

not one dime for port security grants. Despite the Administration's unwillingness to provide any substantial resources for port security, Congress has appropriated almost \$350 million for port security grants. Nevertheless, Congress has provided only six percent of the necessary funding and the Administration has awarded only \$92 million, less than one-third, of the available funds.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go to secure our maritime system. To date, the Coast Guard has completed vulnerability assessments at only eight of our Nation's 350 ports. Moreover, the Coast Guard has conducted vulnerability assessments at only three of the top 25 ports. It has not conducted vulnerability assessments at any of our largest ports, including Los Angeles/Long Beach, New Orleans, Houston, New York, San Francisco, Philadelphia, or Seattle/Tacoma. At current funding levels, the Coast Guard will not complete assessments at the 55 largest ports until 2009. In addition, the Administration proposes to transfer the responsibility for conducting vulnerability assessments from the Coast Guard to the new Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IAIP) Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). I am concerned about transferring these responsibilities for vital security plans to a DHS agency that has been in operation for just three weeks and has few staff members. The Administration must dedicate the personnel and financial resources to get these vulnerability assessments done quickly and efficiently.

Moreover, the Administration must support funding to secure our ports and facilities. The Coast Guard has estimated that facility security will cost \$4.4 billion over the next 10 years. To date, the Administration has only awarded \$92.3 million of the available port security grant funds. When the Maritime Administration solicited requests for these grants, it received requests totaling seven times the available amount. Although Congress has provided an additional \$254 million for port security, no further grants have been awarded.

Last week, the U.S. House of Representatives considered H. Con. Res. 95, the FY2004 Budget Resolution. Cong. Spratt, Ranking Democratic Member of the Committee on Budget, offered a substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 95 that included \$1.5 billion specifically for port security grants. Regrettably, the Republicans defeated this amendment. However, in the Senate, Senator HOLLINGS offered an amendment to its FY2004 Budget Resolution that would provide \$2 billion (\$1 billion in FY2004 and \$1 billion in FY2005) to fund the security requirements of the Maritime Transportation Security Act. It passed by voice vote. As the Budget Resolution goes to Page 4 conference, I urge this Administration and this Congress to strongly support Senator HOLLINGS' amendment and ensure that we begin to provide the necessary resources to secure our national maritime system.

I continue to believe that securing our Nation's ports and the cargo that moves through them is a Federal responsibility. All Americans, whether you live in a port city or whether you live in Boise, Idaho will benefit from that security. The impact on our economy and on all Americans if our Nation's ports are closed down for a few weeks because of a terrorist attack is simply too great. Factory lines will close down. Refineries will run out of oil. Stores will run out of goods.

I urge this Administration and this Congress to act now to ensure that we provide the necessary resources to secure our ports, facilities, and vessels.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND APPRECIATION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

SPEECH OF

**HON. TAMMY BALDWIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, men and women in our armed forces are engaged in battle in Iraq. These volunteers pledged their lives to protect and defend the United States of America.

No words can express the gratitude that I have for their willingness to sacrifice and to risk their lives in a foreign land, far from home. No words can express the compassion and empathy I have for their families and friends, who must carry on with their lives while worrying about their loved ones. Our country must always recognize and honor the loyalty, courage, and commitment of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. I do so today and every day that they are in harm's way.

It is not only our regular military forces who are engaged in this war. National Guard and Reserve units from every state in the union have been called to active duty to serve our country. They have left their jobs and their homes, their husbands and wives, their daughters and sons. They join a long American tradition of citizen soldiers. From the Revolutionary War's Minute Men to the Doughboy's of World War I, from Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders to Vietnam's Green Berets, Americans have answered the call to serve. I am thankful for their courage and sacrifice.

Honoring our men and women in uniform is absolutely the right thing to do. This Congress must recognize and praise our fellow citizens who are placing their lives on the line. It is for this reason that I voted in favor of H. Con. Res. 104. I completely agree with the main message of the resolution: "unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation . . . to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery; and to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq."

I do have significant reservations about other language contained in the resolution, particularly language in the preamble. I strongly disagree with the section of the resolution that notes the President's notice to Congress that "reliance by the United States on further diplomatic and other peaceful means alone will neither adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq nor likely lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq." In the absence of an imminent threat to the United States, working with our allies and other nations to address this threat is the ap-

propriate way to proceed. While the Administration made efforts to engage the world in support of weapons inspections, they did not exhaust means short of war, prior to commencing military action.

I do not support the concept of preemptive military action, without an imminent threat to our national security and American lives. The Administration's preemption doctrine sets a dangerous precedent, and dramatically lowers the threshold for the use of military force. Is a first strike how we will approach the nearly 30 other countries that possess or are developing weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them? And how will we speak with any moral authority to other sovereign nations who seek to take things into their own hands against other states?

I also disagree with the President's linkage of war in Iraq to the September 11 terrorist attacks. The Administration has failed to establish this linkage with any convincing evidence. It is wrong to continue to cloud this critical distinction in the minds of the American people. It also undermines our nation's credibility in the world. I reject the assertion in the resolution's preamble that the "use of military force against Iraq is consistent with necessary ongoing efforts by the United States and other countries against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001."

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the Majority chose to politicize this resolution in support of the troops. This should have been a clean resolution that focused solely on our deep appreciation for our men and women in uniform and their families. Such a resolution would have commanded a unanimous vote of this House, showing our national unity, and conveyed to our troops our unequivocal support for them.

I voted in favor of the resolution, despite my fundamental disagreement with these extraneous provisions, because I felt it was more important to stand in solidarity with our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. My vote is not an endorsement of any other sentiments contained within the resolution, nor should it be construed that way.

I continue to believe that war is not the answer to the threat of Saddam Hussein. I have taken an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. I cannot, and will not, simply delegate the responsibility to the President of the United States. As a Member of Congress, I have a responsibility to review the conduct of the war, engage in the policy debate, and cast my vote in the best interests of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, some will say that questioning the Administration in a time of war is unpatriotic and dangerous to the war effort. My oath compels me to disagree. A democratic country must always have a debate, must always have questions raised, and Congress must never become a rubber stamp.

I am not the first patriotic American to believe this, and I will not be the last. I would like to quote a man known as "Mr. Republican" when he served honorably in the U.S. Senate for many, many years. Senator Robert Taft of Ohio understood that maintaining democracy in time of war requires debate. Two weeks after the attack on Pearl Harbor, on December 19, 1941, he said:

Of course that criticism should not give any information to the enemy. But too many people desire to suppress criticism simply because they think that it will give some comfort to the enemy to know that there is such criticism. If that comfort makes the enemy feel better for a few moments, they are welcome to it as far as I'm concerned, because the maintenance of the right of criticism in the long run will do the country maintaining it a great deal more good than it will do the enemy, and will prevent mistakes which might otherwise occur.

I fervently hope for a short military engagement, minimal civilian casualties, and the safe return of American men and women in uniform. Over the past several months, I have heard from thousands of people from throughout my district concerning the situation in Iraq. Nearly everyone expressed their concerns about the uncertainties of a pre-emptive war with Iraq. It is my belief that, before young American men and women are sent to fight in any war, we should work with the international community to exhaust every alternative short of war. Now that war has begun, all Americans—those who favored military action and those who favored alternative approaches—think of our troops and wish for their quick victory and safe return.

Our work as citizens and policy makers does not stop with this expression of our support for the troops. The start of war does not end the debate and it does not end the dissent. It is imperative that the President and our nation not only honor our commitment to rebuild Iraq following the war, but also rebuild our relations with the nations of this world so that we might once again work closely together to avoid war and maintain peace in solving global challenges.

### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

#### HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 25, 2003*

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 182nd anniversary of Greek independence. Greece is a nation with a great democratic tradition. Athens and the United States share the same values of freedom and democracy. We are both part of what the distinguished scholar Karl Deutsch aptly labeled a "pluralistic security community," a community based on shared values and common interests. Indeed, despite all the current differences, the Euro-Atlantic Alliance, in which our nations are firmly embedded, remains the cornerstone of the zone of the democratic peace.

Maintaining and extending the zone of peace is the most important task for democracies. Greece and the United States have been united in this endeavor for decades. We were allies in the fight against Naziism during World War II, we were allies in the victorious fight against Soviet Communism. After the end of the Cold War, we have also been allies in confronting new threats to world peace. When the powder keg on the Balkans exploded, for example, the Greek and the U.S. governments worked together by promoting peace and supporting humanitarian aid. Particularly with respect to Kosovo, the Greek government's help was essential.

We are also allies in the war against terror, the greatest threat to global peace. Following the September 11 attacks, Greece immediately assured us of its support, and Greek aircrews secured our skies with NATO AWACS. Greece also joined the International Assistance Force in Afghanistan by dispatching a frigate with a crew of over 200. Athens further successfully fought terrorism on its own soil by arresting members of the November 17 group. The arrest and trial of these terrorists has created a sense of security not only among Greek society but—when we look to the Olympic Games in Athens in 2004—among the wider international community that threats of this kind can be mastered.

We are also allies in the goal of helping achieve a just a permanent solution to the Cypriot conflict. I applaud the work of the Greek government in working with their colleagues in the Republic of Cyprus along with the leaders of Turkey to promote a peaceful settlement of the situation in Cyprus and reunification of the island. I regret that the negotiations failed but I hope that a solution can be achieved in the near future.

Finally, let me conclude by stressing that good U.S.-Greek relations are not merely achieved at governmental and official levels. Instead, the Greek Americans in our country enrich our lives and provide for a better cultural understanding. The area of Queens in New York City, parts of which I represent, is home to the largest Greek population outside of Greece. These people are well integrated in our society. As their interactions form the basis for a healthy relationship at all levels, I am optimistic that the U.S.-Greek relationship will remain marked by friendship and trust.

### IN MEMORY OF MAJOR GREGORY STONE

#### HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 26, 2003*

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the deep sorrow I share with every Idahoan at the loss of Maj. Gregory Stone. Maj. Stone died early Tuesday at an Army field hospital in Kuwait, the second man to die from wounds suffered in a grenade attack last Saturday on soldiers at Camp Pennsylvania. Maj. Stone was the Air Liaison Officer there with the Army's 101st Airborne Division.

He was a highly trained military officer with 20 years of distinguished Air Force and Idaho Air National Guard service. Maj. Stone died in a theater of war on the other side of the world, fighting to free a foreign people from tyranny and his own countrymen from fear. In that, he was true to America's most cherished values and traditions. The example of his citizenship and dedication to duty, and how we all seek to emulate it, will be his enduring legacy.

Yet it was as a son and father of two young boys living in Boise that Gregory Stone will be best and most dearly remembered. The sadness felt by the people of a proud and grateful state pales by comparison with his family's grief at his passing. I can only offer them my humble condolences, and the hope that a sure knowledge of Gregory's self-sacrifice and heroism will provide some succor in the difficult days to come.

Maj. Stone embodied the best of America. I am proud to represent the family of such a man. They have my personal thanks, and a promise to preserve those virtues for which their loved one gave the last full measure of devotion.

### SHOCK AND AWE

#### HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 26, 2003*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in "shock and awe." I am in shock and awe of the courage and bravery that our military women and men have shown overseas in the fight to liberate Iraq. They fight our fight, and they do it without question because their Commander-in-Chief asked them to.

I rise today also in "shock and awe" of the actions this past Thursday on the House floor. Late in the night, the budget resolution passed by the skin of its teeth, but those teeth still cut deep. They cut deep to the tune of \$14.6 billion in unspecified cuts to mandatory veterans' benefits programs with \$463 million of that coming in the next year. Ninety percent of those cuts come from cash payments to service-disabled veterans, low income wartime veterans and their survivors. Montgomery G.I. Bill education benefits, vocational rehabilitation and independent living programs for service-disabled veterans, and subsidies for VA home loans also face cuts at the very time when troops fight through sandstorms and fierce enemy resistance. While at war, their benefits are stripped down to avoid "waste, fraud and abuse." Do government programs helping low-income veterans or service-disabled veterans fall under "waste, fraud and abuse?" According to the Republican Leadership in the House, they do.

Along with mandatory spending, VA discretionary spending takes a tremendous cut as well: \$14.2 billion over the next ten years, and 96 percent of discretionary spending is veterans' health care. Priority 8 veterans have already been declared ineligible, and co-payments will increase for pharmaceutical drugs and primary care. In reducing discretionary spending, the Republican budget prevents more veterans from receiving health care and makes room for its tax cuts benefiting the wealthiest Americans, Americans who probably don't have children in fatigues. During wartime, this is shameful and disrespectful to the military women and men who make secure the very freedom that we enjoy.

The "shock and awe" campaign apparently is not limited to military conflict in Iraq. It has engaged the budgetary process and threatens the ability of the U.S. government to care for its own. If we all support our troops and wish the swift return home of American daughters and sons, how can we find it in ourselves to cut funding to programs that extend a hand to the soldiers that said, "No, you stay here. I'll go?" There is no justice in it, and no pair of night-vision goggles will see justice in the budget passed last Thursday night.