Our soldiers were underequipped. It was despicable. It cannot happen again. We have the resources in this country to ensure that our men and women have everything they need in combat.

We also must provide the funding to reset the equipment when it comes home and to keep the Armed Forces from breaking under the strain of the war. We must ensure that soldiers have the proper training before they leave and we must fund the mobilization centers and other military facilities at home so we can undergo the necessary training.

In my State of Ohio, I met this week with the head of the Ohio National Guard who is now being told he is going to have to train the troops in Ohio because they do not want to send them someplace else because they want them trained fast so they can get them to Iraq and Afghanistan. The fact is, he said:

> I don't have the additional funds or equipment to do this.

We have lost 150 Ohioans, 150 in Iraq. In terms of the States, we are probably two or three in the United States in the number of members lost. We lost two because humvees rolled over and they were not trained to drive those humvees. Now they are much heavier than they were before.

The Warner resolution makes it clear that we must guarantee the troops what they need when they need it. And the Gregg amendment underscores the point further. The best exit strategy for United States troops is a multifaceted and comprehensive strategy focused on creating an Iraq for the Iraqis. We must focus on training the Iraqi security forces so the Iraqis can defend and protect themselves. The Iraqi people must understand they will be given the full responsibility of defending and rebuilding their country. We must remove any ambiguity in the minds of Iraqis about our intention and desire to lead and make it clear we do not want to be there. In fact, they need to understand we want to bring our troops home and we want to help them develop the political and military tools necessary to carry on this mission without us.

Bringing stability to Iraq will require our best minds, our resources, and our bipartisan cooperation. We need a massive improvement in interagency coordination, better communication, better reporting to Congress, and the help of our allies and friends throughout the region.

This is my responsibility as a Member of Congress, to exercise oversight and to contribute to our national security. That is why I support the bipartisan Warner resolution. Again, I am confident that given the opportunity, over 60 Members of this Senate will support it.

Last but not least, all of us who represent the people of this country should get down on our knees and ask the Holy Spirit to enlighten the President and us in our decisionmaking because the impact of Iraq will not only affect Iraq, the Middle East, and world peace, but it will impact dramatically the national security of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, from the gravity of the terms with which the senior Senator from Ohio has spoken, I know the Senator speaks from his heart. This Senator certainly concurs it is of the utmost importance of the interests of the United States that we are successful in Iraq because of the threat to the security interests to our country in that region of the world.

If someone will look at a map, we have the Persian Gulf, and on the eastern portion of the Persian Gulf is the Strait of Hormuz, which is only 19 miles wide, through which most of the super oil tankers of the world have to flow out of the Persian Gulf, or if you are from an Arab country, the Arabian Gulf into the great oceans of the world to an oil-thirsty world. That is clearly one interest.

Another interest is clearly the fact that Iran wants to build a nuclear weapon. What an enormously destabilizing situation that would be to put in a rogue nation's hands that is not unaccustomed to peddling things to itchy fingers that like to exact mischief on the rest of the world. You put a nuclear weapon in those itchy fingers, and we have a whole new kind of threat to the stability of the civilized world.

But there are other reasons—the reasons of countries that have been in enormous strife, countries that have been very favorable to the United States, as the country of Jordan and all of the internal turmoil they have. I could go on and on, but there are so many reasons why it is very necessary that the United States have success in that part of the world.

But what we are coming down to is a momentous decision tomorrow, at 1:45 p.m., on whether we are going to continue a policy of this administration of stay-the-course or whether we are going to change that course. This Senator believes we should change that course and that the President's decision to put additional troops into Baghdad is not changing the course, it is more of the course. It is putting more American lives into a sectarian violence caldron where the temperature is so high that we see the reports every day of more and more killings.

Now, this violence did not just start. This violence started 1,327 years ago, when, after the death of Mohammed, the prophet, there was a power play, and his grandson was eliminated as one of the natural heirs to the Prophet Mohammed, and the power was controlled within the clerics who had succeeded Mohammed. It was in that grandson's clan that they then started a resistance born out of revenge, and that then started the separation of the Shiites from what are today the Sunnis. And that has happened for 1,327 years. In the midst of that full-scale civil warfare, this Senator does not believe it is in the interest of our country to put in an additional 17,500 American lives. This Senator believes we ought to force the Iraqis to stop killing each other and to start working out their differences.

Now, at the same time, as recommended by the Iraq study commission, it is clearly important that we have a vigorous international diplomatic initiative to engage all the countries in the region to help bear upon Iraq and that sectarian warfare to get them to try to come to their senses, to try to start striking peace instead of warfare, because all of the countries in the region clearly understand that is in their interest. You take a country such as Saudi Arabia. One of the worst things in the world would be if Iraq was just completely enveloped in chaos; the same with Jordan—two of our friends in the region.

It is in the interests of the United States to conduct this diplomatic initiative in a way that it has not been done in the last 4 years: engaging people whom we have refused to engage, listening and learning in the process, instead of always imposing or giving the perception of imposing ourselves on

everybody else, and at the same time letting the forces that are there stabilize instead of putting more American lives at risk.

So we come to a momentous decision that will come tomorrow afternoon: Do we keep the same course or do we start changing the course with new and fresh ideas, with ideas that have clearly been laid out in the Iraq study commission? It is the conclusion of this Senator that we ought to send a very strong message to the White House that the time for changing the stay-the-course policy is now.

TRIBUTE TO DAN SHAPIRO

Mr. President, I want to make note, in the presence of my longtime, very faithful staff member, Dan Shapiro, who has served me so ably for over 6 years as legislative director, that the needs of providing for his little family have called upon him to leave the public sector, where he has been engaged for years, to enter into the private sector. I want to say on behalf of the people of Florida and the people of the Nelson office that we are grateful for his public service.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of thousands of Rhode Islanders who have talked with me about the need for a new direction in Iraq and the need to bring our troops home.

I speak on behalf of the veterans' families who traveled here to Washington to speak to me about their memories of war and the need for this one to end.

I speak on behalf of the brave men and women serving in Iraq who have sacrificed so much and whose families anxiously await their return.

I speak on behalf of mothers I met who felt they had to buy body armor for their sons and daughters headed for Iraq because they could not trust this administration to provide what was needed.

The Senate may have been muzzled in recent days, but Rhode Islanders certainly have not been. More than 2,000 of them have reached out to my office in frustration, in anger, and in concern—and in the hope that this new Democratic Senate will listen to them and hear them, as this administration will not.

I want to share some of what they have written me:

I was at Michael Weidemann's funeral.

Mr. President, Michael was a 23-year-old Army sergeant from Newport, killed in an IED blast in Anbar Province last November.

The letter continues:

Please, if nothing else, take care of things, so that we do not have to go through what we went through at that funeral. Michael and my son . . . were in the JROTC together. . . . He is on his second tour of Iraq. Please, don't make yesterday a dress rehearsal for me. I want my son to come home, safely.

From Johnston, Rhode Island:

My son . . . is presently serving in Iraq and on his second tour of duty there. . . . The President's plan ignores the American people who voted for change in November, and who continue to demand we bring our troops home. . . . The people made their voice heard, and if the President isn't going to listen, the Democratic Congress will. The President's policies have failed!

From Portsmouth, Rhode Island:

President Bush has ignored the advice of experience, lied to us all, lacked any plan and seems to be expecting his successor to solve the problems. It is our only hope that you, as a member of Congress, can work toward bringing our troops home soon.

From Kingston:

I am appalled at the loss of life—today it was reported 20 more service people were killed. The Kurds are deserting rather than fight in Baghdad. . . . We are not just losing people, we are losing big money. We have seven grandchildren. What kind of debt are we placing on those future generations?

From Warwick:

We never should have begun this war, let's now have the sense to end it, not prolong it. Please do whatever you can to stop the president's initiative to increase our military presence in Iraq. . . . , to spend even more money waging a war that your constituents have indicated they no longer support.

From North Kingstown:

We are looking to you to do whatever is in your power to stop the U.S. escalation of troops in Iraq. I and many in our nation feel this will only make a bad situation worse, widen what is essentially a civil war and lead to further casualties and costs without contributing towards a political solution. . . . We are counting on you and your colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up and be counted and forge a bipartisan solution to end this war.

And finally, a woman from Cumberland forwarded me a message she sent to President Bush:

My nephew . . . is in the 82nd Airborne serving our country in Iraq. He is the bravest person I have ever known, along with all the other men and women serving this country. I am proud to be an American! Please, please, on behalf of my family and the families of all U.S. troops—bring them home now!

Mr. President, these voices will not be unfamiliar to anyone in this body. In every State, we have heard similar voices. You have heard them in Colorado, Mr. President. My friend, Senator SANDERS, has heard them in Vermont. People all across America are speaking to all of us, and it is time for us to listen and to show that we have heard and to start to bring our soldiers home.

The President has not heard these voices. He wants to send tens of thousands more troops to Iraq. He calls this a surge. We consider it a grave mistake.

Tomorrow, our vote can stop the parliamentary maneuvers that have stalled us, and this great deliberative body can begin to debate the most pressing question of this day.

Let's talk for a moment about that question. The other side wishes to debate every question, any question—any question but the escalation by this President of our troops in Iraq by over 21,000 men and women. But this question we want to debate is not a question selected by Democrats for political reasons. It is possible here to choose self-serving questions and to force a debate on those questions just to make a political point. But we have not done that.

This question, whether to escalate the war in Iraq, is not an invention of the Democratic Party. It is not an invention of the Senate. It is President Bush, who proposed to send tens of thousands more troops into harm's way and to escalate this conflict, who has presented this question. This question is what was presented to us by President George W. Bush, and by him alone, and it is the pressing question of today.

For weeks, we on this side of the aisle have emphasized and reemphasized our strong commitment to having a real debate—a debate to a vote—to telling the American people where we stand and to casting our votes on the precise question the President of the United States has presented to America. But we have been impeded, obstructed, maneuvered away from this critical question.

The other side argues that to dispute this President's judgment is to fail to support the troops—even though that judgment has failed the troops and has failed our country and has left us with few good options.

But that is a false choice, Mr. President. And this hour demands better of this institution.

There are ways to accomplish the change America demands, and that reason and good conscience dictate. For instance, I believe that rather than send a single additional American soldier into the sands and marshes of Iraq, this President can announce clearly and unequivocally that our troops will be redeployed from Iraq and will soon come home.

The most powerful motivating force at our country's disposal today is the prospect of our redeployment out of Iraq. Let me repeat that. The most powerful motivating force at our country's disposal today is the prospect of redeployment out of Iraq. Using this power wisely, deftly, and thoughtfully would accomplish three critical objectives that, as I have said, would make great strides toward security in Iraq and stability in the region.

First, a clear statement of our intent to redeploy our troops from Iraq would eliminate the sense there that we are an Army of occupation. This in turn would quiet the nationalist sentiment of the Iraqi people, now aroused against us. Many Iraqis are now so opposed to our presence they think killing American soldiers is acceptable.

Second, without America's intervening presence, the world community would have to face directly the consequences of the situation in Iraq. The prospect of our departure would compel the world to take a more active role to work together with America to bring peace and stability to the region. We

cannot continue as we are now, in every meaningful way completely alone.

Third, Iraq's neighbors will be obliged to assume greater responsibility for averting the risk of a Sunni-Shiite conflict igniting in Iraq and spreading beyond Iraq's borders. Without us in Iraq as a police force for a civil war, neighboring nations will have an enlivened incentive to avert a wider war.

Finally, the Bush administration's preoccupation with Iraq leaves us weakened in our capability to address other obligations around the world, from the changing situation in North Korea, to the ongoing battle for Afghanistan, to the serious threat posed by Iran's nuclear program.

Mr. President, these are serious matters, and they deserve the serious and sustained attention of the Senate. I hope tomorrow's vote will allow us to bring this question that attention.

Mr. President, I will support that vote tomorrow. I ask other Senators, who hear our fellow Americans' genuine and sincere concern about our national interest, will do the same.

I will support not only the resolution disapproving of the President's escalation plan and supporting our troops, but also other, stronger measures that will follow, and that will continue to put pressure on this administration to finally bring our troops home.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, before I begin discussing the war in Iraq, I wish to say a few words about another issue that is perhaps even more important and that is the constitutional issues at the very heart of this entire debate.

Let me be very frank: I am not a great fan of the Bush administration. And of the many grave concerns I have about President Bush and his actions, at the top of that list is that the President seems not to understand what the Constitution of the United States is all about. Whether it is the consistent attack on our constitutional rights which his administration has pursued for a number of years or his ''signing statements'' which attempt to circumvent legislation passed by Congress, the President appears to believe he can do whatever he wants, whenever he wants to. That, in my view, is not what the United States of America is all about, and it is not what our Constitution provides for.

In that regard, I wish to inform my colleagues in the Senate that I have submitted a resolution, similar to one introduced by Congressman DEFAZIO in the House, that makes it very clear the President does not have the constitutional authority to start a war against Iran without the express authority of the Congress. There are many people in my State of Vermont—and there are people all over this country—who are deeply worried that the President may take us into a war in Iran and that he is currently laying the groundwork for that war in exactly the same way he led us into the war in Iraq.

So let me be very clear: If President Bush were to start a war in Iran without receiving the authority to do so from Congress, he would not only be creating, in my view, an international disaster, he would also be creating a major constitutional crisis. I hope very much he does not do that.

President Bush fails to understand the power to declare war under the Constitution is given to the Congress, not the President. My resolution, S. Con. Res. 13, is very simple. It states clearly that it is ''the sense of Congress that the President should not initiate military action against Iran without first obtaining authorization from Congress.'' I hope my colleagues will give strong support to this resolution.

Mr. President, in my State of Vermont and all across this Nation, the American people are increasingly concerned about the war in Iraq. As others have stated more eloquently than I, the American people want real debate in Washington, in the Senate, on this issue that is worrying people all across our Nation. More importantly, not only do they want debate, they want action, and they want action now.

Frankly, I have a hard time understanding why some of my colleagues would try, through parliamentary maneuvers, to prevent a vote on what is at best a very modest proposal. This issue is not complicated in terms of what will be taking place tomorrow on this floor. It seems to me that if you support President Bush's escalation of the war in Iraq—and there are many who do—then vote against the resolution. That is your right. On the other hand, if you don't believe that an escalation of this war is a sensible idea—and I certainly do not—then vote for the Reid resolution. But at the very least, there should be a vote. Let the American people know how we stand.

Let me be clear in giving you my perspective on this war: In my view, President Bush's war in Iraq has been a disaster. It is a war we were misled into and a war many of us believe we never should have gotten into in the first place, a war I voted against as a Member of the House. This is a war the administration was unprepared to fight. The administration has shown little understanding of the enemy or the historical context in which we found ourselves.

Who will ever forget President Bush declaring ''mission accomplished'' aboard the aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln when, in fact, the mission had barely begun. Who will forget Vice President CHENEY telling us that the insurgency was ''in its last throes'' just before some of the bloodiest months of the war. Who will forget those Bush advisors who predicted the war would be a cakewalk, nothing to worry about, and that we would be greeted in Iraq as liberators.

This war in Iraq has come at a very high price in so many ways. This is a war that has cost us terribly in American blood. As of today, we have lost over 3,100 brave American soldiers. In my own small State of Vermont, we have lost 25. Twenty-three thousand more Americans have been wounded, and tens of thousands will be coming home with posttraumatic stress disorder which will impact their lives forever. This is a war which, with the President's proposed increase in funding, will cost us some $500 billion, with the price tag going up by $8 billion every month. This cost is going to add to the huge national debt we are leaving to our children and our grandchildren and it is going to make it that much more difficult for us to fund health care, education, environmental protection, affordable housing, childcare, and the pressing needs of the middle class and working families of our country which have been so long neglected. Yes, for more military spending; no, for the needs of ordinary Americans who are struggling so hard to keep their heads above water.

This increased expense for the war will make it that much harder for us to fund the needs of our veterans whose numbers are increasing as a result of this war. This is a war which has caused unimaginable horror for the people of Iraq. People who suffered so long under the brutality of the Saddam Hussein dictatorship are suffering even more today. There are estimates that hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed or wounded and almost 2 million have been forced to flee their own country, some 8 percent of their entire population. While civil war tears neighborhoods apart, children are without schools, people are without electricity, health care, and other basic necessities of life. The doctors and nurses, teachers and administrators who have provided the professional infrastructure for the people of Iraq are now long gone.

This is a war which has lowered our standing in the international community to an all-time low in our lifetimes, with leaders in democratic countries hesitant to work with us because of the lack of respect their citizens have for our President. Long-time friends and allies are simply wondering: What is going on in the United States of America, that great country? This is a war which has stretched both our Active-Duty military to the breaking point as well as our National Guard and Reserve forces.

Morale in the military is low, and this war will have a lasting impact on the future recruitment, retention, and readiness of our Nation's Armed Forces.

This is a war which has, in many respects, lowered our capability to effectively fight the very serious threats of international terrorism and Islamic extremism. Five years after the horrific attacks of 9/11, Osama bin Laden remains free. Using the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq as their rallying cry, al-Qaida's strength around the world continues to grow. And currently the situation in Afghanistan is becoming more and more difficult.

Tragically, this administration has refused to listen to the American people who, in this last election, made it very clear they want a new direction in Iraq and they want this war wound down. This administration has refused to listen to the thoughtful suggestions of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, which included two former Secretaries of State, including President Bush's own father's Secretary of State, as well as a former Presidential Chief Of Staff and a former Secretary of Defense, that it was time for a change of direction. The President didn't listen to them. This administration has refused to listen to the advice of our military leaders in Iraq who told us increasing troops from the United States would make it easier for the Iraqi Government and military to avoid their political and military responsibilities. The more troops that come in, the easier it is for the Iraqi Government to avoid making the political compromises and the tough choices they have to make.

This administration has refused to listen to the Iraqi people, who, according to a number of polls, tell us very strongly that they believe in the midst of all of the chaos and horror taking place in Iraq today, the Iraqi people say they would be safer and more secure if our troops left their country. In fact, this administration has tragically refused to listen to anybody, except that same shrinking inner circle, led by Vice President CHENEY, who has been consistently wrong from day one. Those are the people the President continues to listen to.

As most everybody understands, and as the recent National Intelligence Estimate has recently confirmed, the situation in Iraq today is extremely dire. The sad truth is that now there are no good options before us; there are simply less bad options. In Iraq today, according to Secretary of Defense Bob Gates, there are now at least four separate wars being fought—four separate wars that our soldiers, who have fought with incredible bravery and skill, now find themselves in the middle of.

Let me quote Secretary Gates, who has recently stated:

I believe there are essentially four wars going on in Iraq: One is Shia on Shia, principally in the south; second is sectarian conflict, principally in Baghdad, but not solely; third is the insurgency; and fourth is al-Qaida.

The reality today, as described by the Secretary of Defense, has nothing to do with why President Bush got us into this war in the first place. In March of 2002, he told us Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that they were poised to use them against us. That was not true and certainly has no relevance to the war today. In 2002, he told us Iraq was somehow linked to al-Qaida and had some responsibility for the 9/11 attack against our country. That also turned out not to be true and certainly has no relevance today to the situation in which we find ourselves.

In the 2006 elections, the American people, in a loud and unmistakable voice, told us they no longer had confidence in the Bush administration's handling of the war in Iraq. In my view, they told us they wanted Congress to begin asserting its constitutional authority over this war and that they wanted us to rein in this administration. Most importantly, they told us they wanted us to begin the process of bringing our troops home as soon as possible. And as a Vermont Senator, that is exactly the effort I intend to make.

In my view, the Reid resolution before us is but a small first step at moving us forward. If it is passed—and I hope it will be—it must be followed with much stronger legislation that has real teeth in it. That is what the American people want. I have cosponsored legislation, introduced by Senator KENNEDY, that would prohibit the use of funds for an escalation of U.S. military forces without a specific, new authorization from the Congress—a prohibition also included in the legislation introduced by Senator OBAMA, whose bill I also support.

Instead of just voicing our disapproval of President Bush's escalation of the war in a nonbinding manner, we should now be considering legislation that provides for the safe and orderly redeployment of virtually all of our troops out of Iraq within the next year, even as we continue to give support to the Iraq Government and their military for the purpose of helping them accept their political and military responsibilities. That is the legislation we should be passing.

Senator FEINGOLD has introduced legislation requiring that our troops be redeployed from Iraq within 6 months of passage of the bill. Senator OBAMA has introduced similar legislation requiring that our troops be redeployed starting this May.

In my view, while I will vote for the Reid resolution tomorrow, and while I think it is terribly important that we bring together a bipartisan effort to tell the President this escalation is wrong, the bottom line is we must go forward well beyond that, and we must do that in the near future. We must exercise the constitutional responsibility we have over the power of the purse.

We are mired in a war that has now gone on longer than any American involvement—longer than American involvement in either the First World War or the Second World War. We will spend more money on this war in real dollars than we spent on either the Korean war or the Vietnam war. Our standing in the international community has declined and our ability to combat international terrorism has been seriously compromised.

It is time to say no to this ill-conceived escalation. It is time to deploy our troops out of harm's way. It is time to end this war and to bring our troops home as soon as we possibly can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS. I know of his passion and his knowledge on the subject. That was demonstrated by his words this evening. He speaks from the heart on many issues. I know he spoke from his heart this evening about this war in Iraq. Before him, Senator WHITEHOUSE, a new colleague from Rhode Island, read letters he received from constituents asking the same questions we are hearing across Illinois and across the country—questions about why we are in this war and how we will start to bring our troops home.

Today, in the House of Representatives, in a historic vote, by a margin of 246 to 182, the House of Representatives made it clear they do not approve of President Bush's new policy to escalate this war in Iraq.

I think you have to step back for a moment and reflect on what happened today. Four years into a war—which Senator SANDERS has reminded us has lasted longer than World War I or II—we are now engaged in the first meaningful debate about the course of that war since the invasion; and 3,132 American soldiers have died, thousands have been injured, billions have been spent, and for years the Congress, in the thrall of another party, didn't have a hearing, didn't have a debate, and didn't question the policy of this war.

It is no surprise that the American people reached the limit of their tolerance and, in the last election, made it clear they want a change—not just a change in Congress but a change in the policy when it came to this war in Iraq. I was heartened after the election, particularly when President Bush asked for the resignation of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld. I thought that finally we were going to see a breakaway from this so-called neocon theory that dragged us into this terrible conflict. Unfortunately, what I hoped for wasn't realized. Even though I think Robert Gates, the successor of Rumsfeld, is a good man and will be a good Secretary of Defense, when it came time for the President to talk about the policies of the war and what we would do, he dug the hole deeper.

I am not a military strategist and don't profess to be. There are people in our caucus with military experience who can speak to a wise strategy and an unwise strategy. I am not necessarily one of those, nor do I profess to be. But I have been to Iraq twice—first, in the early stage, when we visited the Green Zone in Baghdad and it

was so dangerous that we could not even stay overnight. In October, we were allowed to stay the night and visit with troops in the field and talk to some of the people who were working in Iraq. I will share some of those recollections in a moment.

First, let me tell you that my highest priority was to sit across the table from our soldiers, to break bread with them and talk about home and try to take their minds away from the danger of their daily lives. These men and women are the best. These are the best and bravest among us. They are volunteers to a person. They have enlisted in the services and they risk their lives every single day.

Unfortunately, many want to drag this debate into a referendum about whether we respect, admire, and honor these troops. Any honest person would tell you that you should concede the obvious: We all respect, admire, and honor these troops. Many of us believe the best way to honor them is to start bringing them safely home. When I think about what they have faced, and continue to face, and I think about these young men and women getting into these humvees or walking the streets of Baghdad and other cities, risking their lives every day, I want this to end and end soon.

What those on the other side argue is the opposite. They argue that the President is right, that sending more troops into harm's way is the best way to end the war. I could not disagree more. But the point of that disagreement is the reason the debate is necessary. It happened in the House. It should happen in the Senate.

Tomorrow, we will have a chance, at 1:45 p.m. eastern time, to vote as to whether we will have a real debate on this war in Iraq. I am not hopeful. We need the cooperation of Republican Senators to even debate the issue. Many have already announced they are opposed to this debate; they don't want it to occur. I think they are wrong. I think they are walking away from our basic responsibility as Members of the Senate.

I think those who want an escalation of the war need to answer some fundamental questions. I think they should answer the question: How many troops will be involved here? Will it be 21,000, as the President says or, as the CBO tells us, a number much larger than 21,000, which represents combat troops; they may need an equal or larger number to support those combat troops, endangering the lives of 40,000 more soldiers, not 20,000.

Outgoing Army Chief of Staff Peter Schoomaker said yesterday that an increase of 17,500 Army combat troops in Iraq represents, in his words, ''only the tip of the iceberg.'' It worries me that this is the beginning of a spiraling escalation, endangering even more troops.

Army officials have also stated that virtually all of the U.S.-based Army combat brigades are not prepared to be deployed. The Army is scrambling to find the gear and personnel for units that are being sent to Iraq and Afghanistan, pulling both people and equipment out of other units, scavenging for pieces of equipment that are necessary, to get them ready in some fashion for battle. General Schoomaker testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that—pay special attention to this—''I am not satisfied with the readiness of our nondeployed forces.''

We ask a lot of our men and women in uniform. We ask for their commitment to our country. We ask them to be trained and to be brave. But we should never ask them to go into battle without the equipment they need in order to come home safely.

What this general says, the outgoing Army Chief of Staff, is that that is exactly what is going to happen with this escalation. Men and women will be sent into dangerous situations without the protection they need.

On January 25, the Department of Defense inspector general released a summary report that stated that American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan experienced ''shortages of force-protection equipment, such as uparmored vehicles, electronic countermeasure devices, crew-served weapons, and communications equipment.'' January 25, just a few days ago.

The report went on to say:

> As a result, servicemembers were not always equipped to effectively complete their missions.

We have a special responsibility—those who make the policy in this town and those who vote for it—to keep our promise to these soldiers and their families that we will give them the training and equipment they need so they can perform their missions effectively.

The same report I referred to stated that when servicemembers were asked to perform tasks outside their usual duties, they often did not receive the equipment necessary to perform their wartime mission.

These were tasks such as training Iraqi forces, one of our most important missions, or disposing of explosives, a highly dangerous undertaking.

Today's Washington Post states that approximately 40 percent of Army and Marine Corps equipment is now in Iraq or Afghanistan or undergoing repair or maintenance.

It is inexcusable that 4 years and almost $400 billion into this war, we should be sending our troops into action without the equipment they need. Those who support the escalation and say they are supporting the troops need to be asked, and answer, the basic question: How can you support a soldier if you don't give them the equipment they need to be safe, perform their mission, and come home?

Army Deputy Chief of Staff of Force Development, LTG Stephen Speakes, recently said the Army would need 1,500 up-armored trucks for the new forces that were being sent to Iraq. But he went on to say:

> We don't have the [armor] kits, and we don't have the trucks.

He said it will take the Army months, probably until the summer, to supply and outfit additional trucks. In the meantime, units are sharing vehicles, many of which are not properly protected so that these soldiers will be safe.

The Washington Post interviewed commanders in Iraq about the equipment situation. These commanders doubted that the new units would receive the full complement of humvees that they need.

One senior Army official was quoted as saying shortfalls would be inevitable ''unless five brigades of uparmored humvees fall out of the sky.'' This official predicted some units would have to rely more heavily on Bradley fighting vehicles and tanks.

The good news is that these vehicles are very highly armored, but they may not be the best vehicles for the mission.

Our troops are the best. Shouldn't their equipment be the best? If you believe that an escalation of this war and more soldiers thrown into the crossfire of the civil war is in the best interest of America, shouldn't those same Senators step forward and demand that these soldiers be given the equipment they need?

These equipment shortfalls are more acute on the battlefield, of course, but they are echoed throughout our military, including the Guard and Reserve. I recently met with Lieutenant General Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau at the Pentagon. He reports that National Guard equipment readiness levels are at 34 percent. Guard units have about one-third of the equipment they need to be ready for battle. That is 34 percent of the equipment they need for missions at home and abroad. That is another direct cost of the war in Iraq.

I asked the general what the Pentagon's plans were to address this situation. He said there was a 5-year budget plan to bring the Guard up to a readiness level of 60 percent, which incidentally is below the level of readiness when this war began.

In the world we live in, 60 percent is not good enough if it is your son, your daughter, your brother, your sister, your husband, or your wife. It will cost another $40 billion to bring the Guard up to the readiness level that we really need. I think that is an investment we ought to make.

That is one of the real costs of this war—to make sure our troops, our Guard, have the equipment they need. These issues demand our attention, our debate, and our vote.

Tomorrow, if the Republicans refuse to cross the aisle to cooperate, to start this debate, these questions will not be addressed as part of this debate over the escalation of this war. That is not fair to these soldiers. That is not fair to their families. It certainly is not fair to the States and the people we represent.

We should have an up-or-down vote, a basic exercise of Congress's responsibility. We have offered to the Republicans an opportunity to vote not only on the measure that passed the House today but on an alternative offered by Senator MCCAIN, who is asking we increase the troops who will be involved.

I have read many things about this war. Some of them I think are extremely insightful; some of them are troubling. Yesterday in the Washington Post, there was an article which laid out what was expected to happen in Iraq and never occurred.

When GEN Tommy Franks and his top officers got together in August 2002 to review the invasion plan for Iraq, they reflected on what would likely occur. By their estimate today, we would have 5,000 American soldiers left in that theater. Instead, we have over 130,000 and a President wanting to increase that number by 20,000 or 40,000 more. It shows that the planning and vision of the people who scheduled this invasion was seriously flawed.

I joined 22 others on the floor of the Senate voting against the authorization for this war. I felt at the time that the American people had been deceived—deceived about weapons of mass destruction that did not exist, deceived about connections with al-Qaida terrorists and 9/11, which did not exist, deceived about nuclear weapons and mushroom clouds when there was no threat.

That deception that occurred in the fear and panic that still followed 9/11 led many of my colleagues to vote for this war. I was not one of them. But then came the time when I was challenged, and others, as to whether we would vote for the money to wage the war. I stopped and reflected and said if my son or my daughter was in uniform, I would want them to have everything they need to come home safely, even if I think this policy is wrong.

These soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen didn't write this policy. It was written in the Pentagon and the White House. They were sent into battle with the battle plans that were handed to them, not battle plans that they wrote. They deserve a lot better. They deserve to come home. If they are going to war, they deserve the equipment they need. They deserve leadership in the White House and in Congress that is sensitive to their bravery and responds with real caring for their future.

DARFUR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to come to the floor, as I have done many times before, to speak on the crisis in Darfur, Sudan. I keep coming because at the very least, I want to do that, to keep speaking out. But this Senator, this Congress, this country, and the world must all do more. None of us have done enough.

Last fall, U.S. Special Envoy to Darfur Andrew Natsios declared that on January 1, 2007, the United States would launch a forceful ''plan B,'' as he called it, if Sudan did not accept the joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission that is desperately needed in Darfur. As described in the Washington Post, plan B was to include aggressive economic measures against Sudan.

Today is February 16. There are only a handful of U.N. peacekeepers in Darfur. Still no sign of plan B, other than four U.S. Army colonels who have been stationed along the Chad-Sudan border.

Last week, according to a student publication at Georgetown University and other news sources, Ambassador Andrew Natsios told a student audience that genocide was no longer taking place in Darfur. He was quoted as saying:

> The term genocide is counter to the facts of what is really occurring in Darfur.

I understand it is possible to get entangled in words and semantics in the definition of ''genocide,'' but I was truly surprised to read this statement from Ambassador Natsios.

On December 10, not that long ago, the White House released a statement headlined in part, ''President Bush Appalled by Genocide in Darfur.''

The President's statement continued:

> Our Nation is appalled by the genocide in Darfur, which has led to the spread of fighting and hostility in the Republic of Chad and the Central African Republic.

Nothing that I have seen or been told convinces me that conditions in Darfur are significantly better today than they were on December 10 when President Bush reconfirmed the ongoing horror of genocide. I can only assume the President was troubled by the Special Envoy's statement as well.

The State Department has since sought to clarify these remarks and stated that it remains the administration's position that the situation in Darfur is genocide. The State Department explained that the Special Envoy was referring to the fact that death rates are lower now, but the conditions could escalate.

I would argue that they are already escalating. People continue to be murdered and villages have been attacked by air. Humanitarian aid workers have come under special assault recently. These brave men and women, unarmed, working for the poorest people on Earth, have been subjected to beatings, rape, and arrests.

These concentrated attacks threaten the people of Darfur who depend on thin relief lines for survival. If the relief workers are forced to withdraw and these lines are severed, hundreds of thousands of lives will be in jeopardy.

Recently, along with Senator COBURN, I held the first hearing of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law. The focus of the hearing was genocide and the rule of law. Before this hearing, we noted that the United States was a late signatory to the treaty on genocide. One of our predecessors in the Senate, Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin, literally came to the floor of the Senate every day it was in session for years to convince the Senate to ratify this treaty. Finally, it happened. We focused on that treaty and the rule of law.

Given the ongoing crisis in Darfur and our own ineffectual attempts to halt the killing, I felt that should be the first topic of this new subcommittee.

The witnesses who came before us included the Canadian general, former U.N. general, and now Senator in Canada, Romeo Dallaire.

In 1994, General Dallaire commanded a small U.N. force in Rwanda. When the first wave of murders began, General Dallaire called for 5,000 troops—5,000 troops—to halt the killing.

My predecessor, my mentor, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois, along with Senator Jim Jeffords from Vermont, of the opposite party, both came together and called on President Clinton to help. Sadly, the Clinton administration did not. In fairness, they have acknowledged it was the most serious foreign policy mistake of their years in Washington.

General Dallaire did not receive the reinforcements. Instead, this tiny force of 2,500 was reduced. His country started withdrawing their soldiers from the U.N. force until there were only 450 left on the ground. They couldn't deal with the slaughter that followed. It is estimated that over 800,000 people were murdered in a very short period of time.

In Darfur, the African Union has tried to stop the killing, but after 4 years, U.N. peacekeeping forces have not even reached the level of 450. In his statement for the subcommittee hearing on genocide, General Dallaire said this of Darfur:

> I have on occasion considered bringing a flak jacket I wore during the Rwandan genocide—a jacket that was blood-soaked from carrying a 12-year-old girl who had been mutilated and repeatedly raped—into the [Canadian] Senate chamber and throwing it in the middle of the room. Maybe this would finally capture the attention of the political elite in a way words fail to do. Maybe it would finally bring home the point that human rights are not only for those who have the money to buy and sustain [them]; they are the privilege and the right of every human being.

Mr. President, we must do more in Darfur. The United States must work through the United Nations and with other countries of influence to compel the Khartoum Government to accept a peacekeeping mission, and we must help provide the resources to make that possible.

Here at home we can do more as well. I am a strong supporter of divestment. I served in the House of Representatives during apartheid in South Africa when we tried everything in our power to stop the racist government. We suggested divestment. Many said it would be worthless; it wouldn't have an impact. But I think it was a positive

thing, and I am glad that we moved forward.

We need to do the same in Sudan today. Millions of Americans are unknowingly investing in companies that do business in support of the Khartoum Government. I know because I was one of them. I discovered that fact when a reporter, who researched my publicly disclosed investments—not a massive portfolio, I might add—told me one of the mutual funds I owned included the stock of a company doing business in Sudan. I immediately sold it. But that reporter's question was a powerful wake-up call for me.

A growing number of States, led by my home State of Illinois and State Senator Jacqueline Collins, a real leader on this issue, and a growing number of colleges and universities, including Northwestern University—and I particularly salute President Henry Bienen—have taken steps to address this issue of investing in Sudan. Some have sought to fully divest pension funds and endowments, others have adopted more targeted measures to restrict investments in the largest companies operating in Sudan.

I salute these efforts, and I plan to introduce legislation to help provide Federal support for these efforts as well.

Our subcommittee's genocide hearing also identified a serious loophole in Federal antigenocide law that Congress needs to close. Genocide is a Federal crime, but under the law, as currently written, only genocide that takes place in the United States or is committed by a U.S. national can be punished by our courts. Federal investigators have identified war criminals who were involved in the Rwandan genocide and the Srebrenica massacres who have found safe haven in our country. These are people perpetrating genocide in other places on Earth now safely ensconced in the United States. But because they are not U.S. nationals, because the genocide didn't occur within our borders, we cannot, under our current law, prosecute them.

The Justice Department has been unable to prosecute these individuals, and we need to take another look at it. Let me give an example: Salah Abdallah Gosh is the head of security of the Sudanese government. He reportedly has played a key role in the government's genocidal campaign in Darfur. In the year 2005, Mr. Gosh came to Washington to meet with senior administration officials. Under current law, the Justice Department could not arrest him for the crime of genocide.

I am developing legislation that closes this loophole, giving Federal prosecutors the tools they need to prosecute individuals who have committed genocide that are found in the United States. No one guilty of genocide should ever view the United States as a safe haven.

This change in the law would simply bring the antigenocide statute into line with a lot of other Federal laws that cover crimes committed outside the United States, including torture, piracy, material support to terrorists, terrorism financing, and the taking of hostages. Genocide should be subject to the same basic penalties.

I hope these initiatives will be bipartisan, as much of the Congresses work on Darfur has been. These steps I have mentioned will not stop the killing in Darfur, but they will add to our arsenal of weapons against genocide. We should do far more to deal with these dangerous situations, more to prevent mass atrocities from occurring, more to stop crimes against humanity once they begin, and more to help those who have been victimized, punishing the perpetrators.

Eleanor Roosevelt once asked: ''Where do universal human rights begin?'' And she answered: ''They begin in small places, close to home. So close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, the farm, or office where he works.''

I believe the means to stopping genocide in Darfur begins with each of us, and so does the responsibility.

I will close with one observation. As a student at Georgetown University many years ago, I had an outstanding government professor named Jan Karski. Professor Karski had been involved in the Polish underground during World War II. He was a brave man who risked his life fighting the Nazis. He learned of the Holocaust, came to the United States, barely speaking English, trying to find people in Washington who would listen and who could understand that hundreds of thousands of innocent people were being killed. He couldn't find an audience with those who could make a difference.

I thought about that course, and I thought about the course of history, how the Holocaust unfolded during World War II and at least 6 million died, maybe many more, and nothing happened. And I wondered, despite all that time and all that notice, why couldn't they do something?

Now I know.

It has been 4 years since we declared a genocide in Darfur. People continue to be murdered on our watch. I hope my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle will join me not only in these efforts but efforts they believe will move us toward a day when there is peace in this region of the world. We have a responsibility to do that to these people and to the cause of humanity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to come before the Senate today to speak on legislation that the Senate passed last night, S. 188.

Just last month, I introduced S. 188 with Senators REID, LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, BOXER, and MENENDEZ. This straightforward measure would incorporate César E. Chávez—a truly remarkable civil rights leader and American—into the title of the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act passed last year.

César Chávez is an American hero. Like the venerable American leaders who are now associated with this effort, he sacrificed his life to empower the most vulnerable in America. For this reason, he continues to be an important part of our country's journey on the path to a more inclusive America. César Chávez believed strongly in our American democracy and saw the right to vote as a fundamental cornerstone of our freedom. I believe it is fitting that his name be a part of the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to thank Senator LEAHY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, for his support. I sincerely appreciate his efforts to quickly steer S. 188 through his committee. I enthusiastically supported last year's Voting Rights Act reauthorization. I firmly believe that this landmark civil rights legislation has opened the door for millions of Hispanic Americans to fully exercise their right to participate in our democracy.

Adding César E. Chávez's name sends an important message to Hispanic Americans. It signals to the Nation's 40 million Hispanics that the Voting Rights Act has been reauthorized with their interest and constitutional rights in mind. During the Judiciary Committee's consideration of S. 188, Senator LEAHY offered an amendment that incorporated another important American leader. His amendment to add William C. Velásquez to the title of the Voting Rights Act reauthorization bill has my strong and unequivocal support.

In 1974, Mr. Velásquez founded the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, SVREP. Using his powerful slogan—Su Voto es Su Voz or your vote is your voice—he energized the Hispanic community and registered many to vote. Mr. Velásquez envisioned a time when Latinos would play an important role in the American democratic process. When SVREP was established, there were only 1,566 Latino elected officials. Today, there are over 6,000 Hispanics elected to local, State, and Federal office, including 3 U.S. Senators and 23 U.S. Representatives. Like César E. Chávez, Mr. Velásquez did not live to see the remarkable progress our country has made. He passed away in 1988 from kidney cancer. However, I am sure he is looking down on this body with joy and pride.

In addition, Senator CORNYN sought to include the name of former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who also played an integral part in the history of the Voting Rights Act, and Dr. Hector Garcia, founder of the American GI Forum.

Congresswoman Jordan was certainly a remarkable civil rights and social justice leader and I support her inclusion in my legislation. In addition, Dr. Garcia fought for half a century for civil and education rights for Mexican Americans.

Former President Bill Clinton, who first met Dr. Garcia while registering voters in the Rio Grande Valley in 1972, called him a ''national hero.'' In the coming months, I will work with Senator CORNYN to find another appropriate manner to honor Dr. Garcia's work with the American G.I. Forum. The American G.I. Forum was established in the wake of World War II when Hispanic veterans returned home and were categorically denied their G.I. Bill of Rights benefits. Dr. Garcia was propelled into the national spotlight when he fought to have Army PVT Longoria buried alongside others in the local cemetery in his hometown of Three Rivers, TX. Dr. Garcia called Members of Congress and alerted the press to this injustice.

Within 24 hours, he received a telegram from then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson that stated:

> I deeply regret to learn that the prejudice of some individuals extends even beyond this life. I have no authority over civilian funeral homes. Nor does the federal government. However, I have made arrangements to have Felix Longoria buried with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery ... where the honored dead of our nation's war rest.

As our Nation moves forward toward the next chapter of civic equality and inclusion, starting, last year, with the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, it is fitting that we honor civil rights leaders whose contributions and courage helped pave the way for today's more inclusive democracy.

With the Senate's passage of S. 188, my attention and efforts will now focus on the U.S. House of Representatives. I am hopeful that they will approve this measure so that this landmark law can now be known as the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King, César E. Chávez, Barbara Jordan, William C. Velásquez, and Hector P. Garcia Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about the accomplishments of the Kansas Air National Guard, and specifically of the 190th Air Refueling Wing.

I have made several statements on the floor recently regarding my feelings on these resolutions. And today, instead of repeating my feelings on the subject, I would like to acknowledge some of our country's brave men and women.

As we all know, our Nation has been relying heavily on our National Guard in the war on terror. In Kansas, it is no different. However, these men and women continually rise to the challenge, saving lives and defending democracy at home and abroad.

Next week, we commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the 190th Air Refueling Wing in Kansas. The enormous sacrifice and dedication of the men and women serving in 190th brings great credit to their unit and to the State of Kansas.

This outstanding organization began as the 117th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron in Hutchinson, KS. The unit was federally recognized on February 23, 1957.

Next week they will celebrate 50 years of flying aircraft—from the F–80 to the B–57 to the KC–135 tankers they maintain today.

Since 1967, the 190th has been based in our State capital of Topeka, KS. They continue to be leaders in the State and in the Air National Guard, which is evident through their most recent awards—the Spaatz trophy for outstanding Air National Guard Flying Wing and the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award.

As we continue to debate the difficult topic of our presence in Iraq, I hope my colleagues will take a moment to recognize, with me, the outstanding contributions of our Nation's troops. Not only has our volunteer force proven themselves the best in the world, our citizen soldiers have proven themselves second to none.

I hope we will remember the personal sacrifices of these men and women as we debate our support for them and their mission.

ARMITAGE II

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a report released today by a bipartisan panel of Asia specialists cochaired by Richard L. Armitage and Joseph Nye. The report, ''The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Getting Asia Right Through 2020,'' highlights major trends in Asia and provides the panel's comprehensive analysis with security and economic policy recommendations, with specific reference to our bilateral relations with Japan.

Many Senators will recall that Ambassador Armitage and Dr. Nye issued a report in October 2000 titled ''The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership.'' This landmark document, which subsequently became known as the Armitage Report, aimed at strengthening the U.S.-Japan relationship in the areas of politics, security, Okinawa, intelligence, economics and diplomacy. This new report, which is already being called ''Armitage II,'' continues to emphasize the importance of the alliance but goes a step further, by addressing the ways in which the alliance can work to positively influence future affairs in Asia.

The report, which is available on the CSIS Web site at: *http://www.csis.org/component/option,com—csis—pubs/task,view /id,3729/typ*, is not a political document. It reflects the views of the study group members only. Nevertheless, it represents a serious attempt to outline a vision that would achieve a balance of power in Asia through 2020 that favors American interests and values and promotes regional stability.

I encourage all Senators and their staffs to examine this serious and significant new report.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BRIGHT STAR RESTAURANT

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the Bright Star Restaurant in Bessemer, AL. Since 1907, the Bright Star has been providing the citizens of our State and its visitors with delicious food and superior service. Today, this family-owned business, led by Jimmy and Nick Koikos, continues to build on this tradition. While America is famous for its chain restaurants, there remain many of the old ones which have atmosphere, friendship, and good food. They are a valuable part of our communities and unite us in many ways. The Bright Star is a classic.

Known for fresh gulf seafood, quality steaks, and fresh vegetables, the Bright Star is certain to satisfy every palate. The restaurant's Greek style specialties are my personal favorites. In fact, I don't believe the broiled snapper, along with the Greek salad, can be topped. Although, admittedly, the daily meat and three-vegetable specials certainly give them a run for their money.

Famous faces, like legendary coach Paul ''Bear'' Bryant and former Senator Howell Heflin, frequented the Bright Star. I am certain that virtually all of our congressional delegation have eaten there including my colleague, Senator SHELBY, on many occasions. It is the place for good friends, good food, and even a small taste of politics. Today, you will still see Alabama coaches and fans filing through the dining room on their way to and from seeing the Crimson Tide play.

Not so long ago, I brought John Ashcroft by for dinner. This was his first visit to Alabama after becoming the U.S. Attorney General, and I will never forget the wonderful reception Jimmy and the staff gave us. I wanted to show off the best of Birmingham, so dinner at this fine restaurant was a no-brainer. Jimmy gave us a mouth-watering overview of the menu, emphasizing as I had hoped that he would, the renown seafood dishes. Everything sounded delicious, however it turned out that the Attorney General was allergic to seafood and shellfish. I seem to recall he had a steak that he enjoyed, but he certainly missed out on those fresh gulf delicacies.

Located just outside of Birmingham in the quaint downtown area of Bessemer, the Bright Star is easily accessible and certainly a destination attraction. Moreover, you can always expect a good crowd of folks dining there on any day of the week. Luckily, expansions to the building over the years, including ample banquet space, enable diners to be comfortably accommodated. I look forward to the lunch I have scheduled there for next week, and I highly recommend a visit to all.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a treaty which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:27 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq.

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107–117, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

At 5:51 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 976. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 641. A bill to express the sense of Congress that no funds should be cut off or reduced for American troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or their ability to complete their assigned missions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BINGAMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 200. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey, to conduct a study on groundwater resources in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–20).

S. 235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District (Rept. No. 110–21).

S. 263. A bill to amend the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes River Conservancy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–22).

By Mr. BINGAMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 264. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the rehabilitation of the Wallowa Lake Dam in Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–23).

By Mr. BINGAMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 265. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a water resource feasibility study for the Little Butte/Bear Creek Subbasins in Oregon (Rept. No. 110–24).

S. 266. A bill to provide for the modification of an amendatory repayment contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the North Unit Irrigation District, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–25).

S. 220. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A & B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho (Rept. No. 110–26).

By Mr. BINGAMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 275. A bill to establish the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument in the State of New Mexico (Rept. No. 110–27).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 655. A bill to amend the Congressional Charter of The American National Red Cross to modernize its governance structure, to enhance the ability of the board of governors of The American National Red Cross to support the critical mission of The American Red Cross in the 21st century, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 656. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BURR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 657. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to add requirements regarding trauma care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. HAGEL):

S. 658. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the process for listing, recovery planning, and delisting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 659. A bill to amend section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of the death gratuity with respect to members of the Armed Forces without a surviving spouse who are survived by a minor child; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 660. A bill for the relief of Majan Jean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. COCHRAN)):

S. 661. A bill to establish kinship navigator programs, to establish guardianship assistance payments for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 662. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate resources at the Harriet Beecher Stowe House in Brunswick, Maine, to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 663. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the statutory designation of beneficiaries of the $100,000 death gratuity under section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, and to permit members of the Armed Forces to designate in writing their beneficiaries of choice in the event of their death while serving on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. REID, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 664. A bill to provide adequate funding for local governments harmed by Hurricane Katrina of 2005 or Hurricane Rita of 2005; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 665. A bill to require congressional approval of loans made by the Secretary of Transportation in excess of $1,000,000,000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate certain incentives for oil and gas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 667. A bill to expand programs of early childhood home visitation that increase school readiness, child abuse and neglect prevention, and early identification of developmental and health delays, including potential mental health concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 668. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to conduct consumer testing to determine the appropriateness of the current labeling requirements for indoor tanning devices and determine whether such requirements provide sufficient information to consumers regarding the risks that the use of such devices pose for the development of irreversible damage to the skin, including skin cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 669. A bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to provide procedures for the release of Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program contingency funds; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 670. A bill to set forth limitations on the United States military presence in Iraq and on United States aid to Iraq for security and reconstruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. INOUYE, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 671. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax-exempt financing for qualified renewable energy facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for the installation of wind energy property, including by rural homeowners, farmers, ranchers, and small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OBAMA:

S. 674. A bill to require accountability and enhanced congressional oversight for personnel performing private security functions under Federal contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 675. A bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. Res. 85. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the creation of refugee populations in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf region as a result of human rights violations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 3

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3, a bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fair prescription drug prices for Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to expand access to preventive health care services that help reduce unintended pregnancy, reduce abortions, and improve access to women's health care.

S. 22

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 22, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces who serve in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 435

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 435, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to preserve the essential air service program.

S. 469

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 469, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to reduce the incidence of suicide among veterans.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 487, a bill to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donations shall not be considered to involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration.

S. 519

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 519, a bill to modernize and expand the reporting requirements relating to child pornography, to expand cooperation in combating child pornography, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

S. 561

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 561, a bill to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 with respect to the expansion of the adoption credit and adoption assistance programs.

S. 563

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to extend the deadline by which State identification documents shall comply with certain minimum standards and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of S. 583, a bill to create a competitive grant program for States to enable the States to award salary bonuses to highly qualified elementary school or secondary school teachers who teach, or commit to teach, for at least 3 academic years in a school served by a rural local educational agency.

S. 585

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 585, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 593

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 597

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 597, a bill to extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 634, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Chattahoochee Trace National Heritage Corridor in Alabama and Georgia, and for other purposes.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to express the sense of Congress that no funds should be cut off or reduced for American troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or their ability to complete their assigned missions.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on Iraq.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2007

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 626. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for arthritis research and public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, with more than 100 different forms, arthritis is one of the most widespread and devastating health conditions in the United States. Nearly 46 million, or one in every five, American adults suffer from arthritis or chronic joint symptoms, and 300,000 children live with the pain, disability and emotional trauma caused by juvenile arthritis.

As the leading cause of disability in the United States, arthritis is a painful and debilitating chronic disease affecting men, women and children alike. This is why the Federal Government must make a stronger investment in research, treatment and prevention of arthritis.

We know that early diagnosis, treatment, and appropriate management of arthritis can control symptoms and improve quality of life. The Arthritis Prevention, Control and Cure Act will expand the Federal Government's efforts to find new ways to prevent, treat, and care for patients with arthritis and related rheumatic diseases by: (1) improving coordination among Federal agencies and the public with regard to the Federal investment in arthritis research and public health activities through a National Arthritis and Rheumatic Diseases Summit; (2) accelerating research that will lead to improved treatments and a cure for juvenile arthritis; (3) investing in a nationwide public health initiative designed to reduce the pain and disability of arthritis through early diagnosis and effective treatment of the disease; and (4) ensuring kids with arthritis have access to specialty care by addressing the nationwide shortage of pediatric rheumatologists.

We have a responsibility to look for solutions to this issue in a comprehensive manner. I look forward to working with Senator KENNEDY on this important legislation which will make a real difference in the lives of the millions of Americans, both young and old, who suffer from this debilitating disease.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 655. A bill to amend the Congressional Charter of The American National Red Cross to modernize its governance structure, to enhance the ability of the board of governors of The American National Red Cross to support the critical mission of The American Red Cross in the 21st century, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of The American National Red Cross Governance Modernization Act of 2007 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 655

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''The American National Red Cross Governance Modernization Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Substantive changes to the Congressional Charter of The American National Red Cross have not been made since 1947.

(2) In February 2006, the board of governors of The American National Red Cross (the ''Board of Governors'') commissioned an independent review and analysis of the Board of Governors' role, composition, size, relationship with management, governance relationship with chartered units of The American National Red Cross, and whistleblower and audit functions.

(3) In an October 2006 report of the Board of Governors, entitled ''American Red Cross Governance for the 21st Century'' (the ''Governance Report''), the Board of Governors recommended changes to the Congressional Charter, bylaws, and other governing documents of The American National Red Cross to modernize and enhance the effectiveness of the Board of Governors and governance structure of The American National Red Cross.

(4) It is in the national interest to create a more efficient governance structure of The American National Red Cross and to enhance the Board of Governors' ability to support the critical mission of The American National Red Cross in the 21st century.

(5) It is in the national interest to clarify the role of the Board of Governors as a governance and strategic oversight board and for The American National Red Cross to amend its bylaws, consistent with the recommendations described in the Governance Report, to clarify the role of the Board of Governors and to outline the areas of its responsibility, including—

(A) reviewing and approving the mission statement for The American National Red Cross;

(B) approving and overseeing the corporation's strategic plan and maintaining strategic oversight of operational matters;

(C) selecting, evaluating, and determining the level of compensation of the corporation's chief executive officer;

(D) evaluating the performance and establishing the compensation of the senior leadership team and providing for management succession;

(E) overseeing the financial reporting and audit process, internal controls, and legal compliance;

(F) holding management accountable for performance;

(G) providing oversight of the financial stability of the corporation;

(H) ensuring the inclusiveness and diversity of the corporation;

(I) providing oversight of the protection of the brand of the corporation; and

(J) assisting with fundraising on behalf of the corporation.

(6)(A) The selection of members of the Board of Governors is a critical component of effective governance for The American National Red Cross, and, as such, it is in the national interest that The American National Red Cross amend its bylaws to provide a method of selection consistent with that described in the Governance Report.

(B) The new method of selection should replace the current process by which—

(i) 30 chartered unit-elected members of the Board of Governors are selected by a non-Board committee which includes 2 members of the Board of Governors and other individuals elected by the chartered units themselves;

(ii) 12 at-large members of the Board of Governors are nominated by a Board committee and elected by the Board of Governors; and

(iii) 8 members of the Board of Governors are appointed by the President of the United States.

(C) The new method of selection described in the Governance Report reflects the single category of members of the Board of Governors that will result from the implementation of this Act:

(i) All Board members (except for the chairman of the Board of Governors) would be nominated by a single committee of the Board of Governors taking into account the criteria outlined in the Governance Report to assure the expertise, skills, and experience of a governing board.

(ii) The nominated members would be considered for approval by the full Board of Governors and then submitted to The American National Red Cross annual meeting of delegates for election, in keeping with the standard corporate practice whereby shareholders of a corporation elect members of a board of directors at its annual meeting.

(7) The United States Supreme Court held The American National Red Cross to be an instrumentality of the United States, and it is in the national interest that the Congressional Charter confirm that status and that any changes to the Congressional Charter do not affect the rights and obligations of The American National Red Cross to carry out its purposes.

(8) Given the role of The American National Red Cross in carrying out its services, programs, and activities, and meeting its various obligations, the effectiveness of The American National Red Cross will be promoted by the creation of an organizational ombudsman who—

(A) will be a neutral or impartial dispute resolution practitioner whose major function will be to provide confidential and informal assistance to the many internal and external stakeholders of The American National Red Cross;

(B) will report to the chief executive officer and the audit committee of the Board of Governors; and

(C) will have access to anyone and any documents in The American National Red Cross.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) charitable organizations are an indispensable part of American society, but these organizations can only fulfill their important roles by maintaining the trust of the American public;

(2) trust is fostered by effective governance and transparency, which are the principal goals of the recommendations of the Board of Governors in the Governance Report and this Act;

(3) Federal and State action play an important role in ensuring effective governance and transparency by setting standards, rooting out violations, and informing the public; and

(4) while The American National Red Cross is and will remain a Federally chartered instrumentality of the United States, and it has the rights and obligations consistent with that status, The American National Red Cross nevertheless should maintain appropriate communications with State regulators of charitable organizations and should cooperate with them as appropriate in specific matters as they arise from time to time.

SEC. 3. ORGANIZATION.

Section 300101 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''a Federally chartered instrumentality of the United States and'' before ''a body corporate and politic''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting at the end the following new sentence: ''The corporation may conduct its business and affairs, and otherwise hold itself out, as the 'American Red Cross' in any jurisdiction.''.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

Section 300102 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

''(5) to conduct other activities consistent with the foregoing purposes.''.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP AND CHAPTERS.

Section 300103 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting '', or as otherwise provided,'' before ''in the bylaws'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking ''board of governors'' and inserting ''corporation''; and

(B) by inserting ''policies and'' before ''regulations related''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by inserting ''policies and'' before ''regulations shall require''; and

(B) by striking ''national convention'' and inserting ''annual meeting''.

SEC. 6. BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

Section 300104 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 300104. Board of governors

''(a) BOARD OF GOVERNORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The board of governors is the governing body of the corporation with all powers of governing and directing, and of overseeing the management of the business and affairs of, the corporation.

''(2) NUMBER.—The board of governors shall fix by resolution, from time to time, the number of members constituting the entire board of governors, provided that—

''(A) as of March 31, 2009, and thereafter, there shall be no fewer than 12 and no more than 25 members; and

''(B) as of March 31, 2012, and thereafter, there shall be no fewer than 12 and no more than 20 members constituting the entire board.

Procedures to implement the preceding sentence shall be provided in the bylaws.

''(3) APPOINTMENT.—The governors shall be appointed or elected in the following manner:

''(A) CHAIRMAN.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The board of governors, in accordance with procedures provided in the bylaws, shall recommend to the President an individual to serve as chairman of the board of governors. If such recommendation is approved by the President, the President shall appoint such individual to serve as chairman of the board of governors.

''(ii) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the office of the chairman, including vacancies resulting from the resignation, death, or removal by the President of the chairman, shall be filled in the same manner described in clause (i).

''(iii) DUTIES.—The chairman shall be a member of the board of governors and, when present, shall preside at meetings of the board of governors and shall have such other duties and responsibilities as may be provided in the bylaws or a resolution of the board of governors.

''(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Members of the board of governors other than the chairman shall be elected at the annual meeting of the corporation in accordance with such procedures as may be provided in the bylaws.

''(ii) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in any such elected board position and in any newly created board position may be filled by a vote of the remaining members of the board of governors in accordance with such procedures as may be provided in the bylaws.

''(b) TERMS OF OFFICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term of office of each member of the board of governors shall be 3 years, except that—

''(A) the board of governors may provide under the bylaws that the terms of office of members of the board of governors elected to the board of governors before March 31, 2012, may be less than 3 years in order to implement the provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(2); and

''(B) any member of the board of governors elected by the board to fill a vacancy in a board position arising before the expiration of its term may, as determined by the board, serve for the remainder of that term or until the next annual meeting of the corporation.

''(2) STAGGERED TERMS.—The terms of office of members of the board of governors (other than the chairman) shall be staggered such that, by March 31, 2012, and thereafter, ⅓ of the entire board (or as near to ⅓ as practicable) shall be elected at each successive annual meeting of the corporation with the term of office of each member of the board of governors elected at an annual meeting expiring at the third annual meeting following the annual meeting at which such member was elected.

''(3) TERM LIMITS.—No person may serve as a member of the board of governors for more than such number of terms of office or years as may be provided in the bylaws.

''(c) COMMITTEES AND OFFICERS.—The board—

''(1) may appoint, from its own members, an executive committee to exercise such powers of the board when the board is not in session as may be provided in the bylaws;

''(2) may appoint such other committees or advisory councils with such powers as may be provided in the bylaws or a resolution of the board of governors;

''(3) shall appoint such officers of the corporation, including a chief executive officer, with such duties, responsibilities, and terms of office as may be provided in the bylaws or a resolution of the board of governors; and

''(4) may remove members of the board of governors (other than the chairman), officers, and employees under such procedures as may be provided in the bylaws or a resolution of the board of governors.

''(d) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be an advisory council to the board of governors.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP; APPOINTMENT BY PRESIDENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall be composed of no fewer than 8 and no more than 10 members, each of whom shall be appointed by the President from principal officers of the executive departments and senior officers of the Armed Forces whose positions and interests qualify them to contribute to carrying out the programs and purposes of the corporation.

''(B) MEMBERS FROM THE ARMED FORCES.—At least 1, but not more than 3, of the members of the advisory council shall be selected from the Armed Forces.

''(3) DUTIES.—The advisory council shall advise, report directly to, and meet, at least 1 time per year with the board of governors, and shall have such name, functions and be subject to such procedures as may be provided in the bylaws.

''(e) ACTION WITHOUT MEETING.—Any action required or permitted to be taken at any meeting of the board of governors or of any committee thereof may be taken without a meeting if all members of the board or

committee, as the case may be, consent thereto in writing, or by electronic transmission and the writing or writings or electronic transmission or transmissions are filed with the minutes of proceedings of the board or committee. Such filing shall be in paper form if the minutes are maintained in paper form and shall be in electronic form if the minutes are maintained in electronic form.

''(f) VOTING BY PROXY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Voting by proxy is not allowed at any meeting of the board, at the annual meeting, or at any meeting of a chapter.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The board may allow the election of governors by proxy during any emergency.

''(g) BYLAWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The board of governors may—

''(A) at any time adopt bylaws; and

''(B) at any time adopt bylaws to be effective only in an emergency.

''(2) EMERGENCY BYLAWS.—Any bylaws adopted pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) may provide special procedures necessary for managing the corporation during the emergency. All provisions of the regular bylaws consistent with the emergency bylaws remain effective during the emergency.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'entire board' means the total number of members of the board of governors that the corporation would have if there were no vacancies; and

''(2) the term 'emergency' shall have such meaning as may be provided in the bylaws.''.

SEC. 7. POWERS.

Paragraph (a)(1) of section 300105 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking ''bylaws'' and inserting ''policies''.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL MEETING.

Section 300107 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 300107. Annual meeting

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The annual meeting of the corporation is the annual meeting of delegates of the chapters.

''(b) TIME OF MEETING.—The annual meeting shall be held as determined by the board of governors.

''(c) PLACE OF MEETING.—The board of governors is authorized to determine that the annual meeting shall not be held at any place, but may instead be held solely by means of remote communication subject to such procedures as are provided in the bylaws.

''(d) VOTING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In matters requiring a vote at the annual meeting, each chapter is entitled to at least 1 vote, and voting on all matters may be conducted by mail, telephone, telegram, cablegram, electronic mail, or any other means of electronic or telephone transmission, provided that the person voting shall state, or submit information from which it can be determined, that the method of voting chosen was authorized by such person.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF NUMBER OF VOTES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The board of governors shall determine on an equitable basis the number of votes that each chapter is entitled to cast, taking into consideration the size of the membership of the chapters, the populations served by the chapters, and such other factors as may be determined by the board.

''(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The board of governors shall review the allocation of votes at least every 5 years.''.

SEC. 9. ENDOWMENT FUND.

Section 300109 of title 36, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''nine'' from the first sentence thereof; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''The corporation shall prescribe policies and regulations on terms and tenure of office, accountability, and expenses of the board of trustees.''.

SEC. 10. ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDIT.

Subsection (a) of section 300110 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—As soon as practicable after the end of the corporation's fiscal year, which may be changed from time to time by the board of governors, the corporation shall submit a report to the Secretary of Defense on the activities of the corporation during such fiscal year, including a complete, itemized report of all receipts and expenditures.''.

SEC. 11. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3001 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by redesignating section 300111 as section 300113 and by inserting after section 300110 the following new sections:

''§ 300111. Authority of the Comptroller General of the United States

''The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized to review the corporation's involvement in any Federal program or activity the Government carries out under law.

''§ 300112. Office of the Ombudsman

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The corporation shall establish an Office of the Ombudsman with such duties and responsibilities as may be provided in the bylaws or a resolution of the board of governors.

''(b) REPORT.—The Office of the Ombudsman shall submit a report annually to Congress concerning any trends and systemic matters that the Office of the Ombudsman has identified as confronting the corporation.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3001 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 300111 and inserting the following:

''300111. Authority of the Comptroller General of the United States.
''300112. Office of the Ombudsman.
''300113. Reservation of right to amend or repeal.''.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to co-sponsor the American National Red Cross Governance Modernization Act of 2007. This legislation, a product of close cooperation with my colleagues Senator GRASSLEY and Senator KENNEDY, seeks to create a more efficient governance structure of the American Red Cross, and to enhance the Board of Governors' ability to support the critical mission of the American Red Cross in the 21st Century.

Charitable organizations are an indispensable part of American society, but these organizations can only fulfill their important roles by maintaining the trust of the American public. This trust is fostered by effective governance and transparency, which are the principal goals of this legislation. The role of the American Red Cross is one of vital significance to the American people. The ability of the American Red Cross to meet its responsibilities requires a governance structure that reflects a need for clear mission and a culture of accountability.

This past October the American Red Cross Board of Governors announced its unanimous support for a series of important changes to its charter and business practice. The American National Red Cross Governance Modernization Act of 2007 enables a number of those changes, including clarifying the role of the Board of Governors as one of governance and strategic oversight. As this bill facilitates these governance reforms, the American Red Cross is expected to continue to implement amendments to its bylaws consistent with those described in the Governance Report to clarify further the role of the Board of Governors and to outline areas of its responsibility.

This bill ensures that the American Red Cross will remain a federally chartered instrumentality of the United States, and it has the rights and obligations consistent with that status. Consistent with that status Congress expects that the American Red Cross will maintain appropriate communications with State regulators of charitable organizations and to cooperate with them as appropriate in specific matters as they arise from time to time.

Finally, we believe the effectiveness of the American Red Cross will be promoted by the creation of a Red Cross ombudsman to be a dispute resolution practitioner to provide confidential and informal assistance to the many internal and external stakeholders of the American Red Cross. The American Red Cross ombudsman will report to Congress, the American Red Cross chief executive officer, and the audit committee of the Board of Governors. The Red Cross ombudsman will have access to anyone and any documents in the American Red Cross. This is an important tool for improving processes and protections for those inside the American Red Cross who wish to express concerns about the organizations practices and procedures, and an important tool for Congress in providing oversight of the activities of the American Red Cross.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the American National Red Cross Governance Modernization Act of 2007.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BURR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 657. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to add requirements regarding trauma care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator ROBERTS, along with Senators KENNEDY, BURR, MURRAY, CLINTON, BROWN, BINGAMAN, COLLINS, ISAKSON, and BIDEN in introducing the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act.

Our Nation's emergency medical system is a system on the brink. We need to support and strengthen this essential component of our health care system. The Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act is an important building block to achieving an improved national network of care across the country.

Unintentional injury is the leading cause of death among people between the ages of 1 to 44 and in 2002, injuries were responsible for 161,000 deaths. In 2004, about 29.6 million people were treated for an injury in U.S. hospital emergency departments, of which nearly 2 million injuries were severe enough to require hospitalization. Yet, between 20,000 and 25,000 trauma deaths are preventable each year.

A trauma system is an organized, coordinated effort in a specific area that delivers the full range of care to all injured patients. It provides resources, supporting equipment, and personnel along a continuum of care including pre-hospital, hospital, and rehabilitation services. Trauma systems have been proven to reduce mortality rates and provide efficient, cost-effective, and timely care. Since 1990, the Federal Government, through Title XII of the Public Health Service Act, has helped States and territories develop and implement regional and statewide trauma care systems.

The legislation I am introducing today along with my colleagues will reauthorize and reaffirm the Federal Government's commitment to trauma care systems. It will also authorize additional resources for systems planning and development, as well as improved data collection and analysis and the inclusion of an Institute of Medicine study on the state of trauma care and trauma research.

Trauma care is not only critical to providing timely access to lifesaving interventions for persons suffering from serious unintentional injuries, it is central to our national security and disaster preparedness. The tragic events of September 11, 2001 and Hurricanes Rita and Katrina serve as stark reminders of the potential intentional and natural disasters that threaten our Nation. Trauma care systems are an important element of our security and response efforts.

I look forward to working with my colleagues toward expeditious passage of this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 1201 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1201. ESTABLISHMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, with respect to trauma care—

''(1) conduct and support research, training, evaluations, and demonstration projects;

''(2) foster the development of appropriate, modern systems of such care through the sharing of information among agencies and individuals involved in the study and provision of such care;

''(3) collect, compile, and disseminate information on the achievements of, and problems experienced by, State and local agencies and private entities in providing trauma care and emergency medical services and, in so doing, give special consideration to the unique needs of rural areas;

''(4) provide to State and local agencies technical assistance to enhance each State's capability to develop, implement, and sustain the trauma care component of each State's plan for the provision of emergency medical services;

''(5) sponsor workshops and conferences; and

''(6) promote the collection and categorization of trauma data in a consistent and standardized manner.

''(b) GRANTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may make grants, and enter into cooperative agreements and contracts, for the purpose of carrying out subsection (a).''.

SEC. 3. CLEARINGHOUSE ON TRAUMA CARE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 1202; and

(2) by redesignating section 1203 as section 1202.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVING TRAUMA CARE IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 1202 of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by section 3(2), is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1202. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVING TRAUMA CARE IN RURAL AREAS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities for the purpose of carrying out research and demonstration projects with respect to improving the availability and quality of emergency medical services in rural areas—

''(1) by developing innovative uses of communications technologies and the use of new communications technology;

''(2) by developing model curricula, such as advanced trauma life support, for training emergency medical services personnel, including first responders, emergency medical technicians, emergency nurses and physicians, and paramedics—

''(A) in the assessment, stabilization, treatment, preparation for transport, and resuscitation of seriously injured patients, with special attention to problems that arise during long transports and to methods of minimizing delays in transport to the appropriate facility; and

''(B) in the management of the operation of the emergency medical services system;

''(3) by making training for original certification, and continuing education, in the provision and management of emergency medical services more accessible to emergency medical personnel in rural areas through telecommunications, home studies, providing teachers and training at locations accessible to such personnel, and other methods;

''(4) by developing innovative protocols and agreements to increase access to prehospital care and equipment necessary for the transportation of seriously injured patients to the appropriate facilities;

''(5) by evaluating the effectiveness of protocols with respect to emergency medical services and systems; and

''(6) by increasing communication and coordination with State trauma systems.

''(b) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION FOR CERTAIN RURAL AREAS.—In making grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give special consideration to any applicant for the grant that will provide services under the grant in any rural area identified by a State under section 1214(d)(1).

''(c) REQUIREMENT OF APPLICATION.—The Secretary may not make a grant under subsection (a) unless an application for the grant is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 5. COMPETITIVE GRANTS.

Part A of title XII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1203. COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TRAUMA CARE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, may make grants to States, political subdivisions, or consortia of States or political subdivisions for the purpose of improving access to and enhancing the development of trauma care systems.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may make a grant under this section only if the applicant agrees to use the grant—

''(1) to integrate and broaden the reach of a trauma care system, such as by developing innovative protocols to increase access to prehospital care;

''(2) to strengthen, develop, and improve an existing trauma care system;

''(3) to expand communications between the trauma care system and emergency medical services through improved equipment or a telemedicine system;

''(4) to improve data collection and retention; or

''(5) to increase education, training, and technical assistance opportunities, such as training and continuing education in the management of emergency medical services accessible to emergency medical personnel in rural areas through telehealth, home studies, and other methods.

''(c) PREFERENCE.—In selecting among States, political subdivisions, and consortia of States or political subdivisions for purposes of making grants under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to applicants that—

''(1) have developed a process, using national standards, for designating trauma centers;

''(2) recognize protocols for the delivery of seriously injured patients to trauma centers;

''(3) implement a process for evaluating the performance of the trauma system; and

''(4) agree to participate in information systems described in section 1202 by collecting, providing, and sharing information.

''(d) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that will use the grants to focus on improving access to trauma care systems.

''(e) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to projects that demonstrate strong State or local support, including availability of non-Federal contributions.''.

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENT OF MATCHING FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEARS SUBSEQUENT TO FIRST FISCAL YEAR OF PAYMENTS.

Section 1212 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–12) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1212. REQUIREMENT OF MATCHING FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEARS SUBSEQUENT TO FIRST FISCAL YEAR OF PAYMENTS.

''(a) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not make payments under section 1211(a) unless the State involved agrees, with respect to the costs described in paragraph (2), to make available non-Federal contributions (in cash or in kind under subsection (b)(1)) toward such costs in an amount that—

''(A) for the second and third fiscal years of such payments to the State, is not less than $1 for each $1 of Federal funds provided in such payments for such fiscal years; and

''(B) for the fourth and subsequent fiscal years of such payments to the State, is not less than $2 for each $1 of Federal funds provided in such payments for such fiscal years.

''(2) PROGRAM COSTS.—The costs referred to in paragraph (1) are—

''(A) the costs to be incurred by the State in carrying out the purpose described in section 1211(b); or

''(B) the costs of improving the quality and availability of emergency medical services in rural areas of the State.

''(3) INITIAL YEAR OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may not require a State to make non-Federal contributions as a condition of receiving payments under section 1211(a) for the first fiscal year of such payments to the State.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.—With respect to compliance with subsection (a) as a condition of receiving payments under section 1211(a)—

''(1) a State may make the non-Federal contributions required in such subsection in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services; and

''(2) the Secretary may not, in making a determination of the amount of non-Federal contributions, include amounts provided by the Federal Government or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government.''.

SEC. 7. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO CARRYING OUT PURPOSE OF ALLOTMENTS.

Section 1213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–13) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1213. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO CARRYING OUT PURPOSE OF ALLOTMENTS.

''(a) TRAUMA CARE MODIFICATIONS TO STATE PLAN FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.—With respect to the trauma care component of a State plan for the provision of emergency medical services, the modifications referred to in section 1211(b) are such modifications to the State plan as may be necessary for the State involved to ensure that the plan provides for access to the highest possible quality of trauma care, and that the plan—

''(1) specifies that the modifications required pursuant to paragraphs (2) through (11) will be implemented by the principal State agency with respect to emergency medical services or by the designee of such agency;

''(2) specifies a public or private entity that will designate trauma care regions and trauma centers in the State;

''(3) subject to subsection (b), contains national standards and requirements of the American College of Surgeons or another appropriate entity for the designation of level I and level II trauma centers, and in the case of rural areas level III trauma centers (including trauma centers with specified capabilities and expertise in the care of pediatric trauma patient), by such entity, including standards and requirements for—

''(A) the number and types of trauma patients for whom such centers must provide care in order to ensure that such centers will have sufficient experience and expertise to be able to provide quality care for victims of injury;

''(B) the resources and equipment needed by such centers; and

''(C) the availability of rehabilitation services for trauma patients;

''(4) contains standards and requirements for the implementation of regional trauma care systems, including standards and guidelines (consistent with the provisions of section 1867 of the Social Security Act) for medically directed triage and transportation of trauma patients (including patients injured in rural areas) prior to care in designated trauma centers;

''(5) subject to subsection (b), contains national standards and requirements, including those of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the American College of Emergency Physicians, for medically directed triage and transport of severely injured children to designated trauma centers with specified capabilities and expertise in the care of the pediatric trauma patient;

''(6) utilizes a program with procedures for the evaluation of designated trauma centers (including trauma centers described in paragraph (5)) and trauma care systems;

''(7) provides for the establishment and collection of data in accordance with data collection requirements developed in consultation with surgical, medical, and nursing specialty groups, State and local emergency medical services directors, and other trained professionals in trauma care, from each designated trauma center in the State of a central data reporting and analysis system—

''(A) to identify the number of severely injured trauma patients and the number of deaths from trauma within trauma care systems in the State;

''(B) to identify the cause of the injury and any factors contributing to the injury;

''(C) to identify the nature and severity of the injury;

''(D) to monitor trauma patient care (including prehospital care) in each designated trauma center within regional trauma care systems in the State (including relevant emergency-department discharges and rehabilitation information) for the purpose of evaluating the diagnosis, treatment, and treatment outcome of such trauma patients;

''(E) to identify the total amount of uncompensated trauma care expenditures for each fiscal year by each designated trauma center in the State; and

''(F) to identify patients transferred within a regional trauma system, including reasons for such transfer and the outcomes of such patients;

''(8) provides for the use of procedures by paramedics and emergency medical technicians to assess the severity of the injuries incurred by trauma patients;

''(9) provides for appropriate transportation and transfer policies to ensure the delivery of patients to designated trauma centers and other facilities within and outside of the jurisdiction of such system, including policies to ensure that only individuals appropriately identified as trauma patients are transferred to designated trauma centers, and to provide periodic reviews of the transfers and the auditing of such transfers that are determined to be appropriate;

''(10) conducts public education activities concerning injury prevention and obtaining access to trauma care;

''(11) coordinates planning for trauma systems with State disaster emergency planning and bioterrorism hospital preparedness planning; and

''(12) with respect to the requirements established in this subsection, provides for coordination and cooperation between the State and any other State with which the State shares any standard metropolitan statistical area.

''(b) CERTAIN STANDARDS WITH RESPECT TO TRAUMA CARE CENTERS AND SYSTEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not make payments under section 1211(a) for a fiscal year unless the State involved agrees that, in carrying out paragraphs (3) through (5) of subsection (a), the State will adopt standards for the designation of trauma centers, and for triage, transfer, and transportation policies, and that the State will, in adopting such standards—

''(A) take into account national standards concerning that outline resources for optimal care of the injured patient;

''(B) consult with medical, surgical, and nursing speciality groups, hospital associations, emergency medical services State and local directors, concerned advocates and other interested parties;

''(C) conduct hearings on the proposed standards after providing adequate notice to the public concerning such hearing; and

''(D) beginning in fiscal year 2008, take into account the model plan described in subsection (c).

''(2) QUALITY OF TRAUMA CARE.—The highest quality of trauma care shall be the primary goal of State standards adopted under this subsection.

''(3) APPROVAL BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary may not make payments under section 1211(a) to a State if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) in the case of payments for fiscal year 2008 and subsequent fiscal years, the State has not taken into account national standards, including those of the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Emergency Physicians, and the American Academy of Pediatrics, in adopting standards under this subsection; or

''(B) in the case of payments for fiscal year 2008 and subsequent fiscal years, the State has not, in adopting such standards, taken into account the model plan developed under subsection (c) .

''(c) MODEL TRAUMA CARE PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act of 2007, the Secretary shall update the model plan for the designation of trauma centers and for triage, transfer, and transportation policies that may be adopted for guidance by the State. Such plan shall—

''(A) take into account national standards, including those of the American College of Surgeons, American College of Emergency Physicians, and the American Academy of Pediatrics;

''(B) take into account existing State plans;

''(C) be developed in consultation with medical, surgical, and nursing speciality groups, hospital associations, emergency medical services State directors and associations, and other interested parties; and

''(D) include standards for the designation of rural health facilities and hospitals best able to receive, stabilize, and transfer trauma patients to the nearest appropriate designated trauma center, and for triage, transfer, and transportation policies as they relate to rural areas.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—Standards described in paragraph (1)(D) shall be applicable to all rural areas in the State, including both nonmetropolitan areas and frontier areas that

have populations of less than 6,000 per square mile.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO NUMBER OF DESIGNATED TRAUMA CENTERS.—With respect to compliance with subsection (a) as a condition of the receipt of a grant under section 1211(a), such subsection may not be construed to specify the number of trauma care centers designated pursuant to such subsection.''.

SEC. 8. REQUIREMENT OF SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY OF TRAUMA PLAN AND CERTAIN INFORMATION.

Section 1214 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–14) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1214. REQUIREMENT OF SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY OF TRAUMA PLAN AND CERTAIN INFORMATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary may not make payments to a State under section 1211(a) unless, subject to subsection (b), the State submits to the Secretary the trauma care component of the State plan for the provision of emergency medical services, including any changes to the trauma care component and any plans to address deficiencies in the trauma care component.

''(b) INTERIM PLAN OR DESCRIPTION OF EFFORTS.—For each fiscal year, if a State has not completed the trauma care component of the State plan described in subsection (a), the State may provide, in lieu of such completed component, an interim component or a description of efforts made toward the completion of the component.

''(c) INFORMATION RECEIVED BY STATE REPORTING AND ANALYSIS SYSTEM.—The Secretary may not make payments to a State under section 1211(a) unless the State agrees that the State will, not less than once each year, provide to the Secretary the information received by the State pursuant to section 1213(a)(7).

''(d) AVAILABILITY OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.—The Secretary may not make payments to a State under section 1211(a) unless—

''(1) the State identifies any rural area in the State for which—

''(A) there is no system of access to emergency medical services through the telephone number 911;

''(B) there is no basic life-support system; or

''(C) there is no advanced life-support system; and

''(2) the State submits to the Secretary a list of rural areas identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) or, if there are no such areas, a statement that there are no such areas.''.

SEC. 9. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF PAYMENTS.

Section 1215 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–15) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1215. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF PAYMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not, except as provided in subsection (b), make payments under section 1211(a) for a fiscal year unless the State involved agrees that the payments will not be expended—

''(1) for any purpose other than developing, implementing, and monitoring the modifications required by section 1211(b) to be made to the State plan for the provision of emergency medical services;

''(2) to make cash payments to intended recipients of services provided pursuant to this section;

''(3) to purchase or improve real property (other than minor remodeling of existing improvements to real property);

''(4) to satisfy any requirement for the expenditure of non-Federal funds as a condition for the receipt of Federal funds; or

''(5) to provide financial assistance to any entity other than a public or nonprofit private entity.

''(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive a restriction under subsection (a) only if the Secretary determines that the activities outlined by the State plan submitted under section 1214(a)(1) by the State involved cannot otherwise be carried out.''.

SEC. 10. REQUIREMENTS OF REPORTS BY STATES.

The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by striking section 1216.

SEC. 11. REPORT BY SECRETARY.

Section 1222 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–22) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1222. REPORT BY SECRETARY.

''Not later than October 1, 2008, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the activities of the States carried out pursuant to section 1211. Such report shall include an assessment of the extent to which Federal and State efforts to develop systems of trauma care and to designate trauma centers have reduced the incidence of mortality, and the incidence of permanent disability, resulting from trauma. Such report may include any recommendations of the Secretary for appropriate administrative and legislative initiatives with respect to trauma care.''.

SEC. 12. FUNDING.

Section 1232 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–32) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1232. FUNDING.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out parts A and B, there are authorized to be appropriated $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, and $8,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2012.

''(b) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—If the amount appropriated under subsection (a) for a fiscal year is equal to or less than $1,000,000, such appropriation is available only for making grants under part A. If the amount so appropriated is greater than $1,000,000, 50 percent of such appropriation shall be made available for grants under part A and 50 percent shall be made available for grants under part B.

''(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS BY SECRETARY.—

''(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—For the purpose of carrying out part A, the Secretary shall make available 10 percent of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year under subsection (a).

''(2) RURAL GRANTS.—For the purpose of carrying out section 1202, the Secretary shall make available 10 percent of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 13. INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE STUDY.

Part E of title XII of the Public Health Service Act (20 U.S.C. 300d–51 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1254. INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE STUDY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, or another appropriate entity, to conduct a study on the state of trauma care and trauma research.

''(b) CONTENT.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) examine and evaluate the state of trauma care and trauma systems research (including the role of Federal entities in trauma research) on the date of enactment of this section, and identify trauma research priorities;

''(2) examine and evaluate the clinical effectiveness of trauma care and the impact of trauma care on patient outcomes, with special attention to high-risk groups, such as children, the elderly, and individuals in rural areas;

''(3) examine and evaluate trauma systems development and identify obstacles that prevent or hinder the effectiveness of trauma systems and trauma systems development;

''(4) examine and evaluate alternative strategies for the organization, financing, and delivery of trauma care within an overall systems approach; and

''(5) examine and evaluate the role of trauma systems and trauma centers in preparedness for mass casualties.

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under this section.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $750,000 for fiscal year 2008.''.

SEC. 14. RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAMS IN EMERGENCY MEDICINE.

Section 1251 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–51) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1251. RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAMS IN EMERGENCY MEDICINE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities for the purpose of planning and developing approved residency training programs in emergency medicine.

''(b) IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The Secretary may make a grant under subsection (a) only in the applicant involved agrees that the training programs under subsection (a) will provide education and training in identifying and referring cases of domestic violence.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $400,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 though 2012.''.

SEC. 15. STATE GRANTS FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.

Section 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–52) is amended in the section heading by striking ''**DEMONSTRATION**'' .

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 661. A bill to establish kinship navigator programs, to establish guardianship assistance payments for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to re-introduce the Kinship Caregiver Support Act today with my friend and colleague, Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE. The growth of kinship care is a phenomenon that is quietly changing the face of the American family and creating new challenges for our Nation's child welfare system. This bill would be a huge help to kinship caregivers in New York and across the country.

Nationwide, now more than ever children are living in households headed by grandparents and other relatives. In New York City alone, there are over 245,000 adolescents already living in grandparent households. Nationwide, an estimated 20,000 children living in foster care could leave the system if Congress made subsidized guardianship available to their families.

As caregivers who often become parents unexpectedly, these generous family members face unique challenges to

successfully raising children. These challenges are physical, emotional and of course, financial. Grandparents and other relatives raising children often encounter a variety of unnecessary barriers, including difficulties enrolling children in school, authorizing medical treatment, maintaining their public housing leases, obtaining affordable legal services, and accessing a variety of Federal benefits and services. Almost one-fifth of grandparents responsible for their grandchildren live in poverty.

The Kinship Caregiver Support Act attempts to address the full range of difficulties facing kinship caregivers, by allowing relatives to become formal guardians while receiving some financial assistance. This bill will provide relative caregivers with the information and assistance they need to thrive as non-traditional families.

First, the Act contains a ''subsidized guardianship provision'', which will give States the option to use their Title IV–E funds to provide payments to grandparents and other relatives who have assumed legal guardianship of children they have cared for as foster parents.

The Act also establishes the Kinship Navigator Program, which will provide families with the guidance they need to learn how to obtain health care coverage for the children in their care, apply for housing assistance, locate childcare, enroll children in school, and gain access to other services.

Finally, this legislation will require States to notify grandparents and other close relatives when children enter the foster care system. Unfortunately, grandparents and other relatives often do not know when their grandchildren or nieces and nephews come under the care of the State. Notifying grandparents and other relatives when children enter the foster care system will make it easier for families to stay together.

So many grandparents and other relatives are making great personal sacrifices to provide safe and loving homes for the children in their care. It is my hope that my colleagues will join Senator SNOWE and me as we continue this fight for children and families.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 663. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the statutory designation of beneficiaries of the $100,000 death gratuity under section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, and to permit members of the Armed Forces to designate in writing their beneficiaries of choice in the event of their death while serving on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to fix a serious problem that has recently come to light with respect to the administration of the so-called Death Gratuity. The legislation is designed to ensure that a service member can designate to whom a death gratuity benefit is awarded.

Today's Washington Post includes an informative yet troubling article describing the plight of the mother of Petty Officer Second Class Jaime S. Jaenke, U. S. Navy, who died in Iraq in June 2006 as a result of an IED attack. Petty Officer Jaenke was a member of the Navy Reserve and a medic assigned to a Seabee Construction Battalion. She left behind a young daughter, Kayla, who is in the care of Kayla's grandmother, Susan Jaenke.

Regrettably, because of the manner in which death benefits are administered, a hardship situation has been created for Mrs. Jaenke. The article spells out that while the insurance proceeds have been set aside by the State court for the benefit of Kayla, they have not yet been made available. So in the meantime her grandmother is left trying to make ends meet because she is not allowed to receive the gratuity benefit that her daughter thought she would be providing, should the service member's unfortunate death occur.

The article describes a very difficult situation for the person on who Petty Officer Jaenke depended. The financial difficulties Mrs. Jaenke is experiencing is due in part by confusion about how the death gratuity benefit—a sum of $100,000—is being administered under law.

Under current law, the recipient of the $100,000 is dictated by the statute. It provides that a benefit is first awarded to an existing spouse. If there is no spouse, it then is provided to the children, and so on. It's a scheme that was set up to permit speedy resolution of what used to be a very modest benefit. In today's world, however, with the complex needs of service members, it does not comport with the realities of many of our service members and their families. It needs to be changed.

The legislation I am introducing would replace the statutory order of beneficiaries with provisions identical to that used to select beneficiaries under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance—SGLI. The bill would give service members the power to select precisely who will receive the $100,00 death gratuity. It would require the Secretary of Defense to, no later than April 1, 2007, to prepare regulations and create election forms that will enable service members to designate who will receive this benefit.

I hope we can move this legislation quickly and ensure that the intentions of our service members regarding the well being of their children and families can be carried out. We owe at least that much to those who are giving their lives for our nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF SCHEME FOR PAYMENT OF DEATH GRATUITY PAYABLE WITH RESPECT TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The death gratuity authorized under sections 1475 to 1480 of title 10, United States Code, was intended, when originally enacted to provide an immediate cash payment to assist survivors of deceased members of the Armed Forces to meet their financial needs during the period immediately following a member's death and before other survivor benefits become available.

(2) The death gratuity, when first implemented in 1908, amounted to six months of a service member's pay and, until 1991, could not exceed $3,000.

(3) However, following the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the initiation of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, Congress determined that the death benefits available to survivors of members of the Armed Forces should be substantially increased.

(4) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, which was enacted on January 6, 2006, as Public Law 109-163, increased the amount of the death gratuity to $100,000, effective retroactively to October 7, 2001.

(5) Under section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, the law authorizing the death gratuity, those living relatives of deceased members of the Armed Forces who shall receive the death gratuity are specifically designated. Service members are not provided with the opportunity to make an election choosing a beneficiary other than those set forth in section 1477 of title 10, United States Code.

(6) The increased death gratuity, in combination with benefits available under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program, the Survivor Benefit Plan, and Dependency and Indemnity Compensation provide significant support and compensation to the next of kin of deceased members of the Armed Forces. Individual members are best qualified to determine who the beneficiaries for death benefits should be and should be afforded the opportunity to make these selections at appropriate times throughout military service and particularly prior to mobilization or deployment to a combat zone.

(7) Under the current system, many members of the Armed Forces have designated individuals as beneficiaries for the death gratuity in a manner not provided for by law. In these cases, the wishes of these members regarding the disposition of the death gratuity has in many cases not been implemented, to the detriment of their children and other loved ones.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that all members of the Armed Forces should be given the opportunity to affirmatively select who shall receive the death gratuity and that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments should take prompt action to afford members the opportunity to make an election in writing about the disposition of the death gratuity proceeds and to provide appropriate and timely counseling about the manner in which the proceeds of the death gratuity and other forms of insurance will be administered.

(c) MODIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking all that follows ''on the following list:'' and inserting the following:

''(1) To any individual designated by the person in writing.

''(2) If there is no person so designated, to the surviving spouse of the person.

''(3) If there is none of the above, to the children (as prescribed by subsection (b)) of the person and the descendants of any deceased children by representation.

''(4) If there is none of the above, to the parents (as prescribed by subsection (c)) of the person or the survivor of them.

''(5) If there is none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of the person.

''(6) If there is none of the above, to other next of kin of the person entitled under the laws of domicile of the person at the time of the person's death.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''Subsection (a)(2)'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''Subsection (a)(3)'';

(B) by striking (c) and inserting the following new subsection (c):

''(c) For purposes of subsection (a)(4), parents include fathers and mothers through adoption. However, only one father and one mother may be recognized in any case, and preference shall be given to those who exercised a parental relationship on the date, or most nearly before the date, on which the decedent entered a status described in section 1475 or 1476 of this title.''; and

(C) by striking subsection (d).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the provisions of section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply to each member of the Armed Forces covered by such section until the earlier of the following—

(A) the date on which such member makes the designation contemplated by paragraph (1) of section 1477(a) of such title (as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection); or

(B) January 1, 2008.

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments to section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, made by subsection (c).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The regulations required by paragraph (1) shall include forms for the making of the designation contemplated by paragraph (1) of section 1477(a) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (c)), and instructions for members of the Armed Forces in the filling out of such forms.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 667. A bill to expand programs of early childhood home visitation that increase school readiness, child abuse and neglect prevention, and early identification of developmental and health delays, including potential mental health concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of myself and Senator HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, that the text of the Education Begins at Home Act be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 667

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Education Begins at Home Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the home is the first and most important learning environment for children, and parents are their children's first and most influential teacher;

(2) through parent education and family support, we can promote parents' ability to enhance their children's development from birth until entry into kindergarten thereby helping parents to prepare their children for success in school;

(3) undiagnosed and unaddressed developmental and health problems can impede overall child development and school readiness;

(4) all parents deserve and can benefit from—

(A) research-based information regarding child development;

(B) enrichment opportunities with their children; and

(C) early opportunities to become involved with their community and schools; and

(5) early childhood home visitation leads to positive outcomes for children and families, including readiness for school, improved child health and development, positive parenting practices, and reductions in child maltreatment.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To enable States to deliver services under early childhood home visitation programs to pregnant women and parents of children from birth until entry into kindergarten in order to promote parents' ability to support their children's optimal cognitive, language, social-emotional, and physical development.

(2) To improve Early Head Start programs carried out under section 645A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9840a).

(3) To expand early childhood home visitation programs so as to more effectively reach and serve families with English language learners.

(4) To expand early childhood visitation programs so as to more effectively reach and serve families serving in the military.

(5) To establish a public education and awareness campaign concerning the importance of the proper care of infants and young children.

(6) To make available for parents of newborn children parenting classes that convey information about the importance of proper care for newborns, including information about symptoms of abusive head and other injuries.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELIGIBLE FAMILY.—The term ''eligible family'' means—

(A) a woman who is pregnant, and the father of the child if the father is available; or

(B) a parent or primary caregiver of a child, including grandparents or other relatives of the child, and foster parents, who are serving as the primary caregiver from birth until entry into kindergarten, including a noncustodial parent during periods in which such noncustodial parent is physically caring for such child.

(2) HOME VISITATION.—The term ''home visitation'' means services provided in the permanent or temporary residence, or in a mutually agreed upon location in the community, of the individual receiving such services.

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given such term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (52 U.S.C. 450(b)(e)).

(4) SECRETARY.—Except as provided in section 7, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(6) TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS.—The term ''territories and possessions'' means American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(7) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ''tribal organization'' has the meaning given such term in section 4(l) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(l)).

SEC. 4. STATE GRANTS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD HOME VISITATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Education, shall make grants to States to enable such States to establish or expand quality programs of early childhood home visitation, as specified under subsection (f). Each grant shall consist of the allotment determined for a State under subsection (b).

(b) DETERMINATION OF RESERVATIONS; AMOUNT OF ALLOTMENTS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) RESERVATIONS FROM APPROPRIATIONS.—From the total amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

(A) 3 percent for an independent evaluation of the activities carried out under this Act, as specified in section 8;

(B) not more than 3 percent for Federal administrative costs;

(C) 2 percent for training and technical assistance for States;

(D) not more than 2 percent for payments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations with applications approved under this section; and

(E) not more than 0.5 percent for payments to territories and possessions with applications approved under this section.

(2) STATE ALLOTMENTS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD HOME VISITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allot among each of the eligible States the total amount made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year and not reserved under paragraph (1), to carry out early childhood home visitation in accordance with this section.

(B) DETERMINATION OF STATE ALLOTMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Secretary shall allot the amount made available under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year among the States in proportion to the number of children, aged from birth to 5 years, who reside within the State, compared to the number of such individuals who reside in all such States for that fiscal year.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—No State receiving an allotment under clause (i) may receive more than $20,000,000.

(3) INDIAN TRIBES, TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS, TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS.—

(A) INDIAN TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—From amounts reserved for each fiscal year under paragraph (1)(D), the Secretary shall make payments to each Indian tribe or tribal organizations with an application approved under this section in an amount determined in accordance with the respective needs described in the application.

(B) TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS.—From amounts reserved for each fiscal year under paragraph (1)(E), the Secretary shall make payments to each territory and possession with an application approved under this section in an amount determined in accordance with the respective needs described in the application.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

(c) GRANT APPLICATIONS.—

(1) STATE APPLICATIONS.—A State that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall contain the following information:

(A) An assurance that the Governor of the State has designated a lead State agency, such as the State educational agency or the State health and human services agency, to carry out the activities under this section.

(B) An assurance that the State will reserve 3 percent of such grant for evaluation and will participate in the independent evaluation under section 8.

(C) An assurance that the State will reserve 10 percent of the grant funds for training and technical assistance of staff of programs of early childhood home visitation.

(D) An assurance that the State will authorize child care resource and referral agencies to refer parents seeking home visitation services.

(E) The results of a statewide needs assessment that describes—

(i) the quality and capacity of existing programs of early childhood home visitation in the State;

(ii) the number and types of eligible families who are receiving services under such programs; and

(iii) the gaps in early childhood home visitation in the State.

(F) A State plan containing the following:

(i) A description of the State's strategy to establish or expand quality programs of early childhood home visitation to serve all eligible families in the State.

(ii) A description of the quality programs of early childhood home visitation that will be supported by a grant under this section.

(iii) A description of how the proposed program of early childhood home visitation will promote positive parenting skills and children's early learning and development.

(iv) A description of how the proposed program of early childhood home visitation will incorporate the authorized activities described in subsection (f).

(v) How the lead State agency will build on and promote coordination among existing programs of early childhood home visitation in an effort to promote an array of home visitation that ensures more eligible families are being served and are getting the most appropriate services to meet their needs.

(vi) How the lead State agency will promote channels of communication between staff of programs of early childhood home visitation and staff of other early childhood education programs, such as Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) and Early Head Start programs carried out under section 645A of such Act, preschool programs, and child care programs, to facilitate the coordination of services for eligible families.

(vii) How the lead State agency will provide training and technical assistance to staff of programs of early childhood home visitation involved in activities under this section to more effectively meet the needs of the eligible families served with sensitivity to cultural variations in parenting norms and attitudes toward formal support services.

(viii) How the lead State agency will evaluate the activities supported under this section in order to demonstrate outcomes related to the enhancement of—

(I) parent knowledge of early learning and development;

(II) child health, cognitive, language, social-emotional, and physical development indicators; and

(III) child maltreatment indicators for child abuse and neglect prevention.

(IV) School readiness indicators.

(V) Links to community services.

(ix) A description of how the lead State agency will ensure that the home visitation programs will conduct outreach activities to target both mothers and fathers, and increase father involvement where appropriate.

(x) A description of how the lead State agency will increase home visitation programs participation rates for fathers.

(xi) A description of how the lead State agency will ensure that services are made available under the program to grandparents, other relatives or foster parents, of a child from birth through age 5 who serve as the primary caregiver of the child.

(G) Such other information as the Secretary may require.

(2) INDIAN TRIBES, TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS, TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An Indian tribe, tribal organization, territory, or possession that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall contain the information described in paragraph (1) with respect to the applicant entity.

(B) APPROVAL.—The Secretary may approve an application submitted under subparagraph (A) based on the quality of the information contained in the application.

(C) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt an applicant under subparagraph (A) from any requirement of this section if the Secretary determines that the application of such requirements would be inappropriate taking into consideration the resources, needs, and other circumstances of the applicant entity. This subparagraph shall not apply to the requirements described in subsections (f)(1) and (h).

(d) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

(1) RECOMMENDATION OF PANEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve an application under this section based on the recommendations of a peer review panel, as described in paragraph (2).

(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—A peer review panel shall determine which applicants to recommend for approval, for purposes of subparagraph (A), based on the quality of the application submitted. Consideration shall be given by the panel to the inclusion of applicants, to the extent practicable, that have the ability to incorporate comparison or control groups in their service deliver model, recognizing that universal access to home visitation services, among other factors, may prevent some quality programs from conducting such evaluation.

(2) PEER REVIEW PANEL.—The peer review panel shall include not less than—

(A) 3 individuals who are experts in the field of home visitation;

(B) 2 individuals who are experts in early childhood development;

(C) 1 individual with experience implementing a statewide program of early childhood home visitation;

(D) 1 individual who is a board certified pediatrician or a developmental pediatrician; and

(E) 1 individual with experience in administering public or private (including community-based) child maltreatment prevention programs.

(e) DURATION OF GRANTS.—Grants made under this section shall be for a period of no more than 3 years.

(f) STATE USES OF FUNDS.—Each State that receives a grant under this section shall—

(1) provide to as many eligible families in the State as practicable, voluntary early childhood home visitation, on not less frequently than a monthly basis with greater frequency of services for those eligible families identified with additional needs, through the implementation of quality programs of early childhood home visitation that—

(A) adopts a clear, consistent model that is grounded in empirically-based knowledge related to home visiting and linked to program-determined outcomes;

(B) employs well-trained and competent staff, as demonstrated by education or training, and the provision of ongoing and specific training on the model being delivered;

(C) maintains high quality supervision to establish home visitor competencies;

(D) demonstrates strong organizational capacity to implement the program involved;

(E) establishes appropriate linkages and referral networks to other community resources and supports;

(F) monitors fidelity of program implementation to ensure that services are delivered pursuant to the specified model;

(G) are research-based, that provide parents with—

(i) knowledge of age appropriate child development in cognitive, language, social-emotional, and motor domains;

(ii) knowledge of realistic expectations of age-appropriate child behaviors;

(iii) knowledge of health and wellness issues for children and parents;

(iv) modeling and consulting services related to parenting;

(v) skills to interact with their child to enhance age-appropriate development;

(vi) skills to recognize and seek help for health issues and developmental delays, and social, emotional, and behavioral skills;

(vii) activities designed to help parents become full partners in the education of their children; and

(viii) relevant information, consistent with State child welfare agency training, concerning child welfare and protective services resources if appropriate;

(H) ascertain which developmental services the family receives and work with service providers to eliminate gaps in services by offering annual health, vision, hearing, and developmental screening for children from birth until entry into kindergarten, when not otherwise provided;

(I) provide referrals for eligible families, as needed, to additional resources available in the community, such as center-based early education programs, child care services, health or mental health services, family literacy programs, employment agencies, social services, and child care resource and referral agencies;

(J) offer group meetings (at the discretion of the program involved) for eligible families that—

(i) further enhance the information, activities, and skill-building addressed during home visitation; and

(ii) offer opportunities for parents to meet with and support each other;

(K) reserve 10 percent of the grant funds to provide training and technical assistance, directly or through contract, to early childhood home visitation and early childhood care and education staff relating to—

(i) effective methods of conducting parent education, home visiting, and promoting quality early childhood development;

(ii) the relationship of health and well-being of pregnant women to prenatal and early childhood development;

(iii) early childhood development with respect to children from birth until entry into kindergarten;

(iv) methods to help parents promote emergent literacy in their children from birth until entry into kindergarten;

(v) health, vision, hearing, and developmental screenings;

(vi) strategies for helping eligible families with special needs or those eligible families coping with crisis;

(vii) recruiting, supervising, and retaining qualified staff;

(viii) increasing services for underserved populations;

(ix) methods to help parents effectively respond to their children's needs and behaviors; and

(x) implementation of ongoing program quality improvement and evaluation of activities and outcomes;

(L) ensure coordination of programs of early childhood home visitation, early childhood education and care, and early intervention, through an existing or created State-level early childhood coordinating body that includes—

(i) representatives from relevant State agencies, including the State agency responsible for carrying out the plan under section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act;

(ii) representatives from State Head Start Associations;

(iii) the State official with responsibility for carrying out activities under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

(iv) the State official with responsibility for carrying out activities under section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419);

(v) representatives from child care resource and referral State offices;

(vi) representatives from quality programs of early childhood home visitation; and

(vii) a board certified pediatrician or a developmental pediatrician; and

(M) not expend more than 5 percent of the amount of grant funds received under this section for the administration of the grant, including planning, administration, evaluation, and annual reporting.

(g) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—A State is entitled to receive its full allotment of funds under this section for any fiscal year if the Secretary finds that the aggregate expenditures within the State for quality programs of early childhood home visitation, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made was not less than 100 percent of such aggregate expenditures for the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

(h) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each State that receives a grant under this section shall submit an annual report to the Secretary regarding the State's progress in addressing the purposes of this Act. Such report shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the actual services delivered under the grant, including—

(A) the program characteristics, including descriptive information on the service models used and the actual program performance;

(B) the characteristics of the providers involved, including staff qualifications, work experience, and demographic characteristics; and

(C) the characteristics of the recipient of services under the program, including the number of recipients, their demographic characteristics, and family retention;

(2) recipient outcomes that are consistent with program goals, including, where appropriate based on the outcomes being evaluated a description of—

(A) affected parental practices;

(B) child health, cognitive, language, social-emotional, and physical developmental indicators;

(C) child maltreatment indicators, including prevention strategies;

(D) school readiness indicators; and

(E) links to community services;

(3) the research-based instruction, materials, and activities being used in the activities funded under the grant;

(4) the effectiveness of the training and ongoing professional development provided—

(A) to staff supported under the grant; and

(B) to the broader early childhood community;

(5) beginning at the end of the second year of the grant, the results of evaluations described in subsection (c)(4)(G); and

(6) the annual program implementation costs, including the cost for each family served under the program.

SEC. 5. STRENGTHENING EARLY HEAD START HOME VISITATION.

Section 645A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9840a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''provide services to parents to support their role as parents'' and inserting ''provide additional services to parents to support their role as parents (including training in parenting skills, basic child development, and sensitivity to cultural variations in parenting norms and attitudes toward formal supports)'';

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by inserting ''(including home-based services)'' after ''with services''; and

(ii) by inserting '', and family support services'' after ''health services'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (9), (10), and (11), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) develop and implement a systematic procedure for transitioning children and parents from an Early Head Start program into a Head Start program or another local early childhood education program;

''(8) establish channels of communication between staff of Early Head Start programs and staff of Head Start programs or other local early childhood education programs, to facilitate the coordination of programs;'';

(2) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

''(iv) providing professional development and personnel enhancement activities, including the provision of funds to recipients of grants under subsection (a), relating to effective methods of conducting parent education, home visiting, and promoting quality early childhood development.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.—

''(1) HOME VISITOR STAFF.—

''(A) STANDARDS.—In order to further enhance the quality of home visiting services provided to families of children participating in home-based, center-based, or combination program options under this subchapter, the Secretary shall establish standards for training, qualifications, and the conduct of home visits for home visitor staff in Early Head Start programs.

''(B) CONTENTS.—The standards for training, qualifications, and the conduct of home visits shall include content related to—

''(i) structured child-focused home visiting that promotes parents' ability to support the child's cognitive, social, emotional, and physical development;

''(ii) effective strengths-based parent education, including methods to encourage parents as their child's first teachers;

''(iii) early childhood development with respect to children from birth through age 3;

''(iv) methods to help parents promote emergent literacy in their children from birth through age 3;

''(v) ascertaining what health and developmental services the family involved receives and working with the service providers to eliminate gaps in services by offering annual health, vision, hearing, and developmental screenings for children from birth through entry into kindergarten, when needed;

''(vi) strategies for helping families coping with crisis; and

''(vii) the relationship of health and well-being of pregnant women to prenatal and early child development.''.

SEC. 6. TARGETED GRANTS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD HOME VISITATION FOR FAMILIES WITH ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Education, shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible applicants to enable such applicants to support and expand local efforts to deliver services under quality programs of early childhood home visitation, to eligible families with English language learners.

(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT.—In this section, the term ''eligible applicant'' means—

(1) 1 or more local educational agencies (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)); and

(2) 1 or more public or private community-based organizations or agencies that serve eligible families and are capable of establishing and implementing programs of early childhood home visitation.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible applicant that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall include a description of—

(1) the results of a community wide needs assessment that describes—

(A) community demographics demonstrating the need for outreach and services to eligible families with English language learners;

(B) the quality, capacity, and existing programs of early childhood home visitation for eligible families with English language learners;

(C) the gaps in programs of early childhood home visitation for eligible families with English language learners; and

(D) the type of program of early childhood home visitation necessary to address the gaps identified;

(2) the program of early childhood home visitation that will be supported by the grant under this section;

(3) how the proposed program of early childhood home visitation will promote positive parenting skills and children's early learning and development;

(4) how the proposed program of early childhood home visitation will incorporate the authorized activities described in subsection (f);

(5) how services provided through a grant under this section will use materials that are geared toward eligible families with English language learners;

(6) how the activities under this section will build upon and promote coordination among existing programs of early childhood home visitation, if such programs exist in the community, in an effort to promote an array of home visitation that ensures more eligible families with English language learners are being served and are getting the most appropriate services to meet their needs;

(7) how the program will ensure that—

(A) eligible families with English language learners are linked to schools; and

(B) the activities under this section will support the preparation of children for school;

(8) how channels of communication will be established between staff of programs of early childhood home visitation and staff of other early childhood education programs, such as Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) and Early Head Start programs carried out under section 645A of such Act, preschool programs, and child care programs, to facilitate the coordination of services for eligible families with English language learners;

(9) how eligible families with English language learners will be recruited and retained to receive services under this section;

(10) how training and technical assistance will help the staff of programs of early childhood home visitation involved in activities under this section to more effectively serve eligible families with English language learners;

(11) how the eligible applicant will evaluate the activities supported under this section in order to demonstrate outcomes related to the—

(A) increase in number of eligible families with English language learners served by programs of early childhood home visitation;

(B) enhancement of participating parents' knowledge of early learning and development;

(C) enhancement of positive parenting practices related to early learning and development; and

(D) enhancement of children's cognitive, language, social-emotional, and physical development; and

(12) such other information as the Secretary may require.

(d) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall select applicants for funding under this section based on the quality of the applications and the recommendations of a peer review panel, as described in paragraph (2).

(2) PEER REVIEW PANEL.—The peer review panel shall include not less than—

(A) 2 individuals who are experts in the field of home visitation;

(B) 2 individuals who are experts in early childhood development;

(C) 2 individuals who are experts in serving eligible families with English language learners;

(D) 1 individual who is a board certified pediatrician or a developmental pediatrician; and

(E) 1 individual with experience in administering public or private (including community-based) child maltreatment prevention programs.

(e) DURATION OF GRANTS.—Grants made under this section shall be for a period of no more than 3 years.

(f) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Each eligible applicant that receives a grant under this section shall carry out the following activities:

(1) Providing to as many eligible families with English language learners as practicable, voluntary early childhood home visitation, on not less frequently than a monthly basis, through the implementation of other quality programs of early childhood home visitation that are research-based, that provide parents with—

(A) knowledge of age appropriate child development in cognitive, language, social-emotional, and motor domains;

(B) knowledge of realistic expectations of age-appropriate child behaviors;

(C) knowledge of health and wellness issues for children and parents;

(D) modeling, consulting, and coaching on parenting practices;

(E) skills to interact with their child to enhance age-appropriate development;

(F) skills to recognize and seek help for health issues and developmental delays, and social, emotional, and behavioral skills; and

(G) activities designed to help parents become full partners in the education of their children.

(2) Activities to ascertain what health and developmental services families receive and working with service providers to eliminate gaps in service by offering an annual health, vision, hearing, and developmental screening for children from birth through their entry into kindergarten.

(3) Providing referrals for participating eligible families with English language learners, as needed, to additional resources available in the community, such as center-based early education programs, child care services, health or mental health services, family literacy programs, employment agencies, social services, and child care resource and referral agencies.

(4) Offering group meetings (at program discretion), on not less frequently than a monthly basis, for eligible families with English language learners that—

(A) further enhance the information, activities, and skill-building addressed during home visitation;

(B) offer opportunities for parents to meet with and support each other; and

(C) address challenges facing eligible families with English language learners.

(5) Providing training and technical assistance to early childhood home visitation and early childhood care and education staff relating to—

(A) effective service to eligible families with English language learners, including skills to address challenges facing English language learners;

(B) effective methods of implementing parent education, conducting home visitation, and promoting quality early childhood development, with sensitivity to cultural variations in parenting norms and attitudes toward formal support services;

(C) the relationship of health and well-being of pregnant women to prenatal and early child development;

(D) early childhood development with respect to children from birth until entry into kindergarten;

(E) methods to help parents promote emergent literacy in their children from birth until entry into kindergarten;

(F) implementing strategies for helping eligible families with English language learners coping with a crisis;

(G) recruiting, supervising, and retaining qualified staff;

(H) increasing services for underserved eligible families with English language learners;

(I) methods to help parents effectively respond to their children's needs and behaviors; and

(J) implementation of ongoing program quality improvement and evaluation of activities and outcomes.

(6) Coordinating existing programs of early childhood home visitation in order to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of more eligible families with English language learners.

(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The recipient of a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an annual report concerning the progress of the program conducted by the recipient in addressing the purposes of this Act. Each such report shall, at a minimum, include a description of—

(1) the actual service delivery provided for under the grant, including—

(A) program characteristics that include descriptive information on the service model used under the program and actual program performance;

(B) the characteristics of service providers under the program that include staff qualifications, work experience, and demographic characteristics;

(C) the characteristics of recipients of services under the program that include the number, demographic characteristics, and family retention under the program; and

(D) an estimate of the annual program implementation costs;

(2) with respect to recipients of services under the program, whether such services were provided in a manner consistent with program goals including, where appropriate—

(A) parental practices;

(B) child health and development indicators;

(C) child maltreatment indicators;

(D) school readiness indicators; and

(E) links to community services;

(3) the research-based instruction, materials, and activities being used in the activities conducted under the program; and

(4) the effectiveness of the training and ongoing professional development provided—

(A) to the staff supported under the program; and

(B) to the affected early childhood community.

(h) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Grant funds provided under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, Federal and non-Federal funds available for carrying out the activities described in this section.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

SEC. 7. TARGETED GRANTS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD HOME VISITATION FOR MILITARY FAMILIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of Education, shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible applicants to enable such applicants to support and expand efforts to deliver services under quality programs of early childhood home visitation, to eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces.

(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT.—In this section, the term ''eligible applicant'' means any of the following:

(1) A local educational agency that receives payments under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.).

(2) A school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.).

(3) A school established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) A community-based organization serving families with a family member in the Armed Forces.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible applicant that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Defense at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary of Defense may require. The application shall include a description of—

(1) the results of a community wide needs assessment that describes—

(A) community demographics demonstrating the need for outreach and services to eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(B) the quality, capacity, and existing programs of early childhood home visitation for eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(C) the gaps in programs of early childhood home visitation for eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces; and

(D) the type of program of early childhood home visitation necessary to address the gaps identified;

(2) the program of early childhood home visitation that will be supported by the grant under this section;

(3) how the proposed program of early childhood home visitation will promote positive parenting skills and children's early learning and development;

(4) how the proposed program of early childhood home visitation will incorporate the authorized activities described in subsection (f);

(5) how services provided through a grant under this section will use materials that are geared toward eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(6) how the activities under this section will build on and promote coordination with existing programs of early childhood home visitation, if such programs exist in the community, in an effort to promote an array of home visitation that ensures more eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces are being served and are getting the most appropriate services to meet their needs;

(7) how the program will ensure that—

(A) eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces are linked to schools; and

(B) the activities under this section will support the preparation of children for school;

(8) how channels of communication will be established between staff of programs of early childhood home visitation and staff of other early childhood education programs, such as Head State programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) and Early Health State programs carried out under section 645A of such Act, preschool programs, family support programs, and child care programs, to facilitate the coordination of services for eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(9) how eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces will be recruited and retained to receive services under this section;

(10) how training and technical assistance will help staff of programs of early childhood home visitation involved in activities under this section to more effectively serve eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(11) how the eligible applicant will evaluate the activities supported under this section in order to demonstrate outcomes related to the—

(A) increase in number of eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces served by programs of early childhood home visitation;

(B) enhancement of participating parents' knowledge of early learning and development;

(C) enhancement of positive parenting practices related to early learning and development; and

(D) enhancement of children's cognitive, language, social-emotional, and physical development; and

(12) such other information as the Secretary of Defense may require.

(d) APPROVAL OF LOCAL APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall select applicants for funding under this section based on the quality of the applications and the recommendations of a peer review panel, as described in paragraph (2).

(2) PEER REVIEW PANEL.—The peer review panel shall include not less than—

(A) 2 individuals who are experts in the field of home visitation;

(B) 2 individuals who are experts in early childhood development;

(C) 2 individuals who are experts in family support for military families;

(D) 1 individual who is a board certified pediatrician; and

(E) 1 individual with expertise in administering public or private (including community-based) child maltreatment prevention programs; and

(e) DURATION OF GRANTS.—Grants made under this section shall be for a period of no more than 3 years.

(f) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Each eligible applicant that receives a grant under this section shall carry out the following activities:

(1) Providing to as many eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces as practicable, voluntary early childhood home visitation, on not less frequently than a monthly basis, through the implementation of quality programs of early childhood home visitation that are research-based, that provide parents with—

(A) knowledge of age appropriate child development in cognitive, language, social-emotional, and motor domains;

(B) knowledge of realistic expectations of age-appropriate child behaviors;

(C) knowledge of health and wellness issues for children and parents;

(D) modeling, consulting, and coaching on parenting practices;

(E) skills to interact with their child to enhance age-appropriate development;

(F) skills to recognize and seek help for health issues and developmental delays, and social, emotional, and behavioral skills; and

(G) activities designed to help parents become full partners in the education of their children.

(2) Ascertaining what health and development services the family receives under the program and working with service providers to eliminate gaps in service by offering annual health, vision, hearing, and developmental screening for participating children.

(3) Providing referrals for participating eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces, as needed, to additional resources available in the community, such as center-based early education programs, child care services, health or mental health services, family literacy programs, employment agencies, social services, and child care resource and referral agencies.

(4) Offering group meetings (at the discretion of the program), on not less frequently than a monthly basis, for eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces that—

(A) further enhance the information, activities, and skill-building addressed during home visitation;

(B) offer opportunities for parents to meet with and support each other; and

(C) address challenges facing eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces.

(5) Providing training and technical assistance to early childhood home visitation and early childhood care and education staff relating to—

(A) effective service to eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(B) effective methods of conducting parent education, home visiting, and promoting quality early childhood development, with sensitivity to cultural variations in parenting norms and attitudes toward formal support services;

(C) the relationship of health and well-being of pregnant women to prenatal and early child development;

(D) early childhood development with respect to children from birth until entry into kindergarten;

(E) methods to help parents promote emergent literacy in their children from birth until entry into kindergarten;

(F) implementing strategies for helping eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces coping with crisis;

(G) recruiting, supervising, and retaining qualified staff;

(H) increasing services for underserved eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces;

(I) methods to help parents effectively respond to their children's needs and behaviors; and

(J) implementation of ongoing program quality improvement and evaluation of activities and outcomes.

(6) Coordinating existing programs of early childhood home visitation in order to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of more eligible families with a family member in the Armed Forces.

(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The recipient of a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an annual report concerning the progress of the program conducted by the recipient in addressing the purposes of this Act. Each such report shall, at a minimum, include a description of—

(1) the actual service delivery provided for under the grant, including—

(A) program characteristics that include descriptive information on the service model used under the program and actual program performance;

(B) the characteristics of service providers under the program that include staff qualifications, work experience, and demographic characteristics;

(C) the characteristics of recipients of services under the program that include the number, demographic characteristics, and family retention under the program; and

(D) an estimate of the annual program implementation costs;

(2) with respect to recipients of services under the program, whether such services were provided in a manner consistent with program goals including, where appropriate—

(A) parental practices;

(B) child health and development indicators;

(C) child maltreatment indicators;

(D) school readiness indicators; and

(E) links to community services;

(3) the research-based instruction, materials, and activities being used in the activities conducted under the program; and

(4) the effectiveness of the training and ongoing professional development provided—

(A) to the staff supported under the program; and

(B) to the affected early childhood community.

(h) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Grant funds provided under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, Federal and non-Federal funds available for carrying out the activities described in this section.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

SEC. 8. EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From funds reserved under section 6(b)(1)(A), the Secretary shall conduct an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of this Act.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an interim report on the evaluation conducted pursuant to subsection (a) to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a final report on the evaluation conducted pursuant to subsection (a) to the committees described in paragraph (1).

(c) CONTENTS.—The reports submitted under subsection (b) shall include information on the following:

(1) How the grant funds have expanded access to early childhood home visitation in a manner that demonstrates that programs under this Act reflect the quality indicators under this Act.

(2) How the States are documenting compliance with the service delivery indicators under this Act across all entities carrying out programs under this Act with emphasis on the number of families served and the level of service received.

(3) How the services provided under State programs affect outcomes consistent with programs goals, including, where appropriate based on the program being evaluated, parenting practices, child health and development, child maltreatment, school readiness, and links to community services.

(4) The effectiveness of early childhood home visitation on different populations, including the extent to which variability exists in program ability to improve outcomes across programs and populations, such as families with English language learners and families with a family member in the Armed Forces.

(5) The effectiveness of the training and technical assistance activities funded under this Act, including the effects of training and technical assistance activities on program performance and agency-level collaboration.

(6) Recommendations on strengthening or modifying this Act.

SEC. 9. SUPPORTING NEW PARENTS THROUGH HOSPITAL EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall develop and implement a public information and educational campaign to inform the public and new parents about the importance of proper care for infants and children under 5 years of age, including healthy parent-child relationships, the demands and stress associated with caring for infants, positive responses to infants' challenging behaviors including awareness of their social, emotional, and physical needs, awareness of the vulnerability of young children to abusive practices, and the signs and treatment of postpartum depression .

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The campaign developed under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(A) The dissemination of educational and informational materials in print, audio, video, electronic, and other media

(B) The use of public service announcements and advertisements

(C) The dissemination of effective child abuse prevention practices and techniques, including information about research-based home visiting programs, respite care, crisis nurseries, and patent support networks, to parents, caregivers, maternity hospitals, children's hospitals, pediatricians, child care centers, organizations providing prenatal and postnatal care, and organizations providing parenting education and support services.

(D) Connection to existing parental involvement programs.

(2) PREVENTION PRACTICES.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(C) through the campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that every hospital, military hospital, and birth center receiving these materials requests that each maternity patient and father of a newborn child, if available, participate in a single session parenting class, that is approved by the Secretary, on the vulnerabilities of their infant to abusive practices, as well as the importance of proper care for infants and young children, and the symptoms of abusive head and other injuries, and strategies for caring for infants' social, emotional, and physical needs. After participating in the class, the hospital or birth center shall request that such patient or father sign a form stating that they have participated or refused to participate in the parenting class.

(3) EXISTING PROGRAMS.—The implementation and execution of the public information and educational campaign under this section should seek collaboration with and referrals to existing parental involvement programs that specialize in strengthening children's cognitive skills, early literacy skills, social or emotional and physical development and existing prenatal and early childhood home visit programs.

(4) EXISTING STATE REQUIREMENTS.—The implementation and execution of the public information and educational campaign under this section should encourage the Secretary to work with pre-existing State requirements to ensure that no unnecessary burdens are placed on hospitals, military hospitals, and birth centers receiving educational materials.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for fiscal year 2008.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 668. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to conduct consumer testing to determine the appropriateness of the current labeling requirements for indoor tanning devices and determine whether such requirements provide sufficient information to consumers regarding the risks that the use of such devices pose for the development of irreversible damage to the skin, including skin cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I join Senator ISAKSON in introducing the Tanning Accountability and Notification (TAN) Act.

Approximately 1 in 5 Americans will develop skin cancer in their lifetime. While the decline in cancer deaths reported earlier this year is an indication that we are starting to turn the corner on our fight against cancer, approximately 1 million people will be diagnosed with skin cancer and 10,850 are expected to die in 2007 alone.

There are many factors that contribute to these startling figures. In recent years efforts have been undertaken by various organizations to better inform the public about the risk of sun exposure and ways to decrease the chance of developing skin cancer. One area, however, where better information is sorely needed is on the use of indoor tanning salons.

Every day approximately 1 million people visit a tanning salon. It is a practice particularly popular among teens, the group that seems most at risk from the effects of indoor tanning. The American Academy of Dermatology, the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, the National Institutes of Health, NIH, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, and the World Health Organization, WHO, all discourage the use of indoor tanning equipment.

This message and the current information about the risks of indoor tanning I fear are not being adequately passed on to consumers. The FDA has not updated its warnings on tanning beds since 1979. Regular users of indoor tanning beds deserve to be fully informed.

The TAN Act calls upon the FDA to revisit the current label on indoor tanning beds and determine through a process of public hearings and consumer testing what kind of labeling requirements would convey important information on the risks of indoor tanning.

This legislation is not about introducing new regulations but ensuring that the current FDA regulations remain effective in communicating accurate, current, and clear information to consumers about indoor tanning salons.

I look forward to working with my colleagues toward passage of this bipartisan legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 668

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Tanning Accountability and Notification Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. REPORT BY FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION REGARDING LABELING INFORMATION ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USE OF INDOOR TANNING DEVICES AND DEVELOPMENT OF SKIN CANCER OR OTHER SKIN DAMAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall determine—

(1) whether the labeling requirements for indoor tanning devices, including the positioning requirements, provide sufficient information to consumers regarding the risks that the use of such devices pose for the development of irreversible damage to the eyes and skin, including skin cancer; and

(2)(A) whether adding the warning suggested by the American Academy of Dermatology to the current warning label, or any

other additional warning, would communicate the risks of indoor tanning more effectively; or

(B) whether there is no warning that would be capable of adequately communicating such risks.

(b) CONSUMER TESTING.—In making the determinations under subsection (a), the Secretary shall conduct appropriate consumer testing, using the best available methods for determining consumer understanding of label warnings.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS; PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary shall hold public hearings and solicit comments from the public in making the determinations under subsection (a).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report that provides the determinations under subsection (a). In addition, the Secretary shall include in the report the measures being implemented by the Secretary to significantly reduce the risks associated with indoor tanning devices.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. INOUYE, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 671. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President. I rise today with my distinguished colleagues Senators HARRY REID, DANIEL INOUYE, BARBARA BOXER, MARIA CANTWELL, and EDWARD KENNEDY to introduce a bill which will award special immigrant status to the children of naturalized Filipino veterans who fought in World War II thereby allowing these veterans to become reunited with their families.

With the passage of the Immigration Act of 1990, the courage of many Filipino soldiers who fought alongside our troops during World War II was finally honored and acknowledged by our government and they were offered the opportunity to obtain U.S. citizenship. However, the Act did not extend this opportunity to the sons and daughters of these veterans. As a result, many of the brave men who defended this Nation may spend the last years of their lives without the comfort and care of their families.

For over twenty years, many of the sons and daughters of these soldiers have been waiting to obtain immigrant visas. While some have been fortunate enough to have their visas approved, other are still waiting because of a backlog. This is unacceptable. My legislation will finally allow them to reunite with their elderly parents.

I urge my Senate colleagues to honor the sacrifices of these brave men by supporting this bill and allowing those who have served our country so valiantly to have their families by their side for the remainder of their years.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax-exempt financing for qualified renewable energy facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for the installation of wind energy property, including by rural homeowners, farmers, ranchers, and small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, today I am introducing two bills that will help drive the renewable energy revolution that is currently underway in our rural communities. The Rural Community Renewable Energy Bonds Act, which I am introducing with Senator SMITH, and the Rural Wind Energy Development Act, which I am introducing with Senators SMITH, DORGAN and CRAIG, will help spur much needed private investment in renewable energy infrastructure in rural areas.

I have spoken countless times about the great possibilities that rural America holds for our Nation's energy future. I have also expressed my alarm at how our rising dependence on foreign oil is undermining our security and our interests around the world.

How do we build a more energy secure economy—one that is less vulnerable to wild swings in oil prices, political instability, and supply disruptions? Unfortunately, we don't have the resources in this country to drill our way to energy independence. We do, however, have the most productive lands in the world, and the most productive farmers, ranchers, engineers and entrepreneurs in the world. If we give them the right tools, they can build a new, clean energy economy that will rely heavily on biofuels, wind power, solar energy, and alternative sources.

If you spend time in places like Prowers County or Alamosa County, you see that a clean energy revolution is already underway in our heartland. In these rural communities, like so many across the country, people are banding together to build small biofuels plants, solar farms, and wind turbines. These projects are already underway, and they are the seeds for a full-blown clean energy revolution in rural America.

The farmers, ranchers, and entrepreneurs who are behind these projects want to be a part of the solution to our Nation's energy challenges. They also understand that home-grown energy can revitalize the Main Streets that have been boarded up in the last few years.

The bills I am introducing today provide tools that rural communities can use to build a renewable energy economy.

The first bill, the Renewable Energy Bonds Act, provides incentives for investment in wind and other renewable energy projects by giving private developers access to tax-exempt bond markets.

Currently, the Federal tax code only allows municipal and public entities access to tax-exempt bond markets for wind and other renewable energy projects. Private developers, who are more likely to invest in smaller projects and who are currently responsible for nearly 75 percent of current renewable energy development, are not eligible to use these federally tax-exempt bonds.

This is unfortunate because these are the same small developers who don't benefit much from the production tax credit, as their Federal tax liabilities usually aren't big enough to reap the tax credit's benefits.

Renewable energy bonds make sense for these small developers and, because they cost the Federal Government less than the production tax credit, they also make sense from a fiscal perspective. This bill may actually save the Government money.

The second bill I am introducing, the Rural Wind Energy Development Act, would extend the production tax credit to include small wind systems. We have made great strides in wind development over the last few years, as evidenced by wind energy's growing availability to Colorado consumers.

The trouble is that the existing production tax credit only benefits larger producers that want to build wind farms with million-dollar turbines. Small businesses, towns, farms, and families aren't given the same incentive to produce their own renewable power from smaller, more affordable turbines.

This is unfortunate because the National Renewable Energy Lab in Golden, Colorado, and others are making great strides in the development of small wind systems that can be installed on homes and businesses. The system now available costs around $50,000 for 10kW of capacity.

That's a steep investment for any family or any business. But our bill, by providing a tax incentive for their purchase, would not only reduce the cost, but it would create more market certainty for manufacturers of small wind systems. With more systems in production, costs will fall further and small wind will be a real option for more people.

The bill is simple: it creates a five year tax credit of $1500 per half-kW. There is no cap for the purchase and installation of small wind systems, so long as they are smaller than 100kW. It will put more small wind systems on the market and it will give consumers more choices of how to power their homes and businesses.

I'm proud to introduce these bills with my colleagues because they represent two more building blocks for a new, clean energy economy and because they will help revitalize a rural America that has been forgotten for too long.

I hope we can move these straightforward, bipartisan solutions through as quickly as possible.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr.

DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 675. A bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, the Training for Realtime Writers Act of 2007, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators GRASSLEY, COCHRAN, DODD, DURBIN, KERRY, KOHL, MURRAY, ROCKEFELLER, SNOWE and STABENOW.

The 1996 Telecom Act required that all television broadcasts were to be captioned by 2006 and all Spanish language programming was to be captioned by 2010. This was a much needed reform that has helped millions of deaf and hard-of-hearing Americans to be able to take full advantage of television programming. And now the first deadline has passed. On January 1, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) began fining stations for not captioning.

Unfortunately, the United States has fallen behind in training captioners. We must jump start training programs to supply captioning for the many broadcasters just realizing their obligation now. And looking forward, we need to get students in the pipeline now to begin to address the need for Spanish language broadcasting.

This is an issue that I feel very strongly about because my late brother, Frank, was deaf. I know personally that access to culture, news, and other media was important to him and to others in achieving a better quality of life. More than 30 million Americans are considered deaf or hard of hearing and many require captioning services to participate in mainstream activities. In 1990, I authored legislation that required all television sets to be equipped with a computer chip to decode closed captioning. This bill completes the promise of that technology, affording deaf and hard of hearing Americans the same equality and access that captioning provides.

With baby boomers aging, the percentage of the population with hearing loss is increasing dramatically and will continue to outpace population growth for the next decade. But let me emphasize that the deaf and hard of hearing population is only one of a number of groups that will benefit from the legislation. The audience for captioning also includes individuals seeking to acquire or improve literacy skills, including approximately functionally illiterate adults, immigrants learning English as a second language, and children learning to read. Empirical research studies have been conducted repeatedly since 1988 to demonstrate that captions improve the performance of individuals learning to read English.

I see people using closed captioning to stay informed everywhere—from the gym to the airport. Here in the Senate, I would wager that many individuals on our staff have the captioning turned on right now to follow what is happening on the Senate floor while they go about conducting the meetings and phone calls that advance legislation. Captioning helps people educate themselves and helps all of us stay informed and entertained when audio isn't the most appropriate medium.

Although the 2006 deadline has passed, our nation is facing a serious shortage of captioners. The rate of job placement upon graduation nears 100 percent. In addition, the majority of closed captioners are independent contractors. They are the small businesses that run the American economy and we should do everything we can to promote the creation and support of those businesses.

That is why my colleagues and I are re-introducing this vital piece of legislation. The Training for Realtime Writers Act of 2007 would establish competitive grants to be used toward training real time captioners. This is necessary to ensure that we meet the promises we made in the 1996 Telecom Act.

The Senate Commerce Committee reported this bill unanimously in the last two sessions, the full Senate has passed this Act without objection three times now, and we stand here today, once again at the beginning of the process. I am hopeful that this will be the Congress moves our country forward on this accessibility issue. I ask my colleagues to join us once again in support of this legislation and join us in our effort to win its passage into law.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 85—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE CREATION OF REFUGEE POPULATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NORTH AFRICA, AND THE PERSIAN GULF REGION AS A RESULT OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. COLEMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 85

Whereas armed conflicts in the Middle East have created refugee populations numbering in the hundreds of thousands and comprised of peoples from many ethnic, religious, and national backgrounds;

Whereas Jews and other ethnic groups have lived mostly as minorities in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf region for more than 2,500 years;

Whereas the United States has long voiced its concern about the mistreatment of minorities and the violation of human rights in the Middle East and elsewhere;

Whereas the United States continues to play a pivotal role in seeking an end to conflict in the Middle East and continues to promote a peace that will benefit all the peoples of the region;

Whereas a comprehensive peace in the Middle East region will require the resolution of all outstanding issues through bilateral and multilateral negotiations involving all concerned parties;

Whereas the United States has demonstrated interest and concern about the mistreatment, violation of rights, forced expulsion, and expropriation of assets of minority populations in general, and in particular, former Jewish refugees displaced from Arab countries, as evidenced by—

(1) a statement made by President William J. Clinton in an interview after Camp David II in July 2000, at which the issue of Jewish refugees displaced from Arab lands was discussed, where he said that ''[t]here will have to be some sort of international fund set up for the refugees. There is, I think, some interest, interestingly enough, on both sides, in also having a fund which compensates the Israelis who were made refugees by the war, which occurred after the birth of the State of Israel. Israel is full of people, Jewish people, who lived in predominantly Arab countries who came to Israel because they were made refugees in their own land.'';

(2) a statement made by President Carter after negotiating the Camp David Accords, the Framework for Peace in the Middle East, where he stated in a press conference on October 27, 1977, that ''Palestinians have rights . . . obviously there are Jewish refugees . . . they have the same rights as others do'';

(3) section 620 of H.R. 3100, 100th Congress, which states that Congress finds that ''with the notable exceptions of Morocco and Tunisia, those Jews remaining in Arab countries continue to suffer deprivations, degradations, and hardships, and continue to live in peril'' and that Congress calls upon the governments of those Arab countries where Jews still maintain a presence to guarantee their Jewish citizens full civil and human rights, including the right to lead full Jewish lives, free of fear, with freedom to emigrate if they so choose; and

(4) Senate Resolution 76, 85th Congress, introduced by Senator William E. Jenner on January 29, 1957, which—

(A) noted that individuals in Egypt who are tied by race, religion, or national origin with Israel, France, or the United Kingdom have been subjected to arrest, denial or revocation of Egyptian citizenship, expulsions, forced exile, sequestration and confiscation of assets and property, and other punishments without being charged with a crime; and

(B) requested the President to instruct the chief delegate to the United Nations to urge the prompt dispatch of a United Nations observer team to Egypt with the objective of obtaining a full factual report concerning the violation of rights;

Whereas the international definition of a refugee clearly applies to Jews who fled the persecution of Arab regimes, where a refugee is a person who ''owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country'' (Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva July 28, 1951, and entered into force April 22, 1954 (189 UNTS 150));

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) determined that Jews fleeing from Arab countries were refugees that fell within the mandate of the UNHCR, namely—

(1) when in his first statement as newly elected High Commissioner, Mr. Auguste Lindt, at the January 29, 1957, meeting of the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF) Executive Committee in Geneva, stated, ''There is already now another emergency problem arising. Refugees from Egypt. And there is no doubt in my mind that those of those refugee who are not able or not willing to avail themselves of the protection of the Government of their nationality, they might have no nationality or they may have lost this nationality, or, for reasons of prosecution may not be willing to avail themselves of this protection, fall under the mandate of the High Commissioner.'' (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Report of the UNREF Executive Committee, Fourth Session–Geneva 29 January to 4 February, 1957); and

(2) Dr. E. Jahn, on behalf of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, wrote to Daniel Lack, Legal Adviser to the American Joint Distribution Committee, stating, ''I refer to our recent discussion concerning Jews from Middle Eastern and North African countries in consequence of recent events. I am now able to inform you that such persons may be considered prima facie within the mandate of this Office.'' (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Document No. 7/2/3/Libya);

Whereas the seminal United Nations resolution on the Arab-Israeli conflict and other international initiatives refer generally to the plight of ''refugees'' and do not make any distinction between Palestinian and Jewish refugees, such as—

(1) United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967, which calls for a ''just settlement of the refugee problem'' without distinction between Palestinian and Jewish refugees, and this is evidenced by—

(A) a failed attempt by the United Nations delegation of the Soviet Union to restrict the ''just settlement'' mentioned in Resolution 242 solely to Palestinian refugees (S/8236, discussed by the Security Council at its 1382nd meeting on November 22, 1967, notably at paragraph 117, in the words of Ambassador Kouznetsov of the Soviet Union), which signified the international community's intention of having the resolution address the rights of all Middle East refugees; and

(B) a statement by Justice Arthur Goldberg, the Chief Delegate of the United States to the United Nations at that time, who was instrumental in drafting the unanimously adopted United Nations Resolution 242, where he observed, ''The resolution addresses the objective of 'achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem'. This language presumably refers both to Arab and Jewish refugees, for about an equal number of each abandoned their homes as a result of the several wars.'';

(2) the Madrid Conference, which was first convened in October 1991 and was co-chaired by President of the United States, George H.W. Bush, and President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and included delegations from Spain, the European community, the Netherlands, Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon, as well as a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, where in his opening remarks before the January 28, 1992, organizational meeting for multilateral negotiations on the Middle East in Moscow, United States Secretary of State James Baker made no distinction between Palestinian refugees and Jewish refugees in articulating the mission of the Refugee Working Group, stating that ''[t]he refugee group will consider practical ways of improving the lot of people throughout the region who have been displaced from their homes''; and

(3) the Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, which refers in Phase III to an ''agreed, just, fair, and realistic solution to the refugee issue'', language that is consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which applied equally to Arab and Jewish peoples;

Whereas Egypt, Jordan, and the Palestinians have affirmed that a comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict will require a just solution to the plight of all ''refugees'', as evidenced by—

(1) the 1978 Camp David Accords, the Framework for Peace in the Middle East, which includes a commitment by Egypt and Israel to ''work with each other and with other interested parties to establish agreed procedures for a prompt, just and permanent resolution of the implementation of the refugee problem'';

(2) the Treaty of Peace between Israel and Egypt, signed at Washington March 26, 1979, which provides in Article 8 that the ''Parties agree to establish a claims commission for the mutual settlement of all financial claims'' and makes general references to United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 as the basis for comprehensive peace in the region; and

(3) Article 8 of the Treaty of Peace Between the State of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, done at Arava/Araba Crossing Point October 26, 1994, entitled ''Refugees and Displaced Persons'', refers to ''the massive human problems caused to both Parties by the conflict in the Middle East'';

Whereas the call to secure rights and redress for Jewish and other minorities who were forced to flee Arab countries is not a campaign against Palestinian refugees;

Whereas the international community should be aware of the plight of Jews and other minority groups displaced from the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf;

Whereas the history and legacy of Jewish refugees from Arab countries must be preserved;

Whereas no just and comprehensive Middle East peace can be reached without recognition of, and redress for, the uprooting of centuries-old Jewish communities in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf; and

Whereas it would be appropriate and just for the United States, while recognizing rights for Palestinian refugees, to recognize equal rights for former Jewish, Christian, and other refugees from Arab countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND REFUGEES.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States deplores the past and present ongoing violation of the human rights and religious freedoms of minority populations in Arab and Muslim countries throughout the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf; and

(2) with respect to Jews, Christians, and other populations displaced from countries in the region, for any comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace agreement to be credible, durable, enduring, and constitute an end to conflict in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf, the agreement must address and resolve all outstanding issues, including the legitimate rights of all refugees of the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY ON REFUGEES OF THE MIDDLE EAST.

The Senate urges the President to—

(1) instruct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations and all representatives of the United States in bilateral and multilateral fora that, when considering or addressing resolutions that allude to the issue of refugees in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf, they should ensure that—

(A) relevant text refers to the fact that multiple refugee populations have been created by the Arab-Israeli conflict; and

(B) any explicit reference to the required resolution of the Palestinian refugee issue is matched by a similar explicit reference to the resolution of the issue of Jewish, Christian, and other refugees from Arab and Muslim countries throughout the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf region; and

(2) make clear that the United States Government supports the position that, as an integral part of any comprehensive peace, the issue of refugees and the mass violations of human rights of minorities in Arab and Muslim countries throughout the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf must be resolved in a manner that includes—

(A) consideration of the legitimate rights of all refugees displaced from Arab and Muslim countries throughout the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf; and

(B) recognition of the losses incurred by Jews, Christians, and other minority groups as a result of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Wednesday, February 28, 2007, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to consider the President's fiscal year 2008 budget request for the USDA Forest Service.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150..

For further information, please contact Scott Miller at 202–224–5488 or Rachel Pasternack at 202–224–0883.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, March 1, 2007, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify

by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact Tara Billingsley at 202–224–4756 or Britni Rillera at 202–224–1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Friday, February 16, 2007, at 10 a.m., in SD–430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SALAZAR. I ask unanimous consent that Avril Haines, a detailee from the Department of State for the Committee on Foreign Relations, be granted the privileges of the floor for the duration of the debate on S. 574 and any motions related thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 110–1

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on February 16, 2007, by the President of the United States:

Land-Based Sources Protocol to Cartagena Convention (Treaty Document No. 110–1).

I further ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Protocol Concerning Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities (the ''Protocol'') to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, with Annexes, done at Oranjestad, Aruba, on October 6, 1999, and signed by the United States on that same date. The report of the Secretary of State is enclosed for the information of the Senate.

The Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (the ''Cartagena Convention'') is a regional framework agreement negotiated under the auspices of the Regional Seas Program of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). It sets out general legal obligations to protect the marine environment of the Gulf of Mexico, Straits of Florida, Caribbean Sea, and immediately adjacent areas of the Atlantic Ocean—collectively known as the Wider Caribbean Region. The United States became a Party to the Cartagena Convention in 1984. The Cartagena Convention envisions the development of protocols to further elaborate certain of its general obligations and to facilitate its effective implementation.

Negotiated with the active participation and leadership of the United States, the Protocol addresses one of the most serious sources of marine pollution in the Wider Caribbean Region. It is estimated that 70 to 90 percent of pollution entering the marine environment emanates from land-based sources and activities. Among the principal land-based sources of marine pollution in the Caribbean are domestic wastewater and agricultural nonpoint source runoff. Such pollution contributes to the degradation of coral reefs and commercial fisheries, negatively affects regional economies, and endangers public health, recreation, and tourism throughout the region.

The Protocol and its Annexes list priority source categories, activities, and associated contaminants that affect the Wider Caribbean Region, and set forth factors that Parties will be required to apply in determining prevention, reduction, and control strategies to manage land-based sources of pollution. In particular, the Parties are required to ensure that domestic wastewater discharges meet specific effluent limitations, and to develop plans for the prevention and reduction of agricultural nonpoint source pollution. The Protocol is expected to raise standards for treating domestic wastewater throughout the region to levels close to those already in place in the United States.

The United States would be able to implement its obligations under the Protocol under existing statutory and regulatory authority.

The Protocol is the first regional agreement to establish effluent standards to protect one of our most valuable resources, the marine environment. It differs markedly from other, similar regional agreements in its conceptual approach and the specificity of its obligations. As such, the Protocol is expected to set a new standard for regional agreements on this subject. Early ratification will demonstrate our continued commitment to global leadership and to the protection of the marine environment of the Wider Caribbean Region.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol and its Annexes, with the declaration described in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, and give its advice and consent to ratification.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 2007.*

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the minority leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–83, the reappointment of the following Senator to serve as a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term of 2 years: The Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress: the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2007

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon, Saturday, February 17; that on Saturday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the Senate then resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 574, with the time until 1:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees with the Republican leader in control of the time between 1:25 to 1:35 p.m. and the majority leader in control of the time between 1:35 and 1:45 p.m., and at 1:45 p.m. the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:36 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, February 17, 2007, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16, 2007:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

ELI WHITNEY DEBEVOISE II, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE ROBERT B. HOLLAND, III, RESIGNED.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

BIJAN RAFIEKIAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2011. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

SUSAN M. OSOVITZOIEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

TOM K. STATON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

EVAN F. TILLMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MICHAEL A. CLARK, 0000
BELINDA J. COAKLEY, 0000
JANET L. NORMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

EDWARD W. TRUDO, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

CARLOS R. ESQUIVEL, 0000
STANLEY F. GOULD, 0000
JANE L. HOLTZCLAW, 0000
STEPHEN E. POST, 0000
SALVADOR P. RENTERIZ, 0000

To be major

MING JIANG, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHARLES E. DANIELS, 0000
TIMOTHY O. EVANS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRIAN T. THOMPSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL R. CIRILLO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

VERNON L. DARISO, 0000
RICHARD W. FIORVANTI, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

LEONARD R. DOMITROVITS, 0000
JASON A. HIGGINS, 0000
WILLIAM E. ROSCHE, 0000
ROBERT W. SAJEWSKI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SAMSON P. AVENETTI, 0000
DANIEL M. CLARK, 0000
BRYAN DELGADO, 0000
MARK R. DOEHRMANN, 0000
LEIGH A. DUBIE, 0000
DELMAR J. LAKE, JR., 0000
JUAN M. ORTIZ, JR., 0000
RODOLFO D. QUISPE, 0000
FRANCISCO C. RAGSAC, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JASON B. DAVIS, 0000
STEVEN C. FREDERICK, 0000
RICHARD A. JAYROE, 0000
TIMOTHY T. RYBINSKI, 0000
RICHARD F. SCHOFIELD, 0000
KELLY S. SILARD, 0000
PETER M. TAVARES, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DARREN L. DUCOING, 0000
JEFFREY S. FORBES, 0000
SCOTT A. FORTENBERRY, 0000
PRISCILLA A. GUNN, 0000
NATHAN J. TOWNSEND, 0000
KENNETH L. VANZANDT, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ROBERT T. CHARLTON, 0000
SEAN J. COLLINS, 0000
JOHN L. MYRKA, 0000
BRIAN A. TOBLER, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING TRAVIS WAYNE CASH FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Travis Cash, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Travis has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the years Travis has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Travis Cash for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE WESTERN WATERS AND FARM LANDS PROTECTION ACT

HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today again introducing the Western Waters and Farm Lands Protection Act—a bill intended to make it more likely that the energy resources in our Western States will be developed in ways that are protective of vital water supplies and respectful of the rights and interests of the agricultural community.

Based on my previous legislation that was endorsed by the Colorado Farm Bureau and the American Farm Bureau Federation, it would do three things:

First, it would establish clear requirements for proper management of ground water that is extracted in the course of oil and gas development. Second, it would provide for greater involvement of surface owners in plans for oil and gas development and requires the Interior Department to give surface owners advance notice of lease sales that would affect their lands and to notify them of subsequent events related to proposed or ongoing energy development. And, finally, it would require developers to draft reclamation plans and post bonds top assure restoration of lands affected by drilling for federal oil and gas.

PURPOSES OF THE LEGISLATION

Madam Speaker, the western United States is blessed with significant energy resources. In appropriate places, and under appropriate conditions, they can and should be developed for the benefit of our country. But it is important to recognize the importance of other resources particularly water—and other uses of the lands involved—and this bill responds to this need.

Its primary purposes: (1) to assure that the development of those energy resources in the West will not mean destruction of precious water resources; (2) to reduce potential conflicts between development of energy resources and the interests and concerns of those who own the surface estate in affected lands; and (3) to provide for appropriate reclamation of affected lands.

WATER QUALITY PROTECTION

One new energy resource is receiving great attention—gas associated with coal deposits, often referred to as coalbed methane. An October 2000 United States Geological Survey report estimated that the U.S. may contain more than 700 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of coalbed methane and that more than 100 tcf of this may be recoverable using existing technology. In part because of the availability of these reserves and because of tax incentives to exploit them, the West has seen a significant increase in its development.

Development of coalbed methane usually involves the extraction of water from underground strata. Some of this extracted water is reinjected into the ground, while some is retained in surface holding ponds or released and allowed to flow into streams or other water bodies, including irrigation ditches.

The quality of the extracted waters varies from one location to another. Some are of good quality, but often they contain dissolved minerals (such as sodium, magnesium, arsenic, or selenium) that can contaminate other waters—something that can happen because of leaks or leaching from holding ponds or because the extracted waters are simply discharged into a stream or other body of water. In addition, extracted waters often have other characteristics, such as high acidity and temperature, which can adversely affect agricultural uses of land or the quality of the environment.

In Colorado and other States in the arid West, water is scarce and precious—and use of extracted water has the potential to augment the supplies for irrigation and other purposes. Because I want to explore how that potential might be realized without reducing water quality or harming the environment, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 902) that would authorize research and demonstration efforts toward that end.

But, at the same time, it is vital that development of energy resources be accompanied by appropriate safeguards.

That is the purpose of the first part of the bill (Title I). That part would require those who develop federal oil or gas—including coalbed methane—under the Mineral Leasing Act to take steps to make sure their activities do not harm water resources.

Specifically, under section 101, oil or gas operators who damage a water resource—by contaminating it, reducing it, or interrupting it—would be required to provide replacement water to the water users. And this section also specifies that water produced under a mineral lease must be dealt with in ways that comply with all Federal and State requirements.

Further, because water is so important, the bill requires oil and gas operators to make the protection of water part of their plans from the very beginning, requiring applications for oil or gas leases to include details of ways in which operators will protect water quality and quantity and the rights of water users.

These are not onerous requirements, but they are very important—particularly with the great increase in drilling for coalbed methane and other energy resources in Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, and other western states.

SURFACE OWNER PROTECTION

In many parts of the country, the owner of some land's surface does not necessarily own the underlying minerals. And in Colorado and other Western States, those mineral estates often belong to the Federal Government while the surface estates are owned by others, including farmers and ranchers.

This split-estate situation can lead to conflicts. And while I support development of energy resources where appropriate, I also believe that this must be done responsibly and in a way that demonstrates respect for the environment and overlying landowners.

The second part of the bill (Title II) is intended to promote that approach, by establishing a system for development of federal oil and gas in split-estate situations that resembles—but is not identical to—the system for development of federally owned coal in similar situations.

Under Federal law, the leasing of federally owned coal resources on lands where the surface estate is not owned by the United States is subject to the consent of the surface estate owners. But neither this consent requirement nor the operating and bonding requirements applicable to development of federally owned locatable minerals applies to the leasing or development of oil or gas in similar split-estate situations.

I believe that there should be similar respect for the rights and interests of surface estate owners affected by development of oil and gas and that this should be done by providing clear and adequate standards and increasing the involvement of surface owners.

Accordingly, the bill requires the Interior Department to give surface owners advance notice of lease sales that would affect their lands and to notify them of subsequent events related to proposed or ongoing developments related to such leases.

In addition, the bill requires that anyone proposing to drill for federal minerals in a split-estate situation must first try to reach an agreement with the surface owner that spells out what will be done to minimize interference with the surface owner's use and enjoyment and to provide for reclamation of affected lands and compensation for any damages.

I am convinced that most energy companies want to avoid harming the surface owners, so I expect that it will usually be possible for

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

them to reach such agreements. However, I recognize that this may not always be the case—and the bill includes two provisions that address this possibility: (1) if no agreement is reached within 90 days, the bill requires that the matter be referred to neutral arbitration; and (2) the bill provides that if even arbitration fails to resolve differences, the energy development can go forward, subject to Interior Department regulations that will balance the energy development with the interests of the surface owner or owners.

As I mentioned, these provisions are patterned on the current law dealing with development of federally owned coal in split-estate situations. However, it is important to note one major difference—namely, while current law allows a surface owner to effectively veto development of coal resources, under the bill a surface owner ultimately could not block development of oil or gas underlying his or her lands. This difference reflects the fact that appropriate development of oil and natural gas is needed.

RECLAMATION REQUIREMENTS

The bill's third part (Titles III and IV) addresses reclamation of affected lands.

Title III would amend the Mineral Leasing Act by adding an explicit requirement that parties that produced oil or gas (including coalbed methane) under a federal lease must restore the affected land so it will be able to support the uses it could support before the energy development. Toward that end, this part of the bill requires development of reclamation plans and posting of reclamation bonds. In addition, so Congress can consider whether changes are needed, the bill requires the General Accounting Office to review how these requirements are being implemented and how well they are working.

And, finally, Title IV would require the Interior Department to—(1) establish, in cooperation with the Agriculture Department, a program for reclamation and closure of abandoned oil or gas wells located on lands managed by an Interior Department agency or the Forest Service or drilled for development of federal oil or gas in split-estate situations; and (2) establish, in consultation with the Energy Department, a program to provide technical assistance to State and tribal governments that are working to correct environmental problems caused by abandoned wells on other lands. The bill would authorize annual appropriations of $5 million in fiscal 2005 and 2006 for the federal program and annual appropriations of $5 million in fiscal 2005, 2006, and 2007 for the program of assistance to the states and tribes.

Madam Speaker, our country is overly dependent on fossil fuels, to the detriment of our environment, our national security, and our economy. We need to diversify our energy portfolio and make more use of alternatives. But in the interim, petroleum and natural gas (including coalbed methane) will remain important parts of our energy portfolio—and I support their development in appropriate and responsible ways. I believe this legislation can contribute to that by establishing some clear, reasonable rules that will provide greater assurance and certainty for all concerned, including the energy industry and the residents of Colorado, New Mexico, and other Western states. Following is a brief outline of its major provisions.

OUTLINE OF BILL

Section One—This section provides a short title (''Western Waters and Farm Lands Protection Act''), makes several findings about the need for the legislation, and states the bill's purpose.

TITLE I.—PROTECTION OF WATER RESOURCES

Section 101 amends current law to make clear that extraction of water in connection with development of oil or gas (including coalbed methane) is subject to an appropriate permit and the requirement to minimize adverse effects on affected lands or waters.

Section 102 provides that nothing in the bill will—(1) affect any State's right or jurisdiction with respect to water; or (2) limit, alter, modify, or amend any interstate compact or judicial rulings that apportion water among and between different States.

TITLE II.—PROTECTION OF SURF ACE OWNERS

Section 201 provides definitions for several terms used in Title II.

Section 202 requires a party seeking to develop federal oil or gas in a split-estate situation to first seek to reach an agreement with the surface owner or owners that spells out how the energy development will be carried out, how the affected lands will be reclaimed, and that compensation will be made for damages. If no such agreement is reached within 90 days, the matter is to be referred to arbitration by a neutral party identified by the Interior Department.

Section 203 provides that if no agreement under section 202 is reached within 90 days after going to arbitration, the Interior Department can permit energy development to proceed under an approved plan of operations and posting of an adequate bond. This section also requires the Interior Department to provide surface owners with an opportunity to comment on proposed plans of operations, participate in decisions regarding the amount of the bonds that will be required, and to participate in on-site inspections if the surface owners have reason to believe that plans of operations are not being followed. In addition, this section allows surface owners to petition the Interior Department for payments under bonds to compensate for damages and authorizes the Interior Department to release bonds after the energy development is completed and any damages have been compensated.

Section 204 requires the Interior Department to notify surface owners about lease sales and subsequent decisions involving federal oil or gas resources in their lands.

TITLE III.—RECLAMATION

This title amends current law to require parties producing oil or gas under a federal lease to restore affected lands and to post bonds to cover reclamation costs. It also requires the GAO to review Interior Department implementation of this part of the bill and to report to Congress about the results of that review and any recommendations for legislative or administrative changes to improve matters.

TITLE IV.—ABANDONED OIL OR GAS WELLS

Section 401 defines the wells that would be covered by the title.

Section 402 requires the Interior Department, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, to establish a program for reclamation and closure of abandoned wells on federal lands or that were drilled for development offederally-owned minerals in split-estate situations. It authorizes appropriations of $5 million in fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

Section 403 requires the Interior Department, in consultation with DOE, to establish a program to assist states and tribes to remedy environmental problems caused by abandoned oil or gas wells on non-federal and Indian lands. It authorizes appropriations of $5 million in fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE 761ST TANK BATTALION, IN CELEBRATION OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the service, courage and commitment to the United States displayed by the men who fought in the 761st Tank Battalion in World War II. The 761st Tank Battalion, also known as the Black Panthers, made history as the first all black tank unit to see combat.

Like the pilots of the 332nd Fighter Group, more affectionately known as Tuskegee Airmen, the men of 761st enlisted for service during a period in United States history characterized by strict segregation and barbaric acts of violence perpetrated against people of color. At home and in the military, these men experienced discrimination, were relegated to menial service positions and were called to duty only in times of intense crisis. Federal law prohibited black soldiers from serving alongside white troops and although all black regimens were formed few expected to see combat.

Following the efforts of Louisiana General Leslie J. McNair, the commander of the Army Ground Forces and the Black Press, who successfully argued that ''colored'' units should be employed in combat, the U.S. Army began to experiment with segregated combat units. On October 10, 1944, the 761st landed in France on the Normandy Peninsula. They were the first battalion deployed. Thirty black officers and 676 black enlisted men were assigned to General Patton's U.S. Third Army. Despite Patton's vocalization of doubts surrounding the use of black soldiers, the soldiers of the 761st committed themselves to fighting for their country on behalf of their race; an action some undoubtedly hoped would change perceptions of black people as inferior and subhuman. The battalion first saw combat on November 7, 1944. For 183 days, these men engaged and defeated the German Army in towns throughout France and Germany.

Although it would take years for historical records to be amended and rightfully reflect the courage and skill employed by the 761st we know now just how integral they were to achieving victory in WWII. Throughout their tour in combat the battalion helped to liberate more than 30 towns under Nazi control. Collectively, the men of the 761st were awarded 11 Silver Stars, 70 Bronze Stars, 250 Purple Hearts and a Medal of Honor. In 1945 a recommendation for a Presidential Unit Citation was submitted. President Jimmy Carter awarded it in 1978.

The men of the 761st fought for the right to represent this country during the Second World War. Before leaving and upon returning they continued to fight the bigotry, hatred and racism that served to thwart the great promises of this Nation. At all times they acted with dignity, conducting themselves admirably and

always with grace. Because of their efforts, and the efforts of other Black soldiers in segregated units, black soldiers now fight alongside white soldiers today.

I rise today in recognition of the efforts of the 761st battalion and in honor of Black History Month. I commend them for their resolve and hope that their courage, conviction and commitment forever be remembered by all.

TRIBUTE TO AHEPA

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, as AHEPA celebrates 85 years of service in the community, it gives me great pleasure to offer my heartfelt congratulations on your reaching this milestone.

Since its inception in 1922 as a voice against prejudice and hate, AHEPA has grown into a multinational organization that continues to spread the universal truths of Hellenism—humanity, freedom, and democracy—across the United States and around the world.

Many organizations begin with noble causes but waver in purpose as time and obstacles dampen their ambitions. Yet, in the face of depression, war, and the unavoidable hardships of growth and development, AHEPA has continued steadfastly to advocate for the principles of education, philanthropy, civic responsibility, and family and individual excellence—principles that are common to us all as Americans. From helping young people achieve their dreams of education to supporting philanthropy and public service to addressing the deepest needs of families, AHEPA's successes have been remarkable.

Today, while we would hope that prejudice no longer dwells on any streets or in any hearts of America, we live in an imperfect world and the original mission of AHEPA is still vital. Today, we need to keep the dreams of education alive. Today, we need to continue to foster the spirit of giving and volunteerism in our communities. And today, we need to persevere in spreading the hopeful message of freedom and democracy.

As a Member of Congress, I am proud to serve on the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Affairs. In this capacity, I work with fellow caucus members to enhance and strengthen the United States' relationship with Greece and the Republic of Cyprus. The friendship between our nations has a long and rich history, and by continuing to further this important bond, we can stand together to advance the causes of liberty and democracy. In this worthy endeavor, I look forward to continuing to stand with you.

This 85th year is a time to reflect upon AHEPA's past successes and upon the many ways in which Greek-Americans have enriched the fabric of America. Equally important, it is a time to look forward with hope and anticipation to a future of continuing to build the vision that is AHEPA.

Congratulations on 85 years of success and best wishes for many more years ahead.

RECOGNIZING AUSTIN CONNOR CADE FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Austin Cade, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Austin has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the years Austin has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Austin Cade for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL ON TAX TREATMENT OF EXCHANGES OF MUTUAL DITCH COMPANY SHARES

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a bill dealing with the tax treatment of exchanges of mutual ditch company stock, a subject of special importance to Coloradans who hold such stock in order to make beneficial use of water transported through the companies' ditches and associated structures.

The bill is cosponsored by my Colorado colleagues, Representatives SALAZAR, MUSGRAVE, and LAMBORN. I appreciate their assistance and support.

Madam Speaker, mutual ditch companies are unique to Colorado. They are not organized for profit, but for the mutual benefit of the shareholders and operate on the premise that the company owns the water rights and other property and the shareholders have the right to use the water. The Colorado Supreme Court has held that shares of stock in a mutual ditch company represent a definite and specific water right, as well as a corresponding interest in the structures by which the water right is beneficially used.

One such company, based in Windsor, in northeastern Colorado, is working to raise funds to improve the efficiency of its delivery system. To do so, it has contracted to give the City of Greeley and two local water districts part of its water in exchange for $30 million, part in cash and part in the stock of a reorganized corporation. As part of this plan, the Windsor company's shareholders will exchange their stock for shares in the new corporation.

Other similar exchanges have occurred or will occur in the future. But there is concern that shareholders making such an exchange might be called upon to pay taxes in connection with such exchanges.

Federal tax law (Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) allows a tax-free exchange of like-kind property held for productive use in a trade or business. Generally this does not apply to exchanges of stock. However, shares of Colorado mutual ditch companies are different from normal stock shares, and the Colorado Supreme Court has held that because a mutual-ditch shareholder is entitled to apply water to a beneficial use, mutual-ditch shares are real property (like real estate), not personal property (like normal stocks or bonds).

The mutual ditch companies say—and I think they are right—this means exchanges of their shares should be covered by the like-kind exchange exemption. Unfortunately, in 1986, the IRS's General Counsel ruled otherwise.

Since that ruling, however, the Colorado Supreme Court, in a 1997 decision, made it clear that under Colorado law mutual ditch company shares are real property.

The bill would remove any doubt on this point and make clear that Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code will apply to exchanges of shares in a Colorado mutual ditch, reservoir, or irrigation company covered by section 501(c)(12)(A) of the Code.

CELEBRATING THE SCHOMBURG CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN BLACK CULTURE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible work happening at the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. This year marks the 80th anniversary of the Schomburg Center, a milestone worthy of celebration. Over the past 80 years the Schomburg has organized many firsts in African-American history including the first orchestra of classically trained black musicians (1971); established a scholar in residence program attracting many of the world's most renowned scholars and intellectual leaders; collected and exhibited hundreds of thousands of items for collections and galleries organized around important themes from the history and lived legacies of African-Americans and the African Diaspora. It is with great pride that I recognize the accomplishments of the Schomburg over the past 80 years.

This past summer, from June 19th through July 18th, the Schomburg held its second Schomburg-Mellon Humanities Summer Institute. A joint venture between the Schomburg Center and the Mellon-Mays Foundation, the Humanities Summer initiative is designed to increase the number of minority students interested in pursuing graduate degrees in the humanities in fields related to African-American and African Diaspora Studies. The Summer Institute identifies carefully selected prospective scholars and develops and nurtures their interest over the course of 3 years. Providing students with requisite intellectual skills and presenting them with challenges and orientations helpful in the pursuit of humanities careers, the summer institute fills a much needed role in attracting, retaining, and supporting the next generation of scholars and researchers concerned with issues relating to African Americans and the African Diaspora.

The students, culled from schools throughout New York City as well as from Historically Black Colleges and Universities throughout the country, spent the summer exploring the theme ''Africana Age.'' They engaged in discussions, visits, and projects that compelled them to explore the dominant political, economic, and cultural periods of the 20th century; black achievements in social, artistic, and cultural realms that challenged the myth of white supremacy; efforts to forge political and cultural relationships among African peoples across boundaries; and commonalities and differences across time and geography. More than 25 distinguished scholars from around the country conducted seminars, facilitated conversations around works of art, tours of significant African-American landmarks, and aided in conducting research related to the aforementioned themes and subjects. Participating scholars created a research prospectus to aid them in fulfilling academic requirements during their senior year. They also worked both independently and collectively on research projects.

The Schomburg-Mellon Summer Institute continues to provide minority students with opportunities that are instrumental in becoming personally and professionally ready to compete in the ever expanding global marketplace. By providing minority students with mentors; providing them with requisite skills such as conducting research and writing research papers; creating rigorous academic programs rooted in historical truths about the contributions made by people of color; and championing them to fulfill their full potential, the Schomburg-Mellon Summer Institute its part to continue the legacy of producing compassionate and capable intellectual leaders.

The Schomburg-Mellon Summer Institute is but one of many initiatives aimed at uncovering and preserving truths in black culture. There is the annual book fair, a plethora of programs commemorating significant events and themes throughout African American history, and symposiums on important matters such as the African Burial Ground. This fall marks the sixth year of the Junior Scholars program. A program similar to the Summer Institute teaches history and culture while using insights gained to devise solutions to improving quality of life, for African Americans in particular, today. Another program dedicated to connecting youth with living legends, authors, scholars, artists, and business people in ways that show them they can choose to be anything they apply themselves to becoming while providing them with tools that will prove necessary along the way, the Junior Scholar's program epitomizes the Schomburg's commitment to preserving the legacy of descendants of Africa.

While celebrating the Schomburg and its achievements over the course of 80 years it is important to continue to invest in the production of even more scholars, thinkers, and leaders committed to the same goal.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF JOHN NALLIN

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous public service of John Nallin as he prepares his retirement after 20 years with UPS.

During his proud career at UPS, he has served in a number of capacities, starting as a Systems Manager in Delivery Information Systems in 1987 and retiring now as Vice President and Information Services Corporate Repository & Architecture Portfolio Manager. Throughout his years with UPS, John Nallin has helped to make this company a high-tech leader, implementing cutting edge technologies and a progressive business strategy.

Prior to coming to UPS, at a time when the field of information technology was still in its infancy, John helped to execute a similar technological vision at AT&T, Asbach Consulting, American Cyanamid, and Tenneco Chemicals. He truly is one of the pioneers that helped to propel some of America's leading companies into a brave new world of high-tech advances.

John will surely be missed by his colleagues at UPS; but this corporate loss is without doubt the community's gain. John's public service dates back to his years as a United States Marine. And, he remains a community leader as a member of the Board of Directors of New Jersey Mental Health Association and the Board of Advisors for the American Cancer Society. His business acumen has been tapped for the Governor's Economic Growth Council and his generosity of heart has been enlisted as an active participant in a wide variety of United Way activities.

John plays a strong role in helping prepare tomorrow's leaders as well as a member of the New Jersey Institute of Technology Board of Overseers and as a founding member of the Berkeley Heights Education Foundation. And, he serves on the Ramapo College Board of Governors; a board on which I also proudly sit.

On the eve of his retirement from the corporate world, the community looks forward to continuing to work with John Nallin to make North Jersey an even better place in which to work, live, and raise a family.

RECOGNIZING ISAAC DAVID ZEILINGER FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Isaac Zeilinger, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Isaac has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the years Isaac has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Isaac Zeilinger for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF ELK IN ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to managing elk in Rocky Mountain National Park.

Elk are a major attraction for visitors to Rocky Mountain National Park and nearby Estes Park, attracting thousands of people who come to enjoy viewing them and listening to the bulls bugle in late summer and early fall.

But while the elk are a true asset, their numbers are a concern, Property damage and human safety concerns in Estes Park have increased as elk increasingly use parks, golf courses, and yards in close proximity to people and they are also causing adverse effects on the other resources of the park itself. This has led the National Park Service to consider possible steps to address this by reducing the number of elk within the park. My bill is intended to resolve a question that has arisen about how this might be done.

Some historical perspective is useful in understanding the situation.

Elk, or wapiti, are native to the area that includes Rocky Mountain National Park, but hunters had all but eliminated them by the 1870s—and by early in the Twentieth Century, wolves, their only significant predator in the area, had disappeared as well.

They were reintroduced in 1913 and 1914, shortly before Rocky Mountain National Park was established in 1915. Since then, because of the lack of any significant predation—by wolves, other animals, or people—the park's elk population has flourished. By the early 1930s, it had increased so much that the National Park Service became concerned about resulting deteriorating vegetation conditions on their winter range.

Starting in 1944, the elk population was limited, primarily by having rangers cull the herd by shooting some of the elk but also by some trapping and transplanting. For the next 25 years, the number of elk using Rocky Mountain National Park was maintained between 350 and 800 animals.

This ended in 1969, when a ''natural regulation'' policy—meaning no active management within the park—was instituted. In part, this was because the National Park Service thought hunting in adjacent areas would control the elk population in and near the park.

But since then, the park's elk numbers have continued to increase and vegetation changes have been observed, particularly a decline in willow and aspen on the elk's primary winter range.

As a result, the National Park Service has been reconsidering the appropriate size for the park's elk population and ways to address the problem of chronic wasting disease, CWD, a fatal brain disease known to affect deer and elk, which has been detected in elk within the park. Research begun in 1994 was aimed at gathering critical information needed to provide a scientific basis for a new management plan.

I have been following this matter with interest, and last year I wrote the National Park Service about the four alternatives discussed in their draft environmental impact statement, DEIS, on the subject.

As I said in that letter, while I am not a wildlife biologist, my own observations and discussions of the matter with both nearby residents and people with some professional expertise led me to conclude that the document correctly identified adverse consequences for aspen trees and other vegetation that would result from continued high elk densities in the park. Accordingly, as my letter said, I support action to reduce the numbers of elk in the park to something like the numbers that would be expected under natural conditions.

One option discussed in the DEIS would be release of a limited number of gray wolves, in order to return a natural predator that could control elk numbers. However, the DEIS notes that this would involve ''numerous uncertainties,'' including ''whether park managers could effectively control wolf behavior and movements and keep wolves in the park,'' which I think is a source of valid concern for ranchers who operate on nearby lands and for other park neighbors. And, in any case, the DEIS indicates that it would still be necessary for there to be ''lethal reduction''—meaning shooting of elk—at least for some time because the small number of wolves would not be enough to accomplish the desired reduction in the number of elk in the park.

So, as I noted in my letter, I readily understand why this has not been identified as the preferred alternative.

Instead, the DEIS said it would be preferable to have people cull the elk herd by ''lethal reduction''—meaning the shooting of selected animals to reduce the overall numbers to a more appropriate level.

The DEIS identified two ''lethal reduction'' scenarios, differing mainly in the number of elk to be shot: 100 to 200 annually over 20 years or 200 to 700 elk annually for four years and after that 25 to 150 elk annually for 15 years. The DEIS says ''adaptive use of wolves'' could eventually become part of the second scenario, and it identified it as the preferred alternative.

I think the DEIS did a good job of providing reasons for that choice. However, as I said in my letter, I think serious consideration should be given to some changes in its implementation—particularly by exploring ways to increase participation by Colorado sportsmen and sportswomen.

There are several reasons I think this should be explored, especially the potential for significant savings to the taxpayers.

The DEIS estimates that implementing the preferred alternative would cost between about $16.55 million and $18.26 million over the next 20 years, with ''labor'' accounting for between $6.55 million and $7.37 million of those totals. Evidently, these ''labor'' costs would be mostly for compensating the people doing the shooting, between 3 and 10 FTEs, with a smaller amount for administration (1.5 FTEs).

As I indicated in my letter, I think the National Park Service should explore the possibility that those costs could be substantially reduced by offering qualified Coloradans an opportunity to take part—under the strict guidance and direction of the National Park Service—either without compensation or for less compensation than the amounts on which the DEIS estimates were based.

Having reviewed my letter and other public comments on the DEIS, the National Park Service is now moving toward a decision on how to go about reducing the number of elk in Rocky Mountain National Park. That is what they should be doing.

But I am concerned that some of their statements in a recent meeting with Colorado wildlife officials suggest they have mistakenly concluded that they do not have the legal authority to act along the lines I suggested. My bill is intended to make it clear that they do have that authority.

At the meeting, the National Park Service distributed a paper entitled ''Legal Analysis of Hunting within Rocky Mountain National Park.'' I am not a lawyer, and I do not dispute the accuracy of that paper. But I do dispute its relevance—because what is involved here is not ''hunting,'' as that term is generally used, but instead a plan to reduce elk numbers by having people selected by the National Park Service and acting in accordance with its instructions shoot specified numbers of animals over specified periods of time.

So, the question is not whether the National Park Service plans to have elk shot—it does. The question is whether the National Park Service has the authority to consider allowing qualified Coloradans—specifically, those who have hunting licenses and who meet whatever qualifications the National Park Service may set—do the shooting.

My bill would resolve that question by making it clear that the laws applicable to Rocky Mountain National Park do not prevent the National Park Service from doing that.

It also would require the National Park Service to consult with the Colorado Division of Wildlife regarding the possible participation of that state agency in implementing the new plan for managing elk in the park. I have included that provision because, while management of the park is and should remain the sole responsibility of the National Park Service, I think the Service should at least discuss the matter to see whether the Division of Wildlife can be helpful in addressing this matter of concern to both agencies and the public.

I think my bill can help the National Park Service to move forward to resolve a real management problem in a cost-effective manner.

For the benefit of our colleagues, here is an outline of the legislation:

Section 1 provides definitions of terms used in the bill

Section 2 states that nothing in the laws applicable to management of Rocky Mountain National Park is to be construed as prohibiting the Interior Department from using the services of qualified individuals, as volunteers or under contract, from assisting in implementation of the new elk and vegetation management plan by using lethal means to reduce the park's elk population. The term ''qualified individuals'' means people with Colorado resident big-game hunting licenses who have whatever other qualifications the National Park Service may set after consulting with the Colorado Division of Wildlife. This section would not require the National Park Service to use the services of qualified Coloradans, but it would make clear that there is no legal obstacle to their doing so.

Section 3 would require the National Park Service to consult with the Colorado Division of Wildlife regarding that state agency's possible participation in implementing the new plan to manage elk in the park. This would not require such participation, but it would require the National Park Service to consider it.

Section 4 states that nothing in the bill is to be construed as applying to the taking of wildlife within the park for any purpose other than implementation of the new elk management plan.

IN RECOGNITION OF SISTER BARBARA SUESSMAN

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize the life and work of a tremendous role model, advocate, and longtime resident of Brooklyn, Sister Barbara Suessman.

Born on February 26, 1937 in Brooklyn, Barbara attended St. Agnes High School in Rockville Center before joining the ''Dominican Sisters'' in 1956. It was through her involvement with the Dominican Sisters that led Sister Barbara to hear her calling and two years later, she pronounced her religious vows and embarked on a life dedicated to serving the underprivileged.

Sister Barbara held a strong belief that through active involvement with New York City's youth she would be most effective in serving the community. It was this conviction that led her to commit her life to working with various community organizations, schools, and ministries.

She spent the next twelve years teaching in several schools in Brooklyn and Queens. While she valued her years teaching the community's children, Sister Barbara wanted to take on more of an active role training peers how to mentor each other. In 1970, she accepted the position of supervisor at the Brooklyn Diocese sponsored ''New School,'' offering special leadership training. After four years, she left to take over as Program director of the Brooklyn group home, Martin de Porres, where she remained until 1979.

Sister Barbara's dedication to the community's youth was undying—she always sought out additional ways to serve. She was instrumental in founding ''Project Bridge,'' a program under the auspices of Christian Charities aimed at addressing the teen pregnancy problem in New York City. Over time, this modest program grew into a full-service organization with numerous locations around the city, providing services to teenage boys, as well as girls, who are pregnant, parenting, or at-risk of becoming parents.

In 1995, Sister Barbara began yet another endeavor, taking the position of Director of Finance with her Dominican Congregation, and

upon completion of her term, devoted the rest of her time with us to consulting for various religious congregations.

Sister Barbara dedicated her entire life to serving others. She used the power of her beliefs and commitment to instill hope and inspiration in all who knew her.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to honor the life and contributions of Sister Barbara Suessman.

RECOGNIZING JAMES EDWARD LEACH FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize James Leach, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

James has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the years James has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam, Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending James Leach for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRESS MUST CO-SIGN ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to require focused, careful consideration and separate Congressional approval of a form of back-door spending that could leave the taxpayers exposed to serious financial liability.

It is cosponsored by our colleagues Mr. WALZ, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MALONEY, Ms. BACHMANN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KLINE, Ms. MUSGRAVE and Mr. MILLER of Florida. I greatly appreciate their assistance and support.

The bill, entitled the ''Congress Must Co-Sign Act'' deals with proposals to have the Department of Transportation lend a billion dollars—or more—for any one purpose.

It would require greater transparency regarding such loans and a separate Congressional vote to approve each such loan, even if it had received preliminary approval either on its own or as part of a larger measure.

The purpose is to increase Congressional accountability and to reduce the chance the taxpayers will find themselves stuck with the bill if the lender should default on one of these loans.

The bill would require the Secretary of Transportation to provide Congress advance written notice at least 60 days before any Department of Transportation funds can be used to make a loan in an amount greater than $1 billion. This notice would have to include information about the purpose, the authority and the terms and conditions of the loan.

And the bill would require that after receiving the notice, Congress would have to pass legislation approving the loan before the Transportation Department could go forward and lend the money.

This is not just a theoretical matter—one such mega-loan is now being processed within the Administration. And that fact illustrates the need to broaden the focus in the debate about ''earmarks'' and special tax breaks. We in Congress need to take a harder look not just at direct spending and the indirect spending through the tax code, but also at backdoor spending through the lending of taxpayer dollars.

In all these areas, there is a need for greater transparency and accountability. That's why I have introduced H.R. 595, the ''Stimulating Leadership in Controlling Expenditures''—or ''SLICE''—Act, to enact a constitutionally sound version of a line-item veto for individual spending items.

It's also why I have introduced H.R. 905, the Commission on Unfair Tax Breaks and Subsidies—or ''CUTS''—Act, which would provide another way to require action to increase equity and accountability in the federal budget.

And that is why I am introducing this bill today—not because I am convinced that the pending loan, or some similar loans in the future, would not be appropriate, but because I think it's essential that a decision to approve such a mega-loan should be made in a careful, deliberate way with full discussion of the merits and potential risks and a separate vote here in the Congress. At the end of the day, I might vote to approve the pending loan or some other loan of that type, or I might conclude that the potential costs outweigh the likely benefits. My purpose is not to prejudge the result, but to require a better, more open way of making a decision.

The federal budget remains awash in a sea of red ink and we are continuing to add to the Nation's towering pile of debt. People in Colorado and across the country expect greater transparency and accountability from their elected officials and our decisions on spending. This bill would take an important step in that direction and I think it deserves the support of all our colleagues.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CHARLIE NORWOOD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

SPEECH OF

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2007

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I mourn the loss of my friend and colleague, Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD. CHARLIE was a tenacious fighter in Congress who would not back down from his beliefs. More important than his work in the House of Representatives, he was a dedicated husband, loving father of two sons and a grandfather of four.

CHARLIE served his country proudly in Vietnam and was a decorated veteran. Upon his return to the states, he practiced dentistry and helped countless Georgians. In 1994, he brought his compassion and conservative values to Washington. I soon learned that CHARLIE NORWOOD was a man of impressive character and conviction, with a Southern charm and heart of gold.

CHARLIE NORWOOD was a fervent believer in tackling the problem of illegal immigration, and I enjoyed working with him to pass immigration reform. CHARLIE made a valuable contribution to the House's immigration bill in the 109th Congress by including parts of his CLEAR Act in the legislation. I shared his belief that we should direct local law enforcement to help us apprehend the illegal immigrants in this country who are criminals.

CHARLIE courageously battled cancer for a number of years, and he was an inspiration to many, including his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I am pleased that I had the opportunity to work with CHARLIE, and my wife Cheryl and I extend our deepest sympathies to Gloria Norwood and their entire family.

RECOGNIZING RYAN DANIEL HARRIS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Harris, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ryan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the years Ryan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ryan Harris for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

INTRODUCING THE IRAQ CONTINGENCY PLANNING ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, this week the House has considered a resolution focused on the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq by committing more troops. That certainly deserves the debate it has received.

I voted for the resolution disapproving of the escalation plan because I think that plan is misguided and will not be effective in the context of the civil war that has emerged in Iraq.

Of course, I'm not under any illusion that the president will listen to the resolution's message. He has made clear his intention to move

forward, and many troops are already in place or heading to their new positions.

I think that is a tragic error, one that I will work to correct. But at the same time we—both the Administration and the Congress—must consider what may come next.

That is why I am today introducing legislation to require that Congress be informed about the extent to which the Administration is doing the planning that is needed if we are to be prepared to respond to what our intelligence agencies tell us may be further catastrophic developments in Iraq and the region.

You'd think it wouldn't be necessary for Congress to legislate to make sure the Pentagon plans for contingencies. And when, at a recent Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked Secretary Gates whether they were doing that, his answer, while vague, was reassuring.

But vague reassurances aren't enough, and I am following up with this bill because I don't want a repeat of the performance that led the Administration to launch a war in Iraq without a plan for what would come after initial military success.

The Bush Administration was warned—by the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Pentagon's Joint Staff, the State Department's Bureau of intelligence and Research, and the CIA's National Intelligence Council, among others—that U.S. troops could face significant postwar resistance.

And in February, 2003 an Army War College report warned that without an ''overwhelming'' effort to prepare for the U.S. occupation of Iraq, ''The United States may find itself in a radically different world over the next few years, a world in which the threat of Saddam Hussein seems like a pale shadow of new problems of America's own making.''

But despite these warnings, the Bush Administration rushed ahead without a comprehensive plan in place to secure and rebuild the country once our military had achieved its initial objectives.

We all know where that has led us—to the point where, according to the just-released National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on Iraq, we're faced with a deteriorating situation in Iraq in which ''Iraqi society's growing polarization, the persistent weakness of the security forces and the state in general, and all sides' ready recourse to violence are collectively driving an increase in communal and insurgent violence and political extremist.''

And now we are being warned that things well may get even worse.

Specifically, the NIE states that as Iraq's security environment worsens, three prospective security paths could emerge—chaos leading to partition, the emergency of a Shia strongman, or anarchic fragementation of power.

Madam Speaker, the NIE is the Administration's own document, and the most authoritiative written judgment of the Director of National Intelligence with respect to Iraq. I think it must be taken seriously, and I think we in Congress must demand to be told—specifically and in detail—just how the Administration is preparing to respond should any one of those contingencies occur.

That is what my legislation calls for. It would require that by June 30th of this year the Administration inform the House and Senate Armed Services Committees just how the Department of Defense and other agencies would respond to each of the three scenarios identified by the NIE, with an explanation of the proposed role of U.S. troops under each scenario, including a comprehensive analysis identifying and justifying the number of U.S. troops needed in each case.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I want assurances that this Administration is thinking about and planning for troubling possibilities they themselves have depicted. No one wants chaos or increased violence in Iraq, but it would be irresponsible not to plan for those possibilities. While looking at Iraq through rose-colored glasses may make us feel better, we will only do right by our men and women in uniform if we plan for likely contingencies, however unpalatable.

Of course, this legislation isn't intended to solve the larger problem of Iraq. To do that, we need a policy aimed at escalating diplomatic and political efforts and lightening the U.S. footprint in Iraq. But so far the President instead is continuing to embrace the idea that the solution is more troop.

Defense Secretary Gates has said that we'll know within months whether or not that escalation has been successful. So it isn't too soon to begin planning now for what may come next. And it is high time for Congress to insist that the Administration is responding to that essential.

TRIBUTE TO DAN E. STRAIGHT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise today to note the passing of Dan E. Straight. Although Mr. Straight did not reside in my district, he worked on an issue within my district that was dear to his heart—the preservation and reopening of the Rollins Pass road over the Continental Divide near Winter Park, Colorado.

Mr. Straight passed away last week. He led a full life that included patriotic service to our country. He served in the U.S. Air Force for years and saw action in World War II, Korea and Vietnam. He also served his community through work with the Boy Scouts, the American Red Cross and his local Rotary.

And because he loved history and the outdoors, he was a champion for the reopening of the Rollins Pass road. Also known as the Moffat Road due to its proximity to the Moffat railroad tunnel, this road was used as a stage and narrow gauge railroad corridor taking passengers from Colorado's east slope communities to the homesteads, resources and recreational activities on the western slope. Rollin Pass contains historic railroad features such as dramatic trestles that span creek valleys and a feature aptly called the Needle Eye Tunnel near the top. Due to age, rock fall has occurred in the tunnel and it has remained closed.

Due to Mr. Straight's efforts, I included language in the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act to allow for the reopening of the Rollins Pass road to two-wheel drive vehicles. Conversations are occurring between the acted countries and the U.S. Forest Service in this regard. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Straight as we were working on this legislation. It was clear that he had a love for this road, this state and this country and he served it all with distinction and passion.

Madam Speaker, I have attached a story from the Longmont Times-Call newspaper noting his passing.

[From the Daily Times—Call, Feb. 9, 2007]

LONGMONT LOSES 'THE COLONEL'

(By Trevor Hughes)

LONGMONT.—Dan E. Straight, a retired Air Force colonel and tireless advocate of reopening Rollins Pass Road over the Continental Divide to Winter Park, died suddenly Wednesday. He was 84.

A longtime local resident, Straight volunteered with groups ranging from the American Red Cross to the Boy Scouts. He helped launch the Twin Peaks Rotary.

Originally from Greeley, Straight and his family settled in Longmont around 1976 after he retired from the Air Force, for which he had flown more than 29 types of aircraft. The front fuselage of one of them, a B–26B Marauder nicknamed ''Flack Bait,'' is displayed at the Smithsonian.

Straight, known locally to many as ''The Colonel,'' was one of many pilots of the storied World War II bomber. He flew one mission in the bomber, on Valentine's Day 1945, carrying his young daughter's shoe in his pocket so she'd always be near.

Straight often regaled high school students with stories from his service during World War II, Korea and Vietnam, according to his family.

He and Juanita also were Red Cross volunteers who helped Special Transit transport people in Longmont and Boulder County to medical appointments.

But it was perhaps his 25-year presidency of the Rollins Pass Restoration Association that brought Straight the most local attention. The pass, along an old railroad grade and through the Needle's Eye Tunnel, offers a shortcut between Boulder and Grand counties.

The 23-mile route fell out of use by trains in 1928, when the 6.2-mile Moffat Tunnel was completed. With the tracks removed in the late 1920s, trains gave way to cars, and for decades the pass and tunnel drew sightseers and travelers from across the Front Range.

Part of the Needle's Eye Tunnel collapsed in 1979, but it was re-opened to cars in 1987 before another partial collapse that injured a sightseer closed it again in 1990.

''I'm just amazed at the people who built it,'' Straight said in 2003.

Technically difficult to pull off at 11,000 feet, the tunnel-stabilization project entailed drilling eight-foot holes into the tunnel walls and roof, then gluing in inch-thick steel rods.

The 1990 collapse injured an area firefighter who was hit by falling rocks from the roof of the tunnel's southern entrance.

The cause: a single missing rock bolt. Ironically, the space where the missing bolt should be is clearly visible in the commemorative photos given to association members. Straight took that photo, a signed copy of which hangs in the Times-Call newsroom.

Despite the setback, Straight remained committed to reopening the tunnel, and negotiations among local officials about fixing it continue to this day.

''That was his favorite mission in life,'' said his daughter Su Eckhardt.

She added that Straight was involved in many other endeavors, including the Longmont Rotary Club, Westview Presbyterian Church, the Masons, the Shriners, the St. Vrain Photographic Society and the Salvation Army.

''He made a commitment beyond simply joining and paying dues,'' she said.

Clark Misner served as project manager for the Rollins Pass reopening in 1987. Now the county's transportation director, he said Straight's love of railroads and the old wagon route over Rollins Pass prompted his interest in the project.

''He was a really decent guy, a straight shooter, no pun intended,'' Misner said. ''He was direct about what he thought should happen. He was honest and just a good guy.''

Memorial services will be held at 2 p.m. Saturday, Feb. 10, at Westview Presbyterian Church, with the Rev. Bruce McQueen officiating. Military honors will be presented by the Mile High Honor Guard, USAF.

In lieu of flowers, the family suggests memorial donations to the American Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the Rollins Pass Restoration Association, Shrine Children's Hospitals or Westview Presbyterian Church in care of Ahlberg Funeral Chapel, 326 Terry St., Longmont 80501.

RECOGNIZING HAYDEN OSWALD FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Hayden Oswald, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 59, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Hayden has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Hayden has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Hayden Oswald for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

ON OBSERVING THE 2007 NATIONAL SALUTE TO HOSPITALIZED VETERANS WEEK

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor our nation's veterans as we observe the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week.

Each year, during the month of February, our nation's hospitalized veterans are recognized for their brave service to this nation. However, each day I am thankful for their selfless service as they put their lives on the line to defend our freedom at home. Many gave the ultimate sacrifice, and many returned home injured. Over 98,000 veterans currently receive daily care in a Department of Veterans Affairs medical center, clinic, or nursing home. It is to these brave and women we extend our deepest gratitude.

The price of freedom can be high, but soldiers fighting for our country believe freedom is worth every bit of that price and more. They are the reason we can sleep at night here at home, knowing full well that when we wake up the next day liberty will still be the cornerstone upon which this nation stands. We, as a nation, owe them a debt of gratitude, and I hope that Americans all over the world will take a moment this week to remember what our soldiers put on the line for our liberty here at home.

The National Salute Chairman for this year is none other than famous singer and actor Jerry Reed. I have great confidence that Mr. Reed's memorable face, humor, and famous singing and songwriting will draw increased attention to Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week, and I applaud his dedication to such a noteworthy cause. His leadership will be vital to informing others about our hospitalized veterans.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is a great honor for me to personally salute those who have borne the battle while we recognize the 2007 Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CHARLIE NORWOOD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

SPEECH OF

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2007

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my fellow colleagues in mourning the passing of Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD. My friend and the honorable representative for the people of the Ninth District of Georgia passed away on Tuesday after his long battle with lung disease and cancer. This Chamber, and the State of Georgia has lost a friend and one of our most capable and dedicated Members. Even before CHARLIE came to Congress in the election of 1994, he was a courageous individual and public servant. The former Army dentist was a decorated officer serving in Vietnam, having been awarded the Combat Medical Badge and two Bronze Stars for his service.

Words cannot fully express the sorrow that is felt by those who have known and loved CHARLIE. My heart goes out to CHARLIE's wife, Gloria, their two sons, Charles and Carlton, and their four grandchildren. I also will be keeping CHARLIE's staff in my thoughts and prayers, as I had the pleasure of working with Dr. NORWOOD on a variety of issues, and his staff was always a delight to work with. I can only imagine how tough it is for them, and all of CHARLIE's family and friends right now during this difficult time. I will be keeping CHARLIE's memory in my thoughts and prayers. He was always a dear friend of mine, someone who I looked to for his opinion and judgment.

CHARLIE is now leaving us for a better place, but he leaves behind a lasting legacy, and shoes that can never be filled. We have lost a hero and a champion, God bless.

RECOGNIZING GARLAND AND MILDRED KING

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize two outstanding constituents of Missouri's Sixth Congressional District: Garland and Mildred King of Harrison County, MO. Garland and Mildred celebrated their 74th wedding anniversary on December 3, 2006.

Garland and Mildred King were married on December 3, 1932 in Trenton, MO. They have 6 children, 14 grandchildren, 24 great grandchildren, and 1 great-great grandchild on the way. They have owned a family farm in Harrison County for 64 years.

Garland and Mildred King have been outstanding citizens of Harrison County and northwest Missouri. They are dedicated and active members of Melbourne Baptist Church where Garland is a deacon.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Garland and Mildred King. Their marriage of 74 years is inspirational, and I am honored to represent them in the United States Congress.

FORGETTING THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, the following 1984 speech by former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger provides an important perspective on the use of military force in Iraq.

THE USES OF MILITARY POWER''

(By Caspar W. Weinberger)

Thank you for inviting me to be here today with the members of the National Press Club, a group most important to our national security. I say that because a major point I intend to make in my remarks today is that the single most critical element of a successful democracy is a strong consensus of support and agreement for our basic purposes. Policies formed without a clear understanding of what we hope to achieve will never work. And you help to build that understanding among our citizens.

Of all the many policies our citizens deserve and need to understand, none is so important as those related to our topic today the uses of military power. Deterrence will work only if the Soviets understand our firm commitment to keeping the peace, . . . and only from a well-informed public can we expect to have that national will and commitment.

So today, I want to discuss with you perhaps the most important question concerning keeping the peace. Under what circumstances, and by what means, does a great democracy such as ours reach the painful decision that the use of military force is necessary to protect our interests or to carry out our national policy?

National power has many components, some tangible, like economic wealth, technical pre-eminence. Other components are intangible such as moral force, or strong national will. Military forces, when they are

strong and ready and modern, are a credible and tangible addition to a nation's power. When both the intangible national will and those forces are forged into one instrument, national power becomes effective.

In today's world, the line between peace and war is less clearly drawn than at any time in our history. When George Washington, in his farewell address, warned us, as a new democracy, to avoid foreign entanglements, Europe then lay 2–3 months by sea over the horizon. The United States was protected by the width of the oceans. Now in this nuclear age, we measure time in minutes rather than months.

Aware of the consequences of any misstep, yet convinced of the precious worth of the freedom we enjoy, we seek to avoid conflict, while maintaining strong defenses. Our policy has always been to work hard for peace, but to be prepared if war comes. Yet, so blurred have the lines become between open conflict and half-hidden hostile acts that we cannot confidently predict where, or when, or how, or from what direction aggression may arrive. We must be prepared, at any moment, to meet threats ranging in intensity from isolated terrorist acts, to guerrilla action, to full-scale military confrontation.

Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist Papers, said that it is impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national exigencies, or the correspondent extent and variety of the means, which may be necessary to satisfy them. If it was true then, how much more true it is today, when we must remain ready to consider the means to meet such serious indirect challenges to the peace as proxy wars and individual terrorist action. And how much more important is it now, considering the consequences of failing to deter conflict at the lowest level possible. While the use of military force to defend territory has never been questioned when a democracy has been attacked and its very survival threatened, most democracies have rejected the unilateral aggressive use of force to invade, conquer or subjugate other nations. The extent to which the use of force is acceptable remains unresolved for the host of other situations which fall between these extremes of defensive and aggressive use of force.

We find ourselves, then, face to face with a modern paradox: The most likely challenge to the peace—the gray area conflicts—are precisely the most difficult challenges to which a democracy must respond. Yet, while the source and nature of today's challenges are uncertain, our response must be clear and understandable. Unless we are certain that force is essential, we run the risk of inadequate national will to apply the resources needed.

Because we face a spectrum of threats from covert aggression, terrorism, and subversion, to overt intimidation, to use of brute force, choosing the appropriate level of our response is difficult. Flexible response does not mean just any response is appropriate. But once a decision to employ some degree of force has been made, and the purpose clarified, our government must have the clear mandate to carry out, and continue to carry out, that decision until the purpose has been achieved. That, too, has been difficult to accomplish.

The issue of which branch of government has authority to define that mandate and make decisions on using force is now being strongly contended. Beginning in the 1970s Congress demanded, and assumed, a far more active role in the making of foreign policy and in the decision-making process for the employment of military forces abroad than had been thought appropriate and practical before. As a result, the centrality of decision-making authority in the Executive branch has been compromised by the Legislative branch to an extent that actively interferes with that process. At the same time, there has not been a corresponding acceptance of responsibility by Congress for the outcome of decisions concerning the employment of military forces.

Yet the outcome of decisions on whether and when and to what degree to use combat forces abroad has never been more important than it is today. While we do not seek to deter or settle all the world's conflicts, we must recognize that, as a major power, our responsibilities and interests are now of such scope that there are few troubled areas we can afford to ignore. So we must be prepared to deal with a range of possibilities, a spectrum of crises, from local insurgency to global conflict. We prefer, of course, to limit any conflict in its early stages, to contain and control it but to do that our military forces must be deployed in a timely manner, and be fully supported and prepared before they are engaged, because many of those difficult decisions must be made extremely quickly.

Some on the national scene think they can always avoid making tough decisions. Some reject entirely the question of whether any force can ever be used abroad. They want to avoid grappling with a complex issue because, despite clever rhetoric disguising their purpose, these people are in fact advocating a return to post-World War I isolationism. While they may maintain in principle that military force has a role in foreign policy, they are never willing to name the circumstance or the place where it would apply.

On the other side, some theorists argue that military force can be brought to bear in any crisis. Some of these proponents of force are eager to advocate its use even in limited amounts simply because they believe that if there are American forces of any size present they will somehow solve the problem.

Neither of these two extremes offers us any lasting or satisfactory solutions. The first undue reserve would lead us ultimately to withdraw from international events that require free nations to defend their interests from the aggressive use of force. We would be abdicating our responsibilities as the leader of the free world responsibilities more or less thrust upon us in the aftermath of World War II war incidentally that isolationism did nothing to deter. These are responsibilities we must fulfill unless we desire the Soviet Union to keep expanding its influence unchecked throughout the world. In an international system based on mutual interdependence among nations, and alliances between friends, stark isolationism quickly would lead to a far more dangerous situation for the United States: we would be without allies and faced by many hostile or indifferent nations.

The second alternative employing our forces almost indiscriminately and as a regular and customary part of our diplomatic efforts would surely plunge us headlong into the sort of domestic turmoil we experienced during the Vietnam war, without accomplishing the goal for which we committed our forces. Such policies might very well tear at the fabric of our society, endangering the single most critical element of a successful democracy: a strong consensus of support and agreement for our basic purposes.

Policies formed without a clear understanding of what we hope to achieve would also earn us the scorn of our troops, who would have an understandable opposition to being used in every sense of the word casually and without intent to support them fully. Ultimately this course would reduce their morale and their effectiveness for engagements we must win. And if the military were to distrust its civilian leadership, recruitment would fall off and I fear an end to the all-volunteer system would be upon us, requiring a return to a draft, sowing the seeds of riot and discontent that so wracked the country in the '60s.

We have now restored high morale and pride in the uniform throughout the services. The all-volunteer system is working spectacularly well. Are we willing to forfeit what we have fought so hard to regain?

In maintaining our progress in strengthening America's military deterrent, we face difficult challenges. For we have entered an era where the dividing lines between peace and war are less clearly drawn, the identity of the foe is much less clear. In World Wars I and II, we not only knew who our enemies were, but we shared a clear sense of why the principles espoused by our enemies were unworthy.

Since these two wars threatened our very survival as a free nation and the survival of our allies, they were total wars, involving every aspect of our society. All our means of production, all our resources were devoted to winning. Our policies had the unqualified support of the great majority of our people. Indeed, World Wars I and II ended with the unconditional surrender of our enemies. . . . The only acceptable ending when the alternative was the loss of our freedom.

But in the aftermath of the Second World War, we encountered a more subtle form of warfare warfare in which, more often than not, the face of the enemy was masked. Territorial expansionism could be carried out indirectly by proxy powers, using surrogate forces aided and advised from afar. Some conflicts occurred under the name of ''national liberation,'' but far more frequently ideology or religion provided the spark to the tinder.

Our adversaries can also take advantage of our open society, and our freedom of speech and opinion to use alarming rhetoric and disinformation to divide and disrupt our unity of purpose. While they would never dare to allow such freedoms to their own people, they are quick to exploit ours by conducting simultaneous military and propaganda campaigns to achieve their ends.

They realize that if they can divide our national will at home, it will not be necessary to defeat our forces abroad. So by presenting issues in bellicose terms, they aim to intimidate western leaders and citizens, encouraging us to adopt conciliatory positions to their advantage. Meanwhile they remain sheltered from the force of public opinion in their countries, because public opinion there is simply prohibited and does not exist.

Our freedom presents both a challenge and an opportunity. It is true that until democratic nations have the support of the people, they are inevitably at a disadvantage in a conflict. But when they do have that support they cannot be defeated. For democracies have the power to send a compelling message to friend and foe alike by the vote of their citizens. And the American people have sent such a signal by re-electing a strong Chief Executive. They know that President Reagan is willing to accept the responsibility for his actions and is able to lead us through these complex times by insisting that we regain both our military and our economic strength.

In today's world where minutes count, such decisive leadership is more important than ever before. Regardless of whether conflicts are limited, or threats are ill defined, we must be capable of quickly determining that the threats and conflicts either do or do not affect the vital interests of the United States and our allies. . . . And then responding appropriately.

Those threats may not entail an immediate, direct attack on our territory, and our

response may not necessarily require the immediate or direct defense of our homeland. But when our vital national interests and those of our allies are at stake, we cannot ignore our safety, or forsake our allies.

At the same time, recent history has proven that we cannot assume unilaterally the role of the world's defender. We have learned that there are limits to how much of our spirit and blood and treasure we can afford to forfeit in meeting our responsibility to keep peace and freedom. So while we may and should offer substantial amounts of economic and military assistance to our allies in their time of need, and help them maintain forces to deter attacks against them usually we cannot substitute our troops or our will for theirs.

We should only engage our troops if we must do so as a matter of our own vital national interest. We cannot assume for other sovereign nations the responsibility to defend their territory without their strong invitation when our freedom is not threatened.

On the other hand, there have been recent cases where the United States has seen the need to join forces with other nations to try to preserve the peace by helping with negotiations, and by separating warring parties, and thus enabling those warring nations to withdraw from hostilities safely. In the Middle East, which has been torn by conflict for millennia, we have sent our troops in recent years both to the Sinai and to Lebanon, for just such a peacekeeping mission. But we did not configure or equip those forces for combat they were armed only for their self-defense. Their mission required them to be and to be recognized as peacekeepers. We knew that if conditions deteriorated so they were in danger, or if because of the actions of the warring nations, their peacekeeping mission could not be realized, then it would be necessary either to add sufficiently to the number and arms of our troops in short to equip them for combat, . . . or to withdraw them. And so in Lebanon, when we faced just such a choice, because the warring nations did not enter into withdrawal or peace agreements, the President properly withdrew forces equipped only for peacekeeping.

In those cases where our national interests require us to commit combat force we must never let there be doubt of our resolution. When it is necessary for our troops to be committed to combat, we must commit them, in sufficient numbers and we must support them, as effectively and resolutely as our strength permits. When we commit our troops to combat we must do so with the sole object of winning.

Once it is clear our troops are required, because our vital interests are at stake, then we must have the firm national resolve to commit every ounce of strength necessary to win the fight to achieve our objectives. In Grenada we did just that.

Just as clearly, there are other situations where United States combat forces should not be used. I believe the postwar period has taught us several lessons, and from them I have developed six major tests to be applied when we are weighing the use of U.S. combat forces abroad. Let me now share them with you:

First, the United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies. That emphatically does not mean that we should declare beforehand, as we did with Korea in 1950, that a particular area is outside our strategic perimeter.

Second, if we decide it is necessary to put combat troops into a given situation, we should do so wholeheartedly, and with the clear intention of winning. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, we should not commit them at all. Of course if the particular situation requires only limited force to win our objectives, then we should not hesitate to commit forces sized accordingly. When Hitler broke treaties and remilitarized the Rhineland, small combat forces then could perhaps have prevented the holocaust of World War II.

Third, if we do decide to commit forces to combat overseas, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. And we should know precisely how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives. And we should have and send the forces needed to do just that. As Clausewitz wrote, ''no one starts a war or rather, no one in his senses ought to do so without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war, and how he intends to conduct it.''

War may be different today than in Clausewitz's time, but the need for well-defined objectives and a consistent strategy is still essential. If we determine that a combat mission has become necessary for our vital national interests, then we must send forces capable to do the job and not assign a combat mission to a force configured for peacekeeping.

Fourth, the relationship between our objectives and the forces we have committed their size, composition and disposition must be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary. Conditions and objectives invariably change during the course of a conflict. When they do change, then so must our combat requirements. We must continuously keep as a beacon light before us the basic questions: ''Is this conflict in our national interest?'' ''Does our national interest require us to fight, to use force of arms?'' If the answers are ''yes,'' then we must win. If the answers are ''no,'' then we should not be in combat.

Fifth, before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress. This support cannot be achieved unless we are candid in making clear the threats we face; the support cannot be sustained without continuing and close consultation. We cannot fight a battle with the Congress at home while asking our troops to win a war overseas or, as in the case of Vietnam, in effect asking our troops not to win, but just to be there.

Finally, the commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort.

I believe that these tests can be helpful in deciding whether or not we should commit our troops to combat in the months and years ahead. The point we must all keep uppermost in our minds is that if we ever decide to commit forces to combat, we must support those forces to the fullest extent of our national will for as long as it takes to win. So we must have in mind objectives that are clearly defined and understood and supported by the widest possible number of our citizens. And those objectives must be vital to our survival as a free nation and to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as a world power. We must also be farsighted enough to sense when immediate and strong reactions to apparently small events can prevent lion-like responses that may be required later. We must never forget those isolationists in Europe who shrugged that ''Danzig is not worth a war,'' and ''why should we fight to keep the Rhineland demilitarized?''

These tests I have just mentioned have been phrased negatively for a purpose they are intended to sound a note of caution that we must observe prior to committing forces to combat overseas. When we ask our military forces to risk their very lives in such situations, a note of caution is not only prudent, it is morally required.

In many situations we may apply these tests and conclude that a combatant role is not appropriate. Yet no one should interpret what I am saying here today as an abdication of America's responsibilities either to its own citizens or to its allies. Nor should these remarks be misread as a signal that this country, or this Administration, is unwilling to commit forces to combat overseas.

We have demonstrated in the past that, when our vital interests or those of our allies are threatened, we are ready to use force, and use it decisively, to protect those interests. Let no one entertain any illusions if our vital interests are involved, we are prepared to fight. And we are resolved that if we must fight, we must win.

So, while these tests are drawn from lessons we have learned from the past, they also can and should be applied to the future. For example, the problems confronting us in Central America today are difficult. The possibility of more extensive Soviet and Soviet-proxy penetration into this hemisphere in months ahead is something we should recognize. If this happens we will clearly need more economic and military assistance and training to help those who want democracy.

The President will not allow our military forces to creep or be drawn gradually into a combat role in Central America or any other place in the world. And indeed our policy is designed to prevent the need for direct American involvement. This means we will need sustained Congressional support to back and give confidence to our friends in the region.

I believe that the tests I have enunciated here today can, if applied carefully, avoid the danger of this gradualist incremental approach, which almost always means the use of insufficient force. These tests can help us to avoid being drawn inexorably into an endless morass, where it is not vital to our national interest to fight.

But policies and principles such as these require decisive leadership in both the Executive and Legislative branches of government and they also require strong and sustained public support. Most of all, these policies require national unity of purpose. I believe the United States now possesses the policies and leadership to gain that public support and unity. And I believe that the future will show we have the strength of character to protect peace with freedom.

In summary, we should all remember these are the policies indeed the only policies that can preserve for ourselves, our friends, and our posterity, peace with freedom.

I believe we can continue to deter the Soviet Union and other potential adversaries from pursuing their designs around the world. We can enable our friends in Central America to defeat aggression and gain the breathing room to nurture democratic reforms. We can meet the challenge posed by the unfolding complexity of the 1980s.

We will then be poised to begin the last decade of this century amid a peace tempered by realism, and secured by firmness and strength. And it will be a peace that will enable all of us ourselves at home, and our friends abroad to achieve a quality of life, both spiritually and materially, far higher than man has even dared to dream.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CHARLIE NORWOOD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY E. BROWN, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2007

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of CHARLIE NORWOOD. As a Member of Congress from the neighboring state of South Carolina, I was fortunate enough to serve with CHARLIE and see firsthand his dedication to public service. Coming to Congress with a medical background, CHARLIE championed issues regarding a patients' bill of rights which was designed to give people better access to healthcare. As a decorated Vietnam Veteran, CHARLIE was a fighter. He fought for 12 years as a member of Congress on behalf of his constituents. I worked with CHARLIE on a number of issues including education, military, and veterans' issues. As Subcommittee Chairman of Health on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I had the pleasure of participating in a Town Hall meeting with the veterans from his district.

Diagnosed with cancer in 2006, CHARLIE continued to serve the people of Georgia bravely and honorably in the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES despite his ill health. He fought to the end, and in his final days, he returned home to be with his family.

CHARLIE will be sorely missed, but his legacy will never be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Gloria and his two children during this sad time.

RECOGNIZING RUTH ELVIRA DOBBINS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Ruth Elvira Dobbins of Sibley, Missouri. Ruth celebrated her 80th Birthday on January 17th and it is my privilege to offer her my warmest regards on achieving this important milestone. Ruth is a fine citizen of Missouri and the Sibley community. It is an honor to represent Ruth in the United States Congress, and I wish her all the best on this birthday and many more in the future.

THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2008 BUDGET

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with the President's budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2008. The President has said repeatedly that he wants to work with the new leadership in Congress, but his budget request tells a different story. It is clear evidence that he has little interest in making the hard choices facing our Nation and that he continues to favor tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of working Americans.

One of the most notable changes in this budget as compared with those of previous years is the inclusion of supplemental spending requests for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I do appreciate this development, as it will enhance Congressional oversight, which has been sorely lacking in the past. However, this improvement does not alter my deep opposition to the President's plan to augment existing force levels in Iraq by 21,500 troops, a number that could increase significantly once additional support forces are considered. It has become evident that the problem in Iraq cannot be solved by more U.S. troops. As the Iraq Study Group and other experts have concluded, it requires a diplomatic and economic solution, as well as a renewed commitment by the Iraqi government to take greater control of its own security situation. Consequently, Congress will carefully scrutinize the supplemental funding request so that we continue to provide our men and women in uniform with the resources they need to remain safe and effective while moving toward a swift conclusion of our military operations in Iraq. The American people have asked us to act, and we will do so in the coming months.

Sadly, the remainder of the budget demonstrates the President's misplaced priorities and inability to operate within realistic expectations. Once again, the President claims he can have it both ways by making permanent tax cuts for the wealthiest while reaching a balanced budget by 2012. However, the numbers just don't add up. The President doesn't balance his budget through responsible decision-making; he does it by hoping for economic growth that may or may not occur. In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the President has overestimated revenue projections in 2012 by more than $150 billion, and that his budget would actually result in yet another deficit. One hundred and fifty billion dollars is more than a rounding error; it is wishful thinking.

What does the average Rhode Islander get from all of that deficit spending? Unfortunately, it's not much. The President's decision to extend tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans would cost hundreds of billions of dollars in lost revenue, necessitating drastic cuts to important services and resulting in a massive middle-class tax increase. By choosing to extend certain tax cuts expiring in 2010 instead of fixing the Alternative Minimum Tax, the President has made clear that his priorities are with the richest Americans and not the middle class.

Our Nation's most vulnerable populations would also be harmed by the proposed budget. The President has called for $78 billion in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, venerable programs that provide vital health care services to the elderly, the disabled and the poor. Part of those cuts would come from an 8 percent reduction in Medicare reimbursement rates to physicians. Congress has blocked such cuts in the past because we know how devastating they would be to our health care system, yet the President appears oblivious to how dangerous they would be. When I am in Rhode Island, I hear constantly from doctors about how proposed cuts to Medicare reimbursement rates would result in their inability to treat Medicare patients. My State's 16 hospitals would not be able to meet the needs of the community, and our senior citizens would suffer as a result. While I agree that we need to address the long-term solvency of Medicare, any reforms should be implemented in a way that benefits, not damages, our Nation's health care system.

The budget would also threaten to repeal health insurance for Rhode Island children. Rhode Island is one of 18 States that have implemented the State Children's Health Insurance Program to exceed minimum federal standards. Rhode Island's program, Rite Care, has leveraged SCHIP funding to provide health insurance to children in families up to 250 percent of the poverty level, as well as to additional populations such as pregnant women and parents. We have worked hard to bring our insurance coverage rate for children to 94 percent—above the national average of 88 percent. The President's budget would penalize States that are succeeding under SCHIP and increase the uninsured rate among children when we should be going in the opposite direction.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity and Science and Technology, I am concerned that the budget proposal does not invest appropriately in important homeland security initiatives. Despite tragedies experienced in Madrid and London, we continue to ignore the importance of rail security; the Transportation Security Administration budget contains only $41 million for surface transportation security. The Bush Administration has also proposed cutting biodefense-related programs and the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate, both of which will help protect our Nation from emerging threats. Additionally, the budget would reduce funding for programs important to State and local law enforcement in Rhode Island, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program, which awarded $45.2 million to Rhode Island from 2003 to 2006, and the Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention Program, LETPP, from which Rhode Island received $11.5 million in funding from 2004 to 2006. Despite their proven effectiveness in reducing crime in our communities, the Community Oriented Policing Service, COPS, and Justice Assistance Grants, JAGs, would also experience cuts in this budget proposal. The COPS program helps Rhode Island's law enforcement agencies hire police officers, enhance crime fighting technology, and support crime prevention initiatives, while JAG supports State and local drug task forces, community crime prevention programs and prosecution initiatives. In 2006 alone, Rhode Island received $1.6 million in JAG funding and $790,000 in COPS funding that helped keep Rhode Island families safe. An important component of homeland security includes providing our state and local law enforcement with the resources they need to be effective, and I will fight to block these proposed cuts.

A budget is more than a simple ledger of revenue and spending. It is a demonstration of priorities. In this case, the President's priorities are out of touch with what the American people want. The new leadership in Congress is ready to craft a budget that will support strengthening our national defense and will

carefully examine our ongoing commitment in Iraq while not losing sight of those priorities that need to be met here at home. Our budget will reflect the values and needs of working Rhode Islanders. I will fight to properly fund SCHIP so that Rite Care can continue to support our state's most vulnerable patients, and I will fight the drastic proposed physician payment cuts under Medicare so that we do not jeopardize the health and well-being of our Nation's seniors.

Working to put our Nation back on solid financial footing will take time and dedication, and I am up to the challenge. I will fight for a fair budget that benefits all Americans. I look forward to advocating for all Rhode Islanders in the coming months.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REIT INVESTMENT DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT ACT

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, along with my good friends and colleagues, Representatives CANTOR, POMEROY and REYNOLDS, I introduce the REIT Investment Diversification and Empowerment Act, RIDEA. This legislation will continue the tradition of Congress to periodically review and amend the tax rules governing REITs to ensure that they are able to operate within the competitive norms of the marketplace. In an effort to keep REITs competitive, this bill addresses several issues tied to REIT investment diversification and empowerment. The legislation would make several minor, but important, changes in the REIT tax rules to permit REITs on behalf of their shareholders to continue to compete with other real estate companies in international and domestic markets.

In 1960, Congress created the REIT rules to allow average investors to obtain the benefits of owning large-scale, income producing real estate such as shopping malls, apartment communities and office buildings. REITs are typically publicly traded companies that pass through their earnings to individual shareholders. The vision of Congress has come to fruition: The equity market capitalization of REITs as of December 31, 2006 was $438 billion—up from only $1.4 billion at the end of 1971. Investment professionals such as Burton Malkiel of Princeton University, Jeremy Siegel of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania and David Swensen, the manager of the Yale Endowment, have recommended that individual investors should maintain a discrete allocation of REITs as part of a diversified portfolio to maximize performance while lowering investment risk.

Commercial real estate plays an essential part in the national economy, producing about 6 percent of the gross domestic product according to the Federal Reserve Board. REITs have grown to be an essential component of the real estate marketplace and provided investment opportunities for everyone to invest in where we work, live and shop. REITs own all types of income producing real estate, from community shopping centers to landmarks such as Roosevelt Field on Long Island, Tyson's Comer in Virginia, and Queens Plaza, in my home borough of Queens, NY.

REITs are subject to a number of rules to ensure their primary focus is commercial real estate activities. At least 75 percent of a REIT's assets must be comprised of rental real estate, mortgages, cash items and government securities. A REIT also must satisfy two income tests. First, at least 75 percent of a REIT's annual gross income must consist of real property rents, mortgage interest, gain from the sale of a real estate asset and certain other real estate-related sources. Second, at least 95 percent of a REIT's annual gross income must be derived from the income items from the above 75 percent test plus other ''passive income'' sources such as dividends and any type of interest.

For over three decades, the IRS has recognized that real estate investments abroad qualify as ''good assets'' and generate ''good income'' under the REIT tax rules. With that said, the treatment of foreign currency gains directly attributable to overseas real estate investment is not altogether clear, but its correct characterization is becoming increasingly important as REITs continue investing in the most attractive marketplaces for their shareholders. Similarly, as more and more countries begin to authorize REIT-like approaches to real estate investment, it is important that U.S. tax rules allow U.S. REITs to invest in these businesses without negatively affecting their own REIT status.

I do not believe this bill is controversial. The three previous changes to the REIT rules made over the past decade have been sponsored by many Members on both sides of the aisle, and we expect that RIDEA will follow in these bipartisan footsteps. It is also important to note that this bill is endorsed by the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts and the Real Estate Roundtable.

Madam Speaker, this is an opportunity for us to provide REITs the flexibility needed to remain competitive and to make other minor, but important, changes to the REIT rules. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting these changes.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a detailed summary of its provisions be printed in the RECORD.

The REIT Investment Diversification and Empowerment Act (''RIDEA'') includes five titles: Title I—Foreign Currency and Other Qualified Activities, Title II—Taxable REIT Subsidiaries, Title III—Dealer Sales, Title IV—Health Care REITs, and Title V—Foreign REITs.

As the REIT market develops and as REITs continue to expand their overseas investments, the issue of the correct characterization of foreign currency gains, and other types of non-specified income and assets, has become even more important. Title I would in effect codify existing law concerning the income derived, and assets held, by REITs in connection with their REIT-permissible activities outside of the U.S.

Specifically, Title I would treat as qualified REIT income foreign currency gains derived with respect to its business of investing in ''real estate assets'' outside of the U.S. Today REITs can achieve approximately the same results by establishing a ''subsidiary REIT'' in each currency zone in which it operates and securing a private letter ruling from the IRS. RIDEA would allow a REIT to obtain the same result by operating a qualified business unit that satisfies the 75 percent income and asset tests.

Title I also would provide the IRS with authority to determine whether certain types of foreign currency gains were qualifying income, as well as to provide that certain items of income not specifically listed in the REIT gross income provisions should not be taken into account in computing a REIT's gross income.

Under current law, even if a REIT were to earn a substantial amount of certain types of income that are not specified in the gross income baskets, the REIT could jeopardize its REIT status—even though these types of income may be directly attributable to the REIT's business of owning and operating commercial real estate. Examples include amounts attributable to recoveries in settlement of litigation and ''break up fees'' attributable to a failure to consummate a merger. The IRS has issued private letter rulings to taxpayers holding that the particular type of income should be considered either qualifying income or should be ignored for purposes of the REIT rules.

Under this provision, I would expect that the IRS would conclude, for example, that dividend-like items of income such as Subpart F income and income produced by holding stock of a passive foreign investment company either are considered qualified income for purposes of the REIT income tests are not taken into account for purposes of these tests.

Furthermore, Title I would conform the current REIT hedging rule to also apply to foreign currency gains, apply those rules for purposes of both REIT gross income tests and would make conforming changes to other REIT provisions reflecting foreign currency gains.

Title II would increase the limit on taxable REIT subsidiaries, TRS, securities from 20 percent to 25 percent, as originally contemplated in the REIT Modernization Act of 1999. The rationale for a 25 percent limit on TRSs remains the same today. The dividing line for testing a concentration on commercial real estate in the REIT rules has long been set at 25 percent, and even the mutual fund rule uses a 25 percent test. It is not too often that an industry requests Congress to increase the amount of income it can earn to a double level of taxation.

Title III updates the rules that require a REIT to be a long-term investor in real estate. A REIT is subject to a 100 percent tax on net income from sales of property in the ordinary course of business—''prohibited transactions'' or ''dealer sales''. In 1976, Congress recognized the need for a bright line safe harbor for determining whether a REIT's property sale constituted a prohibited transaction. Congress further liberalized these rules in 1978 and 1986 to better comport with industry practice and to simplify a REIT's ability to sell long-term investment property without fear of being taxed at a 100 percent rate. The current safe harbor exceptions for rental property and timber provide that a sale may avoid being classified as a prohibited transaction if it meets several requirements, including that the REIT own the property for at least 4 years and that each year it sell either less than seven properties or 10 percent of its portfolio, as measured by tax basis.

Largely because commercial real estate is increasingly recognized as a separate asset class that provides substantial diversification

and performance benefits for retirement savings, the real estate market has achieved greater levels of liquidity than ever before. This increased liquidity has provided real estate owners who have invested for the long term with more and more opportunities to maximize value by selling assets sooner than originally expected. REITs that rely on the safe harbor have been precluded from selling some of their investment assets because of the current 4-year requirement.

The safe harbor is intended to provide a clear dividing line between a REIT acting as an investor rather than a dealer. However, the 4-year requirement is arbitrary and not consistent with other Code provisions that define whether property is held for long term investments, e.g., the 1-year holding period to determine long-term capital gains treatment for individuals, and the 2-year holding period to distinguish whether the sale of a home is taxable because it is held for investment purposes. A 2-year holding period better reflects current economic realities.

In addition, the 10 percent limit that is now based on tax basis negatively impacts companies that are the least likely to have engaged in ''dealer'' activity. The most established REITs have typically held their properties the longest, resulting in low adjusted bases due to depreciation or amortization deductions. Thus, the aggregate bases of all the REITs properties will be relatively much lower for purposes of the safe harbor exception than for a REIT that routinely turns over its properties every 4 years. Accordingly, the REIT that holds its properties for the longer term is penalized.

In 1999, Congress adopted a provision that utilizes fair market value rules for purposes of calculating personal property rents associated with the rental of real property. The measurement change in Title III to the 10 percent test from tax basis to fair value is fully consistent with this 1999 provision.

Title IV parallels the treatment under the REIT rules of health care facilities to lodging facilities. Payments made from a subsidiary owned by a REIT to that REIT usually are not considered qualified income for REIT purposes. Congress in 1999 carved out an exception under which a REIT may establish a TRS that can lease lodging facilities from a REIT holding a controlling interest, with the payments to the REIT considered good ''rents'' under the REIT rules. Under these rules, a TRS is not allowed to operate or manage lodging or health care facilities; instead an independent contractor must do so.

When this change was made in 1999, health care operators did not object to bearing the risks associated with being liable as a long-term lessee. Recently, many operators of health care assets such as assisted living facilities have indicated that they would rather be independent operators of the facilities and instead rely on a REIT to bear all real estate-related financial risks. Most health care REITs now believe that the TRS restriction is interfering with their ability to manage their operations in the most efficient manner.

Title IV would allow a REIT's TRS to lease health care facilities from its controlling REIT so long as the facilities are operated and managed by an independent contractor. It also clarifies that a TRS's mere possession of a license which, for example, is sometimes required for State purposes, is not considered the operation or management of the facilities.

Governments around the world have recognized the success of REITs in the United States as creating ''liquid real estate'' for the first time in history. More than 20 countries have adopted REIT legislation, with the United Kingdom making the leap on January 1 and Germany expected to follow suit later this year. Although the Tax Code treats stock in a U.S. REIT as a qualified asset that generates qualifying income, current law does not afford the same treatment to the stock of non-U.S. REITs.

Instead of investing abroad either directly or in a joint venture, a U.S. REIT might want to invest through a REIT organized in that country. However, a company could lose its status as a U.S. REIT if it owns more than 10 percent of a foreign REIT's securities, even though the foreign company is the equivalent of a U.S. REIT. A U.S. REIT should have the flexibility in deciding what form its overseas real estate investment should take.

Title V would allow a U.S. REIT to acquire securities in a foreign REIT so long as that REIT has the same core attributes as a U.S. REIT. The Treasury Department would have the responsibility to analyze the foreign laws and rules to determine if the REITs organized in a particular country meet this test, much as it does in determining whether entities organized abroad are ''per se'' corporations under the ''check the box'' entity classification rules. In making these determinations, the Secretary should take into account whether the laws, stock market requirements, or market preferences in a country imbue listed foreign REITs with these characteristics: (1) At least 75 percent of the company's assets must be invested in real estate assets; (2) the foreign REIT either receives a dividends paid deduction or is exempt from corporate level tax; and (3) the foreign REIT is required to distribute at least 85 percent of its taxable income to shareholders on an annual basis.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this bipartisan legislation.

SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

HON. GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for some provisions of President Bush's FY08 budget request regarding illegal immigration.

His plan includes hiring 3,000 new Border Patrol agents, improving technology and infrastructure along the border, and helping end the failed ''catch and release'' policy. The President's proposal also offers assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies.

My district in Southern Arizona continues to bear the burden of our Nation's failed immigration policy, especially in our schools, hospitals, and law enforcement agencies. The President's ideas will, to some degree, help alleviate this crisis.

However, these policies must be a part of a comprehensive immigration reform plan to effectively secure the border and stop illegal immigration.

We not only need better border security and more support for border patrol agents, but also employer sanctions for those knowingly hiring illegal immigrants and a guest worker program. Most importantly, we need fair compensation for border communities struggling with the costs of illegal immigration.

I applaud the President for reaching out to Congress on this issue, and I look forward to working with the administration and Republicans and Democrats in Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

HONORING ALAMEDA COUNTY LIBRARY PROGRAM

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Alameda County Library. The Library's Write to Read Youth Literacy program at Juvenile Hall in San Leandro, CA, was honored on January 22, 2007 at a White House Ceremony in conjunction with the 2006 Coming Up Taller Awards. The Library's 8-year effort to help incarcerated youths read and write won a $10,000 Federal grant, the Coming Up Taller award, and plaudits at the White House Ceremony.

The Coming Up Taller Awards recognize and support outstanding community arts and humanities programs that celebrate the creativity of America's young people, and provide them with new learning opportunities and a chance to contribute to their communities. The awards also highlight the contributions that historians, scholars, librarians, and visual and performing arts make to families and communities by mentoring children.

The Alameda County Library's Write to Read Youth Literacy program at Juvenile Hall has introduced the joy of reading to more than 4,000 incarcerated youths. Founded in 1999, Write to Read motivates and inspires young people housed in the Alameda County Juvenile Hall to strengthen their reading skills and make meaningful connections to authors and books that can positively influence the choices they make in their own lives.

Offered 3 days a week, the Write to Read program enables youths to take books to their rooms, meet with authors, and engage in tutoring and book discussions.

Alameda County Librarian Jean Hofacket was present at the White House ceremony to receive the library award along with Amy Cheney, juvenile hall librarian, and Hannah Kefala of Alameda, a former juvenile hall resident who now attends Chabot College in Hayward.

Ms. Kefala said meeting authors through the program helped her learn ''my human rights'' and gave her pointers ''on how to improve my future.'' Her comments are a testament to the success of the Alameda County Library's Write to Read Youth Literacy program at Juvenile Hall.

I join the community in applauding the Alameda County Library's success and contributions to make a positive difference in the lives of youth incarcerated at the Juvenile Hall.

DELETING ONLINE PREDATORS

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the Deleting Online Predators Act of 2007, H.R. 1120. This legislation is a critical step to empower parents to exercise more control over what their children do on the Internet and to protect them from Internet predators.

In Lake County, IL, we have seen what can happen when Internet predators are able to make contact with children. In October 2005, Joseph Caprigno molested a 14 year-old boy he met on the Internet. Caprigno, a 40 year-old man, arranged to meet the boy in a 7–11 parking lot in an Internet chat room. In January a 20 year-old man, Michael Zbonski, molested a 16 year-old girl he met on MySpace.com. Frighteningly, not only did he communicate with this girl for 2 years on the Internet, he admitted to having a sexual relationship with one of the victim's underage friends.

The Deleting Online Predators Act is a commonsense piece of legislation designed to empower parents to play a more active role in their children's activities online. The bill calls on the Federal Trade Commission to issue consumer alerts and establish a unique Web site to better educate parents as to the dangers posed by Internet predators. Parents are the first and most important line of defense against these predators, and it is imperative to arm them with timely and accurate information to protect their children.

This bill also requires schools to prevent children from accessing social networking Web sites and chat rooms unless they are doing so for a legitimate educational purpose and are under adult supervision. It also requires public libraries to prevent children from accessing these Web sites unless they have the permission of a parent. I believe this is an entirely appropriate action to help parents determine what their children can and cannot do online. It seems foolish for the taxpayer to subsidize what amounts to a loophole by which children can circumvent their parent's wishes and unwittingly expose themselves to Internet predators.

Madam Speaker, Lake County also offers one more case that plainly demonstrates the need for this legislation. The Lake County State's Attorney recently filed Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse charges against two teachers who are accused of soliciting and arranging to molest underage students at the school where they taught. Jason Glick and James Lobitz didn't just molest two underage students, they arranged to do so using school-owned computer equipment and resources during school hours.

The cases against Jason Glick and James Lobitz are still pending, but by passing this bill, we can send a message to parents that just as we wouldn't allow sexual predators to roam the halls of a school, we will not allow them to infiltrate our schools over the Internet.

RECOGNIZING UWCHLAN TOWNSHIP POLICE CHIEF PATRICK DAVIS UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Uwchlan Township Police Chief Patrick Davis upon his retirement after more than 30 years of dedicated service to the people of Chester County and southeastern Pennsylvania.

Chief Davis has been one of the most prominent and important law enforcement officials in the 6th Congressional District, a trustworthy member of our public safety community and shining example of a selfless public service.

Chief Davis' broad range of experience and knowledge about the community was forged during more than three decades fighting crime in southeastern Pennsylvania. His distinguished career began in 1976 as a patrol officer with the Thornbury Township Police Department. A year later, he joined the Uwchlan Township Police Department, the start of an outstanding career that saw him rise through the ranks before eventually becoming chief of police in 1994.

As police chief in Uwchlan Township, he oversaw the actions of 26 full-time employees and helped keep our neighborhoods, streets and schools safe from crime and violence. I'm sure his son Andrew and wife Kathy are as proud of him as we are.

So I ask, Madam Speaker, that my colleagues join me in celebrating the exemplary career of Uwchlan Township Police Chief Patrick Davis. I'd like to personally thank him for his years of distinguished service to the community and congratulate him on a well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO A LIFETIME OF SERVICE BY MR. LESTER FOX OF SOUTH BEND, INDIANA

HON. JOE DONNELLY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 2007

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, today I pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of South Bend, Indiana, Lester J. Fox, who devoted his life to the service of his community. During the 1940's he served as a union leader at the Studebaker Corporation which led him to a new career as advocate for the unemployed, the elderly and the underserved.

He became director of Project ABLE in 1963 after the closing of the Studebaker plant, the largest employer in South Bend at the time. The experimental project developed and implemented a network of services for the many unemployed older workers left in the wake of this economic disaster.

With the newly created "War on Poverty" in 1965, Fox established the Regional Office of Economic Opportunity in Atlanta, Georgia, implementing the Economic Opportunity Act in six southeastern states over a two year period.

Fox returned to South Bend to become President and CEO of REAL Services, Inc., an organization that assesses the status and needs of the older adult population in Saint Joseph County. The agency's role was broadened twice, once to include the area Agency on Aging in five North Central Indiana counties, administering the Older American's Act and legislation related to the aged and disabled, and again in 1990, to manage the Community Action Agency serving low-income families.

Lester Fox has been awarded the Sagamore of the Wabash, the highest honor bestowed by governors of Indiana, on four separate occasions by four different governors. In 1996, Les was inducted into the South Bend Community Hall of Fame.

Fox has served on numerous boards, has been a member of the White House Conference on Aging, and was a Consultant to the U.S. Senate Committee on Aging.

So, today, on behalf of the citizens of northern Indiana, I thank Les Fox for his years of unselfish dedication. As he retires from 40 years as President of REAL Services, I pay special tribute to a man who exemplifies self sacrifice and serves as a role model for us all.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2119–S2183

Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 655–675, and S. Res. 85. **Pages S2164–65**

Measures Reported:

S. 200, to require the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey, to conduct a study on groundwater resources in the State of Alaska. (S. Rept. No. 110–20)

S. 235, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima Tieton Irrigation District. (S. Rept. No. 110–21)

S. 263, to amend the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes River Conservancy. (S. Rept. No. 110–22)

S. 264, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the rehabilitation of the Wallowa Lake Dam in Oregon, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 110–23)

S. 265, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a water resource feasibility study for the Little Butte/Bear Creek Subbasins in Oregon. (S. Rept. No. 110–24)

S. 266, to provide for the modification of an amendatory repayment contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the North Unit Irrigation District. (S. Rept. No. 110–25)

S. 220, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A & B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho. (S. Rept. No. 110–26)

S. 275, to establish the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument in the State of New Mexico, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 110–27) **Page S2164**

Iraq Sense of Congress—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 12:00 noon on Saturday, February 17, 2007, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 574, to express the sense of Congress on Iraq; that the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided between the Majority and Republican Leaders, or their designees; that the Republican Leader be in control of the time between 1:25–1:35 p.m., and the Majority Leader be in control of the time between 1:35 p.m.–1:45 p.m.; provided further, that at 1:45 p.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S2182**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaty:

Land-Based Sources Protocol to Cartegena Convention (Treaty Doc. No. 110–1).

The treaty was transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed. **Page S2182**

Appointments:

National Council on the Arts: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Minority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–83, the reappointment of the following Senator to serve as a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term of two years: Senator Bennett. **Page S2182**

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress: Senators Smith, Chambliss, Burr, and Brownback. **Page S2182**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Eli Whitney Debevoise II, of Maryland, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

Bijan Rafiekian, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2011.

Routine lists in the Army, Marine Corps. Pages S2182–83

Messages from the House: Page S2164

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Page S2164

Additional Cosponsors: Page S2165

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2166–81

Additional Statements: Pages S2163–64

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Pages S2181–82

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S2182

Privileges of the Floor: Page S2182

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 7:36 p.m., until 12 noon, on Saturday, February 17, 2007.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PAYING FOR COLLEGE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine college affordability, focusing on higher education, higher costs and higher student debt, and the Higher Education Act and its amendments, after receiving testimony from Jon H. Oberg, former researcher, Department of Education, Rockville, Maryland; Suze Orman, CNBC, and Tamara Draut, Demos Institute, both of New York, New York; and Sandy Baum, Skidmore College, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the College Board.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 80 public bills, H.R. 1110–1189; and 31 resolutions, H.J. Res. 37; H. Con. Res. 67–74; and H. Res. 172–193 were introduced. Pages H1891–96

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H1896–97

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 700, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects (H. Rept. 110–15);

H.R. 569, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–16);

H.R. 584, to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Education in Washington, DC, as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building, with amendments (H. Rept. 110–17);

H.R. 544, to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the ''Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse'' (H. Rept. 110–18);

H.R. 478, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the ''Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse'' (H. Rept. 110–19);

H.R. 399, to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse'' (H. Rept. 110–20);

H.R. 430, to designate the United States bankruptcy courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Conrad Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse,'' with amendments (H. Rept. 110–21); and

H.R. 429, to designate the United States courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse'' (H. Rept. 110–22); and

H.R. 800, to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, and to provide for mandatory injunctions for unfair labor practices during organizing efforts, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–23). Page H1891

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative McNulty to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. Page H1793

Disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 63, to disapprove of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq, by a yea-and-nay vote of 246 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 99. Pages H1793–1847

H. Res. 157, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution, was agreed to on Tuesday, February 13.

Adjournment Resolution: The House agreed by unanimous consent to H. Con. Res. 67, providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses. **Pages H1847–48**

Late Report: Agreed that the Committee on Financial Services have until midnight on Friday, February 23, 2007 to file a report on H.R. 556, to ensure national security while promoting foreign investment and the creation and maintenance of jobs, to reform the process by which such investments are examined for any effect they may have on national security, and to establish the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. **Page H1848**

Consideration of Motions to Suspend the Rules: The House agreed to H. Res. 161, to provide for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, by a Recorded vote of 220 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 101, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 100. **Pages H1848–54**

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007: H.R. 976, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, by a 2/3 Recorded vote of 360 ayes to 45 noes, Roll No. 102. **Pages H1854–60**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, February 28. **Page H1861**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Hoyer and Representative Van Hollen to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 27, 2007. **Page H1861**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Capps wherein she resigned from the Committee on the Budget. **Page H1861**

Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Representatives Kennedy, DeLauro, and Pryce (OH). **Page H1861**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1847.

Senate Referrals: S. Con. Res. 12 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services; S. 188 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and S. 487 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. **Page H1869**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1847, H1853, H1853–54, and H1860. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 8 a.m. on Friday, February 16 and at 6:21 p.m., the House stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of H. Con. Res. 67, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2007.

Committee Meetings

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense met in executive session to hold a hearing on Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Future of the Nation's Navigation Infrastructure. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Implementation of U.S. VISIT Entry/Exit Program. Testimony was heard from Bob Mochny, Acting Director, U.S. VISIT, Department of Homeland Security.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Forest Service: State and Private Forestry and Research. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the USDA, Forest Service: Abigail R. Kimball, Chief; James E. Hubbard, Deputy Chief; and Ann M. Bartuska, Deputy Chief, Research and Development.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on the Capitol Visitor Center. Testimony was heard from Stephen Ayers, Acting Architect of the Capitol; Robert Hixon, Capitol Visitor Center Project Executive; and Terrel Dorn, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO.

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, on Fiscal Year 2007 held a hearing on Emergency Supplemental Request. Testimony was heard from Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of State.

IRS AND THE TAX GAP

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on IRS and the Tax Gap. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: Mark W. Everson, Commissioner; and Nina E. Olson, National Taxpayer Advocate, both with the IRS; and J. Russell George, Inspector General, Tax Administration; Michael Brostek, Director, Tax Issues, Strategic Issues Team, GAO; and a public witness.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Concluded hearings on Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TRANSPORTATION WORKFORCE SECURITY CLEARANCES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection held a hearing entitled ''Impact of Background and Security Clearances on the Transportation Workforce.'' Testimony was heard from Robert D. Jamison, Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION; OVERSIGHT PLAN

Committee on House Administration: Met for organizational purposes.

The Committee approved an Oversight Plan for the 110th Congress.

OVERSIGHT—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Held an oversight hearing entitled ''Reports, Audits and Investigations by the General Accountability Office (GAO) and the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Regarding the Department of the Interior.'' Testimony was heard from Earl E. Devaney, Inspector General, Department of the Interior; and Robin M. Nazzaro, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D175)*

H.R. 434, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through July 31, 2007. Signed on February 15, 2007 (Public Law 110–4)

H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007. Signed on February 15, 2007 (Public Law 110–5)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of February 19 through February 24, 2007

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House Committees

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

12 noon, Saturday, February 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Saturday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 574, Iraq Sense of Congress and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at approximately 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

4 p.m., Tuesday, February 20

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abercrombie, Neil, Hawaii, E380
Brown, Henry E., Jr., S.C., E383
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E384
Donnelly, Joe, Ind., E386
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E375, E376
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E386
Giffords, Gabrielle, Ariz., E385
Graves, Sam, Mo., E373, E375, E376, E378, E378, E380, E380, E383
Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E386
Langevin, James R., R.I., E383
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E380
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E374, E375
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E378
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E380
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E385
Udall, Mark, Colo., E373, E375, E376, E378, E378, E379
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E377

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.