

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING JOHN M. McCANN

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate John M. McCann of Chicago on receiving the Dr. Robert Hamilton Special Service Award in recognition of his years of excellence and dedication to the DePaul University Athletic Department.

John McCann is being honored for his years of service to DePaul University as sports information director. From 1958 to 1973, John was the man responsible for the promotion of DePaul athletics, years that produced some of the most exciting times in Blue Demons history.

A lifelong Chicagoan, John was raised on the city's west side, attending St. Philip's School. During World War II, John was in the U.S. Navy, stationed on the USS Case. Upon his return from the war, John enrolled at DePaul University, beginning a relationship that would last a lifetime.

After graduating from DePaul in 1950, John began his career in education, first working as a teacher at DePaul Academy. He later joined the ranks of teachers and administrators in the Chicago public schools, eventually becoming the principal of Lakeview's Louis J. Agassiz Elementary School, a position he retired from in 1984.

But John's true passion was always with DePaul athletics. As sports information director, John oversaw the publicity and media coverage of dominant years in Blue Demons basketball, including the great teams of the 1960s that starred Howie Carl and Billy Haig. John was an integral part of the DePaul basketball family that was led by the legendary Coach Ray Meyer and his longtime assistant, the late Frank McGrath.

To John and his wife, Cay, family has always been a priority. Their son Kevin has followed in his footsteps as an educator, rising to his current position as principal of Jamieson School in Lincoln Park. John is most proud, though, that Kevin and his two siblings, Mary and John, all attended his beloved alma mater, DePaul.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the people of Chicago and the members of the DePaul family in recognizing the great honor being bestowed upon John McCann and wish him continued happiness in the future.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GEORGE AND VIE OBERN

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to two special citizens, George and Vie Obern.

George and Vie Obern have dedicated themselves to improving conditions for bicyclists, hikers and equestrians throughout Santa Barbara County. George and Vie Obern's work led to the successful development of local trail and pathway projects, including the Maria Ygnacia Creek Bikepath, the Coastal Route Bikepath, the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and many others.

During the 1970s, George and Vie Obern assumed a leadership role in the development of many bikepaths and trails, working to bring consensus among local homeowners, special districts, Caltrans, the Southern Pacific Railroad and county government regarding the need to build six miles of paved bikepath in the midst of an urbanized area.

The Coastal Route and Maria Ygnacia Creek bikepaths are the primary recreational facilities for the Goleta Valley and are two of the best urban pathways in the State. On January 20th, 2004, the Santa Barbara County Supervisors designated the Coastal Bike Route in Goleta Valley as the "Obern Trail" in recognition of the hard work and dedication that George and Vie Obern exhibited in their work to develop the trails. It is my pleasure and honor to recognize the Oberns at this time for their work in our community. The generosity and dedication of people like George and Vie Obern are what make our community special, and I am happy to salute them.

PAYING RESPECTS TO HAL SHROYER

HON. BOB BEAUPREZ

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to a great American, a great Coloradan and a great Republican.

My good friend, Hal Shroyer of Adams County, Colorado, is without question a giant in Colorado politics. As one who has toiled through the political party leadership myself from precinct committeeman to State chairman, I can honestly say that my State, our country and our Republican Party have no greater patriot and warrior than Mr. Shroyer.

For decades he has fought valiantly for the causes and ideals of the GOP. Having served at all levels of party leadership, including his chairmanship of the Adams County GOP, Hal Shroyer has represented the ideals and philosophy of the Republican Party with civility, grace and patriotism. A shrewd strategist, a motivating leader and an appropriate role model for all who relish the thrill of partisan battle yet respect the integrity of the local opposition, Hal Shroyer set the example in Colorado of what it means to be a party leader.

Mr. Speaker, we unfortunately live in an age where honest differences about principles and policy too often give way to petty and personal attacks. Hal Shroyer may be among the last of a dying breed. He is a great man of integrity

and principle, a man who loves America more than anything, a great husband to his late wife Maxine, a great friend to all who have the pleasure of making his acquaintance and, put simply, a decent and honorable American.

Mr. Speaker, Hal Shroyer of Adams County, Colorado, is a true American treasure; and it is my tremendous honor to pay my most heartfelt respects to him and his legacy of leadership and patriotism.

FEBRUARY SCHOOL OF THE MONTH

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce the Early Childhood program in the Hempstead Union Free School District as School of the Month in the Fourth Congressional District for February 2004.

The principal of the Early Childhood program is Florence Galloway, and the superintendent of schools is Dr. Nathaniel Clay. The Early Childhood program serves almost 1,000 students in the village of Hempstead's first Full Day Kindergarten program. The faculty work to ensure children begin life on the right path, with a strong commitment to education and family values.

The administrators and teachers of the Full Day Kindergarten program are committed to teaching every child to read by the third grade through an enriched curriculum of math, science, and social studies. The students are taught socialization skills that revolve around respect, sharing and interaction, a superior combination.

This invaluable program was spearheaded by the current principal, Mrs. Florence Galloway, in 2003. Mrs. Galloway has dedicated her life to improving the classroom and school environment, while remaining active within the community. During her 48 years in education, Mrs. Galloway dedicated 35 to the Hempstead School District. After more than 2 decades of service at the Marshall Street Primary School, Mrs. Galloway accepted the position of coordinator for the district's pre-K program. Shortly after, Mrs. Galloway took on the role of principal for the district's newly formed Early Childhood program, a task she has proudly served for 11 years. Mrs. Galloway will be retiring this year after nearly a half-century of impeccable service. She will be greatly missed not only in Hempstead but in the entire Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, the faculty and students of the Early Childhood program, along with the community, have created a wonderful learning environment. I am proud to name the Hempstead Early Childhood program as the school of the month for February 2004.

• 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.

A LIFE OF SERVICE AND
COURAGE—A TRIBUTE**HON. KAY GRANGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a young man from my district who exemplified great courage while serving his country. Army Spc. Jason Chappell was fatally wounded 2 weeks ago in Iraq when a suicide bomber hit his vehicle.

Chappell displayed his extraordinary commitment to fight for freedom and justice. Freedom and justice are the building blocks of democracy, and these values are the heartbeat of all our soldiers who fight for our country every day.

Chappell's wife, Stephanie, reflects on her husband's kind nature by describing him as an "angel" who "wanted nothing more than to help other people."

Specialist Chappell served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division's Company B in Fort Hood, Texas. He is remembered by his family as one who was devoted to family and country and dedicated to the causes of justice, freedom, and peace.

He lived an extraordinary life, rich with love, laughter, and pride. As a Member of Congress, I rise today to acknowledge Specialist Chappell and his family for his sacrifice and service to the cause of freedom and the war against terror.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Jason Chappell's wife and family. May you be strengthened and comforted in this challenging time.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1385, BREAST
CANCER STAMP EXTENSION**HON. RAHM EMANUEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor and in strong support of H.R. 1385, which extends the authorization of a special postage stamp to benefit breast cancer research.

Since its introduction in July 1998, the Breast Cancer Stamp has provided the American people with a way to directly support breast cancer research. The stamp carries a seven cent surcharge, which goes directly to the life-saving research efforts of the National Cancer Institute and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. The American people have demonstrated that they care about this research by purchasing over 430 million stamps. That's a direct, voluntary contribution of over \$30 million to this cause, one stamp at a time.

The American public has opened their hearts to women everywhere by acknowledging that breast cancer is a disease which can affect all of our families. Indeed, more than 2 million women in the United States have been diagnosed and treated for breast cancer. One in eight women will develop breast cancer during her lifetime, and 40,000 American women will die from the disease this year. Breast cancer is an issue that we should

all care about, particularly since women from every State, of every ethnic and economic background are diagnosed and treated for the disease every year.

In my home State of Illinois, researchers estimate that over 10,000 women will develop breast cancer during the coming year. Their lives depend on early detection and early, effective treatment. When Americans send letters and cards using the Breast Cancer Stamp, they aren't just showing that they've contributed to the cause of research. They are reminding their friends and loved ones about the importance of self examination and mammograms. They are promoting vigilance, awareness, and involvement in the fight against breast cancer. They are showing that increased awareness makes a considerable difference for every woman diagnosed with breast cancer.

The American people have shown they recognize the necessity of investment in breast cancer research through their continued purchase of these stamps, and I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of this program. I also remind my colleagues that there is still work to be done.

Along with this bill, I am proud to have cosponsored six other breast cancer related bills which currently await further action in this Congress. Among them are proposals to provide funding and authorization for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to expand research on environmental and age-related factors in breast cancer prevalence, authorization of additional funding to the National Institute of Health for early detection and prevention programs, and legislation to require private health insurance plans to provide coverage for minimum hospital stays for major breast cancer-related surgery. I ask my colleagues to honor the spirit of the millions of citizens who made the Breast Cancer Stamp a success, by pledging your support to these potentially life-saving measures still awaiting action.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for introducing this important legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1385.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER
CONGRESSMAN JAMES M. HANLEY**HON. JAMES T. WALSH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to former Congressman James M. Hanley. Mr. Hanley, who died earlier this month, served eight terms in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1965 to 1981. At his retirement at the conclusion of the 96th Congress, he was chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I have been fortunate to know Congressman Hanley throughout my life, as he was a resident of the same Tipperary Hill neighborhood in Syracuse, NY, in which I grew up. A graduate of St. Lucy's Academy in Syracuse and a veteran of World War II, Congressman Hanley won an upset election for Congress in 1964 based upon his reputation as an active community leader and successful businessman.

Mr. Hanley translated the keys to his business success as a local funeral director into his Congressional office operations, attending to personal details and providing timely response to constituent requests. He was a thoughtful and gracious man who actively legislated on behalf of the best interests of the people he served.

After his retirement, the Federal office building in downtown Syracuse was named James M. Hanley Federal Building by this institution in his honor. On behalf of the people of the central New York district he represented, I extend our deepest sympathies and thanks to his wife Rita, son Peter, daughter Christine, four grandchildren, and great-grandson.

Mr. Speaker, I also respectfully request that remarks made during the Hon. James M. Hanley funeral at St. Patrick's Church in Syracuse, NY, be embodied into the RECORD. Remarks were spoken by John Mahoney, former Chief of Staff to the late Representative James M. Hanley:

Thirty years or so ago, after a tough redistricting, Jim ended up with a Congressional seat that ran from Oswego County to the Pennsylvania border. It was so politically lopsided, even the cows were enrolled Republicans.

The campaign was brutal—16 to 20 hours a day.

On one particular day, we started off about 6:00 a.m. at the gates of Crouse Hinds, shaking hands with both the graveyard shift coming off duty and the first shift going on.

During the course of the morning, Jim did a radio talk show in Syracuse, then went to a neighborhood coffee klatch in Cazenovia, spoke at a service club luncheon in Norwich, and met with a farm group outside Deposit. We then drove back up to Oxford for a Dinner, and about 10:00 headed back toward Syracuse—because we had to be at another plant gate at 6:15 in the morning.

Somewhere outside of Sherburne, I found myself nodding behind the wheel. Since there were just the two of us, and Jim was almost asleep already, I said "I've got to stop for coffee or we'll end up in a ditch, and some farmer will find us after the last snow in March."

As we sat at a semi-circular counter—I with my eyes at half-mast, and Jim with his jaw only an inch or so off the counter—I caught a glint of recognition in the eye of a truck driver across from us. He sat there stirring his coffee and stared at Jim's bedraggled appearance. Finally he said, "There must be some benefit to that business that I JUST CAN'T SEE."

The mysterious benefit that he couldn't see was the very benefit that I knew drove Jim Hanley. It was the opportunity to serve others: the ability to stand up for the little guy.

Jim, who was a bread-and-butter liberal of the old school, saw a unique beauty in the people who were up against the odds: the impoverished veteran; the kid from the ghetto who had two strikes against him before he was seven; the widow trying to survive on Social Security; the abused family; the breadwinner broken by unemployment; the farmer driven to the wall by corporate agribusiness.

He knew that the comfortable and the connected would always be able to fend for themselves. But what about those who were merely guests in the world of the "haves?" They needed an empathetic voice.

Jim was a simple man with a knack for unraveling the complicated; he was a patient man who was never very patient when it came to the plight of the have-nots; he was a patriotic man who wore his patriotism in

his heart, not on his sleeve; he was a deeply moral man who disdained the outward trappings of feigned piety; he was the eternal optimist in an increasingly foreboding world.

He also believed that government was the instrument of the people, not its enemy, and that some of the worst errors a society could produce were sins of omission rather than sins of commission.

One might be inclined to think that today marks the end of an era—but that only happens when we bury both the body and the spirit—and we certainly aren't doing that today. There are today literally hundreds of young and middle-aged people who have been inspired by Jim's love of the little guy.

This legacy will never die.

And speaking of love and legacies, a subject that was nearest and dearest to Jim was his family. He spoke often, fondly and almost reverentially, of his mother and father, Mike and Alice Gillick Hanley; and, of course, he idolized Rita, Peter, Chris, and Jimmy, Jim, Patrick, Liza and Meg. It's often said that God never takes someone home, but what he sends a new light in his place. And so today, as Jim ascends that glorious staircase, we welcome his and Rita's newest heir, on month old Dylan Michael.

A part of Jim's other family is also present this morning—the team who worked side by side with him on behalf of the folks in Central New York. Tom DeYulia, Kate Ryan, Mike Kinsella, Bob Warne, Jim Ryan and several others. I know the thoughts I express are shared by each of them as well.

I would be remiss at this point, and I know Jim would be upset with me, if I didn't shift gears and include at least one humorous anecdote in my remarks.

As many of you realize, Jim was known affectionately on Capitol Hill as "Gentleman Jim." His civilized approach to everyone he met ran to the heart of his beliefs—the dignity of the individual.

Sometimes that philosophy took on comical overtones.

Jim knew that one of the highest forms of respect was remembering another's first name. He had a legendary reputation for that.

What many people didn't realize was that Jim had a slight impairment in one ear and so sometimes his hearing was skewed.

He remembered what he heard, but he didn't always hear names correctly.

One day at the Capitol, I was approached by an old friend, Dick Conlon, who was the staff director on one of the committees. He said, "John I have a favor to ask. Jim is always very gracious to me. He goes out of his way to stop and chat. But he invariably calls me Bill—and it's embarrassing—especially if someone else is present." I said I'd take care of it, and proceeded to explain the situation to Jim. Jim said, "I always thought his name was Bill." I repeated that it was Dick.

A week or so later Conlon stopped me again, and with a shrug of disappointment said, "Thanks a lot. Hanley came up to a group of us yesterday, smiled and stuck out his hand to me, paused for a second or two and, then said 'Hi, uh, Tom. Keep up the good work.'"

At this point, I think its time for me to depart gracefully. I have been blessed with the friendship and trust of one of God's truly fine men.

Jim, thanks for the chance to share in a beautiful life.

In your own words, "Till then . . ."

A LIFE OF SERVICE AND COURAGE

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a young man from my district who exemplified great courage while serving his country. Private First Class Ervin Dervishi was fatally wounded two weeks ago in Iraq when his unit was attacked by grenade fire.

Private Dervishi displayed his extraordinary commitment to fight for freedom and justice. Freedom and justice are the building blocks of democracy, and these values are the heartbeat of all immigrants, like Private Dervishi, who fight for our country every day.

Born in Albania, Private Dervishi came to America with his brother and his parents in search of a better life for their family. He quickly enrolled in his local high school and became a heralded athlete on the soccer field. Not merely settling for citizenship alone, Private Dervishi wanted to contribute to society. That's why he began participating in a two-year volunteer program called Young Explorers with the Waxahachie Police Department. At his memorial service, Private Dervishi's adviser for Young Explorers, Police Chief Nathan Bickerstaff, praised this young man for his enthusiastic nature and fascination with law enforcement. Police Chief Bickerstaff smiled as he recalled Private Dervishi telling him that someday he would become a police officer.

Private Dervishi moved to Fort Worth and joined the Army's 4th Infantry Division in Fort Hood, Texas, after graduating from Western Hills High School. After deployment to Iraq, Private Dervishi showed exemplary combat skills and was present at the capture of Saddam Hussein. He was laid to rest with military honors, and Brig. Gen. Robert Crear presented the family with two distinctive posthumous decorations—the Purple Heart and Bronze Star—for their son's service. High-ranking officials of the Albanian government, including President Alfred Moisiu, have also recognized Private Dervishi's mark in the world by conferring the Golden Eagle Medalion on Private Dervishi. This award is rarely given, but it marks Private Dervishi as a martyr for freedom and peace for two countries.

Private Dervishi is remembered by his family and peers as a true friend who was devoted to family and country and dedicated to the causes of justice, freedom, and peace.

Private Dervishi understood more about freedom in his short life than many will in an entire lifetime. He lived an extraordinary life, rich with love, laughter, and pride. As a Member of Congress, I rise today to acknowledge Private Dervishi and his family for their sacrifice and service to the cause of freedom and the war against terror.

In his eulogy, Police Chief Bickerstaff vowed to carry a photo of Private Dervishi as a reminder of his ultimate sacrifice, saying "he will always be a hero in my eyes."

Our thoughts and prayers go out to the Dervishi family. May you be strengthened and comforted in this devastating time.

IN RECOGNITION OF JACK T. GENTRY

HON. ROY BLUNT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has distinguished himself in southwest Missouri by his commitment to improving our manufacturing sector and expanding our markets abroad. Jack T. Gentry of Springfield, MO, is a builder, creator, innovator, and motivator. He has worked aggressively to give manufacturers a voice in their community and government. Ten years ago, he was the driving force in creating the Springfield Area Manufacturers Association (SAMA), the region's first manufacturer's association, and then served as its president. In September 2002, SAMA broadened its focus to include 40 manufacturers throughout southwest Missouri, and the name was changed to the Southwest Area Manufacturers Association. Today the organization represents more than 60 manufacturing companies.

The association's mission and Jack Gentry's aim is to represent the economic, political, educational, and social interests of southwest Missouri area manufacturers and their employees, while promoting the betterment of the local economy and the environment, as well as the well being of the manufacturing industry in southwest Missouri.

Jack Gentry has always been ahead of manufacturing trends and issues. More than a decade ago, Jack and the Manufacturing Association began taking action on issues that are center stage in manufacturing today. With his leadership, the Association developed awareness programs about how to find, create, and train a literate labor force. The association contributed \$37,000 to public schools for technology and provided career awareness opportunities for high school students by hosting plant tours, internships, and school-to-work initiatives. In 1993, Positronic Industries, Jack's company and a founding SAMA member, began working with the U.S. Department of Labor and Ozarks Technical Community College to develop company-paid apprenticeships in order to meet the need for a skilled workforce. To date, 128 employees have completed their training in nine areas and received Department of Labor certification.

The association also initiated discussion about the impact of taxes, workers' compensation, and health care costs on the manufacturing sector with government leaders. It was the first time in southwest Missouri that manufacturers spoke with a unified voice about their concerns.

Positronic Industries, founded by Jack in 1966, embodies his manufacturing philosophy—work smart, expand markets, keep ahead of trends, and deliver a reliable, dependable product. The bedrock of that philosophy is a workforce of skilled employees. Positronic employs 800 individuals worldwide manufacturing high performance, high reliability electronic connectors in ten facilities located throughout southwest Missouri, Puerto Rico, France, and Singapore.

In the face of adversity, Jack has demonstrated repeatedly both his commitment to his employees and his refusal to quit. When the Positronic plant in Rogersville, MO, was

destroyed by fire in 1983, Jack promised to rebuild and put the 200 employees back to work quickly. He kept his promise. In 6 weeks, the plant was back in full production with full employment. In the two decades that followed, Jack's superior management skills enabled Positronic to flourish in an unpredictable economic environment.

At the same time, Jack gave his time and energy to benefit those following in his manufacturing legacy. During his service on several boards and agencies, he has offered the government invaluable advice on policy and practices. Over the course of his career, Jack has served as a Technical Advisor on Electromechanical Components for Electronic Equipment to the International Electrotechnical Commission, which sets worldwide standards for electronic equipment, and as the Secretariat of the International Electrotechnical Commission committee. In addition, he has been appointed to the Industry Sector Advisory Committee, which establishes policy for imports and exports for electronic components and was chairman of the Rectangular Connector Committee for the Electronic Industries.

Jack Gentry is a member of the President's Council of the National Association of Manufacturers and a strong advocate for American goods in the international market. He will be honored for his work and leadership by the Southwest Area Manufacturers Association on February 18, 2004, and awarded lifetime honorary membership in SAMA as President Emeritus.

These honors are a fitting tribute to Jack Gentry's untiring effort to advance manufacturing, expand markets and improve the economies of southwest Missouri and the United States.

HONORING KOINONIA FOSTER
HOMES, INC.

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Koinonia Foster Homes, Inc., for their hard work and dedication on behalf of thousands of children and families who are in need of their services. A great example of their efforts will be taking place as they sponsor a community-wide, interdenominational Honorary Pastors and Wives Luncheon on February 17th in Fresno, CA.

In 1982, Koinonia Foster Homes, Inc., was founded by Miriam Golden who had previously fostered over 37 abused and neglected children in addition to raising her own four natural children. "Koinonia" is a Greek word that means to communicate relationship and fellowship, which entails that their staff and foster parents relate to children from a position of trustworthiness, dependability and a deep moral commitment. Koinonia Foster Homes is a State-licensed, nonprofit organization that works in cooperation with county social service agencies that remove children from their homes due to abuse and neglect and then refer them to Koinonia for placement in a foster home. Once referred to the program, Koinonia places these children in agency-certified homes where they receive love and guidance from caring, committed and trained foster

families, as well as therapeutic services provided by master's-level social work staff.

Koinonia Foster Homes' mission is to provide the highest quality treatment foster care program available for children, youth and their families. Regional offices throughout California and Nevada support over 1,000 foster children, utilizing approximately 500 certified foster families. Koinonia's largest program is its Therapeutic Foster Care Program which provides treatment-based foster care to children between the ages of birth through 18 years of age who have been removed from their homes. Other programs include Residential Group Homes, The Crisis Resolution Center, The Day Treatment Program, and Bridgehaven which is a co-ed transitional housing program for youth ages 18–20. Koinonia Foster Homes is regarded as a leader in the care of at-risk children and the recruitment of new foster homes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Koinonia Foster Homes, Inc., for the hope and compassion that they have provided for our children and communities. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing them many years of continued success.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the RECORD and draw my colleagues' attention to the attached statement that was recently issued by a bipartisan group of 156 mayors from across the country regarding global climate change. These mayors represent more than 46 million people in local communities ranging in size from 700 people in LaConner, Washington, to more than 4 million in Houston, Texas. The mayors state: "Mayors from across the U.S. are concerned about the impacts of global warming on our communities. Many of us are actively pursuing reductions at the municipal level, but know it will take leadership at the national level to slow the rate of global warming. We urge the Federal Government to focus attention and policy efforts on this critical issue."

I encourage my colleagues to read the attached statement in its entirety. The mayors' statement serves as a reminder that Congress must get serious about addressing greenhouse gas reductions to minimize the impact of global warming already felt across our country. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address this important issue.

U.S. MAYORS' STATEMENT ON GLOBAL
WARMING 2003

Mayors from across the U.S. are concerned about the impacts of global warming on our communities. Many of us are actively pursuing reductions at the municipal level, but know it will take leadership at the national level to slow the rate of global warming. We urge the Federal Government to focus attention and policy efforts on this critical issue.

Global warming poses significant threats to communities across the country. We are already feeling impacts in the form of heat waves, shrinking water supplies and snow pack, increased rates of asthma, floods and storms, and coastal erosion.

The scientific community is very clear in its warning—we must act now to signifi-

cantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions below current levels or we will quickly reach a point at which global warming can not be reversed. This issue requires an effective response from the U.S. Federal Government.

Many local governments across the country have made it a policy priority to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As mayors, we know that actions that promote energy conservation and efficiency, sustainable transportation (such as expanded mass transit, alternative fuel vehicles, and bike and pedestrian safety amenities) and reduce solid waste also reduce greenhouse gas and criteria pollutants emissions and bring a host of benefits to our communities. These actions reduce financial waste for local governments, businesses and citizens; they make our communities more livable; they increase spending and economic investment in our communities; and they increase the quality of life for current and future generations.

In addition to these benefits, two other reasons have recently emerged that put reducing greenhouse gas emissions at the top of the policy priority list. The first is energy security. Switching to cleaner energy sources, practicing conservation and maximizing energy efficiency will ease U.S. dependence on foreign fossil fuel-based energy, and at the same time improve local air quality and public health.

The second driver is the simple fact that the people in our communities are calling on us as elected leaders to address global warming. A public mandate is emerging in cities and towns across the country calling for governments at all levels to protect the global climate.

As Mayors responsible for the well being of our communities, we urge the federal government to maintain, enhance and implement new domestic policies and programs that work with local communities to reduce global warming pollution.

Initial Signatories: Mayor James Garner, Hempstead NY; Mayor Ed Garza, San Antonio TX; Mayor R.T. Rybak, Minneapolis MN; Mayor Vera Katz, Portland OR; Mayor Dick Murphy, San Diego CA.

STATEMENT SIGNATORIES

Name	City and state	Population
Dan Coody	Fayetteville, AR	58,047
Jim Daley	Little Rock AR	181,133
Patrick Hays	North Little Rock, AR	60,433
Beverly Johnson	Alameda, CA	76,259
Bob Ornelas	Arcata, CA	16,651
Tom Bates	Berkeley, CA	102,743
Stacey Murphy	Burbank, CA	100,316
Stephen Padilla	Cliff Vista, CA	200,000
Mike Nixon	Cloverdale, CA	7,150
Janet Kurvers	Cotati, CA	6,700
Roberta Cooper	Hayward, CA	144,721
Leah Gold	Healdsburg, CA	11,522
Roosevelt F. Dorn	Inglewood, CA	112,580
Beverly O'Neil	Long Beach, CA	461,522
Keb Kearsley	Malibu, CA	12,575
Dennis Kennedy	Morgan Hill, CA	33,556
David Smith	Newark, CA	43,043
Jerry Brown	Oakland, CA	399,484
Dena Mossar	Palo Alto, CA	61,200
Davic Glass	Petaluma, CA	54,548
Tom Pico	Pleasanton, CA	67,724
Jonathan Sharkey	Port Hueneme, CA	21,845
Grace Vargas	Falito, CA	91,873
Irma Anderson	Richmond, CA	99,216
Armando Flores	Rohmert Park, CA	42,236
Heather Fargo	Sacramento, CA	407,018
Peter Kikus	San Anselmo, CA	12,378
Judith Valles	San Bernardino, CA	185,401
Dick Murphy ¹	San Diego, CA	1,275,112
Willie Brown	San Francisco, CA	776,733
Ron Gonzales	San Jose, CA	894,943
Shelia Young	San Leandro, CA	79,452
Marty Blum	Santa Barbara, CA	92,325
Emily Reilly	Santa Cruz, CA	54,593
Richard Bloom	Santa Monica, CA	84,084
Sharon Wright	Santa Rosa, CA	147,595
Craig Litwin	Sebastopol, CA	7,750
Julia Miller	Sunnyvale, CA	131,760
Dan Walker	Torrance, CA	137,946
Ray DiCuiilio	Ventura, CA	9,157,540
Jeff Prang	West Hollywood, CA	35,716
Helen Klanderud	Aspen, CO	5,914
William R. Toor	Boulder, CO	94,673
John Fabrizio	Bridgeport, CT	139,529

STATEMENT SIGNATORIES—Continued

Name	City and state	Population
Carl Amento	Hamden, CT	57,581
John DeStefano	New Haven, CT	123,626
Dannel P. Malloy	Stamford, CT	117,083
Michael Jarjura	Waterbury, CT	107,271
Michael Paulhus	Windham, CT	22,857
Rocky Randels	Cape Canaveral, FL	8,829
Jeff Perlman	Delray Beach, FL	60,020
Thomas Bussing	Gainesville, FL	95,447
Joy Cooper	Hallandale, FL	34,282
Mara Giulianti	Hollywood, FL	139,357
James Weekley	Key West, FL	25,478
Gary Frankel	North Lauderdale, FL	32,264
John Marks	Tallahassee, FL	150,624
Shirley Clarke Franklin	Atlanta, GA	4,112,646
Patsy Jo Hillard	East Point, GA	39,595
Jeremy Harris	Honolulu, HI	395,327
Arlene Mulder	Arlington Heights, IL	76,031
Lorraine Morton	Evanston, IL	74,239
Ralph W. Conner	Maywood, IL	26,987
Scott King	Gary, IN	631,362
Chuck Oberlie	Michigan City, IN	32,900
Jerry E. Abramson	Louisville, KY	693,604
Keith Villere	Covington, LA	8,483
C. Ray Nagin	New Orleans, LA	484,674
Thomas Menino	Boston, MA	589,141
John Yunits	Brockton, MA	94,304
Michael Sullivan	Cambridge, MA	101,355
Michael McGlynn	Medford, MA	55,765
David Cohen	Newton, MA	83,829
Kelly Gay	Somerville, MA	77,478
John Madden	Williamstown, MA	8,424
Bryan K. Knedler	Mount Rainier, MD	8,498
Katny Porter	Takoma Park, MD	17,299
Michael Hurley	Belfast, ME	6,381
Jim Cloutier	Portland, ME	64,249
Ivan Fende	Chocoma Charter, MI	7,148
May Hamman-Roland	Apple Valley, MN	45,527
Elizabeth Klautz	Burnsville, MN	60,220
James Jadin	Dayton, MN	4,699
Gary Doty	Duluth, MN	86,228
Jeff Kagarmier	Mankato, MN	32,427
R.T. Rybak	Minneapolis, MN	353,395
Karen Anderson	Minnetonka, MN	51,301
Carol Wilcox	Morris, MN	5,068
Ardell Brede	Rochester, MN	85,806
Carolyn Gentili	Virginia, MN	9,157
Harvey Johnson	Jackson, MS	184,256
Mike Kadas	Missoula, MT	57,053
Charles R. Worley	Ashville, NC	68,889
Michael Nelson	Carrboro, NC	16,782
Kevin Foy	Chapel Hill, NC	48,715
William V. Bell	Durham, NC	187,035
Michael Fahy	Omaha, NE	399,357
Michael Blastos	Keene, NH	22,563
Walter Hoerman	Rochester, NH	28,461
Joseph Doria, Jr.	Bayonne, NJ	61,842
Joseph Scarpelli	Burk, NJ	76,119
Robert Bowsper	East Orange, NJ	69,824
David L. Ganz	Fair Lawn, NJ	31,637
Alberto Santos	Kearny, NJ	40,513
Victor de Luca	Maplewood, NJ	23,868
Louise Wilson	Montgomery Twp, NJ	17,481
Sharpe James	Newark, NJ	273,546
Douglas Palmer	Trenton, NJ	85,403
Martin Chavez	Albuquerque, NM	448,607
Oscar Goodman	Las Vegas, NV	1,563,282
Anthony Masiello	Buffalo, NY	292,648
James Garner	Hempstead, NY	56,554
Alan J. Cohen	Ithaca, NY	29,287
Robert Blais	Lake George Village, NY	985
Ernest Davis	Mount Vernon, NY	68,381
Irene Elia	Niagara Falls, NY	55,593
William Johnson	Rochester, NY	1,098,201
Ken Klotz	Saratoga Springs, NY	26,186
Matthew Driscoll	Syracuse, NY	147,306
Donald Plusquellic	Akron, OH	694,960
Thomas Longo	Garfield Heights, OH	30,734
Jack Ford	Toledo, OH	313,619
Alan DeBoer	Ashland, OR	19,522
Helen Berg	Corvallis, OR	49,322
Vera Katz	Portland, OR	529,121
Stephen Reed	Harrisburg, PA	48,950
David Cicilline	Providence, RI	173,618
Joseph P. Riley, Jr.	Charleston, SC	96,650
Gus Garcia	Austin, TX	656,562
Laura Miller	Dallas, TX	3,519,176
Euline Brock	Denton, TX	80,537
Mike Moncrief	Fort Worth, TX	502,369
Lee Brown	Houston*, TX	4,177,646
Filemon Esquivel, Jr.	Kingsville, TX	25,575
Ed Garza	San Antonio, TX	1,144,646
Robert Habingreither	San Marcos, TX	661,890
Rocky Anderson	Salt Lake City, UT	181,743
William Ward	Chesapeake, VA	199,184
Daniel Harshman	Edinburg, VA	813
Meyera Obendorf	Virginia Beach, VA	433,461
Peter Clavelle	Burlington, VT	38,889
Mark Asmundson	Bellingham, WA	67,171
Don Wright	LaConner, WA	761
Skye Richendfer	Mount Vernon, WA	26,232
Patricia Cohen	Oak Harbor, WA	19,795
Stan Biles	Olympia, WA	42,514
Rosemarie Ives	Redmond, WA	45,256
Greg Nickels	Seattle*, WA	563,374
John Powers	Spokane, WA	195,629
Bill Baarsma	Tacoma, WA	193,556
John D. Medinger	La Crosse, WI	51,818
Dave Cieslewicz	Madison, WI	208,054
John Norquist	Milwaukee, WI	596,974
Theresa Estnes	Wauwatosa, WI	47,271
Gerald Bach	Wisconsin Rapids, WI	18,435

STATEMENT SIGNATORIES—Continued

Name	City and state	Population
		46,722,006

¹ Initial signatories.

RECOGNIZING THE MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE HAMMOND COUNCIL PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pleasure that I stand before you today to recognize the many accomplishments of the Hammond Council Parent Teacher Association (PTA) as it celebrates the PTA's 2004 Founders' Day. This very important occasion will be celebrated on Friday, February 13, 2004 at the Dynasty Banquet Hall in Hammond, Indiana.

The National PTA was founded in 1897 by Ms. Alice McLellan Birney and Ms. Phoebe Apperson Hearst. In 1970, the National Congress of Colored Parents, which was founded by Ms. Selena Sloan Butler, joined the National PTA. Due to the vision and determination of these women, the organization has taken the lead in promoting the welfare of children throughout the country.

The Hammond Council PTA was chartered on April 30, 1945 as a member of the Indiana PTA and the National PTA. Being a member of the state as well as national PTA, the Hammond Council has provided continuous support and resources to local families which focus on the health and education of children. The Hammond Council has continued the legacy of the PTA's founders through many projects such as Hammond's Survive Alive Program which has developed and saved the lives of many students and their families.

Each year, the Hammond Council also recognizes the top ten students from the four Hammond high schools through a special scholarship program. The recipients are honored in partnership with the School City of Hammond and the Hammond Rotary Club. Along with their leadership in their local community, members from the Hammond Council have also gone on to serve as officers for the Indiana PTA. Some of the local leaders include, past President Ms. Beverly Zawadski, the current President Ms. Marilyn Jones, the President Elect Ms. Dee Jones, and the Secretary Ms. Pat Taylor.

Each year in February, the PTA celebrates Founders' Day to recognize the accomplishments and dedication of teachers, volunteers, administrators, and community leaders who have made a positive impact on their community. During the celebration on Friday, February 13, the Hammond Council PTA will announce its 2004 winners of the 15th Volunteer of the Year Award, the Outstanding Local Unit Award, and the Membership and National PTA Lifetime Achievement Awards.

Mr. Speaker, as this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring and congratulating the Hammond Council PTA and all its members as they celebrate the 2004 Founders' Day. Their many great accomplishments and service to the chil-

dren of the Hammond community, as well as throughout the state, is worthy of the highest commendation.

TRIBUTE TO ELROY "CRAZYLEGS" HIRSCH

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the great life of Elroy "Crazylegs" Hirsch. On January 28, 2004, Wisconsin lost a true state icon, but Crazylegs leaves his rich legacy in the hearts of all Wisconsinites.

Elroy Hirsch was born in Wausau, WI and grew into an incredible high school athlete while playing football and basketball at Wausau High School. He was such an accomplished high school player that in 1998 he was inducted into the National High School Hall of Fame.

After high school, he became a standout halfback for the University of Wisconsin Badgers during the 1942 season. The Badgers finished the 1942 season 8–1–1 and were ranked third nationally by the AP. Hirsch was key to the 1942 victory over top-ranked Ohio State by throwing one touchdown pass and recording more than 200 total offensive yards. It was during this season that he earned the name "Crazylegs" after a reporter wrote that "his crazy legs were gyrating in six different directions all at the same time."

Due to his assignment with the United States Marine Corps, Hirsch continued his collegiate athletic career with the University of Michigan, and went on to play professionally for the Chicago Rockets from 1946–1948 and then with the Los Angeles Rams from 1949–1957. After a record setting career with the NFL, he was named to the NFL's All-Time All-Star team.

Following his time as General Manager with the Los Angeles Rams, Hirsch returned to Wisconsin and the university where he started his collegiate athletic career. When he arrived as Athletic Director, the Badgers' athletic program was struggling. He was committed and successful in turning around the athletic program in his 18-year role at the University of Wisconsin. During the years following his retirement, Hirsch was the Wisconsin Badgers biggest fan.

Despite living in various communities across the United States during his accomplished career, it was evident that his home was truly with the people of Wisconsin and Wisconsin athletics, as with every autograph he signed "always a Badger."

INTRODUCTION OF THE LONG TERM CARE HOSPITAL MORATORIUM ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Long Term Care Hospital Moratorium Act. This bill places a moratorium on the

growth of costly Medicare Long Term Care Hospital (LTCH) beds until enough information is available to determine whether continued growth is required to meet the needs of our seniors and people with disabilities.

The number of these facilities has increased substantially from 109 to 300 in the past decade and Medicare expenditures directed to these facilities have grown from \$398 million in 1993 to an anticipated \$2.3 billion in 2005. The recent 275% increase in facilities and over 500% increase in Medicare expenditures are dramatic. It is time for Congress to question whether this rapid growth reflects a true increase in clinical need or just a means to game robust profits from Medicare.

LTCHs are one of four types of post-acute settings that are reimbursed under Medicare. Patients in these facilities have medically complex conditions that include ventilator dependency, multiple medical system failures, complicated infectious conditions, wound care and post-surgical recuperation. These patients generally have stays in these facilities of 25 days or more. Currently, only 1 percent of Medicare beneficiaries discharged from acute hospitals are transferred to LTCHs. These facilities are the most expensive on average of all the post-acute alternatives with a base rate cost per patient episode being \$35,700.

The growth in the long term care hospital sector is being fueled by large for-profit companies that are reporting significant revenue increases and robust profit margins. Their margins are significantly higher than those for acute hospitals and skilled nursing facilities. Wall Street recognition of the industry's positive financial outlook is likely related to the 300 percent increase that has been posted this year in the stocks of these publicly-traded companies.

Recent data from the non-partisan Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) suggests that there may also be substantial overlap between the types of patients being treated in LTCHs and skilled nursing facilities; despite LTCHs costing 4–5 times more. The potential for LTCHs to substitute for less costly skilled nursing facilities is exacerbated by the fact that there is currently no clinical patient admission criteria under Medicare for LTCHs.

A review of the LTCH Medicare provider network raises a number important public policy questions. These questions include:

Is there evidence of clinical need to support the rapid growth in LTCH facilities?

Is the current Medicare payment system inappropriate or is the reimbursement amount excessive for LTCH services?

Are LTCHs and skilled nursing facilities clinical substitutes? If so, are there clinical criteria that can be developed to determine which patients require LTCHs vs. skilled nursing facilities?

This legislation simply places a moratorium on the future growth of this provider network category until these questions are answered. The Secretary of Health and Human Services may terminate this moratorium upon obtaining adequate information to address these questions and implementing any required changes to the Medicare payment system for these services. The Secretary is also required to submit a report to Congress at least one month prior to terminating the moratorium specifying the rationale and evidence supporting the termination.

It is appropriate for Congress, who is responsible for providing fiscal oversight of

Medicare, to enact this legislation. Both MedPAC and the Health and Human Services' Office of the Inspector General are already investigating aspects of these issues. The LTCH and skilled nursing home industries, patient advocacy groups and other relevant sources can offer additional data. Using the data obtained during this moratorium, the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the Congress can make an informed decision on what interventions are necessary within the LTCH industry to both ensure beneficiaries are receiving the treatment they require and that Medicare funds are being prudently spent.

U.S. NEEDS SPACE BASED MISSILE DEFENSE

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, today I submit the following article from Vital Speeches into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. "U.S. Needs Space-Based Missile Defense" is a speech given by my highly respected predecessor, Representative Bob Schaffer.

[From Vital Speeches, Oct. 15, 2003]

U.S. NEEDS SPACED-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE
ADDRESS BY BOB SCHAFFER, FORMER U.S. CONGRESSMAN FROM COLORADO, DELIVERED TO THE COUNCIL FOR NATIONAL POLICY, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO, SEPTEMBER 26, 2003

Thank you, Ambassador Cooper. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I have been a long-time admirer of Ambassador Hank Cooper since before I went to Congress in 1996. As a Member of Congress, I relied on the Ambassador's judgment and vision for guidance when considering questions of America's defense against those who would threaten our liberty.

The district I represented, up until January of this year, in Congress was essentially the entire eastern half of Colorado—very rural. Consequently, the committees to which I was assigned in Congress had to do with agriculture, natural resources and education. I served on no committees that had direct involvement with national defense, foreign affairs or military preparedness.

But as one who represented a constituency of broad interests, I endeavored to learn as much as I could about national defense. And the more I learned about the very real threat America faces with respect to long-range missile attack, the more I became convinced that there are not enough leaders in Congress paying attention to this vital national security concern.

As Ambassador Cooper mentioned, my interest led me around the world meeting with parliamentarians and defense leaders of other nations. I made eight trips to Russia, as many to Ukraine, and others to Asia, Central Asia, and Europe.

Since September 11th, America has been focused on combating terrorism in Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere. We have been reorienting our national defense to address the weakness exploited by the terrorists who killed Americans on American soil, and toward protecting Americans abroad from similar potential attacks. This, of course, is necessary and exactly what we should be doing.

America is not focused enough on conventional threats.

Let me explain my concern for national security through an analogy of home security.

As homeowners, we put the toughest lock, where, on the front door, right? Well, the burglars have figured out how to get in through the windows. In response, we are now fortifying our windows, doubling them up, and locking down the smaller points of access. This makes perfect sense.

However, my friends, we are leaving the front door wide open to conventional attack from potential threats far more sophisticated and direct than the terrorists of rogue nations. We can't forget that countries like China still maintain arsenals of long-range ballistic missiles targeted at American cities like the one we're in right now. From their current launch sites, these missiles are just a half-an-hour away from their American targets. Once launched, we have no defense against them.

Good leadership is essential.

As a suggestion, I was asked to speak on what it will take for us to build the effective defenses we need, to defend us from the increasing threat and proliferation of ballistic missiles of all types, whether short-range, intermediate-range, and long-range, capable of attacking our homes and cities.

Two words will do. Good leadership.

In one way, the current Bush administration has displayed good leadership in its missile defense program. It has exerted the will to deploy a missile defense as seen in its decisions to withdraw from the 1972 ABM Treaty, deploy a National Missile Defense system, and increase funding.

As a result of President Bush's leadership, the 1972 ABM Treaty resides in the dustbin of history. As a result of President Bush's leadership, the United States stands on the verge of deploying a National Missile Defense system, which is expected to reach initial operation in the next few years.

It may be helpful to review some highlights of the National Missile Defense program, if only to point how Americans not only have the desire to defend themselves from ballistic missile attack, they also have the commitment and ability to build a defense.

Highlights include how:

In early September Northrop Grumman submitted a bid to compete for the Missile Defense Agency's Targets and Countermeasures prime integration program, valued at more than \$1 billion for an initial four-year program. The Bush administration takes the issue of mid-course-phase decoys and countermeasures seriously.

In August this year, progress was reported on the construction of a \$900 million sea-based X-band radar, which will be home ported at Adak, Alaska, in the Aleutian Islands superceding earlier plans to build a ground-based Xband radar on Shemya Island, also in the Aleutians.

This sea-based X-band radar will be self-propelled, using a semi-submersible oilrig being modified at shipyards in Brownsville and Corpus Christi. The radar will weigh 50,000 tons and be 390 feet long and 250 feet high. Scheduled to begin operation in 2005, this sea-based X band radar will hand off ballistic missile tracking information to interceptors located at Fort Greely, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base.

Also in August, Orbital Sciences Corporation test launched from Vandenberg a prototype of the three-stage booster to be used in the ground-based interceptor for our National Missile Defense system.

President Bush's plan calls for deploying by 2004, four ground-based interceptors at Vandenberg, and six groundbased interceptors at Fort Greely, increasing the number of ground-based interceptors deployed at Fort Greely to a total of 20 by the end of 2005.

Contracts have been let for pouring concrete for the missile silos at Fort Greely, and

for refurbishing existing missile silos at Vandenberg Air Force Base. In June 2002, for example, it was reported how a contract for \$325 million was issued to build six underground missile silos at Fort Greely.

These are significant steps to our deployment of a National Missile Defense. The deployment of X-band radar, development of a booster for the ground-based interceptor, testing of the kinetic kill vehicle, and fielding of interceptors are coming together.

Intelligent design.

But good leadership involves more than the will to deploy a defense. While the will to deploy a missile defense is a key ingredient, an ingredient missing from the preceding Clinton administration, which believed in the ABM Treaty as the cornerstone of arms control, good leadership also needs to point the way of how to build an effective defense.

Building an effective defense requires more than spending money. It requires an intelligent design.

Speaking of money, Congress and the Bush administration have recognized the importance of funding missile defense.

For example, in June of this year the House Appropriations Committee approved a budget of about \$8.9 billion for missile defense, an increase of about \$1.3 billion. Real money is being spent.

Congress has shown increasing willingness to fund a missile defense, and for good reason. Not only has the threat of ballistic missile attack increased from China's buildup of ballistic missiles of all types, but the proliferation of ballistic missiles continues to increase.

The proliferation of ballistic missiles poses a grave threat internationally. India and Pakistan look at each other in terms of increasing numbers of ballistic missiles, some of which are presumably armed with nuclear weapons.

Japan is losing any sense of complacency over the increasing ballistic missile threat it faces as it was reported in June how North Korea has fielded between 160 and 170 intermediate-range Nodong missiles that can reach nearly all of Japan.

In June it was also reported how Japan, in response to this hostile buildup of ballistic missiles by North Korea, requested an additional \$1.2 billion for the next fiscal year to deploy a two layer missile defense system, consisting of PAC-3 missiles produced under license, and upgrading its four Aegis destroyers to deploy the SM-3 interceptor.

From our experience in Iraq we know that the PAC-3 missile works very well, both as an interceptor of short-range ballistic missiles and of aircraft, using hit-to-kill technology based on radar guidance. PAC-3 performed with a high probability of intercept, unlike the earlier improved PAC-2, which although successful from a strategic viewpoint in the 1991 Gulf War, was essentially jury-rigged for its mission of intercepting Scuds.

The Navy's SM-3 ballistic missile interceptor has proved itself positively, achieving three interceptions out of four attempts. The four interception test in June 2003, while unsuccessful, demonstrated the ability of naval ships to share target cueing information as the firing of the SM-3 from the U.S.S. Lake Erie was reportedly cued from another ship up-range.

The test failure of the SM-3 evidently occurred when one of the cells of its solid fuel Divert and Attitude Control System failed to ignite—a problem of quality control rather than the underlying technology.

The United States has over twenty years of experience in testing hit-to-kill technology for missile defense, achieving its first successful interception of an ICBM target in the June 1984 Homing Overlay Experiment.

The time has come to deploy hit-to-kill technology in an effective defense.

But building an effective missile defense requires an intelligent design. It requires the same elements of good strategy that have always formed an essential part of military victory, whether victory through a policy of peace through strength, or a policy of determination to achieve victory and lasting peace.

An effective defense requires good position.

No small part of military strategy is devoted to the maneuver and positioning of troops. Good position, good location, holding the high ground, whether the top of a hill or a mountain top, being able to look down and fire at an approaching enemy, is a key element of military strategy.

For this reason U.S. military strategy emphasizes air superiority, the high ground of combined air, land, and sea operations. There is also the high ground of space, which U.S. military forces recognize as vital to the operation of our intelligence, communications, reconnaissance, and navigation systems, which rely heavily on satellites.

Building an effective missile defense also requires good position. But this position isn't found on the ground, it is found in space where the ballistic missile operates.

Building an effective missile defense requires a strategy that deploys a missile defense in the high ground of space. Good leadership would deploy a missile defense in space. Good leadership would point the way to space.

Both the Strategic Defense Initiative of the 1980's and early 1990's and Project Defender of the later 1950's and early 1960's pointed the way to space, recognizing the inherent advantages of deploying a missile defense in space.

The earlier Project Argus nuclear test shots in 1958 and Starfish 1962 also pointed to space. Dr. Nicholas Christofilos from Lawrence Livermore realized space provides a position with global coverage against ballistic missile threats.

The strategic advantages of deploying a missile defense in space are considerable.

Global coverage, the capability for boost-phase interception, the use of robotics minimizing operational costs, and the potential of high-energy lasers and particle beams led these earlier missile defense programs to emphasize the development of defenses based in space.

Even the Clinton administration was aware of the advantages that accrue from deployment of a missile defense in space, as seen in its decision to complete the termination of the Brilliant Pebbles program for deploying a space-based interceptor defense, and attempt to terminate the Space Based Laser.

Believing in the ABM Treaty as the cornerstone of arms control, the Clinton administration was not interested in building effective defenses.

While Brilliant Pebbles had been approved for acquisition in 1991, it was subsequently opposed by key Democrats in Congress, who sought a technological regression, unwilling to change the strategy of Mutual Assured Destruction embodied in the ABM Treaty.

Technological leadership and space superiority.

Building an effective missile defense requires the United States to deploy its kinetic kill interceptors in space like Brilliant Pebbles, not in the underground concrete missile silos.

An intelligent design would utilize the advantages that deployment in space offers in providing global coverage, boost-phase interception, the use of robotics, minimal operational costs, and the ability to use high-energy lasers for boost phase interception and active discrimination of decoys.

There is a third ingredient for building an effective missile defense. This ingredient is

technological leadership, including the ability to manage programs involving technology to produce timely results.

Good leadership needs to manage the effort to build a missile defense effectively, to produce timely results rather than create an endless cycle of studies, delays, testing, and indecision.

In the past the United States has exhibited bursts of technological leadership, including President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, which supported a vast program of research and development for missile defense technology.

We need to remember those times and examples of technology leadership to build an effective missile defense.

Good leadership involves more than creating program momentum by funding a single program with more dollars. It includes the ability to manage technology, and lead a fundamentally strong program to completion and success.

It includes the ability to concurrently manage technology development programs with acquisition, to allow for improvements in current acquisition and the development of second- and third-generation defenses.

It includes the ability to concurrently manage a variety of technology programs, pursuing at the same time different avenues of basing and technology, recognizing the wealth of ideas and technology developed under the Strategic Defense Initiative, giving the United States the ability to construct a missile defense in multiple layers.

It includes the ability to match an intelligent design for building an effective missile defense with the pursuit of technology, seeking a technological momentum designed to defeat the ballistic missile.

It includes an understanding of how the strategy of "Mutual Assured Destruction" which was behind the ABM Treaty was designed to restrain the use and development of new technology.

Notably, space not only offers a position of advantage for deploying a missile defense, it stimulates the development of new technology.

Technological leadership includes the ability to resolve problems.

Highlights of where technological leadership has been lacking in the current program for building a missile defense, include:

The termination in 2001 of the Navy Area Wide defense program, which would have provided Aegis cruisers and destroyers with a defense against short-range ballistic missiles and aircraft like PAC-3.

While the proposed SM-2 Block VIA interceptor for Navy Area Wide would have relied on a blast fragmentation warhead rather than hit-to-kill, differentiating it from PAC-3, its program termination may be viewed with disappointment.

The termination in 2001 and 2002 of the Space Based Laser program, which would have provided a very effective boost phase defense against ballistic missiles of all types, short, intermediate, and long-range.

Notably, the Space Based Laser program successfully demonstrated its end-to-end beam generation and training back in 1997. From the point on, the program's next step was to test a scalable high-energy laser in space.

Presumably, the termination of the Space Based Laser program came as a result of opposition in the Senate to the deployment of missile defenses in space.

Apparently lacking in the current administration was an understanding of the advantages of technological readiness of the Space Based Laser, unwilling to overcome apparent political opposition at a time when most Americans support missile defenses.

Technological leadership also includes the ability to communicate the advantages of

technology, as well as the ability to develop it.

While the current administration has demonstrated its commitment to fund a missile defense and support the deployment of a ground-based defense, and has withdrawn from the ABM Treaty, it has yet to support a design to build an effective defense, much less insist on technological leadership.

America's current plans include a virtual technological regression in any planning for a space-based interceptor defense, unwilling or unable to use past technology developed for Brilliant Pebbles.

Unwilling or unable to use Brilliant Pebbles technology for space-based interceptors, the current administration and the Congress have been unwilling or unable to employ technological advances that have occurred in:

The increasing use of robotics, including autonomous operation and data fusing and joint decision making between independently operating robots, which NASA has developed for missions on Mars.

The development and increasing use of photonic or fiber optics for sensors, communications, and computer processing, which provide a means to defend against electromagnetic pulse.

The development of three-dimensional computer chips, allowing for the integration of different processes, whether computer processing communications, processing of sensor data, and active response within the same chip.

These advances in photonics and computer chips, combined with continuing advances in nanotechnology, including Micro Electro Mechanical Systems or MEMS, could potentially allow for the development of kinetic kill vehicles smaller than Brilliant Pebbles, which were essentially based on late 1980's technology.

Instead of building kinetic kill vehicles that weigh in the tens of kilograms, the United States could potentially be building kinetic kill vehicles that weigh under a kilogram, perhaps in the tens of grams, approaching the theoretical limits for kinetic kill vehicles suggested by Lowell Wood at Lawrence Livermore when he proposed the idea of Genius Sand as an advance generation Brilliant Pebble.

America's defense planners seem to have a striking aversion to the development of advanced technology systems, especially those taking advantage of deployment in space, as seen not only in its termination of the Space Based Laser, but its very low level of funding for the development of a system of space-based relay mirrors that could utilize a high-energy laser to strike at targets around the world.

This system of relay mirrors, suggested in the Strategic Defense Initiative as a way to take advantage of high energy laser technology that was ground-based or air-based, is being funded at a level of around \$1 million when it should be funded at the billion-dollar level.

The state of U.S. technological leadership is also seen by Pentagon planning to deploy a system of optical communication satellites, in other words, satellites using laser communications, which would provide much needed bandwidth and high security. These had been proposed in the early 1980's and the Air Force had performed some early demonstrations.

More than twenty years after this exciting concept was proposed, the Pentagon is finally planning to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to develop a satellite laser communications system. This comes after the European Union successfully demonstrated the use of laser communications with its Artemis satellite.

I was asked to speak about what it will take for us to build the effective defenses we need. Good leadership is the answer.

Three key ingredients to good leadership include not only the will to build a defense, but an intelligent design and technological leadership.

Over the past three years, our country has clearly demonstrated its will to build a missile defense; I strongly suggest to you that we still need an intelligent design and technological leadership to build an effective defense.

HONORING ANDREW TOTI

HON. DENNIS A. CARDOZA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American inventor from Modesto, California, Mr. Andrew Toti. Mr. Toti has invented a number of household items, and has over 200 United States and foreign patents to his credit. He is a perfect example of the "can-do" attitude that Americans possess. His ingenuity has created the vertical blinds which many of us have in our office windows, to a device that helped save lives in World War II.

In a 1995 interview with Parade magazine, Mr. Toti stated that the most important element to successful inventing is defining a need for a new product or identifying a problem, then finding an elegant solution. Mr. Toti has been finding solutions to problems, and inventing new products almost his entire life. He credits his parents for nurturing and supporting his craft, and giving him advice on how to become a success.

At the young age of twelve, Mr. Toti created a new kind of combination lock, however it was not marketed very well. He learned quickly from this mistake. Mr. Toti has always been able to admit to mistakes, and this is one of his greatest qualities. When Mr. Toti was sixteen, he had built a boat with a very powerful motor. His mother was worried he would drown, so he began making a life vest using duck and goose feathers. He noticed that these vests were a bit bulky, so began filling them with compressed air. The War Department was told of his invention, and paid Mr. Toti \$1500 for the rights. This life saving device soon became the Mae West life vest. This is the same life vest that President George H.W. Bush was wearing when he was shot down over the Pacific Ocean. Without this life preserver, President Bush might not have survived his ordeal in the ocean.

As you know Mr. Speaker, the San Joaquin Central Valley is a lush agricultural area, and our farmers grow anything from peaches to wine grapes, and raise cattle and poultry. Mr. Toti's ingenuity has helped two major industries in the area. First, in 1951, Mr. Toti patented his feather-plucking machine. This machine uses thousands of rubber "fingers" to remove the feathers of poultry. Twenty-one years later, he assisted in designing a grape-harvesting machine for Ernest and Julio Gallo, two of the most prominent viticulturalists in the nation. Recently, Mr. Toti developed an endotracheal tube, which aids physicians with rapid intubation of the trachea in situations where the tube needs to bend due to anatomical variations in the body.

I ask all of my colleagues today to help me recognize and thank Mr. Toti for his contributions to our nation. It is my honor to represent such a fine constituent in the House of Representatives.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF VIOLET BROSART

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker. I am honored to rise today to officially recognize and pay tribute to Violet Brosart, an outstanding community leader.

Violet Brosart is a resident of Lackawanna, New York and is currently serving as the President of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of New York. The American Legion Auxiliary is the largest women's patriotic service organization in the world. Its primary goals are to serve veterans and their families, to promote patriotism and Americanism, and to serve our children and communities.

President Brosart is a 36 year member of Hamburg Unit #527 in Erie County. She has served as its president and remains an active member. She has also been active in her community, becoming involved in Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, Youth Baseball, the Empire State Ballet Company, and the Hamburg Little Theater. She also worked for 10 years as a child day care provider. Mrs. Brosart is the mother of four and grandmother of ten. She also has one great grandchild.

Each year the Department President chooses a project of particular interest to her and raises money for that cause. This year President Brosart has chosen the Alzheimer's Association as her special project. More than 14 million Americans will be diagnosed with Alzheimer's Disease within the next 50 years unless a cure or prevention is found. Alzheimer's disease affects not just the patient, but the family as well. Often children and grandchildren find themselves becoming the caregivers to those who once gave care to them. Money raised for this special project will be distributed to all seven areas of the Alzheimer's Coalition in New York State, based on need. The money will be used to support programs in the following areas: early diagnosis, effective treatment, essential support networks, and caregiver training. In addition to these areas of concern the Alzheimer's Coalition is working in conjunction with the VA facilities to aid veterans that have Alzheimer's. By embracing this project, President Brosart and the American Legion Auxiliary can "Help for Today" and "Hope for Tomorrow." To date, over \$15,500 has been raised, with a goal of \$40,000 by August 1, 2004.

Traveling throughout the 62 Counties in New York State, President Brosart emphasizes the American Legion Auxiliary's strong commitment to our country and to our veterans. Her patriotic spirit is evident in all of her speeches and presentations. The members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of New York are very proud of President Brosart and her deep commitment to the veterans of our nation.

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS POWERS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dennis Powers, former Director of Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Station and Harold A. Miller Professor of Biological Sciences. He passed away on December 8, 2003, at the age of 65, following a long illness.

Dennis was born on May 4, 1938 in Dearborn, Michigan. He served in the United States Marine Corps' First Reconnaissance Company from 1957 to 1959 and then in the Marine Corps Reserve from 1960–1963. In 1963 he graduated from Ottawa University in Ottawa, Kansas; he was married this same year. Dr. Powers received a PhD from the University of Kansas in 1970 and subsequently completed postdoctoral research at both the State University of New York-Stony Brook and the Marine Biology Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. From 1972 to 1988 he held multiple positions at Johns Hopkins University, including chair of the Department of Biology, Director of the McCollum-Pratt Institute for Biochemistry, and Acting Director of the Chesapeake Bay Institute.

In 1988 he became Director of Stanford's Hopkins Marine Station, which is located in Pacific Grove, on the Monterey Peninsula. Dr. Powers held the Director's position until 2000. I think one of his colleagues stated it best when she said, "Dennis Powers' impact on Hopkins Marine Station has been enormous." His legacy at Hopkins includes collaborating with others to establish four new endowed chair positions, ensuring construction of a new research and teaching facility, and working with the Monterey Bay Aquarium to launch the Tuna Research and Conservation Center.

Dr. Powers was a brilliant research scientist and dedicated administrator. His scientific career involved development of "integrative biology," a branch of biological inquiry whereby scientists study the interconnections between the microscopic and macroscopic levels of biological organization. This discipline recognizes the fundamental fact that all levels of biological systems, from a tiny cell to a whole ocean basin, play important roles in the overall health and well-being of our living systems. Dennis's inquiry into marine organisms, particularly fishes, focused on understanding how genetic information helps animals survive under different, and often-times stressful, environmental conditions. In addition to his contributions to integrative biology, he was known for his efforts to integrate biomedical research techniques into the areas of marine biology and environmental science.

Dr. Powers mentored numerous students, was active in many scientific societies, and served on the editorial boards of multiple peer-reviewed academic journals, including Physiological and Biochemical Zoology as well as Biological Oceanography.

Mr. Speaker, Dennis Powers was a brilliant scientist and an exceptional person, and for these reasons, I am proud to be able to honor him today. I wish to express my condolences to his three daughters, Kathi, Julie, and Wendy, and his four grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF JIM FINDLAY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about a wonderful man, Jim Findlay.

[From the Toledo Events Magazine, Jan. 2004]

MORE TO THE STORY

ENTREPRENEUR ADDS TWO CHAPTERS TO AUTOBIOGRAPHY

(By Sue Van Fleet)

If a life can be said to correspond to the pages in a book, then it was time for Jim Findlay to add a few more chapters.

The well-known entrepreneur, and philanthropist had written an autobiography in 2001. "In the Company of Friends" almost resembles a scrapbook, its text interspersed with photos, letters, poems, quotes and newspaper clippings.

Findlay was the chairman and co-founder of Impact Products, a business in Sylvania Township that provided supplies to the sanitary maintenance industry. But only six months after the book was printed, the company was sold to Park Avenue Equity Partners. At the time of the sale, Impact Products had 160 employees and more than \$40 million in sales.

"Since the motivating purpose of the book was to create a permanent record of the company, I felt it would be important to talk about its sale" Findlay said.

Impact had become an employee-owned company in 1986 with the establishment of an ESOP (Employee Stock Ownership Program). In March 1998, Findlay and his children sold their remaining interest to the ESOP trust, making the employees 100 percent owners of the company.

"Since I was leaving, they then had an opportunity to sell and get a 15 percent premium over what we were valued at," Findlay said. "So I encouraged them to do so, so they could diversify their holdings rather than have it all in Impact, which they did." Impact's employees averaged about \$156,000 each from the sale, an amount that varied according to their seniority.

"So they did good, and they really should, because it was the employees that made the company," Findlay said. "I've always felt very strongly that if you take care of the employees, they'll take care of the customers. We've always shared with them."

The company brought in estate planning professionals and investment firms for seminars and individual counseling sessions to help them make good decisions regarding their investments.

"Over the next two weeks there were a lot of new cars in the parking lot," Findlay said. "And a lot of them were able to buy homes and do some things that they weren't able to before, so, I was very proud to be able to do that for my employees."

If he had to do it over again, would he have gone the ESOP route? Findlay says yes, but with some reservations. For instance, as the company's stock price increased, it created a debt that would have to be paid to employees who decided to tender their stock upon retiring or leaving the company. Findlay also fretted that he was putting his employees at excessive risk since so much of their personal investment was tied up in one asset. Both these problems were eliminated with the sale of the company to Park Avenue.

On the plus side, the ESOP gave every employee ownership in the company, increasing

their motivation and giving Findlay a way of thanking them for their part in Impact's success. It also made it possible for he and his wife, Celia, to establish several trusts and provide gifts to charitable organizations. "So we were able to do some things while we're living rather than do it all after we passed away," he said.

The second chapter Findlay added to the new edition is titled "The Rest of the Story." In it he details some of the many awards that came his way in late 2001 and 2002. Both Celia and Jim Findlay are graduates of the University of Toledo, she in education and he in business. They have set up scholarships at UT in both disciplines and have supported UT with both time and money over the years.

In August 2001, the university named a building on its Scott Park campus after them. The Findlay Athletic Complex houses the baseball, softball and soccer facilities. Jim Findlay was also awarded an honorary doctoral degree from UT and received the Alumni Association's Gold 'T' Award, which recognizes alumni who have served the university and the community.

He was especially touched when he was invited to the home of UT President Dan Johnson and his wife, Elaine, following the commencement ceremony in which he received his honorary degree. "How could an average student and an ordinary Joe be the guest of a college president and receive from his hand the highest honor the university can bestow?" Findlay wrote in his book. "... Surrounded by the happy voices of a company of friends, consisting of wife, children, grandchildren and esteemed friends, I knew that whatever the future might hold, I have known and experienced the deep joy of blessedness." In October 2002, Findlay was honored by manufacturer reps at the annual convention of the International Sanitary Supply Association, receiving the first ever Manufacturer Representative Distinguished Service Award. Findlay has been a standout in terms of how he treats his reps, notably having the only corporation in his industry with a 401(k) plan for them.

"My manufacturer reps are the ones who did the selling and put us on the map," Findlay said. "I've always felt extremely close to them. If the law would have allowed us to do so, I would have made them part of the ESOP"

Although Findlay has enjoyed a life full of many successes, there were two things he didn't accomplish that he had wanted to: the establishment of an Impact Charitable Foundation and the creation of an Impact School of Continuing Education. They were close to launching the school for their employees when the company was sold. The foundation may yet come to fruition as others work toward that end.

Seven years ago, Findlay started Findlay Business Partners Ltd., which leases storage and office warehouses. With units at 3315 Centennial Rd. and 3545 Silica Road, the business is run by his children. His son Jon is president, while daughter Sarah and son James Jr. are vice presidents.

When asked what he is most proud of, he mentions being able to pass the business complex on to his children, as well as the scholarships he has set up for business and education students at UT and for minorities at Toledo Christian School.

Although much of the book details Findlay's business, it also covers his childhood, time in the service, college years, relationship with his church and UT; and family. At the end of the book he provides an update on the health of his wife, Celia, whom he calls the love of his life. She is in the fifth round of chemotherapy for carcinoma of the endometrium.

"My greatest, most fervent hope for all families is that each child will choose a lifetime partner as well as I did," he writes in the 16th chapter. He and the former UT homecoming queen were wed on Jan. 28, 1949. "Relationships are what it's all about," Findlay said. "I don't need yachts or luxury cars—I don't live too high. Success is about building relationships with people and being fair in trying to treat everybody alike."

SCHOOL BOARD APPRECIATION
MONTH

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, in the month of January, across the country, the State of Texas and in the Fifth Congressional District, we celebrate School Board Recognition Month to acknowledge the hard work of school board members and thank them for their valuable service in the education of our children.

During School Board Recognition Month, we honor the administrators, staff, and volunteers of the Richardson Independent School District who work to promote academic excellence and provide a safe learning environment for our students.

School board members are responsible for fulfilling one of the most important roles in our society: helping develop young men and women into the future leaders of our Nation's economy, government, community, and houses of worship.

I would like to extend my most sincere thanks to all Richardson school board members for their continued dedication and hard work. Their contribution to the education of our children is truly helping to shape the future of our communities and our Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO GREGG CHERRY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Gregg Cherry who has shown a deep commitment to serving and improving his community through his work with child services and a career in law enforcement.

Gregg was born March 29, 1955, to James and Audrey Cherry. He is the oldest of five children. He was born and raised in the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood of Brooklyn, New York. Gregg is a graduate of the old Boys High School where he played several positions on the football team. His football career continued at Shaw University where he received bachelors degrees in English and Communications in 1980. He is the loving father of Craig and Raven Cherry.

It was his love and commitment to his community which led him to a career in law enforcement. During his tenure as an investigator and caseworker for the Bureau of Child Welfare, Gregg saw the many inconsistencies and tragedies children encountered in the child welfare system and wanted to make a positive difference. So, in 1984, he joined the New York City Police Department.

He graduated in the first police academy class under the tutelage of Benjamin Ward, the first African American Police Commissioner of New York City. He began his service at the 79th police precinct. His no-nonsense attitude quickly gained the respect of his community and peers alike.

For his work, Gregg was honored in 1977 with a Gold Shield as a detective. He also served as an organized crime investigator and in the vice and narcotics units in the NYPCD. Gregg's other law enforcement efforts include work as an Anti Terrorist Profiler, a security monitor of Federal installations in the New York area, and an independent investigative consultant with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

After 20 years of stellar service, Gregg retired on January 16th of this year and is now planning to pursue a career in Federal law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, Gregg Cherry has had a long and distinguished career in the NYCPD and remains committed to serving his community and country with his future employment in Federal law enforcement. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today; and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

HONORING JOHN HUNTER GRAY

BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Hunter Gray, a civil rights activist involved in the southern movement from the summer of 1961 to the summer of 1967.

Hunter Gray, formerly John Salter, took the name of his Native American family some years ago and has been one of the Nation's most ardent advocates on behalf of Native rights. He was recently diagnosed with a severe and possibly fatal case of lupus that has also brought on a bad case of diabetes.

John Salter was very active with the Jackson, Mississippi, NAACP and boycott in 1964. He was in the trenches with Medgar Evers and others during the civil rights movement from 1961 until Evers was assassinated and Gray and his wife and young son left the State. He also wrote a book titled, Jackson, Mississippi: An American Chronicle of Struggle and Schism (1979).

Hunter Gray's commitment to civil rights has continued throughout the years. He and his wife Eldri, who has been a partner in the struggle for equality for 40 years, now live in Idaho. He has been hospitalized several times over the past few months, and his medication and hospitalization costs are very expensive. Many of his friends are organizing a testimonial and fund-raiser to let him know how grateful we are to him for his many sacrifices and contributions to civil rights, Native American and labor causes.

For further information on Hunter Gray, I refer you to his widely read Web site at www.hunterbear.org. Hunter Gray has left a formative mark on the shape of Mississippi history. I thank him for his service to civil rights and to Mississippi. I ask that you keep him in your prayers and meditations.

HONORING THE GARLAND ISD
DURING SCHOOL BOARD APPRECIATION MONTH

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, in the month of January, across the country, the State of Texas and in the Fifth Congressional District, we celebrate School Board Recognition Month to acknowledge the hard work of school board members and thank them for their valuable service in the education of our children.

During School Board Recognition Month, we honor the administrators, staff, and volunteers of the Garland Independent School District who work to promote academic excellence and provide a safe learning environment for our students.

School board members are responsible for fulfilling one of the most important roles in our society: helping develop young men and women into the future leaders of our Nation's economy, government, community, and houses of worship.

I would like to extend my most sincere thanks to all Garland school board members for their continued dedication and hard work. Their contribution to the education of our children is truly helping to shape the future of our communities and our Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO MARVIN L.
LIFSHUTZ

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Marvin L. Lifshutz in recognition of his extraordinary accomplishments in the field of health care law.

Marvin has specialized in the representation of health care professionals for 40 years. He has represented individual physicians, medical groups, medical staffs at hospitals and medical societies. He represents private practices and hospital-based practices for a variety of specialty clients, including the negotiation of exclusive contracts for employees, independent contractors and chiefs of departments.

In the area of managed care, he has created the organizational structures for independent practice associations and their by-laws, negotiated contracts with health maintenance organizations as well as union health care contracts. He has also formed large and small groups of health care providers in setting up medical clinics.

Marvin has assisted in mergers as well as the purchase and sale of medical practices for all subspecialties. He has also represented health care providers who provide Medicare or Medicaid services in the State of New York. Marvin currently represents physicians and physician groups in managed care negotiations and also represents companies acquiring management service organizations (MSOs) that are in the process of going public.

With such a wealth of information, he has shared his expertise on health care law with

business, health and legal groups. He lectures at the State and County Medical Societies as well as the health care division of the C.P.A. Society on issues of medical practices, managed care, hospital staff privileges, limited partnerships and asset protection for physicians. Marvin also has several medical societies as clients and has lectured at many hospitals to the attending medical staff on different health care issues. Additionally, he has lectured to residents at different hospitals throughout New York State.

Marvin also represents large health care groups in negotiating different contracts for various HMOs. He has formed many multiple specialty groups with MSOs and has negotiated with investment bankers who are acquiring many health care groups which are going to be taken public. Marvin has served as a consultant to a number of hospitals on different matters that pertain to their needs, and in conjunction with other groups he has performed compliance studies for large health care organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Marvin L. Lifshutz has demonstrated exceptional skills and knowledge in the field of health care law and continues to provide important representation in this area. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF
LOUIS ALLEN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the anniversary of the death of Louis Allen. I submit the following article from Dittmer, John. "Local People." Urbana. University of Illinois Press, 1994, page 215.

"Mississippi Freedom Summer Timeline," January 31, 1964

On the evening of January 31, 1964, Louis Allen was gunned down outside his home in Amite County, Mississippi. Married and the father of four children, the 45-year-old independent logger was hit in the face with two loads of buckshot, dying almost instantly. Three years earlier, he had seen Mississippi State legislator E.H. Hurst shoot Herbert Lee, local civil rights pioneer, in cold blood. After word got around that Allen had talked with Justice Department officials about the case, his life became a nightmare. Over the next two years, Allen suffered economic harassment, was jailed on false charges and had his jaw broken by a deputy sheriff.

When, early in 1964, he learned that whites were planning to kill him, the victim made plans to join his brother in Milwaukee. Allen was to leave Mississippi on February 1, one day too late. No one was ever charged in the murder.

HONORING THE DALLAS ISD DURING SCHOOL BOARD APPRECIATION MONTH

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, in the month of January, across the country, the State of Texas and in the Fifth Congressional District, we celebrate School Board Recognition Month to acknowledge the hard work of school board members and thank them for their valuable service in the education of our children.

During School Board Recognition Month, we honor the administrators, staff, and volunteers of the Dallas Independent School District who work to promote academic excellence and provide a safe learning environment for our students.

School board members are responsible for fulfilling one of the most important roles in our society: helping develop young men and women into the future leaders of our Nation's economy, government, community, and houses of worship.

I would like to extend my most sincere thanks to all Dallas school board members for their continued dedication and hard work. Their contribution to the education of our children is truly helping to shape the future of our communities and our Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 and February 4, I was in Rhode Island performing official duties. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

HONORING THE LIFE OF J.R.
RICHARDS

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life of J.R. Richards. J.R. was an exemplary leader in my community, the 23rd Congressional District. I had the pleasure of knowing and working alongside J.R. during my time as a school nurse in the Santa Barbara School Districts.

As a teacher, he devoted his life to public education, through which he daily strove to serve young people. In this capacity, he taught mathematics; and many of his students have commented to me on how interesting and dynamic he made the subject for them. J.R. told me once that his greatest pleasure came from drawing out math skills from a classroom of students for whom math was particularly challenging. As one of the most dedicated teachers in the Santa Barbara School Districts, he

embodied the highest principles of the teaching profession.

J.R.'s teaching extended beyond the required classroom curriculum. He challenged not only his students but also his colleagues to strive to achieve their highest potential. His role as a teacher was expanded to one of a friend, mentor and confidant to multitudes of his students, their families and the school staff and faculty.

When J.R. became principal of Santa Barbara High School in 1995 he came not as an outsider but as a leader among his peers. He was one of the family. He had graduated from the school in 1957 and in some ways never left. In his new position, he brought a light and warmth to the campus that enabled all students of all backgrounds to feel welcome. In return for his dedication, he has left a lasting impression on all of his students who feel his impact on their lives today. Each person who recalls J.R. Richards holds close at heart that welcoming, affirming "DON" standing in the halls before class. He inspired confidence, urging each of us to strive to be the very best we can. We won't let you down J.R. You mean too much to us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that today we join with J.R.'s family in mourning the passing of this exceptional man, whose presence will be greatly missed.

LOWER BUCKS COUNTY DAV CHAPTER #117-PA CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Lower Bucks County Disabled American Veterans Chapter #117-PA, an organization that will be celebrating its 50th anniversary on February 15, 2004.

Lower Bucks County DAV Chapter #117 shares a proud history with one of the Nation's oldest and most important housing developments. In 1951, developer William Levitt first unveiled the three styles of homes that would eventually populate what would later be known as Levittown, a planned housing development constructed to meet the needs of the employees of the Rohm and Haas Chemical plant in Bristol, 3M in Bristol Township, and the new steel-making facility for U.S. Steel-Fairless Works in Falls Township. Many veterans of World War II and the Korean War purchased homes in this community under the GI Bill's mortgage package. As a result, numerous Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion posts were established in the area to meet the needs of the local veteran population.

Although differing in their individual mission statements, all these groups had one common denominator: war-inflicted injuries. As a means of combating some of the myths associated with conflict-related disabilities, a small group of World War II and Korean War veterans petitioned the National Disabled Americans for a charter. On October 21, 1953, Lower Bucks County DAV Chapter #117-PA was established; and over the years, its members have shown that those injured in battle can become indispensable members of society through their activities within the community.

Throughout the past 50 years, Lower Bucks County DAV Chapter #117's leadership and its members have never failed to remember their primary objective: to come to the aid of veterans and to be an active service organization within the community it serves. I commend DAV Chapter #117 for its continued leadership, and I wish it all the best as it enters its next 50 years of service.

PAWNEE SESQUICENTENNIAL
RECOGNITION

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the Village of Pawnee, Illinois, as they celebrate their sesquicentennial. Established in 1854, the people of Pawnee have prospered while giving so much to this great nation.

In the middle of the 19th century, the Village of Pawnee started as a settlement at the bottom of a hill next to a creek in central Illinois. In the past, the small town boasted its own coalmine and railroad. Pawnee's earliest inhabitants were farmers, coalminers, common folk, and businessmen. Today, because of its outstanding school system, churches, and low crime rate, the town has blossomed into a village of 2,800 residents.

I am proud to represent the great people of the Village of Pawnee and to share in this special occasion with them. I thank them for all they give to this great nation and I wish them many successes in the years to come. Congratulations!

For those today who don't know enough about Pawnee, Illinois I have included this brief history of the town by Skip Minder:

"Justus Henkle and his family were the first Pawnee area settlers, arriving in the middle of March, 1818. They were followed by other early settlers, many of who settled at the bottom of a hill next to a creek, thus assuring a water supply.

The small settlement became known as the Horse Creek Settlement. In 1854, it petitioned the U.S. Post Office Department for a post office. The Post Office Department did not like the Horse Creek Settlement name and arbitrarily changed it to Pawnee, and so it has been from that time forward.

The Village of Pawnee was incorporated on November 9, 1891, and was and is still governed by a Village President and six Village Trustees.

In its early days the town boasted its own coalmine, the Horse Creek Coal Company, which later became the Peabody Coal Company Mine #5, and its own railroad known as the Pawnee Railroad. That railroad was the forerunner of the current Chicago and Illinois Midland Railroad (C&IM).

One of Pawnee's inhabitants was a man named Edward A. Baxter (1847–1934). At age 14, he enlisted in Indiana as a Union soldier during the Civil War along with six of his brothers. They became known as the "seven fighting Baxter brothers". All survived the war.

In 1865, young soldier, Ed Baxter, stood in the honor guard at the head of Abraham Lincoln's casket during funeral services for Lincoln in Indianapolis, Indiana. Lincoln's body

was then transported to Springfield, Illinois for burial. Later, Baxter came to Pawnee in the summer of 1870 and remained until his death in 1934.

Another prominent citizen was Harry Howland Mason (1873–1946). He was the publisher of the Pawnee Herald newspaper until he was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1934 as Representative for the 21st Congressional District.

Pawnee's earliest inhabitants were farmers, and later farmers and coal miners, common folk, and businessmen. Today it has blossomed into a village of 2,800 residents. Rather than growth in its business and agricultural areas, growth is attributed to its outstanding school system, churches, and low crime rate. Many residents choose to reside in Pawnee and commute to their employment in other communities.

In June of this year it will celebrate its sesquicentennial, 150 years of being. It looks forward to at least 150 more years!"

BLIND INTO BAGHDAD

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, anyone interested in why there has been such chaos in post-war Iraq needs to read the article I am inserting in the RECORD by James Fallows which appeared in the most recent issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

[From the Atlantic Monthly, January/February 2004]

BLIND INTO BAGHDAD

(By James Fallows)

On a Friday afternoon last November, I met Douglas Feith in his office at the Pentagon to discuss what has happened in Iraq. Feith's title is undersecretary of defense for policy, which places him, along with several other undersecretaries, just below Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz in the Pentagon's hierarchy. Informally he is seen in Washington as "Wolfowitz's Wolfowitz"—that is, as a deputy who has a wide range of responsibilities but is clearly identified with one particular policy. That policy is bringing regime change to Iraq—a goal that both Wolfowitz and Feith strongly advocated through the 1990s. To opponents of the war in Iraq, Feith is one of several shadowy, Rasputinlike figures who are shaping U.S. policy. He is seen much the way enemies of the Clinton Administration saw Hillary Clinton. Others associated with the Bush Administration who are seen this way include the consultant Richard Perle; Lewis "Scooter" Libby, the chief of staff for Vice President Dick Cheney; and the Vice President himself. What these officials have in common is their presumably great private influence and—even in the case of the Vice President—their limited public visibility and accountability.

In person Douglas Feith is nothing like Rasputin. Between a Reagan-era stint in the Pentagon and his current job he was a Washington lawyer for fifteen years, and he answered my questions with a lawyer's affability in the face of presumed disagreement. I could be biased in Feith's favor, because he was the most senior Administration official who granted my request for an interview about postwar Iraq. Like Donald Rumsfeld, Feith acts and sounds younger than many

others of his age (fifty). But distinctly unlike Rumsfeld at a press conference, Feith in this interview did not seem at all arrogant or testy. His replies were relatively candid and unforced, in contrast to the angry or relentlessly on-message responses that have become standard from senior Administration officials. He acknowledged what was "becoming the conventional wisdom" about the Administration's failure to plan adequately for events after the fall of Baghdad, and then explained—with animation, dramatic pauses, and gestures—why he thought it was wrong.

Feith offered a number of specific illustrations of what he considered underappreciated successes. Some were familiar—the oil wells weren't on fire, Iraqis didn't starve or flee—but others were less so. For instance, he described the Administration's careful effort to replace old Iraqi dinars, which carried Saddam Hussein's image ("It's interesting how important that is, and it ties into the whole issue of whether people think that Saddam might be coming back"), with a new form of currency, without causing a run on the currency.

But mainly he challenged the premise of most critics: that the Administration could have done a better job of preparing for the consequences of victory. When I asked what had gone better than expected, and what had gone worse, he said, "We don't exactly deal in 'expectations.' Expectations are too close to 'predictions.' We're not comfortable with predictions. It is one of the big strategic premises of the work that we do."

The limits of future knowledge, Feith said, were of special importance to Rumsfeld, "who is death to predictions." "His big strategic theme is uncertainty," Feith said. "The need to deal strategically with uncertainty. The inability to predict the future. The limits on our knowledge and the limits on our intelligence."

In practice, Feith said, this meant being ready for whatever proved to be the situation in postwar Iraq. "You will not find a single piece of paper . . . If anybody ever went through all of our records—and someday some people will, presumably—nobody will find a single piece of paper that says, 'Mr. Secretary or Mr. President, let us tell you what postwar Iraq is going to look like, and here is what we need plans for.' If you tried that, you would get thrown out of Rumsfeld's office so fast—if you ever went in there and said, 'Let me tell you what something's going to look like in the future,' you wouldn't get to your next sentence!"

"This is an important point," he said, "because of this issue of What did we believe? . . . The common line is, nobody planned for security because Ahmed Chalabi told us that everything was going to be swell." Chalabi, the exiled leader of the Iraqi National Congress, has often been blamed for making rosy predictions about the ease of governing postwar Iraq. "So we predicted that everything was going to be swell, and we didn't plan for things not being swell." Here Feith paused for a few seconds, raised his hands with both palms up, and put on a "Can you believe it?" expression. "I mean—one would really have to be a simpleton. And whatever people think of me, how can anybody think that Don Rumsfeld is that dumb? He's so evidently not that dumb, that how can people write things like that?" He sounded amazed rather than angry.

No one contends that Donald Rumsfeld, or Paul Wolfowitz, or Douglas Feith, or the Administration as a whole is dumb. The wisdom of their preparations for the aftermath of military victory in Iraq is the question. Feith's argument was a less defensive-sounding version of the Administration's general response to criticisms of its postwar policy: Life is uncertain, especially when the lid

comes off a long-tyrannized society. American planners did about as well as anyone could in preparing for the unforeseeable. Anyone who says otherwise is indulging in lazy, unfair second-guessing. "The notion that there was a memo that was once written, that if we had only listened to that memo, all would be well in Iraq, is so preposterous," Feith told me.

The notion of a single memo's changing history is indeed farfetched. The idea that a substantial body of knowledge could have improved postwar prospects is not. The Administration could not have known everything about what it would find in Iraq. But it could have—and should have—done far more than it did.

Almost everything, good and bad, that has happened in Iraq since the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime was the subject of extensive pre-war discussion and analysis. This is particularly true of what have proved to be the harshest realities for the United States since the fall of Baghdad: that occupying the country is much more difficult than conquering it; that a breakdown in public order can jeopardize every other goal; that the ambition of patiently nurturing a new democracy is at odds with the desire to turn control over to the Iraqis quickly and get U.S. troops out; that the Sunni center of the country is the main security problem; that with each passing day Americans risk being seen less as liberators and more as occupiers, and targets.

All this, and much more, was laid out in detail and in writing long before the U.S. government made the final decision to attack. Even now the collective efforts at planning by the CIA, the State Department, the Army and the Marine Corps, the United States Agency for International Development, and a wide variety of other groups inside and outside the government are underappreciated by the public. The one pre-war effort that has received substantial recent attention, the State Department's Future of Iraq project, produced thousands of pages of findings, barely one paragraph of which has until now been quoted in the press. The Administration will be admired in retrospect for how much knowledge it created about the challenge it was taking on. U.S. government predictions about postwar Iraq's problems have proved as accurate as the assessments of pre-war Iraq's strategic threat have proved flawed.

But the Administration will be condemned for what it did with what was known. The problems the United States has encountered are precisely the ones its own expert agencies warned against. Exactly what went wrong with the occupation will be studied for years—or should be. The missteps of the first half year in Iraq are as significant as other classic and carefully examined failures in foreign policy, including John Kennedy's handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, in 1961, and Lyndon Johnson's decision to escalate U.S. involvement in Vietnam, in 1965. The United States withstood those previous failures, and it will withstand this one. Having taken over Iraq and captured Saddam Hussein, it has no moral or practical choice other than to see out the occupation and to help rebuild and democratize the country. But its missteps have come at a heavy cost. And the ongoing financial, diplomatic, and human cost of the Iraq occupation is the more grievous in light of advance warnings the government had.

BEFORE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001: THE EARLY DAYS

Concern about Saddam Hussein pre-dated the 9/11 attacks and even the inauguration of George W. Bush. In 1998 Congress passed and President Bill Clinton signed the Iraq Liberation Act, which declared that "it should

be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power." During the 2000 presidential campaign Al Gore promised to support groups working to unseat Saddam Hussein. In the week before Bush took office, Nicholas Lemann reported in *The New Yorker* that "the idea of overthrowing Saddam is not an idle fantasy—or, if it is, it's one that has lately occupied the minds of many American officials, including people close to George W. Bush." But the intellectual case for regime change, argued during the Clinton years by some Democrats and notably by Paul Wolfowitz, then the dean of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, shifted clearly toward operational planning after the destruction of the World Trade Center.

For much of the public this case for war against Iraq rested on an assumed connection (though this was never demonstrated, and was officially disavowed by the President) between Saddam Hussein's regime and the terrorist hijackers. Within the government the case was equally compelling but different. September 11 had shown that the United States was newly vulnerable; to protect itself it had to fight terrorists at their source; and because Saddam Hussein's regime was the leading potential source of future "state-sponsored" terrorism, it had become an active threat, whether or not it played any role in 9/11. The very next day, September 12, 2001, James Woolsey, who had been Clinton's first CIA director, told me that no matter who proved to be responsible for this attack, the solution had to include removing Saddam Hussein, because he was so likely to be involved next time. A military planner inside the Pentagon later told me that on September 13 his group was asked to draw up scenarios for an assault on Iraq, not just Afghanistan.

Soon after becoming the Army Chief of Staff, in 1999, General Eric Shinseki had begun ordering war-game exercises to judge strategies and manpower needs for possible combat in Iraq. This was not because he assumed a war was imminent. He thought that the greater Caspian Sea region, including Iraq, would present a uniquely difficult challenge for U.S. troops, because of its geography and political tensions. After 9/11, Army war games involving Iraq began in earnest.

In his first State of the Union address, on January 29, 2002, President Bush said that Iraq, Iran, and North Korea were an "axis of evil" that threatened world peace. "By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States."

By the time of this speech efforts were afoot not simply to remove Saddam Hussein but also to imagine what Iraq would be like when he was gone. In late October of 2001, while the U.S. military was conducting its rout of the Taliban from Afghanistan, the State Department had quietly begun its planning for the aftermath of a "transition" in Iraq. At about the time of the "axis of evil" speech, working groups within the department were putting together a list of postwar jobs and topics to be considered, and possible groups of experts to work on them.

ONE YEAR BEFORE THE WAR: THE "FUTURE OF IRAQ"

Thus was born the Future of Iraq project, whose existence is by now well known, but whose findings and potential impact have rarely been reported and examined. The State Department first publicly mentioned the project in March of 2002, when it quietly

announced the lineup of the working groups. At the time, media attention was overwhelmingly directed toward Afghanistan, where Operation Anaconda, the half-successful effort to kill or capture al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters, was under way.

For several months before announcing the project the State Department had been attempting to coordinate the efforts of the many fractious Iraqi exile organizations. The Future of Iraq project held the potential for harnessing, and perhaps even harmonizing, the expertise available from the exile groups.

It was also in keeping with a surprisingly well established U.S. government tradition of preparing for postwar duties before there was a clear idea of when fighting would begin, let alone when it would end. Before the United States entered World War II, teams at the Army War College were studying what went right and wrong when American doughboys occupied Germany after World War I. Within months of the attack on Pearl Harbor, a School of Military Government had been created, at the University of Virginia, to plan for the occupation of both Germany and Japan. In 1995, while U.S. negotiators, led by Richard Holbrooke, were still working at the Dayton peace talks to end the war in the Balkans, World Bank representatives were on hand to arrange loans for the new regimes.

Contemplating postwar plans posed a problem for those who, like many in the State Department, were skeptical of the need for war. Were they making a war more likely if they prepared for its aftermath? Thomas Warrick, the State Department official who directed the Future of Iraq project, was considered to be in the antiwar camp. But according to associates, he explained the importance of preparing for war by saying, "I'm nervous that they're actually going to do it—and the day after they'll turn to us and ask, 'Now what?'" So he pushed ahead with the project, setting up numerous conferences and drafting sessions that would bring together teams of exiles—among them Kanan Makiya, the author of the influential anti-Saddam book, *Republic of Fear*, first published in 1989. A small number of "international advisers," mainly from the United States, were also assigned to the teams. Eventually there would be seventeen working groups, designed systematically to cover what would be needed to rebuild the political and economic infrastructure of the country. "Democratic Principles and Procedures" was the name of one of the groups, which was assigned to suggest the legal framework for a new government; Makiya would write much of its report. The "Transitional Justice" group was supposed to work on reparations, amnesty, and de-Baathification laws. Groups studying economic matters included "Public Finance," "Oil and Energy," and "Water, Agriculture and Environment."

In May of 2002 Congress authorized \$5 million to fund the project's studies. In the flurry of news from Afghanistan the project went unnoticed in the press until June, when the State Department announced that the first meetings would take place in July. "The role of the U.S. government and State Department is to see what the Iraqis and Iraqi-Americans want," Warrick said at a conference on June 1, 2002. "The impetus for change comes from [Iraqis], not us. This is the job of Iraqis inside and outside."

That same day President Bush delivered a graduation speech at West Point, giving a first look at the doctrine of pre-emptive war. He told the cadets, to cheers, "Our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for pre-emptive action when necessary to defend our liberty and to defend our lives." Later in the summer the doctrine was elaborated in a new

National Security Strategy, which explained that since "rogue states" could not be contained or deterred, they needed to be destroyed before they could attack.

Whenever National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice was interviewed that summer, she talked mainly about the thinking behind the new policy. When Vice President Dick Cheney was interviewed, he talked mainly about Saddam Hussein's defiance of international law. But when Secretary of State Colin Powell was interviewed, he constantly stressed the value of an international approach to the problem and the need to give UN arms inspectors adequate time to do their job.

War with Iraq was not inevitable at this point, but it seemed more and more likely. Daily conversation in Washington, which usually reverts to "So, who do you think will be the next President?," switched instead to "So, when do you think we're going to war?"

It was in these circumstances that the Future of Iraq project's working groups deliberated. Most of the meetings were in Washington. Some were in London, and one session, in early September, took place in Surrey, where representatives of a dozen mutually suspicious exile groups discussed prospects for democratic coexistence when Saddam Hussein was gone. (Along with Chalabi's INC the meeting included several rival Kurdish groups, Assyrian and Turkomen organizations, the Iraqi Constitutional Monarchy Movement, and others.)

The project did not overcome all the tensions among its members, and the results of its deliberations were uneven. Three of its intended working groups never actually met—including, ominously, "Preserving Iraq's Cultural Heritage." The "Education" group finally produced a report only six pages long, in contrast to many hundreds of pages from most others. Some recommendations were quirky or reflected the tastes of the individual participants who drafted them. A report titled "Free Media" proposed that all Iraqi journalists be taken out of the country for a month-long re-education process: "Those who 'get it' go back as reporters; others would be retired or reassigned." A group that was considering ways of informing Iraq about the realities of democracy mentioned Baywatch and Leave It to Beaver as information sources that had given Iraqis an imprecise understanding of American society. It recommended that a new film, *Colonial America: Life in a Theocracy*, be shot, noting, "The Puritan experiments provide amazing parallels with current Moslem fundamentalism. The ultimate failures of these US experiments can also be vividly illustrated—witch trials, intolerance, etc."

But whatever may have been unrealistic or factional about these efforts, even more of what the project created was impressive. The final report consisted of thirteen volumes of recommendations on specific topics, plus a one-volume summary and overview. These I have read—and I read them several months into the occupation, when it was unfairly easy to judge how well the forecast was standing up. (Several hundred of the 2,500 pages were in Arabic, which sped up the reading process.) The report was labeled "For Official Use Only"—an administrative term that implies confidentiality but has no legal significance. The State Department held the report closely until, last fall, it agreed to congressional requests to turn over the findings.

Most of the project's judgments look good in retrospect—and virtually all reveal a touching earnestness about working out the details of reconstructing a society. For instance, one of the thickest volumes considered the corruption endemic in Iraqi life and laid out strategies for coping with it. (These

included a new "Iraqi Government Code of Ethics," which began, "Honesty, integrity, and fairness are the fundamental values for the people of Iraq.") The overview volume, which appears to have been composed as a series of PowerPoint charts, said that the United States was undertaking this effort because, among other things, "detailed public planning" conveys U.S. government "seriousness" and the message that the U.S. government "wants to learn from past regime change experiences."

For their part, the Iraqi participants emphasized several points that ran through all the working groups' reports. A recurring theme was the urgency of restoring electricity and water supplies as soon as possible after regime change. The first item in the list of recommendations from the "Water, Agriculture and Environment" group read, "Fundamental importance of clean water supplies for Iraqis immediately after transition. Key to coalition/community relations." One of the groups making economic recommendations wrote, "Stressed importance of getting electrical grid up and running immediately—key to water systems, jobs. Could go a long way to determining Iraqis' attitudes toward Coalition forces."

A second theme was the need to plan carefully for the handling and demobilization of Iraq's very sizable military. On the one hand, a functioning army would be necessary for public order and, once coalition forces withdrew, for the country's defense. ("Our vision of the future is to build a democratic civil society. In order to make this vision a reality, we need to have an army that can work alongside this new society.") On the other hand, a large number of Saddam's henchmen would have to be removed. The trick would be to get rid of the leaders without needlessly alienating the ordinary troops—or leaving them without income. One group wrote, "All combatants who are included in the demobilization process must be assured by their leaders and the new government of their legal rights and that new prospects for work and education will be provided by the new system." Toward this end it laid out a series of steps the occupation authorities should take in the "disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration" process. Another group, in a paper on democratic principles, warned, "The decommissioning of hundreds of thousands of trained military personnel that [a rapid purge] implies could create social problems."

Next the working groups emphasized how disorderly Iraq would be soon after liberation, and how difficult it would be to get the country on the path to democracy—though that was where it had to go. "The removal of Saddam's regime will provide a power vacuum and create popular anxieties about the viability of all Iraqi institutions," a paper on rebuilding civil society said. "The traumatic and disruptive events attendant to the regime change will affect all Iraqis, both Saddam's conspirators and the general populace." Another report warned more explicitly that "the period immediately after regime change might offer these criminals the opportunity to engage in acts of killing, plunder and looting." In the short term the occupying forces would have to prevent disorder. In the long term, according to a report written by Kanan Makiya, they would need to recognize that "the extent of the Iraqi totalitarian state, its absolute power and control exercised from Baghdad, not to mention the terror used to enforce compliance, cannot be overestimated in their impact on the Iraqi psyche and the attendant feeling of fear, weakness, and shame." Makiya continued, "These conditions and circumstances do not provide a strong foundation on which to build new institutions and a modern nation state."

Each of the preceding themes would seem to imply a long, difficult U.S. commitment in Iraq. America should view its involvement in Iraq, the summary report said, not as it had Afghanistan, which was left to stew in lightly supervised warlordism, but as it had Germany and Japan, which were rebuilt over many years. But nearly every working group stressed one other point: the military occupation itself had to be brief. "Note: Military government idea did not go down well," one chart in the summary volume said. The "Oil and Energy" group presented a "key concept": "Iraqis do not work for American contractors; Americans are seen assisting Iraqis."

Americans are often irritated by the illogic of "resentful dependence" by weaker states. South Koreans, for example, complain bitterly about U.S. soldiers in their country but would complain all the more bitterly if the soldiers were removed. The authors of the Future of Iraq report could by those standards also be accused of illogical thinking, in wanting U.S. support but not wanting U.S. control. Moreover, many of the project's members had a bias that prefigured an important source of postwar tension: they were exiles who considered themselves the likeliest beneficiaries if the United States transferred power to Iraqis quickly—even though, precisely because of their exile, they had no obvious base of support within Iraq.

To skip ahead in the story: As chaos increased in Baghdad last summer, the chief U.S. administrator, L. Paul "Jerry" Bremer, wrestled constantly with a variant of this exile paradox. The Iraqi Governing Council, whose twenty-five members were chosen by Americans, was supposed to do only the preparatory work for an elected Iraqi government. But the greater the pressure on Bremer for "Iraqification," the more tempted he was to give in to the council's demand that he simply put it in charge without waiting for an election. More than a year earlier, long before combat began, the explicit recommendations and implicit lessons of the Future of Iraq project had given the U.S. government a very good idea of what political conflicts it could expect in Iraq.

TEN MONTHS BEFORE THE WAR: WAR GAMES AND WARNINGS

As combat slowed in Afghanistan and the teams of the Future of Iraq project continued their deliberations, the U.S. government put itself on a wartime footing. In late May the CIA had begun what would become a long series of war-game exercises, to think through the best- and worst-case scenarios after the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. According to a person familiar with the process, one recurring theme in the exercises was the risk of civil disorder after the fall of Baghdad. The exercises explored how to find and secure the weapons of mass destruction that were then assumed to be in and around Baghdad, and indicated that the hardest task would be finding and protecting scientists who knew about the weapons before they could be killed by the regime as it was going down.

The CIA also considered whether a new Iraqi government could be put together through a process like the Bonn conference, which was then being used to devise a post-Taliban regime for Afghanistan. At the Bonn conference representatives of rival political and ethnic groups agreed on the terms that established Hamid Karzai as the new Afghan President. The CIA believed that rivalries in Iraq were so deep, and the political culture so shallow, that a similarly quick transfer of sovereignty would only invite chaos.

Representatives from the Defense Department were among those who participated in the first of these CIA war-game sessions.

When their Pentagon superiors at the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) found out about this, in early summer, the representatives were reprimanded and told not to participate further. "OSD" is Washington shorthand, used frequently in discussions about the origins of Iraq war plans, and it usually refers to strong guidance from Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Feith, and one of Feith's deputies, William Luti. Their displeasure over the CIA exercise was an early illustration of a view that became stronger throughout 2002: that postwar planning was an impediment to war.

Because detailed thought about the postwar situation meant facing costs and potential problems, and thus weakened the case for launching a "war of choice" (the Washington term for a war not waged in immediate self-defense), it could be seen as an "antiwar" undertaking. The knowledge that U.S. soldiers would still be in Germany and Japan sixty-plus years after Pearl Harbor would obviously not have changed the decision to enter World War II, and in theory the Bush Administration could have presented the overthrow of Saddam Hussein in a similar way: as a job that had to be done, even though it might saddle Americans with costs and a military presence for decades to come. Everyone can think of moments when Bush or Rumsfeld has reminded the nation that this would be a longterm challenge. But during the months when the Administration was making its case for the war—successfully to Congress, less so to the United Nations—it acted as if the long run should be thought about only later on.

On July 31, 2002, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee invited a panel of experts to discuss the case for war against Iraq. On August 1 it heard from other experts about the likely "day after" consequences of military victory. Senator Joseph Biden, a Democrat from Delaware, was then the chairman of the committee. That first day Biden said that the threat of WMD might force him to vote in favor of the war (as he ultimately did). But he worried that if the United States invaded without full allied support, "we may very well radicalize the rest of the world, we may pick up a bill that's \$70 billion, \$80 billion, we may have to have extensive commitment of U.S. forces for an extended period of time in Iraq."

Phebe Marr, an Iraq scholar retired from the National Defense University, told the committee that the United States "should assume that it cannot get the results it wants on the cheap" from regime change. "It must be prepared to put some troops on the ground, advisers to help create new institutions, and above all, time and effort in the future to see the project through to a satisfactory end. If the United States is not willing to do so, it had best rethink the project." Rend Rahim Francke, an Iraqi exile serving on the Future of Iraq project (and now the ambassador from Iraq to the United States), said that "the system of public security will break down, because there will be no functioning police force, no civil service, and no justice system" on the first day after the fighting. "There will be a vacuum of political authority and administrative authority," she said. "The infrastructure of vital sectors will have to be restored. An adequate police force must be trained and equipped as quickly as possible. And the economy will have to be jump-started from not only stagnation but devastation." Other witnesses discussed the need to commit U.S. troops for many years—but to begin turning constitutional authority over to the Iraqis within six months. The upshot of the hearings was an emphasis on the short-term importance of security, the medium-term challenge of maintaining control while transferring sov-

ereignty to the Iraqis, and the long-term reality of commitments and costs. All the experts agreed that what came after the fall of Baghdad would be harder for the United States than what came before.

SIX MONTHS BEFORE THE WAR: GETTING SERIOUS

One week before Labor Day, while President Bush was at his ranch in Texas, Vice President Cheney gave a speech at a Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Nashville. "There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction [and that he will use them] against our friends, against our allies, and against us," Cheney said. Time was running out, he concluded, for America to remove this threat. A few days later CNN quoted a source "intimately familiar with [Colin] Powell's thinking" as saying that Powell was still insistent on the need for allied support and would oppose any war in which the United States would "go it alone . . . as if it doesn't give a damn" about other nations' views. Just after Labor Day, Powell apparently won a battle inside the Administration and persuaded Bush to take the U.S. case to the United Nations. On September 12 Bush addressed the UN General Assembly and urged it to insist on Iraqi compliance with its previous resolutions concerning disarmament.

Before the war the Administration exercised remarkable "message discipline" about financial projections. When asked how much the war might cost, officials said that so many things were uncertain, starting with whether there would even be a war, that there was no responsible way to make an estimate. In part this reflected Rumsfeld's emphasis on the unknowability of the future. It was also politically essential, in delaying the time when the Administration had to argue that regime change in Iraq was worth a specific number of billions of dollars.

In September, Lawrence Lindsay, then the chief White House economic adviser, broke discipline. He was asked by *The Wall Street Journal* how much a war and its aftermath might cost. He replied that it might end up at one to two percent of the gross domestic product, which would mean \$100 billion to \$200 billion. Lindsay added that he thought the cost of not going to war could conceivably be greater—but that didn't placate his critics within the Administration. The Administration was further annoyed by a report a few days later from Democrats on the House Budget Committee, which estimated the cost of the war at \$48 billion to \$93 billion. Lindsay was widely criticized in "back-ground" comments from Administration officials, and by the end of the year he had been forced to resign. His comment "made it clear Larry just didn't get it," an unnamed Administration official told *The Washington Post* when Lindsay left. Lindsay's example could hardly have encouraged others in the Administration to be forthcoming with financial projections. Indeed, no one who remained in the Administration offered a plausible cost estimate until months after the war began.

In September, the United States Agency for International Development began to think in earnest about its postwar responsibilities in Iraq. It was the natural contact for nongovernmental organizations, or NGOs, from the United States and other countries that were concerned with relief efforts in Iraq.

USAID's administrator, Andrew Natsios, came to the assignment with a complex set of experiences and instincts. He started his career, in the 1970s, as a Republican state legislator in Massachusetts, and before the Bush Administration he had been the administrator of the state's "Big Dig," the largest

public-works effort ever in the country. Before the Big Dig, Natsios spent five years as an executive at a major humanitarian NGO called World Vision. He also served in the Persian Gulf during the 1991 Gulf War, as an Army Reserve officer. By background he was the Administration official best prepared to anticipate the combination of wartime and postwar obligations in Iraq.

At any given moment USAID is drawing up contingency plans for countries that might soon need help. "I actually have a list, which I will not show you," Natsios told me in the fall, "of countries where there may not be American troops soon, but they could fall apart—and if they do, what we could do for them." By mid-September of 2002, six months before the official beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Natsios had additional teams working on plans for Iraq. Representatives of about a dozen relief organizations and NGOs were gathering each week at USAID headquarters for routine coordination meetings. Iraq occupied more and more of their time through 2002. On October 10, one day before Congress voted to authorize the war, the meetings were recast as the Iraq Working Group.

FIVE MONTHS BEFORE THE WAR: OCCUPIERS OR LIBERATORS?

The weekly meetings at USAID quickly settled into a pattern. The representatives of the NGOs would say, "We've dealt with situations like this before, and we know what to expect." The U.S. government representatives would either say nothing or else reply, "No, this time it will be different."

The NGOs had experience dealing with a reality that has not fully sunk in for most of the American public. In the nearly three decades since U.S. troops left Vietnam, the American military has fought only two wars as most people understand the term: the two against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. But through the past thirty years U.S. troops have almost continuously been involved in combat somewhere. Because those engagements—in Grenada, Lebanon, Panama, Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and elsewhere—have no obvious connection with one another, politicians and the public usually discuss them as stand-alone cases. Each one seems an aberration from the "real" wars the military is set up to fight.

To the NGO world, these and other modern wars (like the ones in Africa) are not the exception but the new norm: brutal localized encounters that destroy the existing political order and create a need for long-term international supervision and support. Within the U.S. military almost no one welcomes this reality, but many recognize that peacekeeping, policing, and, yes, nation-building are now the expected military tasks. The military has gotten used to working alongside the NGOs—and the NGOs were ready with a checklist of things to worry about once the regime had fallen.

An even larger question about historical precedent began to surface. When Administration officials talked about models for what would happen in Iraq, they almost always referred to the lasting success in Japan and Germany—or else to countries of the former Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe. (A civilian adviser who went to Baghdad early in the occupation recalls looking at his fellow passengers on the military transport plane. The ones who weren't asleep or flipping through magazines were reading books about Japan or Germany, not about the Arab world. "That was not a good sign," he told me.) If one thought of Iraq as Poland, or as the former East Germany, or as the former Czechoslovakia, or as almost any part of the onetime Soviet empire in Eastern Europe other than Romania, one would naturally

conclude that regime change in itself would set the country well along the path toward recovery. These countries were fine once their repressive leaders were removed; so might Iraq well be. And if the former Yugoslavia indicated darker possibilities, that could be explained as yet another failure of Clinton-era foreign policy.

Many NGO representatives assumed that postwar recovery would not be so automatic, and that they should begin working on preparations before the combat began. "At the beginning our main message was the need for access," I was told by Sandra Mitchell, the vice-president of the International Rescue Committee, who attended the USAID meetings. Because of U.S. sanctions against Iraq, it was illegal for American humanitarian organizations to operate there. (Journalists were about the only category of Americans who would not get in trouble with their own government by traveling to and spending money in Iraq.) "Our initial messages were like those in any potential crisis situation," Mitchell said, "but the reason we were so insistent in this case was the precarious situation that already existed in Iraq. The internal infrastructure was shot, and you couldn't easily swing in resources from neighboring countries, like in the Balkans." The NGOs therefore asked, as a first step, for a presidential directive exempting them from the sanctions. They were told to expect an answer to this request by December. That deadline passed with no ruling. By early last year the NGOs felt that it was too dangerous to go to Iraq, and the Administration feared that if they went they might be used as hostages. No directive was ever issued.

Through the fall and winter of 2002 the International Rescue Committee, Refugees International, InterAction, and other groups that met with USAID kept warning about one likely postwar problem that, as it turned out, Iraq avoided—a mass flow of refugees—and another that was exactly as bad as everyone warned: the lawlessness and looting of the "day after" in Baghdad. The Bush Administration would later point to the absence of refugees as a sign of the occupation's underreported success. This achievement was, indeed, due in part to a success: the speed and precision of the military campaign itself. But the absence of refugees was also a sign of a profound failure: the mistaken estimates of Iraq's WMD threat. All pre-war scenarios involving huge movements of refugees began with the assumption that Saddam Hussein would use chemical or biological weapons against U.S. troops or his own Kurdish or Shiite populations—and that either the fact or the fear of such assaults would force terrified Iraqis to evacuate.

The power vacuum that led to looting was disastrous. "The looting was not a surprise," Sandra Mitchell told me. "It should not have come as a surprise. Anyone who has witnessed the fall of a regime while another force is coming in on a temporary basis knows that looting is standard procedure. In Iraq there were very strong signals that this could be the period of greatest concern for humanitarian response." One lesson of postwar reconstruction through the 1990s was that even a short period of disorder could have long-lasting effects.

The meetings at USAID gave the veterans of international relief operations a way to register their concerns. The problem was that they heard so little back. "The people in front of us were very well-meaning," says Joel Chamy, who represented Refugees International at the meetings. "And in fairness, they were on such a short leash. But the dialogue was one-way. We would tell them stuff, and they would nod and say, 'Everything's under control. To me it was like the old four-corners offense in basketball. They were

there to just dribble out the clock but be able to say they'd consulted with us."

And again the question arose of whether what lay ahead in Iraq would be similar to the other "small wars" of the previous decade-plus or something new. If it was similar, the NGOs had their checklists ready. These included, significantly, the obligations placed on any "occupying power" by the Fourth Geneva Convention, which was signed in 1949 and is mainly a commonsense list of duties—from protecting hospitals to minimizing postwar reprisals—that a victorious army must carry out. "But we were corrected when we raised this point," Sandra Mitchell says. "The American troops would be 'liberators' rather than 'occupiers,' so the obligations did not apply. Our point was not to pass judgment on the military action but to describe the responsibilities."

In the same mid-October week that the Senate approved the war resolution, a team from the Strategic Studies Institute at the Army War College, in Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, began a postwar-planning exercise. Even more explicitly than the NGOs, the Army team insisted that America's military past, reaching back to its conquest of the Philippines, in 1898, would be a useful guide to its future duties in Iraq. As a rule, professional soldiers spend more time thinking and talking about history than other people do; past battles are the only real evidence about doctrine and equipment. The institute—in essence, the War College's think tank—was charged with reviewing recent occupations to help the Army "best address the requirements that will necessarily follow operational victory in a war with Iraq," as the institute's director later said in a foreword to the team's report. "As the possibility of war with Iraq looms on the horizon, it is important to look beyond the conflict to the challenges of occupying the country."

The study's principal authors were Conrad Crane, who graduated from West Point in the early 1970s and taught there as a history professor through the 1990s, and Andrew Terrill, an Army Reserve officer and a strategic-studies professor. With a team of other researchers, which included representatives from the Army and the joint staff as well as other government agencies and think tanks, they began high-speed work on a set of detailed recommendations about postwar priorities. The Army War College report was also connected to a pre-war struggle with yet another profound postwar consequence: the fight within the Pentagon, between the civilian leadership in OSD and the generals running the Army, over the size and composition of the force that would conquer Iraq.

FOUR MONTHS BEFORE THE WAR: THE BATTLE IN THE PENTAGON

On November 5, 2002, the Republicans regained control of the Senate and increased their majority in the House in national midterm elections. On November 8 the UN Security Council voted 15-0 in favor of Resolution 1441, threatening Iraq with "serious consequences" if it could not prove that it had abandoned its weapons programs.

Just before 9/11 Donald Rumsfeld had been thought of as standing on a banana peel. The newspapers were full of leaked anonymous complaints from military officials who thought that his efforts to streamline and "transform" the Pentagon were unrealistic and damaging. But with his dramatic metamorphosis from embattled Secretary of Defense to triumphant Secretary of War, Rumsfeld's reputation outside the Administration and his influence within it rose. He was operating from a position of great power when, in November, he decided to "cut the TPFDD."

"Tipfid" is how people in the military pronounce the acronym for "time-phased force

and deployment data," but what it really means to the armed forces, in particular the Army, is a way of doing business that is methodical, careful, and sure. The TPFDD for Iraq was an unbelievably complex master plan governing which forces would go where, when, and with what equipment, on which planes or ships, so that everything would be coordinated and ready at the time of attack. One reason it took the military six months to get set for each of its wars against Iraq, a comparatively pitiful foe, was the thoroughness of TPFDD planning. To its supporters, this approach is old-school in the best sense: if you fight, you really fight. To its detractors, this approach is simply old—ponderous, inefficient, and, although they don't dare call it cowardly, risk-averse at the least.

A streamlined approach had proved successful in Afghanistan, at least for a while, as a relatively small U.S. force left much of the ground fighting to the Northern Alliance. In the longer run the American strategy created complications for Afghanistan, because the victorious Northern Alliance leaders were newly legitimized as warlords. Donald Rumsfeld was one member of the Administration who seemed still to share the pre-9/11 suspicion about the risks of nation-building, and so didn't much care about the postwar consequences of a relatively small invasion force. (His deputy, Paul Wolfowitz, was more open to the challenge of rebuilding Iraq, but he would never undercut or disobey Rumsfeld.) In November, Rumsfeld began working through the TPFDD, with the goal of paring the force planned for Iraq to its leanest, lightest acceptable level.

The war games run by the Army and the Pentagon's joint staff had led to very high projected troop levels. The Army's recommendation was for an invasion force 400,000 strong, made up of as many Americans as necessary and as many allied troops as possible. "All the numbers we were coming up with were quite large," Thomas White, a retired general (and former Enron executive) who was the Secretary of the Army during the war, told me recently. But Rumsfeld's idea of the right force size was more like 75,000. The Army and the military's joint leadership moderated their requests in putting together the TPFDD, but Rumsfeld began challenging the force numbers in detail. When combat began, slightly more than 200,000 U.S. soldiers were massed around Iraq.

"In what I came to think of as Secretary Rumsfeld's style," an Army official who was involved in the process told me recently, "he didn't directly say no but asked a lot of hard questions about the plan and sent us away without approval. He would ask questions that delayed the activation of units, because he didn't think the planned flow was right. Our people came back with the understanding that their numbers were far too big and they should be thinking more along the lines of Afghanistan"—that is, plan for a light, mobile attack featuring Special Forces soldiers. Another participant described Rumsfeld as looking line by line at the deployments proposed in the TPFDD and saying, "Can't we do this with one company?" or "Shouldn't we get rid of this unit?" Making detailed, last-minute adjustments to the TPFDD was, in the Army's view, like pulling cogs at random out of a machine. According to an observer, "The generals would say, Sir, these changes will ripple back to every railroad and every company."

The longer-term problem involved what would happen after Baghdad fell, as it inevitably would. This was distinctly an Army rather than a general military concern. "Where's the Air Force now?" an Army officer asked rhetorically last fall. "They're back on their bases—and they're better off,

since they don't need to patrol the 'no-fly' zones [in northern and southern Iraq, which U.S. warplanes had patrolled since the end of the Gulf War]. The Navy's gone, and most of the Marines have been pulled back. It's the Army holding the sack of shit." A related concern involved what a long-term commitment to Iraq would do to the Army's "ops tempo," or pace of operations—especially if Reserve and National Guard members, who had no expectations of long-term foreign service when they signed up, were posted in Iraq for months or even years.

The military's fundamental argument for building up what Rumsfeld considered a wastefully large force is that it would be even more useful after Baghdad fell than during actual combat. The first few days or weeks after the fighting, in this view, were crucial in setting long-term expectations. Civilians would see that they could expect a rapid return to order, and would behave accordingly—or they would see the opposite. This was the "shock and awe" that really mattered, in the Army's view: the ability to make clear who was in charge. "Insights from successful occupations suggest that it is best to go in real heavy and then draw down fast," Conrad Crane, of the Army War College, told me. That is, a larger force would be necessary during and immediately after the war, but might mean a much smaller occupation presence six months later.

"We're in Baghdad, the regime is toppled—what's next?" Thomas White told me, recounting discussions before the war. One of the strongest advocates of a larger force was General Eric Shinseki, the Army Chief of Staff. White said, "Guys like Shinseki, who had been in Bosnia [where he supervised the NATO force], been in Kosovo, started running the numbers and said, 'Let's assume the world is linear.' For five million Bosnians we had two hundred thousand people to watch over them. Now we have twenty-five million Iraqis to worry about, spread out over a state the size of California. How many people is this going to take?" The heart of the Army's argument was that with too few soldiers, the United States would win the war only to be trapped in an untenable position during the occupation.

A note of personal rancor complicated these discussions, as it did many disagreements over postwar plans. In our interview Douglas Feith played this down—maintaining that press reports had exaggerated the degree of quarreling and division inside the Administration. These reports, he said, mainly reflected the experience of lower-level officials, who were embroiled in one specific policy area and "might find themselves pretty much always at odds with their counterparts from another agency." Higher up, where one might be "fighting with someone on one issue but allied with them on something else," relations were more collegial. Perhaps so. But there was no concealing the hostility within the Pentagon between most uniformed leaders, especially in the Army, and the civilians in OSD.

Donald Rumsfeld viewed Shinseki as a symbol of uncooperative, old-style thinking, and had in the past gone out of his way to humiliate him. In the spring of 2002, fourteen months before the scheduled end of Shinseki's term, Rumsfeld announced who his successor would be; such an announcement, which converts the incumbent into a lame duck, usually comes at the last minute. The action was one of several calculated insults.

From OSD's point of view, Shinseki and many of his colleagues were dragging their feet. From the Army's point of view, OSD was being reckless about the way it was committing troops and highhanded in disregarding the military's professional advice.

One man who was then working in the Pentagon told me of walking down a hallway a few months before the war and seeing Army General John Abizaid standing outside a door. Abizaid, who after the war succeeded Tommy Franks as commander of the Central Command, or CENTCOM, was then the director of the Joint Staff—the highest uniformed position in the Pentagon apart from the Joint Chiefs. A planning meeting for Iraq operations was under way. OSD officials told him he could not take part.

The military-civilian difference finally turned on the question of which would be harder: winning the war or maintaining the peace. According to Thomas White and several others, OSD acted as if the war itself would pose the real challenge. As White put it, "The planning assumptions were that the people would realize they were liberated, they would be happy that we were there, so it would take a much smaller force to secure the peace than it did to win the war. The resistance would principally be the remnants of the Baath Party, but they would go away fairly rapidly. And, critically, if we didn't damage the infrastructure in our military operation, as we didn't, the restart of the country could be done fairly rapidly." The first assumption was clearly expressed by Cheney three days before the war began, in an exchange with Tim Russert on Meet the Press:

RUSSELL: "If your analysis is not correct, and we're not treated as liberators but as conquerors, and the Iraqis begin to resist, particularly in Baghdad, do you think the American people are prepared for a long, costly, and bloody battle with significant American casualties?"

CHENEY: "Well, I don't think it's likely to unfold that way. Tim, because I really do believe that we will be greeted as liberators . . . The read we get on the people of Iraq is there is no question but what they want to get rid of Saddam Hussein and they will welcome as liberators the United States when we come to do that."

Through the 1990s Marine General Anthony Zinni, who preceded Tommy Franks as CENTCOM commander, had done war-gaming for a possible invasion of Iraq. His exercises involved a much larger U.S. force than the one that actually attacked last year. "They were very proud that they didn't have the kind of numbers my plan had called for," Zinni told me, referring to Rumsfeld and Cheney. "The reason we had those two extra divisions was the security situation. Revenge killings, crime, chaos—this was all foreseeable."

Thomas White agrees. Because of reasoning like Cheney's, "we went in with the minimum force to accomplish the military objectives, which was a straightforward task, never really in question," he told me. "And then we immediately found ourselves shorthanded in the aftermath. We sat there and watched people dismount and run off with the country, basically."

THREE MONTHS BEFORE THE WAR

In the beginning of December, Iraq submitted its 12,000-page declaration to the UN Security Council contending that it had no remaining WMD stores. Near the end of December, President Bush authorized the dispatch of more than 200,000 U.S. soldiers to the Persian Gulf.

There had still been few or no estimates of the war's cost from the Administration—only contentions that projections like Lawrence Lindsay's were too high. When pressed on this point, Administration officials repeatedly said that with so many uncertainties, they could not possibly estimate the cost. But early in December, just before Lindsay was forced out, The New York Re-

view of Books published an article by William Nordhaus titled "Iraq: The Economic Consequences of War," which included carefully considered estimates. Nordhaus, an economist at Yale, had served on Jimmy Carter's Council of Economic Advisers; the article was excerpted from a much longer economic paper he had prepared. His range of estimates was enormous, depending on how long the war lasted and what its impact on the world economy proved to be. Nordhaus calculated that over the course of a decade the direct and indirect costs of the war to the United States could be as low as \$121 billion or as high as \$1.6 trillion. This was a more thoroughgoing approach than the congressional budget committees had taken, but it was similar in its overall outlook. Nordhaus told me recently that he thinks he should have increased all his estimates to account for the "opportunity costs" of stationing soldiers in Iraq—that is, if they are assigned to Iraq, they're not available for deployment somewhere else.

On the last day of December, Mitch Daniels, the director of the Office of Management and Budget, told The New York Times that the war might cost \$50 billion to \$60 billion. He had to backtrack immediately, his spokesman stressing that "it is impossible to know what any military campaign would ultimately cost." The spokesman explained Daniels's mistake by saying, "The only cost estimate we know of in this arena is the Persian Gulf War, and that was a sixty-billion-dollar event." Daniels would leave the Administration, of his own volition, five months later.

In the immediate run-up to the war the Administration still insisted that the costs were unforeseeable. "Fundamentally, we have no idea what is needed unless and until we get there on the ground," Paul Wolfowitz told the House Budget Committee on February 27, with combat less than three weeks away. "This delicate moment—when we are assembling a coalition, when we are mobilizing people inside Iraq and throughout the region to help us in the event of war, and when we are still trying, through the United Nations and by other means, to achieve a peaceful solution without war—is not a good time to publish highly suspect numerical estimates and have them drive our declaratory policy."

Wolfowitz's stonewalling that day was in keeping with the policy of all senior Administration officials. Until many months after combat had begun, they refused to hazard even the vaguest approximation of what financial costs it might involve. Shinseki, so often at odds with OSD, contemplated taking a different course. He was scheduled to testify, with Thomas White, before the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 19, which turned out to be the first day of actual combat. In a routine prep session before the hearing he asked his assistants what he should say about how much the operations in Iraq were going to cost. "Well, it's impossible to predict," a briefer began, reminding him of the official line.

Shinseki cut him off. "We don't know everything," he said, and then he went through a list of the many things the military already did know. "We know how many troops are there now, and the projected numbers. We know how much it costs to feed them every day. We know how much it cost to send the force there. We know what we have spent already to prepare the force and how much it would cost to bring them back. We have estimates of how much fuel and ammunition we would use per day of operations." In short, anyone who actually wanted to make an estimate had plenty of information on hand.

At this point Jerry Sinn, a three-star general in charge of the Army's budget, said

that in fact he had worked up some numbers—and he named a figure, for the Army's likely costs, in the tens of billions of dollars. But when Senator Byron Dorgan, of North Dakota, asked Shinseki at hearings on March 19 how much the war just beginning would cost, Shinseki was loyally vague ("Any potential discussion about what an operation in Iraq or any follow-on probably is undefined at this point").

When Administration officials stopped being vague, they started being unrealistic. On March 27, eight days into combat, members of the House Appropriations Committee asked Paul Wolfowitz for a figure. He told them that whatever it was, Iraq's oil supplies would keep it low. "There's a lot of money to pay for this," he said. "It doesn't have to be U.S. taxpayer money. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon." On April 23 Andrew Natsios, of USAID, told an incredulous Ted Koppel, on Nightline, that the total cost to America of reconstructing Iraq would be \$1.7 billion. Koppel shot back, "I mean, when you talk about one-point-seven, you're not suggesting that the rebuilding of Iraq is gonna be done for one-point-seven billion dollars?" Natsios was clear: "Well, in terms of the American taxpayers' contribution, I do; this is it for the U.S. The rest of the rebuilding of Iraq will be done by other countries who have already made pledges. . . . But the American part of this will be one-point-seven billion dollars. We have no plans for any further-on funding for this." Only in September did President Bush make his request for a supplemental appropriation of \$87 billion for operations in Iraq.

Planning for the postwar period intensified in December. The Council on Foreign Relations, working with the Baker Institute for Public Policy, at Rice University, convened a working group on "guiding principles for U.S. post-war conflict policy in Iraq." Leslie Gelb, then the president of the Council on Foreign Relations, said that the group would take no position for or against the war. But its report, which was prepared late in January of last year, said that "U.S. and coalition military units will need to pivot quickly from combat to peacekeeping operations in order to prevent post-conflict Iraq from descending into anarchy." The report continued, "Without an initial and broad-based commitment to law and order, the logic of score-settling and revenge-taking will reduce Iraq to chaos."

The momentum toward war put officials at the United Nations and other international organizations in a difficult position. On the one hand, they had to be ready for what was coming; on the other, it was awkward to be seen discussing the impending takeover of one of their member states by another. "Off-the-record meetings were happening in every bar in New York," one senior UN official told me in the fall. An American delegation that included Pentagon representatives went to Rome in December for a confidential meeting with officials of the UN's World Food Programme, to discuss possible food needs after combat in Iraq. As *The Wall Street Journal* later reported, the meeting was uncomfortable for both sides: the Americans had to tell the WFP officials, as one of them recalled, "It is looking most probable you are going to witness one of the largest military engagements since the Second World War." This was hyperbole (Korea? Vietnam?), but it helped to convince the WFP that relief preparations should begin.

On December 11 an ice storm hit the Mid-Atlantic states. For Conrad Crane and his associates at the Army War College, deep in their crash effort to prepare their report on postwar Army challenges, this was a bless-

ing. "The storm worked out perfectly," Crane told me afterward. "We were all on the post, there was no place anyone could go, we basically had the whole place to ourselves."

By the end of the month the War College team had assembled a draft of its report, called "Reconstructing Iraq: Insights Challenges and Missions for Military Forces in a Post-Conflict Scenario." It was not classified, and can be found through the Army War College's Web site.

The War College report has three sections. The first is a review of twentieth-century occupations—from the major efforts in Japan and Germany to the smaller and more recent ones in Haiti, Panama, and the Balkans. The purpose of the review is to identify common situations that occupiers might face in Iraq. The discussion of Germany, for instance, includes a detailed account of how U.S. occupiers "de-Nazified" the country without totally dismantling its bureaucracy or excluding everyone who had held a position of responsibility. (The main tool was a Fragebogen, or questionnaire, about each person's past activities, which groups of anti-Nazi Germans and Allied investigators reviewed and based decisions on.)

The second section of the report is an assessment of the specific problems likely to arise in Iraq, given its ethnic and regional tensions and the impact of decades of Baathist rule. Most Iraqis would welcome the end of Saddam Hussein's tyranny, it said. Nonetheless, "Long-term gratitude is unlikely and suspicion of U.S. motives will increase as the occupation continues. A force initially viewed as liberators can rapidly be relegated to the status of invaders should an unwelcome occupation continue for a prolonged time. Occupation problems may be especially acute if the United States must implement the bulk of the occupation itself rather than turn these duties over to a post-war international force."

If these views about the risk of disorder and the short welcome that Americans would enjoy sound familiar, that is because every organization that looked seriously into the situation sounded the same note.

The last and most distinctive part of the War College report is its "Mission Matrix"—a 135-item checklist of what tasks would have to be done right after the war and by whom. About a quarter of these were "critical tasks" for which the military would have to be prepared long before it reached Baghdad: securing the borders so that foreign terrorists would not slip in (as they in fact did), locating and destroying WMD supplies, protecting religious sites, performing police and security functions, and so on. The matrix was intended to lay out a phased shift of responsibilities, over months or years, from a mainly U.S. occupation force to international organizations and, finally, to sovereign Iraqis. By the end of December copies of the War College report were being circulated throughout the Army.

According to the standard military model, warfare unfolds through four phases: "deterrence and engagement," "seize the initiative," "decisive operations," and "post-conflict." Reality is never divided quite that neatly, of course, but the War College report stressed that Phase IV "post-conflict" planning absolutely had to start as early as possible, well before Phase III "decisive operations"—the war itself. But neither the Army nor the other services moved very far past Phase III thinking. "All the A-Team guys wanted to be in on Phase III, and the B-team guys were put on Phase IV," one man involved in Phase IV told me. Frederick Barton, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, who was involved in post-war efforts in Haiti, Rwanda, and elsewhere, put it differently. "If you went to the Pen-

tagon before the war, all the concentration was on the war," he said. "If you went there during the war, all the concentration was on the war. And if you went there after the war, they'd say, 'That's Jerry Bremer's job.'" Still, the War College report confirmed what the Army leadership already suspected: that its real challenges would begin when it took control of Baghdad.

TWO MONTHS BEFORE THE WAR

On January 27, 2003, the chief UN weapons inspector, Hans Blix, reported that "Iraq appears not to have come to a genuine acceptance, not even today, of the disarmament that was demanded of it." Twenty-four hours later, in his State of the Union address, President Bush said that the United States was still hoping for UN endorsement of an action against Iraq—but would not be limited by the absence of one.

Increasingly the question in Washington about war was When? Those arguing for delay said that it would make everything easier. Perhaps Saddam Hussein would die. Perhaps he would flee or be overthrown. Perhaps the UN inspectors would find his weapons, or determine conclusively that they no longer existed. Perhaps the United States would have time to assemble, if not a broad alliance for the battle itself, at least support for reconstruction and occupation, so that U.S. soldiers and taxpayers would not be left with the entire job. Even if the responsibility were to be wholly America's, each passing month would mean more time to plan the peace as thoroughly as the war: to train civil-affairs units (which specialize in peacekeeping rather than combat), and to hire Arabic-speakers. Indeed, several months into the U.S. occupation a confidential Army "lessons learned" study said that the "lack of competent interpreters" throughout Iraq had "impeded operations." Most of the "military linguists" who were operating in Iraq, the study said, "basically [had] the ability to tell the difference between a burro and a burrito."

Those arguing against delay said that the mere passage of time wouldn't do any good and would bring various risks. The world had already waited twelve years since the Gulf War for Saddam Hussein to disarm. Congress had already voted to endorse the war. The Security Council had already shown its resolve. The troops were already on their way. Each passing day, in this view, was a day in which Saddam Hussein might deploy his weapons of terror.

Early in January the National Intelligence Council, at the CIA, ran a two-day exercise on postwar problems. Pentagon representatives were still forbidden by OSD to attend. The exercise covered issues similar to those addressed in the Future of Iraq and Army War College reports—and, indeed, to those considered by the Council on Foreign Relations and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: political reconstruction, public order, border control, humanitarian problems, finding and securing WMD.

On January 15 the humanitarian groups that had been meeting at USAID asked for a meeting with Donald Rumsfeld or Paul Wolfowitz. They never got one. At an earlier meeting, according to a participant, they had been told, "The President has already spent an hour on the humanitarian issues." The most senior Pentagon official to meet with them was Joseph Collins, a deputy assistant secretary of defense. The representatives of the NGOs were generally the most senior and experienced figures from each organization; the government representatives were not of the same stature. "Without naming names, the people we met were not real decision-makers," Joel Charny says.

On January 24 a group of archaeologists and scholars went to the Pentagon to brief

Collins and other officials about the most important historic sites in Iraq, so that they could be spared in bombing. Thanks to precision targeting, the sites would indeed survive combat. Many, of course, were pillaged almost immediately afterward.

On January 30 the International Rescue Committee, which had been participating in the weekly Iraq Working Group sessions, publicly warned that a breakdown of law and order was likely unless the victorious U.S. forces acted immediately, with martial law if necessary, to prevent it. A week later Refugees International issued a similar warning.

At the end of January, Sam Gardiner entered the picture. Gardiner is a retired Air Force colonel who taught for years at the National War College in Washington. His specialty is war gaming, and through the 1990s he was involved once or twice a year in major simulations involving an attack on Baghdad. In the late 1990s Gardiner had been a visiting scholar at the Swedish National Defense University, where he studied the effects of the bombing of Serbia's electrical grid. The big discovery was how long it took to get the system up and running again, after even a precise and limited attack. "Decapitation" attacks on a regime, like the one planned for Iraq, routinely begin with disabling the electrical grid. Gardiner warned that this Phase III step could cause big Phase IV problems.

Late in 2002 Gardiner had put together what he called a "net assessment" of how Iraq would look after a successful U.S. attack. His intended audience, in government, would recognize the designation as drill. "Net assessment" is a familiar term for a CIA-style intelligence analysis, but Gardiner also meant it to reflect the unusual origin of his data: none of it was classified, and all of it came from the Internet. Through the power of search engines Gardiner was able to assemble what in other days would have seemed like a secret inside look at Iraq's infrastructure. He found electricity diagrams for the pumps used at Iraq's main water stations; he listed replacement parts for the most vulnerable elements of the electrical grid. He produced a scheme showing the elements of the system that would be easiest to attack but then quickest to repair. As it happened, damage to the electrical grid was a major postwar problem. Despite the precision of the bombing campaign, by mid-April wartime damage and immediate postwar looting had reduced Baghdad's power supply to one fifth its pre-war level, according to an internal Pentagon study. In mid-July the grid would be back to only half its pre-war level, working on a three-hours-on, three-hours-off schedule.

On January 19 Gardiner presented his net assessment, with information about Iraq's water, sewage, and public-health systems as well as its electrical grid, at an unclassified forum held by the RAND Corporation, in Washington. Two days later he presented it privately to Zalmay Khalilzad. Khalilzad was a former RAND analyst who had joined the Bush Administration's National Security Council and before the war was named the President's "special envoy and ambassador-at-large for Free Iraqis." (He has recently become the U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan.) Gardiner told me recently that Khalilzad was sobered by what he heard, and gave Gardiner a list of other people in the government who should certainly be shown the assessment. In the next few weeks Gardiner presented his findings to Bear McCornell, the USAID official in charge of foreign disaster relief, and Michael Dunn, an Air Force general who had once been Gardiner's student and worked with the Joint Chiefs of Staff as acting director for strategic plans and policy. A scheduled briefing with Joseph

Collins, who was becoming the Pentagon's point man for postwar planning, was canceled at the last minute, after a description of Gardiner's report appeared in *Inside the Pentagon*, an influential newsletter.

The closer the nation came to war, the more the Administration seemed to view people like Gardiner as virtual Frenchmen—that is, softies who would always find some excuse to oppose the war. In one sense they were right. "It became clear that what I was really arguing was that we had to delay the war," Gardiner told me. "I was saying, 'We aren't ready, and in just six or eight weeks there is no way to get ready for everything we need to do.'" (The first bombs fell on Baghdad eight weeks after Gardiner's meeting with Khalilzad.) "Everyone was very interested and very polite and said I should talk to other people," Gardiner said. "But they had that 'Stalingrad stare'—people who had been doing stuff under pressure for too long and hadn't had enough sleep. You want to shake them and say, 'Are you really with me?'"

At the regular meeting of the Iraq Working Group on January 29, the NGO representatives discussed a recent piece of vital news. The Administration had chosen a leader for all postwar efforts in Iraq: Jay M. Garner, a retired three-star Army general who A cartoon by Sage Stossel had worked successfully with the Kurds at the end of the Gulf War. The NGO representatives had no fault to find with the choice of Garner, but they were concerned, because his organization would be a subunit of the Pentagon rather than an independent operation or part of a civilian agency. "We had been pushing constantly to have reconstruction authority based in the State Department," Joel Charny told me. He and his colleagues were told by Wendy Chamberlin, a former ambassador to Pakistan who had become USAID's assistant administrator for the area including Iraq, that the NGOs should view Garner's appointment as a victory. After all, Garner was a civilian, and his office would draw representatives from across the government. "We said, 'C'mon, Wendy, his office is in the Pentagon!'" Charny says. Jim Bishop, a former U.S. ambassador who now works for InterAction, pointed out that the NGOs, like the U.S. government, were still hoping that other governments might help to fund humanitarian efforts. Bishop asked rhetorically, "Who from the international community is going to fund reconstruction run through the Pentagon?"

Garner assembled a team and immediately went to work. What happened to him in the next two months is the best-chronicled part of the postwar fiasco. He started from scratch, trying to familiarize himself with what the rest of the government had already done. On February 21 he convened a two-day meeting of diplomats, soldiers, academics, and development experts, who gathered at the National Defense University to discuss postwar plans. "The messiah could not have organized a sufficient relief and reconstruction or humanitarian effort in that short a time," a former CIA analyst named Judith Yaphe said after attending the meeting, according to Mark Fineman, Doyle McManus, and Robin Wright, of the *Los Angeles Times*. (Fineman died of a heart attack last fall, while reporting from Baghdad.) Garner was also affected by tension between OSD and the rest of the government. Garner had heard about the Future of Iraq project, although Rumsfeld had told him not to waste his time reading it. Nonetheless, he decided to bring its director, Thomas Warrick, onto his planning team. Garner, who clearly does not intend to be the fall guy for postwar problems in Baghdad, told me last fall that Rumsfeld had asked him to kick Warrick off

his staff. In an interview with the BBC last November, Garner confirmed details of the firing that had earlier been published in *Newsweek*. According to Garner, Rumsfeld asked him, "Jay, have you got a guy named Warrick on your team?" "I said, 'Yes, I do.' He said, 'Well, I've got to ask you to remove him.' I said, 'I don't want to remove him; he's too valuable.' But he said, 'This came to me from such a high level that I can't overturn it, and I've just got to ask you to remove Mr. Warrick.'" *Newsweek's* conclusion was that the man giving the instructions was Vice President Cheney.

This is the place to note that in several months of interviews I never once heard someone say "We took this step because the President indicated . . ." or "The President really wanted . . ." Instead I heard "Rumsfeld wanted," "Powell thought," "The Vice President pushed," "Bremer asked," and so on. One need only compare this with any discussion of foreign policy in Reagan's or Clinton's Administration—or Nixon's, or Kennedy's, or Johnson's, or most others—to sense how unusual is the absence of the President as prime mover. The other conspicuously absent figure was Condoleezza Rice, even after she was supposedly put in charge of coordinating Administration policy on Iraq, last October. It is possible that the President's confidants are so discreet that they have kept all his decisions and instructions secret. But that would run counter to the fundamental nature of bureaucratic Washington, where people cite a President's authority whenever they possibly can ("The President feels strongly about this, so . . .").

To me, the more likely inference is that Bush took a strong overall position—fighting terrorism is this generation's challenge—and then was exposed to only a narrow range of options worked out by the contending forces within his Administration. If this interpretation proves to be right, and if Bush did in fact wish to know more, then blame will fall on those whose responsibility it was to present him with the widest range of choices: Cheney and Rice.

ONE MONTH BEFORE THE WAR

On February 14 Hans Blix reaffirmed to the United Nations his view that Iraq had decided to cooperate with inspectors. The division separating the United States and Britain from France, Germany, and Russia became stark. On February 15 antiwar demonstrators massed in major cities around the world: a million in Madrid, more than a million in Rome, and a million or more in London, the largest demonstration in Britain's history.

On February 21 Tony Blair joined George Bush at Camp David, to underscore their joint determination to remove the threat from Iraq.

THREE WEEKS BEFORE THE WAR

As the war drew near, the dispute about how to conduct it became public. On February 25 the Senate Armed Services Committee summoned all four Chiefs of Staff to answer questions about the war—and its aftermath. The crucial exchange began with a question from the ranking Democrat, Carl Levin. He asked Eric Shinseki, the Army Chief of Staff, how many soldiers would be required not to defeat Iraq but to occupy it. Well aware that he was at odds with his civilian superiors at the Pentagon, Shinseki at first deflected the question. "In specific numbers," he said, "I would have to rely on combatant commanders' exact requirements. But I think . . ." and he trailed off.

"How about a range?" Levin asked. Shinseki replied—and recapitulated the argument he had made to Rumsfeld.

"I would say that what's been mobilized to this point, something on the order of several

hundred thousand soldiers, are probably, you know, a figure that would be required.

"We're talking about post-hostilities control over a piece of geography that's fairly significant, with the kinds of ethnic tensions that could lead to other problems. And so, it takes significant ground force presence to maintain safe and secure environment to ensure that the people are fed, that water is distributed, all the normal responsibilities that go along with administering a situation like this."

Two days later Paul Wolfowitz appeared before the House Budget Committee. He began working through his prepared statement about the Pentagon's budget request and then asked permission to "digress for a moment" and respond to recent commentary, "some of it quite outlandish, about what our postwar requirements might be in Iraq." Everyone knew he meant Shinseki's remarks.

"I am reluctant to try to predict anything about what the cost of a possible conflict in Iraq would be," Wolfowitz said, "or what the possible cost of reconstructing and stabilizing that country afterwards might be." This was more than reluctance—it was the Administration's consistent policy before the war. "But some of the higher-end predictions that we have been hearing recently, such as the notion that it will take several hundred thousand U.S. troops to provide stability in post-Saddam Iraq, are wildly off the mark."

This was as direct a rebuke of a military leader by his civilian superior as the United States had seen in fifty years. Wolfowitz offered a variety of incidental reasons why his views were so different from those he alluded to: "I would expect that even countries like France will have a strong interest in assisting Iraq's reconstruction," and "We can't be sure that the Iraqi people will welcome us as liberators . . . [but] I am reasonably certain that they will greet us as liberators, and that will help us to keep requirements down." His fundamental point was this: "It's hard to conceive that it would take more forces to provide stability in post-Saddam Iraq than it would take to conduct the war itself and to secure the surrender of Saddam's security forces and his army. Hard to imagine."

None of the government working groups that had seriously looked into the question had simply "imagined" that occupying Iraq would be more difficult than defeating it. They had presented years' worth of experience suggesting that this would be the central reality of the undertaking. Wolfowitz either didn't notice this evidence or chose to disbelieve it. What David Halberstam said of Robert McNamara in *The Best and the Brightest* is true of those at OSD as well: they were brilliant, and they were fools.

TWO WEEKS BEFORE THE WAR

At the beginning of March, Andrew Natsios won a little-noticed but crucial battle. Because the United States had not yet officially decided whether to go to war, Natsios had not been able to persuade the Office of Management and Budget to set aside the money that USAID would need for immediate postwar efforts in Iraq. The battle was the more intense because Natsios, unlike his counterparts at the State Department, was both privately and publicly supportive of the case for war. Just before combat he was able to arrange an emergency \$200 million grant from USAID to the World Food Programme. This money could be used to buy food immediately for Iraqi relief operations—and it helped to ensure that there were no postwar food shortages.

ONE WEEK BEFORE THE WAR

On March 13 humanitarian organizations had gathered at USAID headquarters for

what was effectively the last meeting of the Iraq Working Group. Wendy Chamberlin, the senior USAID official present, discussed the impending war in terms that several participants noted, wrote down, and later mentioned to me. "It's going to be very quick," she said, referring to the actual war. "We're going to meet their immediate needs. We're going to turn it over to the Iraqis. And we're going to be out within the year."

On March 17 the United States, Britain, and Spain announced that they would abandon their attempt to get a second Security Council vote in favor of the war, and President Bush gave Saddam Hussein an ultimatum: leave the country within forty-eight hours or suffer the consequences. On March 19 the first bombs fell on Baghdad.

AFTERWARD

On April 9 U.S. forces took Baghdad. On April 14 the Pentagon announced that most of the fighting was over. On May 1 President Bush declared that combat operations were at an end. By then looting had gone on in Baghdad for several weeks. "When the United States entered Baghdad on April 9, it entered a city largely undamaged by a carefully executed military campaign," Peter Galbraith, a former U.S. ambassador to Croatia, told a congressional committee in June. "However, in the three weeks following the U.S. takeover, unchecked looting effectively gutted every important public institution in the city—with the notable exception of the oil ministry." On April 11, when asked why U.S. soldiers were not stopping the looting, Donald Rumsfeld said, "Freedom's untidy, and free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things. They're also free to live their lives and do wonderful things, and that's what's going to happen here."

This was a moment, as when he tore up the TPFDD, that Rumsfeld crossed a line. His embrace of "uncertainty" became a reckless evasion of responsibility. He had only disdain for "predictions," yes, and no one could have forecast every circumstance of postwar Baghdad. But virtually everyone who had thought about the issue had warned about the risk of looting. U.S. soldiers could have prevented it—and would have, if so instructed.

The looting spread, destroying the infrastructure that had survived the war and creating the expectation of future chaos. "There is this kind of magic moment, which you can't imagine until you see it," an American civilian who was in Baghdad during the looting told me. "People are used to someone being in charge, and when they realize no one is, the fabric rips."

On May 6 the Administration announced that Bremer would be the new U.S. administrator in Iraq. Two weeks into that job Bremer disbanded the Iraqi army and other parts of the Baathist security structure.

If the failure to stop the looting was a major sin of omission, sending the Iraqi soldiers home was, in the view of nearly everyone except those who made the decision, a catastrophic error of commission. There were two arguments for taking this step. First, the army had "already disbanded itself," as Douglas Feith put it to me—soldiers had melted away, with their weapons. Second, the army had been an integral part of the Sunni-dominated Baathist security structure. Leaving it intact would be the wrong symbol for the new Iraq—especially for the Shiites, whom the army had oppressed.

"These actions are part of a robust campaign to show the Iraqi people that the Saddam regime is gone, and will never return," a statement from Bremer's office said.

The case against wholesale dissolution of the army, rather than a selective purge at

the top, was that it created an instant enemy class: hundreds of thousands of men who still had their weapons but no longer had a paycheck or a place to go each day. Manpower that could have helped on security patrols became part of the security threat. Studies from the Army War College, the Future of Iraq project, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, to name a few, had all considered exactly this problem and suggested ways of removing the noxious leadership while retaining the ordinary troops. They had all warned strongly against disbanding the Iraqi army. The Army War College, for example, said in its report, "To tear apart the Army in the war's aftermath could lead to the destruction of one of the only forces for unity within the society."

"This is not something that was dreamed up by somebody at the last minute," Walter Slocombe—who held Feith's job, undersecretary of defense for policy, during the Clinton Administration, and who is now a security adviser on Bremer's team—told Peter Slevin, of *The Washington Post*, last November. He said that he had discussed the plan with Wolfowitz at least once and with Feith several times, including the day before the order was given. "The critical point," he told Slevin, "was that nobody argued that we shouldn't do this." No one, that is, the Administration listened to.

Here is the hardest question: How could the Administration have thought that it was safe to proceed in blithe indifference to the warnings of nearly everyone with operational experience in modern military occupations? Saying that the Administration considered this a truly urgent "war of necessity" doesn't explain the indifference. Even if it feared that Iraq might give terrorists fearsome weapons at any moment, it could still have thought more carefully about the day after the war. World War II was a war of absolute necessity, and the United States still found time for detailed occupation planning.

The President must have known that however bright the scenarios, the reality of Iraq eighteen months after the war would affect his re-election. The political risk was enormous and obvious. Administration officials must have believed not only that the war was necessary but also that a successful occupation would not require any more forethought than they gave it.

It will be years before we fully understand how intelligent people convinced themselves of this. My guess is that three factors will be important parts of the explanation.

One is the panache of Donald Rumsfeld. He was near the zenith of his influence as the war was planned. His emphasis on the vagaries of life was all the more appealing within his circle because of his jauntiness and verve. But he was not careful about remembering his practical obligations. Precisely because he could not foresee all hazards, he should have been more zealous about avoiding the ones that were evident—the big and obvious ones the rest of the government tried to point out to him.

A second is the triumphalism of the Administration. In the twenty-five years since Ronald Reagan's rise, political conservatives have changed position in a way they have not fully recognized. Reagan's arrival marked the end of a half century of Democrat-dominated government in Washington. Yes, there has been one Democratic President since Reagan, and eventually there will be others. But as a rule the Republicans are now in command. Older Republicans—those who came of age in the 1960s and 1970s, those who are now in power in the Administration—have not fully adjusted to this reality. They still feel like embattled insurgents, as if the liberals were in the driver's seat. They

recognize their electoral strength but feel that in the battle of ideology their main task is to puncture fatuous liberal ideas.

The consequence is that Republicans are less used to exposing their own ideas to challenges than they should be. Today's liberals know there is a challenge to every aspect of their world view. All they have to do is turn on the radio. Today's conservatives are more likely to think that any contrary ideas are leftovers from the tired 1960s, much as liberals of the Kennedy era thought that conservatives were in thrall to Herbert Hoover. In addition, the conservatives' understanding of modern history makes them think that their instincts are likely to be right and that their critics will be proved wrong. Europeans scorned Ronald Reagan, and the United Nations feared him, but in the end the Soviet Union was gone. So for reasons of personal, political, and intellectual history, it is understandable that members of this Administration could proceed down one path in defiance of mounting evidence of its perils. The Democrats had similar destructive self-confidence in the 1960s, when they did their most grandiose Great Society thinking.

The third factor is the nature of the President himself. Leadership is always a balance between making large choices and being aware of details. George W. Bush has an obvious preference for large choices. This gave him his chance for greatness after the September 11 attacks. But his lack of curiosity about significant details may be his fatal weakness. When the decisions of the past eighteen months are assessed and judged, the Administration will be found wanting for its carelessness. Because of warnings it chose to ignore, it squandered American prestige, fortune, and lives.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ORVILLE ROUCH

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise before you today to pay tribute to a remarkable man from my district. Orville Rouch of Pueblo, Colorado, died recently at the age of eighty-five. Orville was a patriot, a devoted family man and a father who will be missed by many in the community. I think it appropriate that we remember his life here today.

After serving his nation in the Army during World War II, Orville returned to the states and enrolled in the San Francisco College of Mortuary Science. He soon joined the family business started by his parents, the Rouch Funeral Home, which has served the community for over eighty years. Orville was an active member of the Pueblo Charter Lions Club, Pueblo Masonic Lodge 17, and the First United Methodist Church. Orville cherished the relationships he established in the civic community. He will be forever remembered for his dedication to his business and community, and most of all, Orville will be remembered as a loving father to his two sons.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise before this body of Congress to pay tribute to the life of Orville Rouch. Orville was remarkable man who served the Pueblo community and State of Colorado selflessly. My heart goes out to his family during this difficult time of bereavement.

TRIBUTE TO MARTHA LAFFER ZIEGLER

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to Martha Laffer Ziegler who passed away during the congressional recess. Martha served as the District Representative in my congressional office from 1981 until 1985, but her public service long predated our association, and she continued to work for the community after she moved on to the private sector.

Martha Ziegler played an active role in the political life of San Mateo County for nearly four decades beginning in the 1960s. She developed her political skills working to elect Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown in 1958 and 1962. She fought for civil rights, women's rights, and the environment, and was an advocate against the Vietnam war. With a reputation as a skilled political organizer, she directed numerous campaigns in San Mateo County, including the McGovern presidential campaign in 1972.

In 1980, Martha joined me in my first campaign for Congress. In that year of the Reagan landslide, Mr. Speaker, I was the only Democratic challenger to defeat an un-indicted Republican incumbent. I am grateful for Martha's help in that effort. After my election, I asked Martha to be my District Representative in my office in San Mateo, California. We worked together for four years, until she took a position in the private sector. She continued to play an active political roll, serving as a member of the Northern California Steering Committee for the Gore presidential campaign in 1988. She also assisted in fund raising for the Clinton-Gore campaigns in 1992 and 1996.

Mr. Speaker, Martha Laffer was born in Jewell, Kansas, in 1926. She received a degree in economics from the University of Kansas in 1947 and on June 17, 1948, married Robert Boynton Ziegler. They settled in the Bay Area, where her husband established a medical practice, and in 1957 they moved to Redwood City. Martha and Robert Ziegler were the parents of four children—Robert, Nancy, David and Daniel.

In addition to her extensive community and political service, Martha was a devoted wife and mother, lover of animals, and wonderful cook and gardener, with a passion for music and literature. She was a singer, first with the West Bay Opera Company and later with the California Bach Society, which she co-founded in 1974 with music director Edwin Flath.

Mr. Speaker, in 1990, Martha and Bob Ziegler moved from Redwood City to Heraldsgburg, California, where they were winegrowers and active in the community for over a decade. Martha passed away in Heraldsgburg last December. I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to her.

TRIBUTE TO LON MANN

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Arkansas' finest citizens, Lon

Mann. I am proud to recognize Lon in the Congress for his invaluable contributions and service to his profession, his family, his state and this nation.

A third generation farmer, Mr. Mann returned from World War II to continue in the family tradition as a cotton producer and gin-ner as a partner at McClendon Mann & Felton Gin Company in Marianna, AR. He was a leader in the revitalization of the National Cotton Council of America and served as its president as he advocated for America's cotton farmers. He also served as president of the Mid-South Ginners Council and the Agricultural Council of Arkansas, as a trustee of the National Cotton Council's Cotton Foundation and was rightfully inducted into the Arkansas Agricultural Hall of Fame. Mr. Mann was the recipient of numerous awards including the University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service "Cotton Achievement" award, the Harry Baker Award from the National Cotton Council and the Horace Hayden Cotton Ginner of the Year Award in 2000.

Mr. Mann's efforts extended beyond the cotton fields into the community as Chairman of the Board of Methodist Hospital and Health Systems in Memphis, TN, and president of the Marianna-Lee County School Board.

Lon Mann was a faithful and dedicated husband to his wife, June, a loving father to daughters June, Louise and Burkley and son William, and the proud grandfather of six grandchildren. Throughout his life, he was dedicated to serving his fellow citizens as a leader in both his profession and his community, and he deserves our respect and gratitude for his priceless contributions. I will be forever honored by our friendship.

On behalf of the Congress, I extend sympathies to Lon's family, and gratitude for all he did.

TRIBUTE TO JAY LAWHON

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Arkansan and an outstanding citizen. I am proud to recognize Jay Lawhon in the Congress for his invaluable contributions and service to his community, his family, his state and this nation.

Mr. Lawhon was born on a small farm near Harrison in northwest Arkansas in 1919. After serving in the Navy in World War II, Mr. Lawhon moved to southeast Arkansas to become a vocational agriculture teacher. He served as principal of McCrory High School before beginning his career in the seed industry. Mr. Lawhon opened Lawhon Farm Supply in the late 1950's, and passed the thriving business to his son, Noal, in 1975 in order to begin his work as a missionary.

As lay leader in McCrory's Methodist Church and founder of the World Christian Relief Fund, Mr. Lawhon made several humanitarian trips to Bangladesh when floods and famine struck in the 1970's. He later traveled to Haiti to help build a hospital and continued to visit the country to teach Haitians to drill and repair wells for water and plant trees.

Jay Lawhon was a faithful and dedicated husband to his wife, Lillian, a loving father to

Noal and the proud grandfather of two grandchildren and one great-granddaughter. Throughout his life, he was dedicated to serving his fellow citizens as a leader in both his profession and his community, and he deserves our respect and gratitude for his priceless contributions. I will be forever honored by his friendship.

On behalf of the Congress, I extend sympathies to Jay's family, and gratitude for all he did to make the world a better place.

HONORING RETIRING COUNCIL
MEMBER DORIS RODRIQUEZ

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to pay tribute to Council Member Doris Rodriguez, who is retiring from the Hayward City Council at the end of her term on April 6, 2004. Ms. Rodriguez will leave a legacy of 27 years of dedicated service to the city of Hayward, California.

Her initial service was on the City of Hayward Citizens Advisory Commission from 1977 to 1984, followed by an appointment to the city's Planning Commission, where she served a seven-year stint. Rodriguez was first appointed to the City Council in 1991 and was elected in 1992 and has served consecutive four-year terms.

The city of Hayward has benefited from Rodriguez's tireless contributions as a city council liaison on the Airport Committee, Commercial Center Improvement Committee, Citizens Advisory Commission, Downtown Revitalization Committee, Public Agencies Committee and the Route 92/880 Interchange Citizens Advisory Committee. Serving as the council's liaison, Rodriguez has been the city's vital link to the community. She has garnered wide-ranging respect with all segments of the community. Her intellect, her sound judgment, her calming personality, her sincere interest in Hayward issues and its citizens, and her ability to work with myriad organizations have benefited Hayward immeasurably.

Rodriguez is an integral part of Hayward's fabric. She is a member of numerous organizations. Her name is not merely listed on the membership rosters but she is intricately involved in the heart of the organizations to make a positive contribution to Hayward. These organizations, who continue to benefit from Rodriguez's experience and commitment, include Friends of the Hayward Library, Hayward Area Planning Association, Hispanic Elected Local Officials, Southgate Home Owners Association, League of Women Voters, and Sun Gallery.

On March 19, 2004, the City of Hayward will host a farewell dinner to thank Council Member Doris Rodriguez for her tireless efforts on behalf of Hayward and its citizens. I join the fine citizens of the city to thank Doris for a job well done.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LUCY
MEYRING

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay tribute to the historic achievement of a remarkable woman from my home state. Lucy Meyring of North Park, Colorado was recently chosen as the next president of the Colorado Cattleman's Association. What makes this more special is the fact that the Cattleman's association is the oldest in the country and Lucy will become its first female president. I join with my colleagues to congratulate Lucy on this remarkable achievement.

Lucy has spent her entire life as a cattlemaster in Colorado, and has a deep love of ranching and the cattle industry. As the newest leader of the Colorado Cattleman's Association, Lucy hopes to educate our youth on the importance of agriculture and the origin of such staples as milk and meat. While Lucy recognizes that she will have an extensive travel schedule over the next year, she believes that doing so will provide a unified voice for all cattlemen throughout Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise before this body of Congress to pay tribute to the achievements of Lucy Meyring. Throughout her life, Lucy has been a devoted cattlemaster and earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues, friends and fellow citizens. It is a great honor to rise before this body of Congress to congratulate Lucy on her achievements. I wish her all the best throughout her tenure.

CONGRATULATING MR. PORTNOW
AND THE RECORDING ACADEMY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share remarks made by Recording Academy President Neil Portnow at the 46th Annual Grammy Awards on February 8th, 2003. Mr. Portnow worked on behalf to the Recording Academy in a variety of volunteer leadership roles for over 20 years before being selected as President by the Board of Trustees in September of 2002.

In his first two years as President of the Academy, Mr. Portnow has used his creative talents in marketplace development and his many years in the entertainment industry to advocate on behalf of the Music and Arts community, especially in the area of Music Education funding.

I know I am joined by my colleagues in the House of Representatives in congratulating Mr. Portnow and the Recording Academy on their success in fostering, supporting and promoting a myriad of music-based education and community programs throughout the country.

To follow are the remarks presented by Neil Portnow, President, Recording Academy, on February 8th, 2004 on the occasion of the 46th Annual Grammy Awards:

Thank you for joining as we celebrate the 46th Annual Grammy Awards.

Tonight, you've seen some remarkable performances that span the spectrum of recorded music, with musical icons joining wonderfully talented young artists to demonstrate that we are all one family.

But our family extends beyond the boundaries of the artists nominated tonight for Grammy Awards. You, the music fans, are the most important part of our family for whom all of us in this creative community give our all. We are inspired to create and make our music so that you can hear and enjoy it. After all, music uplifts the very fabric of our daily lives.

As in all families, there are times when we must all come together as one. Tonight is one of those times.

Many of our music family have arrived here on this Grammy stage because they had the benefit of exposure to music and the arts in school. Proposals for dramatic cuts in funding for the arts mean that our children will be denied that vital opportunity. We cannot sit idly by and allow this to happen. If our leaders spend our resources to search for something, it ought to be for tools of mass education and cultural enlightenment in our nation.

The Recording Academy recognizes your hunger and passion for music. We also represent the music-makers and many others involved in the creative process whose livelihood depends on your support. And tonight we are asking for that support.

We have spent the past year researching and examining the complex issues created by the digital world and this evening, we are announcing a national program designed to educate and inform music lovers everywhere about the serious issues and alternatives surrounding digital downloading of music. We encourage you to visit our new Web site, What's The Download.com, and learn about legal downloading and the ethical choices you can make about how you get your music.

The coming months and years will be a critical time for all of us who bring you the music. Our industry will emerge from what has been a perfect storm. And we will reinvent and renew that which requires change, providing more choices and options to discover and enjoy music.

Just as you would respond to one of your family members seeking your help, we ask you to help us keep music strong and alive for this and for generations to come. You can be sure that we will continue to do our part; we're counting on you to please do yours.

A TRIBUTE TO JUDGE LENARD D.
LOUIE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to an extraordinary man and an excellent judge who has dedicated his life to the people of San Francisco. Judge Lenard D. Louie currently presides in the San Francisco Superior Court.

Born in San Francisco, Judge Louie attended both the University of San Francisco and Hastings School of Law. Upon graduation, he passed the bar and began his public service career as a Deputy District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco. During the sixteen years that Judge Louie was a prosecutor he proudly points out that he "handled

everything from the most Mickey Mouse of cases to the heaviest of homicides," experiences that would later serve him well when he became a Judge.

Mr. Speaker, after sixteen years of tireless public service as a prosecutor for the City and County of San Francisco, Lenard Louie was appointed to a seat on the San Francisco Municipal Court by then Governor Deukmejian. After serving admirably on that bench for three years, Governor Deukmejian then appointed Judge Louie to a seat on the San Francisco Superior Court, a position he continues to hold to this day. At the Superior Court Judge Louie utilizes a tough but fair approach, described by many as politely banging heads, in handling cases. In fact, he is often described as the Emperor of Settlements for his ability to squeeze both sides into agreement.

In addition to his public service in the judicial system, Judge Louie is an active participant in the Chinese American community. He is a past National President of the Chinese American Alliance, a member of the Board of the Chinese Times Newspaper Association and an active member of the Louise Fong Kwong Family Association.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Judge Lenard D. Louie for his tireless hard work and exemplary service to the people of San Francisco and extending our best wishes to his wife Lily, his daughters and his grandchildren.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GEOFFREY
ZARAGOZA

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise before you today to pay tribute to the short but inspiring life of a citizen from my district. Geoffrey Zaragoza from La Jara, Colorado passed away recently at the young age of nineteen. Geoffrey was a beloved son, friend and sportsman who will be missed by all and I think it is appropriate that we take the time to recognize his remarkable young life here today.

Geoffrey will be remembered for his love of the outdoors. He always looked forward to casting his line upon the many fishing spots throughout the state. Geoffrey was also an accomplished track athlete whose speed mesmerized the crowds cheering on the Alamosa track and cross-country teams. Those in the community who knew Geoffrey will remember his devotion to always do his very best. He will certainly remain an inspiration to the entire La Jara community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise before this body of Congress and this nation to pay tribute to the life of Geoffrey Zaragoza. Geoffrey was a beloved young man who made a tremendous impact on his community in his short life. He was a loving son, a devoted fisherman, track athlete and a loyal friend to many. The La Jara community and State of Colorado will truly miss him. My heart goes out to Geoffrey's loved ones in this difficult time of bereavement.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL KONECNY

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Arkansan and an outstanding citizen; I am proud to recognize Samuel Konecny in the Congress. His recent death was a great loss to his community, his family, his state and this nation.

As a third-generation farmer and a member of the Arkansas State Plant Board, he was proud of his efforts to preserve the Grand Prairie. His desire to conserve was highlighted when he allocated 53 acres of virgin prairie to the Department of Arkansas Heritage and received the Arkansas Conservationist of the Year award.

Mr. Konecny served his country with distinction as a retired captain in the Arkansas National Guard and served as company commander for the local unit. He and his unit were deployed throughout the Central High School crisis and helped break the stranglehold of segregation when he escorted "The Little Rock Nine" safely to school.

An avid churchgoer, Mr. Konecny was a member of Holy Rosary Catholic Church in Stuttgart. He was a 4th Degree Knights of Columbus and helped initiate the Slovak Oyster Supper.

Maybe most importantly, Mr. Konecny was a man of great generosity both with his money and his time. He was instrumental in persuading Riceland Foods and Producers Rice Mill to encourage members to donate rice to the food program to feed the hungry. He spent many hours of his life helping people in need and performed many acts of charity throughout his church and community.

A devout public servant, he served as a supporter and legislative liaison to former Governors Bill Clinton and Jim Guy Tucker and was a long-time sergeant at arms for the Arkansas State Senate. Sam Konecny was a man of honor, religion and compassion. On behalf of the Congress, I extend sympathies to his family, and gratitude for all he did to make the world a better place.

HONORING DR. JACOB EAPEN, RECIPIENT OF MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA'S AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE AS A CALIFORNIA PHYSICIAN

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jacob Eapen, M.D., a Frerfront, California pediatrician, who is the recipient of the first Physician Recognition Award from the Medical Board of California. The California Medical Board, which licenses physicians throughout the State, created a Physician Recognition Task Force last year to begin an annual program to recognize physicians for outstanding service.

On January 30, 2004, Dr. Eapen received the award in recognition of his career devoted to improving public health for the underserved

worldwide, as well as for his current work as a pediatrician for Alameda County Health Services, where he reaches out to poor children in East Bay communities and children being held at Juvenile Hall in San Leandro, California.

He has been the commissioner of public health in Alameda County for more than four years.

A native of India, Dr. Eapen graduated from the Tivandrum Medical College at Kerala University and traveled to Africa, where he worked as the director of the pediatric unit in Agha Kahn Hospital in Tanzania. He also worked and taught in Nigeria.

While he was working in a Nigerian hospital, Dr. Eapen saw hundreds of children die from diseases because of malnourishment. Since then, he has dedicated his career to pediatric services for the underprivileged. He has also served as a United Nations' health adviser in the Philippines.

Dr. Eapen earned a master's degree in public health in 1984 from the University of California, Berkeley. He completed a second residency in 1992 from Stanford University, which allowed him to practice in the United States. He has been honored by Stanford Medical School as one of the 40 outstanding Stanford Medical alumni from among 7000 graduates of the last sixty years.

Dr. Eapen has embraced Public Health Services in an explicit attempt to foster more appropriate and effective policies and practices to benefit poor, underserved patients. He devotes his time and energy to working in the county health system to improve public health.

After receiving his award, Dr. Eapen told the Medical Board of California that epidemics have no borders, and he also spoke against the potential closure of clinics in Alameda County, California, because of costs.

Dr. Eapen epitomizes the essence of the award he received from the Medical Board. He is indeed dedicated to improving public health care and is working daily to usher in real changes in the lives of people. To quote Dr. Eapen: "There's so much to be done."

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR
WARREN ZIMMERMANN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last week a prominent thinker and actor in American foreign policy passed away. Ambassador Warren Zimmermann died on Tuesday, February 3, from pancreatic cancer. He was a career foreign service officer, who later taught at both Johns Hopkins and Columbia universities.

I had the honor and privilege of working with Ambassador Zimmermann in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Our collaboration began when he was chosen to represent the United States at the Vienna Follow-Up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. At the time, I was Chairman of the Helsinki Commission. Under his leadership, State Department officers and Commission staff together formed the basis of the U.S. delegation. Ambassador Zimmermann recognized the talent, expertise and political support offered by the Commission and ensured that bureaucratic hurdles would not jeopardize its integration and effectiveness.

Warren Zimmermann also agreed essentially with Commission views about being bold on human rights, on naming the names of political prisoners and divided families as well as the names of the countries whose governments were denying them and many others their basic human rights. Ambassador Zimmermann challenged the Soviets and their Warsaw Pact allies to uphold their Helsinki Final Act commitments. This happened during the critical first years that Gorbachev was in power in Moscow, and the Vienna meeting helped to give real meaning to words like glasnost and perestroika by insisting, before it would conclude, on actual implementation of existing commitments along with more specific and forward-looking new human rights commitments.

To his credit, and with potential implications for his, career, Ambassador Zimmermann was prepared to remain in Vienna until the Soviets resolved long-standing human rights cases. During the course of the meeting, over 600 of the 750 Soviet political prisoners listed as such by the United States were freed, including all Helsinki monitors. The number of bilateral family reunification cases was reduced from 150 to about 10, and foreign radio broadcast jamming ended. While other, larger factors were, of course, at play, Warren Zimmermann, the U.S. Delegation and the friends and allies of the United States meeting in Vienna from 1986 to 1989 helped in no small way to bring an end to the Cold War and the decades-long, artificial division of Europe.

Warren Zimmermann not only engaged his fellow diplomats. He also developed close contacts with Soviet human rights activists during his postings at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow which he maintained through the Vienna meeting. For his efforts on behalf of refugees, he was awarded the Anatoly Sharansky Freedom Award by the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews.

After the Vienna meeting ended in 1989, he went on to serve as the United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia. In that capacity, he would again work with the Commission at a decisive time, namely the beginning of the violent disintegration of the Yugoslav federation. The Helsinki principles, which we had just defended in Vienna, were about to witness their most severe violations primarily at the direction of Slobodan Milosevic. Ambassador Zimmermann knew well the complexities of the Balkans, but, like the Commission, he also knew that human rights violations—in this case taking the form of ethnic cleansing—could not be explained and accepted as the historical inevitability that the region's nationalist propagandists would want us to believe.

Warren Zimmermann's approach to U.S. foreign policy embraced the broader, comprehensive view of security that was relevant to the Cold War, to the Balkan conflicts and to our world today. In 1986, he noted the vital connection between a state's approach to human rights domestically and its conduct internationally. "If a state is pathologically distrustful of its own citizens," he asked, "is it not prone to a certain paranoia in its foreign policy? If a state does not earn the trust of its own citizens, should it have the confidence of other states? If a state is a threat to its own people, can it fail to present a potential threat to peoples beyond its borders?"

Mr. Speaker, Warren Zimmermann was an American patriot who served this Nation with

honor and distinction for decades. His professional legacy is marked by a continual striving for freedom, democracy and human rights, and today there are innumerable people in Europe and elsewhere who live freer, happier lives because of his life's work.

I want to extend my sincerest condolences to Ambassador Zimmermann's wife, Teeny, his entire family, many friends and admiring colleagues.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE AND MARY
GLEASON

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to pay tribute today to two phenomenal individuals from my district who have devoted over a half century to each other and to their fellow citizens. George and Mary Gleason of Aspen, Colorado, recently marked 60 years of marriage. As they, their family, and friends celebrate this union, I would like to take this time to honor the Gleasons and their dedication to each other before this body of Congress and this nation.

George and Mary first met in 1942. As native Coloradans, they attended college in state and exchanged their vows there as well. Early in their marriage, the Gleason's spent time away from the state during World War II due to George's career as an aerospace engineer. As dedicated skiers, Aspen was a favorite destination for them and they eventually purchased a cabin there. In the 1980s they became permanent residents. The Gleason were able to pass along the love of this town to their children, many of whom still call Aspen home. The Gleasons have truly become pillars in this picturesque mountain town, maintaining their love of skiing and organizing outdoors trips for the senior community.

Mr. Speaker, George and Mary Gleason have maintained their commitment to each other and to their community for 60 years. Their enthusiasm for life and for the outdoors is infectious for all who they encounter. Their love for each other, their children, and grandchildren knows no bounds. I am honored to pay tribute to the anniversary of their vows and to the abiding love the Gleasons have for each other. I wish them many more years in matrimonial bliss. Happy 60th wedding anniversary!

HONORING FRENCH WORLD WAR II
VETERAN OUTREACH AMBAS-
SADORS

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three French citizens who, in spite of prevailing politics, have graciously opened their communities and homes to visiting World War II veterans as part of a person-to-person outreach leading up to the 60th anniversary observance of the Normandy invasion.

The 70th Infantry Division fought in the Alsace/Lorraine province of France for 86 consecutive days during World War II. The division successfully liberated 58 towns before culminating their combat by breaching the Siegfried Line at Saarbrücken, Germany. During the operation they suffered 835 killed in action, 2,713 wounded, and lost 397 soldiers as prisoners of war. An additional 54 of their number were classified as missing in action.

Since the war, veterans of the division have returned many times, establishing lasting friendships among the people they helped to liberate. In return, the people of France have erected solemn monuments to their liberators and routinely decorate the graves of Americans buried in nearby military cemeteries.

As preparations commence to observe the 60th anniversary of the June 6, 1944 invasion at Normandy, I would like to specifically recognize three individuals whose consistent hospitality is demonstrative of the goodwill that continues to be shared between many French citizens and the American veterans who fought for their liberation.

Mr. Leon Dietsch, Mayor of Spicheren, has hosted numerous receptions during recent years to honor visiting Americans. Mr. Dietsch was particularly instrumental in establishing a memorial on Spicheren Heights, the site of one of the bloodiest battles in the history of the 70th Infantry Division.

I also wish to honor Mr. Edwin Neis, curator of the Museum of History and Military at Freyming-Merlebach, France. The museum maintains numerous displays depicting American operations during the battle to liberate the area in World War II. Mr. Neis has gone to great efforts to honor American soldiers and make all American visitors feel welcome when they visit.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute to the family of Thomas Kirsch of Spicheren. The Kirsch family has welcomed American veterans into their homes as guests, treating visitors to home cooked meals and rich cultural activities. Their friendship to visiting Americans contributes greatly to the fostering of good French/American relations.

Mr. Speaker, in these times of global insecurities, it is refreshing to observe that, in spite of political and cultural differences, the people of the United States and France can still warmly reach out and embrace each other in friendship and respect.

HONORING MAKER'S MARK DIS-
TILLERY FOR 50TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF FIRST BATCH

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the first batch of whisky being barreled at the Maker's Mark Distillery in Loretto, Kentucky.

As you may be aware, bourbon whisky is "America's native spirit." It was recognized by a 1964 Act of Congress as a "Distinctive product of the United States." This designation has brought prestige and respect to this fine whisky. However, over the years, the Maker's Mark brand has brought even more.

Maker's Mark was created in 1953 by Bill Samuels, Sr. Dissatisfied with the traditional

taste of bourbon, he forsook his family's generations-old bourbon recipe and created a new one. By substituting red winter wheat for the typical bourbon flavoring grain of rye, he created a bourbon that was gentler on the palate, yet remained full-flavored. This not only created a whisky with a surprisingly smooth finish, it created a whole new class of bourbon: premium bourbon. Today, every other premium bourbon on the market owes its existence to that first batch of Maker's Mark that went into the barrel in 1954.

Maker's Mark is still handcrafted every step of the way at the same distillery, which is the world's oldest working bourbon distillery in continuous operation and has been designated a National Historic Landmark. Each bottle is hand-dipped in its distinctive signature red sealing wax, symbolizing the brand's handcrafted nature. No wonder it has become the top-selling bourbon in the state of Kentucky, the number one call brand bourbon in New York City, and one of the few brands of bourbon that continues to grow in a declining product category.

Maker's Mark has brought tremendous economic benefits to the State of Kentucky, not only by providing a steady source of employment for Kentucky residents, but also through regular contributions to local and national charities. Maker's Mark also is a key destination on the Bourbon Heritage Trail, which brings thousands of visitors to our State annually.

While the Maker's Mark folks are committed to making fine bourbon, they're also passionate about helping to ensure that their product is enjoyed responsibly. That's why they and other distillers have joined forces to invest millions of dollars in the Century Council, a national not-for-profit group dedicated to reducing drunk driving and underage drinking.

For all of these accomplishments, the men and women at Maker's Mark deserve our utmost respect and our heartfelt congratulations.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS RAMSAY

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Arkansan and an outstanding citizen; I am proud to recognize Louis Ramsay in the Congress. His recent death was a great loss to his community, his family, his state and this nation.

Born, raised and educated in Fordyce, Arkansas, Mr. Ramsay left his home town to play quarterback for the Razorback football team at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville. After earning a pre-law degree from the university, Mr. Ramsay served as a pilot in the U.S. Army Air Corps in Europe in WWII where he was awarded the Air Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters. He was discharged from the U.S. Air Force Reserve as a Major.

Mr. Ramsay lived his life serving his community in every capacity imaginable. He worked at the law firm baring his name, Ramsay, Bridgforth, Harrelson & Starling, and was Chairman of the Executive Committee and Emeritus Director of Simmons First National Corp. He was the only person in Arkansas history to have been elected and served

as president of both the Arkansas Bar Association and Arkansas Bankers' Association.

He served as chair to Arkansas' Sesquicentennial Commission in 1985, appointed by then-Governor Bill Clinton. In 2003 he was inducted into the Walton School of Business, Arkansas Business Hall of Fame and a faculty fund was soon established at the University of Arkansas Sam M. Walton College of Business in honor of Mr. Ramsay and his wife.

Mr. Ramsay was a role model for us all. A man who worked hard and did his best to give back to his community more than he took from it. On behalf of the Congress, I extend sympathies to Louis' family, and gratitude for all he did to make the world a better place.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY FAUGHT

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this body of Congress and this nation today to pay tribute to a remarkable woman from my district. Dorothy Faught of Cortez, Colorado just celebrated her 80th birthday. As her family and friends mark the occasion, I would like to honor Dorothy here today.

Dorothy Faught has spent decades caring for others in her career as a nurse. In fact, Dorothy has been working in the healing profession since 1945, having started by treating soldiers returning from World War II. Dorothy has spent her first 30 years as the head nurse in the intensive care units in Detroit, Michigan. She went on to continue her career as the Director of Nursing at the Cortez hospital. Dorothy continues her career to this day, working at Southwest Home Health. Her love and knowledge of nursing has won the praise from her colleagues and patients. Dorothy has passed down her enthusiasm for the profession to her two daughters and serves as a role model to others serving in health care.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give praise to Dorothy's remarkable career. Dorothy serves as an inspiration to the Cortez community, especially her patients. I am truly honored to recognize her here today. I congratulate Dorothy for her success and thank her for her service. Happy 80th birthday!

WELCOMING TUNISIAN PRESIDENT BEN ALI TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 50 years, the Republic of Tunisia has thrived as an independent, prosperous nation in a region often synonymous with instability. Tunisia's political, social, and economic success can be partially attributed to the continued positive leadership of His Excellency President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali. I would like to join my colleagues in welcoming President Ben Ali to the United States and to Washington, D.C. on February 17th.

President Ben Ali has worked tirelessly to ensure a free society, greater democratic

openness, and complete respect for human rights in Tunisia. Over the last two decades, Tunisia has shown tremendous development, reducing poverty, bolstering educational standards, and strengthening economic growth.

Tunisia's flourishing economy offers great hope for African and Middle Eastern countries, while she also continues to play an increasingly important role in the politics of the international community. One of Tunisia's most valuable assets has been its continued willingness to support a Middle East peace process. Despite being surrounded by nations engulfed in political turmoil, Tunisia continues to take an active role in combating international unrest.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing President Ben Ali during his visit as a critical figure in the enhancement of positive global relations with the Middle East.

TRIBUTE TO STEWARD E. JESSUP

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Arkansan, an outstanding citizen, an accomplished farmer and a World War II Veteran; I am proud to recognize Stewart E. Jessup in the Congress.

Mr. Jessup was a third generation rice grower who, with his wife and sons, farmed approximately 3,000 acres of rice, soybeans, wheat and milo at their farm at Lodge's Corner, Arkansas. He also served his country with honor in World War II as a first lieutenant navigator aboard B-29's in the Pacific theater.

When Mr. Jessup wasn't tending to his farm or serving his country, he spent his time restoring antique tractors and engines—a painstaking art that demonstrated his extreme focus and deep patience.

He served his community loyally as a member of the Arkansas State Water Code Study Commission, Arkansas Soybean Promotion Board, Farmers Home Administration—Arkansas Advisory Board, Stuttgart Grain Drying Cooperative board of directors, Arkansas County ASCS Committee, president of the Arkansas County Farm Bureau, and chairman of the DeWitt School Board.

Mr. Jessup was an Arkansan by choice, a veteran by duty and a farmer by nature. On behalf of the Congress, I extend sympathies to his family, and gratitude for all he did to make the world a better place.

HONORING COACH GLENN ROBINSON

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to offer this statement of recognition for Glenn Robinson, the men's basketball head coach for Franklin and Marshall College.

Coach Robinson is a hometown hero for us here in Lancaster. He has passed Illinois Wesleyan's coaching legend, Dennie Bridges, to become the all-time winningest coach in

NCAA Division III men's basketball with 667 wins.

Coaching more than 900 games for the Diplomats, Coach Robinson has compiled a historic record. He has won more games than any other college basketball coach in Pennsylvania. Historically, he is one of only 41 coaches in collegiate basketball history to have won 600 games.

Among the top thirty coaches on all levels of the NCAA, Coach Robinson holds the tenth best winning percentage of all time. That puts him in the elite company of coaching legends like John Wooden, Jerry Tarkanian, Dean Smith, Don Meyer, Jim Boeheim, Lute Olson, Phog Allen, and Mike Krzyzewski.

Robinson, who will be inducted into the West Chester Hall of Fame on February 13, has guided the Diplomats to the Division III Final Four four times (1979, 1991, 1996 and 2000) and was named the Basketball Times Division III "Coach of the Year" in 1991. He has earned conference and National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) regional "Coach of the Year" honors 11 times.

But Coach Robinson isn't just about winning basketball games. He produces young men who are winners in life as well. You can't talk about records and winning percentage without mentioning the players who have made it possible. Part of his success has been the players with whom he has worked. Players like Will Lasky (1991 honorable mention, 1992 first team), Don Marsh (1977 & 1979 second team), Jeremiah Henry (1996 first team), Phil Hoeker (1989 honorable mention), Dave Janetta (1994 honorable mention, 1995 third team, 1995 second team), Dennis Westley (1981 second team) and Alex Kraft (2000 first team, 2001 honorable mention) all earned All-America honors under Robinson.

Unlike most Division I schools, which measure graduation rate based on the percentage of 4-year players who get a degree, Coach Robinson has a different standard. During his tenure, all but one player to earn a varsity letter in basketball has earned a degree, a statistic which few, if any, other college in the Nation can boast.

Coach Robinson grew up in Yeadon, Pennsylvania, just outside of Philadelphia and played high school basketball at nearby Aldan Lansdowne High before continuing his studies at West Chester University. At West Chester, he played collegiate baseball and basketball for the Division II Rams before graduating in 1967, earning a masters degree a year later.

Robinson joined the F&M basketball coaching staff in 1968 under Hall of Fame coach and athletic trainer Chuck Taylor. In 1971, he took over the Diplomats' when Taylor resigned to focus on his athletic training responsibilities.

His first win came on December 7, 1971 in Mayser Gymnasium, as Franklin & Marshall men's basketball team, then sporting an 0-2 record downed Western Maryland College 80-51. Robinson went on to lead the 1971-72 Diplomats to a 7-14 record with wins over Western Maryland, Eastern, Penn State-Harrisburg, Haverford, Juniata, Messiah and a season concluding 68-51 victory over Drexel University.

In 1973 the team improved to 11-13 as Coach Robinson put the pieces in place to build a successful program.

In 1974, Robinson and the Diplomats snapped their 10-year span of losing records,

with 13-11 season record, the team's most wins for a Franklin and Marshall men's basketball team since its 13-6 showing in 1959.

In 1976, Coach Robinson set the school win record with a 17-8 record, erasing the 16 win seasons of Woody Sponaugle in 1952, J. Shober Barr in 1941 and Robinson's own mark from the 1975 season.

In 1977, he broke his own record with 22 wins. And he did it again in 1979 with 27, 1991 with 28 and 1996 with 29.

His career win total accounts for an astonishing 60 percent of the total collegiate wins in Franklin & Marshall men's basketball history (1,115) since the inception of the sport in 1899-1900 under H.S. Wingert.

Coach Robinson is a pillar in our community and has built a program known for the success of its teams on the court and its players off of it.

I commend Coach Robinson for reaching this historic milestone. He has earned it. He deserves every accolade and award he receives.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. J. ALAN SHAND

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a solemn heart that I rise to pay tribute to the passing of a great man from my district. Dr. J. Alan Shand was a beloved member of his community and a staple in most of their lives. He will be remembered as a valued member of the La Junta, Colorado community and I am honored to bring his many contributions to the attention of this body of Congress and nation today.

Following service in World War II, Dr. Shand moved to La Junta in 1946 along with his wife and son and he found a job at Mennonite Hospital. They expanded their family to include another son and daughter. During Dr. Shand's career he was not only one of the town's most beloved doctors but he also helped deliver a gift to hundreds of families: babies. Wanting to be a doctor since he was young, Dr. Shand reached his goal and then went beyond.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Shand, a humble man with a great disposition, was a pillar of his community. Dr. Shand brought many young ones into this world and continued to touch their lives from that day forward. It is with great sadness that we mourn his loss. I join this body of Congress in paying tribute to his good works and fine example. My heart goes out to Dr. Shand's loved ones and to his community during this difficult time of bereavement.

TRIBUTE TO DEPUTY COMMISSIONER R. LEWIS SHAW, SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor R. Lewis Shaw of South Carolina for his serv-

ice to our state and great contribution to our environment. Lewis Shaw is retiring as Deputy Commissioner of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), a position he has held since 1984. During his long tenure, Lewis Shaw has become equated with DHEC and the whole gamut of environmental regulation: clean air, clean water, toxic and nuclear waste disposal, and waste remediation. He has supervised the state's involvement in all aspects of the clean-up of Savannah River Site. His command of the issues and professional ability are such that Lewis Shaw has served as our state's chief environmental quality officer under both Republican and Democratic Governors.

Lewis Shaw was long ago recognized on the national as well as the state level. In 1985, Attorney General Meese appointed him to one of four State Environmental Directorships on the National Enforcement Council. He served on the Council from 1985-1990, and as Chairman in 1989. In 1988, Lewis Shaw helped create the Southern Environmental Enforcement Network (SEEN,) to facilitate the enforcement of environmental statutes, rules and regulations in member states. He served as Chairman of Southern Environmental Enforcement Network in 1991.

Lewis Shaw was a member of the governing body which founded the Southern Appalachian Mountains Initiative (SAMI) in 1994. SAMI is an organization of stakeholders formed to explore the environmental stability of the Southern Appalachian Mountains and develop long-range plans to protect those resources. In 1997, Lewis Shaw was selected to serve as Chairman of SAMI. In 1999, he was elected President of the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS), the non-partisan organization of state environmental commissioners, after serving as secretary-treasurer and vice-president. From 2001-2004, Lewis Shaw served as President of the Environmental Research Institute of the States, ECOS's research arm.

Out of respect for him and his wide-ranging experience, Lewis Shaw has been called to testify before numerous committees of Congress, representing the views of South Carolina, and on occasion, all the states on environmental issues.

I have had the good fortune of working with Lewis Shaw on some tough issues: on the multiple problems at Savannah River Site, on a toxic waste landfill at Pinewood and a hazardous waste incinerator in Rock Hill; at Superfund sites in Cherokee and Chester Counties; on ozone exceedences in York County and ozone transport, and on clean water throughout my district. I could always count on Lewis Shaw to understand the problem and know the law, and to present solutions that were fair and feasible. He has been an asset to South Carolina for 33 years and to me for the 22 years that I have served in Congress. He will be sorely missed and hard to replace, but he leaves a great legacy: a much better environment and a model of performance that everyone in the field of environmental regulation would do well to emulate.

CRAIG NIGRELLI DEPARTS KOAT

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the finest and most respected news anchors in New Mexico—Craig Nigrelli. Craig is departing KOAT television of Albuquerque, New Mexico, after a strong four-year run. He will soon be leaving for KSTP-TV in Minnesota. Before he departs, I would like to reflect on his career.

Craig is one of New Mexico's most highly respected broadcast journalists. He joined the Action 7 News anchor desk in February 2000. As a popular morning and noontime anchor, he has commanded high ratings against some tough competition and is often credited with making a major contribution toward building KOAT's solid reputation.

In 1989, Craig received his B.A. degree in Communications/Economics from Rutgers University. He began his broadcasting career in radio as an anchor/reporter for radio station WJLL-AM in Niagara Falls, New York, and then as anchor/reporter for WBEN-AM in Buffalo, New York, from May 1991 until June 1993. In April 1993, Craig made the move to television as a general assignment reporter for WIVB-TV in Buffalo, and became the station's anchor/co-anchor from October 1995 until January 2000. During this time, he was praised for his reports on the crash of TWA Flight 800, the one-year anniversary of the federal-building bombing in Oklahoma, and the FBI raid on Timothy McVeigh's childhood home near Buffalo. This extensive experience prepared him well for his successful tenure at KOAT.

Throughout his years at KOAT, Craig has developed a reputation in the New Mexico political community for being one of the few TV reporters to whom the moniker "political reporter" is applied. He has been a major presence on KOAT election coverage, and his departure will leave a void in this busy year. After being interviewed dozens of times by Craig, I can honestly say that I do not know his political affiliation or leanings. He has asked me, and countless other elected officials and candidates, the tough questions that New Mexico viewers want to know. I do not think there can be a higher compliment than that for a journalist.

On February 16, I will travel to the KOAT studio in Albuquerque for what will probably be my last interview with Craig on the noon news. I have no doubt that he will be missed by his colleagues and viewers alike for his judgment, experience, toughness under pressure, and his wonderful sense of humor. He will be gone, but not forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing Craig the best of luck in all his future endeavors. His dedication to quality journalism cannot be understated, and I am pleased to have been able to honor him here today. While Craig and his lovely wife, Carol, embark on a new chapter in their life, I want them to know they will always have friends in New Mexico.

A TRIBUTE TO FORMER NORTH CAROLINA CONGRESSMAN DAVID HENDERSON FOR A LIFETIME OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise here today to pay tribute to one of North Carolina's greatest public servants, former Congressman David Henderson. With true dedication and talent, Congressman Henderson left a lasting mark on his community, his state, and his country.

Born in Wallace, North Carolina, in 1921, David Henderson began a life of accomplishment that spanned from a Major in the U.S. Air Corps to Congressman of the United States. After graduating from Davidson College in 1942, Henderson served his country overseas in India, China, and Okinawa, only to return to the University of North Carolina Law School to earn a law degree in 1949. He held numerous leadership positions throughout his career including: solicitor and judge of the Duplin County General Court, Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives' Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Member of the Governor's Advisory Boards for Economic Development and Aviation, Member of the Duplin County Board of Economic Development, and even Fireman of the Year for the Wallace County Volunteer Fire Department.

Although Congressman Henderson earned many achievements throughout his life, his greatest accomplishment was securing legislation to establish the Cape Lookout National Seashore along the Outer Banks. His commitment to preserving this natural landmark created one of the most popular coastal parks in the United States. Prior to serving sixteen years in the U.S. House of Representatives, Henderson came to Washington to serve as Assistant Counsel to the House Education and Labor Committee, and the Chief Staffer of an investigating sub-committee chaired by Congressman John F. Kennedy.

Former Congressman Henderson passed away on January 7, 2004, but will be remembered for his endless contributions to our society. This nation was blessed to have known and honored a true public servant.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ERIC AND GRACE CROSS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I rise to pay tribute to the passing of two great people from my district. Eric and Grace Cross, who spent the last 32 years of their life in Alamosa, Colorado, recently passed away at the ages of 76 and 74. The Crosses dedicated their lives to public service and to the challenging fields of teaching and missionary work. I am honored today to bring their contributions to the attention of this body of Congress and this nation.

Eric and Grace met as teenagers at the Briercrest Bible Institute, and after their mar-

riage in 1949, moved to Ecuador for four years to work as missionaries. They served an additional six years as missionaries in Del Rio, Texas before moving to Alamosa. Eric later earned a Bachelor's Degree in special education from Adams State College and the two of them continued to minister to the migrants who worked the fields of the San Luis Valley.

In 1966, after a move to Palisade, Colorado, Eric became a teacher, and later principal, at the Regional Center, where Grace also worked as a technician and later a dorm supervisor. At night, Eric earned his Masters degree in special education at Western State College. In what little spare time Eric had left he served as an interim minister in churches throughout western Colorado and eastern Utah. When Eric and Grace retired, they continued to serve the Alamosa community, coordinating the soup kitchen and help desk for the Palisade Migrant Center.

Mr. Speaker, Eric and Grace were dedicated people that selflessly served their community and country and I am honored to pay tribute to them here today. Their lifetime of service is an incredible model for all Americans and my thoughts and prayers go out to their families during this difficult time of bereavement.

THE LOSS OF CAPTAIN MATTHEW J. AUGUST

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to recognize the loss of a soldier in Iraq, a Rhode Island citizen who served with dignity and honor. I join the people of Rhode Island in mourning this great loss.

On Tuesday, January 27, U.S. Army Captain Matthew J. August was killed in Khalidiyah, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device exploded next to his convoy. Captain August was commander of B Company, 1st Engineer Battalion out of Fort Riley, Kansas. A resident of North Kingstown, Rhode Island, Capt. August graduated in 1993 from Bishop Hendricken High School—my alma mater—and then further distinguished himself as a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1997. It was at West Point that he met his wife, Captain Maureen August, who also served in Iraq in the 1st Armored Division.

Last week, I was honored to join Captain August's wife, his parents, Donna and Richard August, his older brother Mark, his younger sister Melanie, and other family and friends at a memorial service in Rhode Island. Those who knew him well spoke highly of his kindness, his commitment to his wife and family, and his patriotism and love of service. He was described as a natural leader who earned the respect of all those he encountered.

This loss causes us to reflect on the bravery demonstrated by our men and women in uniform as they carry out their obligations in the face of danger. When their Nation called them to duty to preserve freedom, liberty and the security of their neighbors, they answered without hesitation. We remember those who have fallen not only as soldiers, but also as

patriots who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. May we keep their loved ones in our thoughts and prayers as they struggle to endure this difficult period and mourn the heroes America has lost.

We will continue to hope for the safe and speedy return of all of our troops serving throughout the world.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID H. MILLER

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this body of Congress and this Nation today to pay tribute to the passing of a man who spent his lifetime seeking to expand trade and investment ties between the United States and Africa. David H. Miller, of Silver Spring, Maryland, and originally from the state of Michigan, passed away on February 2 following a year-long battle with cancer. As his family, relatives, and friends mourn their loss, I would like to recognize a few of his many achievements here today.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. William P. Miller of Farmington Hills, Michigan, Mr. Miller received a Bachelor's degree in Political Science from George Washington University and a Masters degree in Business Administration with a concentration on finance from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Mr. Miller worked for the public relations company of Black, Manafort, Stone & Kelly as a Research Associate and for Congressman Mark Siljander as a Legislative Assistant for Foreign Affairs. Thereafter, Mr. Miller was the Desk Officer for South Africa, Angola, and Namibia at the U.S. Agency for International Development. Mr. Miller then served as the Senior Associate for Africa at the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), where he led over 140 U.S. companies on investment missions to 16 African countries.

Mr. Miller helped to create the Corporate Council on Africa, and served as its first Executive Director from May 1993 to June 1999. At the Council, Miller was the principal liaison between the Council staff and more than 210 corporate and individual members. Mr. Miller was responsible for advising member companies on trade and investment activities in Africa; outreach to African government and private sector leaders; U.S. executive and legislative activities relating to African issues; and projects before international financial institutions such as the World Bank Group and the African Development Bank. Under his direction, the Corporate Council on Africa grew from an organization with six members, a limited budget, and one employee to an organization of over 210 members, an annual budget in excess of \$3 million, and fourteen employees.

Mr. Miller formed AfricaGlobal, and served as its Managing Director and Director of Government Affairs. He was responsible for handling the government clients and the governmental affairs of AfricaGlobal's corporate clients. Mr. Miller advised government clients on how to best communicate and create positive relationships with the international private sector and political leaders. Mr. Miller had extensive experience in corporate affairs and com-

munications, and was the speechwriter for AfricaGlobal's clientele.

Mr. Speaker, David H. Miller worked with great dedication in advancing relations between African nations and the United States, and is certainly deserving of praise before this body today. He is survived by his wife, the former Kyung Hee Cho; his children Max, Audrey, and Han; his parents; his brothers Bill and John, his sisters Anne and Mary; other extended family members; and a host of friends both in Africa and in the United States. Our thoughts are with them during their time of bereavement. To his family, friends, and the many people in the community who knew him, David H. Miller will be missed deeply.

DO WE REALLY WANT A WAL-MART ECONOMY?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 8, 2004. The article is about the price that is paid by Chinese workers for Wal-Mart's low prices. But, in fact, the article has far broader implications for American workers.

The article makes clear that low prices offered by Wal-Mart are built on a foundation of injustice for Chinese workers. But more importantly, for American workers the article demonstrates how the race to the bottom for workers wages and benefits occurs in this country. By implication, it illustrates that if today Wal-Mart and companies like it produce lower wages by squeezing their own workers wages and benefits, that creates pressure on competitors to do the same thing.

Every Member of Congress and every American ought to ask whether America really wants to follow the Wal-Mart economic model.

[From the Washington Post Foreign Service, Feb. 8, 2004]

CHINESE WORKERS PAY FOR WAL-MART'S LOW PRICES

(By Peter S. Goodman and Philip P. Pan)

SHENZHEN, CHINA.—Inside the factory, amid clattering machinery and clouds of sawdust, men without earplugs or protective goggles feed wood into screaming electric saws, making cabinets for stereo speakers. Women hunch over worktables, many hands bandaged and few covered by gloves, pressing transistors into circuit boards.

Most of the 2,100 workers here are poor migrants from the countryside who have come to this industrial hub in southern China for jobs that pay about \$120 a month. A sign on the wall reminds them of their expendability in a nation with hundreds of millions of surplus workers: "If you don't work hard today, tomorrow you'll have to try hard to look for a job."

The calculations driving production here at Shenzhen Baoan Fenda Industrial Co. are no different from those governing global capitalism in general—make more for less—but it is applied with particular vigor on this shop floor. Sixty percent of the stereos coming off the line are for one customer: Wal-Mart Stores Inc., whose mastery at squeezing savings from its supply chain made it the world's largest company.

"The profit is really small," said Surely Huang, a factory engineer, speaking of the

350,000 stereos that Fenda agreed in March to supply to the retailer for \$30 to \$40 each. Huang said they sell for \$50 in the United States. "We have to constantly cut costs to satisfy Wal-Mart."

Yet this factory and thousands of others along China's east coast have decided, with China's leaders, that the deal is worth the price. Wal-Mart provides access to vastly more store shelves than they could ever reach by themselves, a way to build a brand from Fort Worth to Frankfurt. Meeting Wal-Mart's strict requirements could improve the factory's efficiency and make it easier to land contracts from other major retailers.

As capital scours the globe for cheaper and more malleable workers, and as poor countries seek multinational companies to provide jobs, lift production and open export markets, Wal-Mart and China have forged themselves into the ultimate joint venture, their symbiosis influencing the terms of labor and consumption the world over.

With sales of more than \$245 billion a year, Wal-Mart is the largest retailer in the United States, still the ultimate consumer market. China is the most populous country, with 1.3 billion people, most still poor enough to willingly move hundreds of miles from home for jobs that would be shunned by anyone with better prospects. The Communist Party government has become perhaps the world's greatest facilitator of capitalist production, beckoning multinational giants with tax-free zones and harsh punishment for anyone with designs on organizing a labor movement.

More than 80 percent of the 6,000 factories in Wal-Mart's worldwide database of suppliers are in China. Wal-Mart estimates it spent \$15 billion on Chinese-made products last year, accounting for nearly one-eighth of all Chinese exports to the United States. If the company that Sam Walton built with his "Made in America" ad campaign were itself a separate nation, it would rank as China's fifth-largest export market, ahead of Germany and Britain.

Back in its home market, Wal-Mart's vast appetite for Chinese imports has placed it at the center of a sharp debate over whether the influx of low-cost products from China is good for Americans.

Domestic manufacturers, labor groups and some politicians point to China's record trade surplus with the United States, estimated to have totaled \$120 billion last year, and accuse Beijing of manipulating its currency, condoning the exploitation of its workers and competing unfairly, resulting in the loss of U.S. manufacturing jobs.

But Chinese officials counter that nearly two-thirds of the country's exports are shipped from factories wholly or jointly owned by foreign investors, with Wal-Mart often cited as the prime example, supplying Americans with a steady flow of low-cost, high-quality goods.

With its near-religious devotion to the pursuit of "everyday low prices," Wal-Mart illustrates why U.S.-based multinationals with operations here have not joined in the chorus for protectionism.

"For the benefit of the consumer, we should buy merchandise where we get the best value," said Andrew Tsuei, managing director of Wal-Mart's global procurement center in Shenzhen.

Joe Hatfield, president of Wal-Mart's Asia operations, noted that many of the goods his company buys in China—toys, furniture, textiles and holiday ornaments—have mostly not been made in the United States for years. The Bush administration has pressed China to increase the value of its currency, which some argue makes China's goods unfairly cheap on world markets. Hatfield rolled his eyes.

"That would be a travesty to do to the consumer in the United States," he said. "You do that and the cost of living is going to go up."

For Wal-Mart and other multinational companies doing business in China, a stable currency, political peace and a compliant workforce are nearly as important as low costs.

"There might be places in other parts of the world where you can buy cheaper, but can you get [the product] on the ship?" Tsuei said. "If we have to look at a country that's not politically stable, you might not get your order on time. If you deal in a country where the currency fluctuates, everyday there is a lot of risk. China happens to have the right mix."

Labor activists in China and abroad say that mix includes the ruling party's ban on independent trade unions—workers may join only the party-run union—as well as courts and regulatory agencies controlled by local party officials who are often willing to overlook labor violations to appease businesses that can be milked for taxes, fees and bribes.

The activists argue that as Wal-Mart pits suppliers against one another and squeezes them for the lowest price, the workers suffer.

"Wal-Mart pressures the factory to cut its price, and the factory responds with longer hours or lower pay," said a Chinese labor official, who declined to be named for fear of punishment. "And the workers have no options."

In the city of Dongguan in southern Guangdong province, where Wal-Mart suppliers are concentrated, a 27-year-old worker who gave her name as Miss Qin complained that she can rarely afford meat with her \$75-per-month wages at Kaida Toy Co. "Every day we eat vegetables, mostly we eat vegetables," she said, leaning over a plate of fried carrots in a dingy restaurant.

Qin helps make plastic toy trains for Wal-Mart, but says she cannot afford to buy toys for her 9-year-old son. "In four years, they haven't increased the salary," she said.

Kong Xianghong, the No. 2 official for the party-run union in Guangdong province, acknowledged that low wages, long hours and poor conditions are common in factories that supply Wal-Mart and other U.S.-based corporations. "It's better than nothing," he said. "Labor protections, working conditions and wages are related to a country's level of economic development. Of course, we want better labor protections, but we can't afford it. We need the jobs. We need to guarantee people can eat."

Still, Kong said, the party-controlled union has been frustrated that Wal-Mart has refused for three years to allow it to set up branches in the 31 Wal-Mart stores in China—even though he has assured the company that the union wouldn't help workers struggle for better pay. Wal-Mart has also fought efforts to unionize its U.S. stores.

Wal-Mart's China headquarters is a monument to its frugality—a low building covered in white tile. The linoleum conference table is pockmarked with gaps where the plywood shows through. Tea is served in plastic cups. In Hatfield's office, where he presides over Wal-Mart's Asia operations, the rusty window frame is open, the sound of car horns washing in from the street.

Wal-Mart portrays itself as a force for good in China. The company says it enforces labor standards for its suppliers and insists that they comply with Chinese law.

"We look at safety. We look at health, and this comes with a cost. We ensure people get paid above minimum wage. They have to have fire extinguishers, fire exits," Tsuei said. "There are people out there who cannot have those things and offer a lower price. We do not do business with those people."

Wal-Mart employs 100 auditors who annually inspect every supplier's factory. Last year, the company suspended deals with about 400 suppliers, primarily for exceeding limits on overtime, Tsuei said. Another 72 factories were blacklisted permanently last year, he said, almost all for employing children under China's legal working age of 16.

But Wal-Mart does not conduct regular inspections of smaller factories that sell goods to the company through middlemen. Nor does it inspect all its suppliers' subcontractors or the Chinese manufacturing operations of U.S. suppliers such as Mattel Inc. and Dell Inc.

"The inspection system is not effective," said Li Qiang, a labor organizer who has been in contact with workers at more than a dozen factories that supply Wal-Mart, and who worked in one himself before leaving China three years ago. "The factories are usually notified in advance, and they often prepare by cleaning up, creating fake time sheets and briefing workers on what to say."

Li said these factories often require employees to work as many as 80 hours per week during the busy season for \$75 to \$110 per month, violating Chinese labor laws. If Wal-Mart really wanted to monitor conditions among its suppliers, Li said, it could do so with surprise visits, longer inspections and independent auditors. "But if they did that, prices would definitely go up," he said.

Wal-Mart is such a big player in China that it does not have to go looking for suppliers; the suppliers come to them, jamming a reception area at the procurement center.

Yu Xiaoma of Guangzhou Kangaroo Leathers Co., which makes handbags and wallets for Wal-Mart and other multinationals, said: "You can't make much money from Wal-Mart. They demand the lowest, lowest price."

Amy Gu, vice manager for exports for Goodbaby Corp., which makes baby strollers near Shanghai, said the company sometimes takes orders to supply Wal-Mart at or below cost through a partnership with a Canadian distributor, Dorel Industries Inc. "Dorel will tell us, 'Well, Wal-Mart has given us this price, we need a factory cost of this much,'" Gu said. "And we have to find a way to deliver it."

Wal-Mart says such arrangements benefit both sides. Hatfield said the company has made distribution more efficient and fair by cutting out middlemen and resisting corruption. In a country where transportation remains unreliable, Wal-Mart's distribution network has given manufacturers access to customers around the country and the world.

He touted the case of a Guangdong factory that began supplying Wal-Mart stores in Shenzhen with a drink made of milk and egg yolk, delivering 25,000 units the first month. It proved popular. By September, Wal-Mart was shipping 1 million units a month across southern China.

"They can just drop it at our distribution center and we take care of the rest," Hatfield said. "Now it's a national brand."

Yet those who run the factory that produces the drink, Weijiashi Food & Beverage Co., say they haven't yet shared in the success.

"In the beginning, we made money," said a manager reached by telephone, who gave his name as Mr. Li.

"But when Wal-Mart started to launch nationwide distribution, they pressured us for a special price at below our cost. Now, we're losing money on every box, while Wal-Mart is making more money."

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MERRIWETHER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted entrepreneur from Monte Vista, Colorado. George Merriwether sets an example for people to work hard no matter their age. His enthusiasm for life is an inspiration to the community and I would like to join my colleagues here today in recognizing George's tremendous service to the Monte Vista community.

At ninety years old, George Merriwether is still putting in countless hours five to six times a week at his own irrigation business. George started the business at age sixty when, after working twenty-six years in Los Angeles, he decided to return to Colorado. George's irrigation business is oriented towards service, with two pump crews installing pumps and one man in charge of their rebuilding.

Mr. Speaker, George Merriwether is a dedicated individual who enriches the lives of Monte Vista citizens by providing a great irrigation service to the community. George has demonstrated a passion for work that is rare for a man of any age. One can only imagine what our nation could do if we all had as much energy and compassion as he does. George's enthusiasm and commitment certainly deserve the recognition of this body of Congress.

HONORING CONGREGATION SINAI AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker it is with great pleasure that I rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to Congregation Sinai of West Haven, Connecticut as they celebrate their seventy-fifth anniversary. Today's celebration marks a tremendous milestone in the Congregation's history and I am proud to join them in commemorating this special occasion.

Houses of worship play a vital role in our communities—providing a haven for those in search of comfort as well as a place to build and strengthen the bonds of fellowship. In addition to catering to the cultural and spiritual needs of West Haven's Jewish community, the contributions made by both the organization and its members are innumerable. Throughout its seventy-five year history, Congregation Sinai has been an active member of the West Haven community—touching the lives of many.

Founded in 1929 by ten families as the West Haven Jewish Community Center, Congregation Sinai has grown to become a leading synagogue in the Greater New Haven area—providing spiritual leadership and working diligently for the betterment of their community. From annual blood drives and spiritual programs to sponsoring local political debates and charity fundraising events, the members

of Congregation Sinai have truly helped to shape their community.

Working with the West Haven Clergy Association, the Congregation's leaders have worked diligently to promote brotherhood and understanding between groups of varying religious backgrounds. Members donate their time and energies to a variety of causes and the Congregation has opened its doors to youth and other community groups—offering them a place to meet so that they too can make a difference in the community.

Through their endless compassion and generosity, Congregation Sinai and its membership have left an indelible mark on the City of West Haven. I am proud to rise today to extend my sincere congratulations and very best wishes to Congregation Sinai as they celebrate their seventy-fifth anniversary. Mazel Tov!

HONORING THE MEN AND WOMEN
OF THE 459TH AEROMEDICAL
STAGING SQUADRON

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since September 11, 2001, valiant young Americans have served our country on the front lines of the War on Terrorism, and some have made the ultimate sacrifice. We will always remember and recognize their courage and selflessness in defense of our Nation.

Over the past two and a half years, thousands of brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines have returned home wounded, sometimes seriously, from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. These heroes have arrived at Andrews Air Force base aboard the U.S. Air Force's Worldwide Aeromedical Evacuation flights.

Upon arrival, these service members are met by a group of heroes in their own right, the reserve airmen and women of the 459th Aeromedical Staging Squadron. Since their mobilization on April 3, 2003 these men and women have worked tirelessly to ensure that our injured and wounded service members are moved safely from the Aeromedical Evacuation System to stateside facilities where they can receive critical lifesaving care.

The 100-bed Contingency Aeromedical Staging Facility (CASF) was established in March to supplement the existing Andrews Air Force Base ASF in anticipation of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Working out of makeshift facilities, including a fitness building and tennis center, the men and women of the Andrews CASF maintain the highest standard of care for wounded service members transiting the U.S. Air Force's Evacuation system. Since April 2003 the Andrews CASF staff has moved 11,307 injured military personnel through Andrews on their way to military medical centers nationwide.

In our many visits to the Walter Reed Army Medical Center here in Washington, DC, and the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland, my wife Beverly and I have met countless young soldiers, sailors and Marines who survived life-threatening injuries because of the quick and effective work of those responsible for the Air Force's Aeromedical

Evacuation Flights and Staging Facilities. Each and every day, the nurses, physicians, and medical technicians of the Andrews CASF stand ready to receive and care for some of our most critically wounded heroes from the War on Terrorism. All Americans are proud of their service and grateful for their efforts, none more so than those whose lives they held in their hands. The men and women of the Contingency Aeromedical Staging Facility have fulfilled their responsibility with distinction and with grace under pressure, and have demonstrated yet again the skill and dedication of America's citizen soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this often overlooked group of American heroes and I ask that my colleagues in the Congress join with me today in honoring their patriotism and their contribution to the cause of freedom around the globe.

So that they may be honored individually, I am submitting the names of the 86 personnel of the Andrews CASF, including 30 members of the 89th Medical Group, for the RECORD:

Adams, Shaun—MD; Anderson, James—VA; Anderson, Larry Jr—MD; Arrington, Shelia—VA; Allis, Patrick—NC; Ascue, Joseph—VA; Ayala-Tipmongkol, Patricia—VA; Barlow, Raymond—PA; Becton, Avery—VA; Beebe, Deborah—TX; Bowles, Charmayne—MD; Brandon, Lewis—MD;

Brooks, Sylvia—MD; Bullock, Geraldine—NC; Bulow, Tequila—MD; Campbell, Shanita—VA; Cesaro, Roger—MD; Delaney, Allen—SC; Devilla, Eustaquio—VA; Drummond, Jimmie—MD; Emeagwali, Edith—MD; Fairley, Xamodria—MD; Fields, Darrell—MO; Finn, Sophia—MD;

Fitzpatrick, Alice—VA; Fletcher, James—MA; Fullenwilder, Edson—MD; Gadsden, Tamar—MD; Gavin, Shaun—MD; Gill, Mary—MD; Goston, Santoskaun—VA; Green (Walker), Candice—PA; Guerra, Adrian—IL; Hagans, Rudy—MD; Harvey, Nakia—MD; Hayden, Donald—KY;

Heyward, Cheryl—DC; Hodge, Nketia—VA; Howard, Charles—MD; James, Joseph—MD; James, Zenobia—MD; Johnson, Deborah—NC; Johnson, Doreen—MD; Johnson, Dwines—NC; Jones, Bonnie—MD; Jones-Everett, Jennifer—MD; Kee, Frances—MD; Kellner, Karen—MD;

King, Caleb—MD; Knight, Nina—PA; Leggett, Taeka—VA; Lewis, Christopher—MD; Lipscomb, Marina—MD; Longfellow, Dawn—DE; Lyde, Georgia—MD; Martin, Roberta—MD; Masonis, Michael—MD; McCall, Colon—MD; Meredith, Janelle—MD; Mewborn, Margaret—VA;

Millner, Johnnie—VA; Mills, Edwards, Shera—NC; Moore, Ricardo—VA; Moore, Vanessa—NC; Morgan, Jennifer—VA; Morton, Sandi—VA; Myles, Larry—VA; Pauldine, Ronald—MD; Persons, Cynthia—VA; Phifer, Dianett—VA; Plog, Hunter—MD; Quinerly, Julius—VA;

Retener, Jose—MD; Reynolds, Gary—MD; Richardson, Leonard—MD; Roberts, Tracy—SC; Rudd, Brant—MD; Sawka, Ann—PA; Sherry-Notar, Precious—VA; Silver, James—MD; Simon, Norman—VA; Smith, William—VA;

Stiles, Erlinda—MD; Sylvestro, Patricia—MD; Taylor, Meghan—VA; Thomas, Edward—VA; Troutman, Wanda—NC; Tutwiler, Terry—VA; Vogan, Kieth—WV; Whitney, Angel—DE; Williams, Cornelius—VA; and Woodyard, April—NC.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO FRANK
MONTERA

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I rise to pay tribute to the passing of a great man from my district. Mayor Frank Montera, a native of Pueblo, Colorado, recently passed away at the age of 87. Frank dedicated his life to public service and I am honored today to bring his contributions to the attention of this body of Congress and this nation.

Mayor Montera will be forever remembered for his tremendous service to his community. He served on the Aguilar Town Council for almost 30 years, spent another eight on the Aguilar School Board, and later served as the town's Mayor. Frank was a diligent public servant who had a long history of involvement in community affairs. Frank's example serves as a model of how hard work and altruistic endeavors facilitate a prosperous and rewarding community.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Montera was an incredible role model for America's youth. Frank dedicated his life to representing the scholastic endeavors of a generation. His compassionate and selfless service to Aguilar and the Colorado community certainly deserves the recognition of this body of Congress and this nation. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family during this time of bereavement.

H.R. 3030—IMPROVING THE COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT ACT

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3030, Reauthorization of the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG). I am a strong supporter of this block grant, as noted in my previous remarks on February 4, 2004.

I am disappointed, however, that H.R. 3030, as passed, failed to correct provisions in current law that permit religious organizations receiving funds under this Act to discriminate in employment based on religion. While these provisions have existed in current law for five years, I cannot condone the continuation of discriminatory policies.

I supported the Democratic substitute offered by my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee, Representatives LYNN WOOLSEY and GEORGE MILLER, that restore basic civil rights for workers while ensuring the ongoing participation of faith-based groups in CSBG programs. I also supported the Miller amendment to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation program for an additional six months.

This extension is long overdue given that 8.4 million Americans are now unemployed—159,344 in Wisconsin alone—and it is taking longer and longer for them to find work. I hear daily from job seekers in my district about how difficult it has been to find employment in this

economy. It is unconscionable that previous attempts to extend aid to those who have lost their jobs as a result of this Administration's misguided economic policies have been blocked by the majority leadership. Passing an extension of this important program has given hope to those who have, through no fault of their own, lost their jobs in these tough economic times.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Woolsey amendment did not pass and that congressional leadership insists on retaining language discriminating against employees at faith-based organizations based on religion. Despite these reservations, I supported final passage of H.R. 3030, as amended by Mr. MILLER's unemployment extension amendment, and I hope the Senate will pass this important bill quickly to help millions of job seekers currently unemployed and looking for work.

DEMOCRATIC PROPOSAL TO
EXTEND UI BENEFITS

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican economists, the Wall Street Journal and other conservative propaganda organs are loudly proclaiming that the recession is over. They are trumpeting a new prosperity. But there are no jobs for the more than three million who lost their jobs. In my District unemployment is an awful reality. Every worker would like to be employed in a job that allows him to bring home a check big enough to meet his family's needs. However, if you don't have a job, then you welcome the desperately needed unemployment insurance.

The stories of two unemployed workers in my district put a human face on the ugly statistics related to this calamity. John Pleck and Nina Worrell both face an uncertain future because of the Bush Administration's focus on tax cuts for the rich. John's UI benefits expired in December, leaving him with no income. He spends each day searching the "job wanted ads" while submitting applications for various jobs. The Democratic plan would provide John with more time to find a well paying job. John's story is heard everyday throughout the United States. In fact, John's current situation is very similar to another constituent in my district. Mrs. Nina Worrell spent 14 years working for United Airlines. Mrs. Worrell has been unemployed for more than a year and has struggled to pay her bills. Her UI benefits also expired in December, leaving Mrs. Worrell with few choices. While she has continued to search for a new job, the unemployment rate

in New York has continued to skyrocket. We must extend UI benefits for people such as John and Nina.

The Republican Administration continues to support policies that harm America: Continuation of the Republican war against working families; failure to appreciate contributions of working families to the overall national resources and purpose; the war in Iraq being fought by the relatives of these unemployed Americans.

Democrats prefer an economic stimulus package for jobs. The compassionate, the right action to take, the policy which best serves the national interests and national security at this time is the simple extension of unemployment insurance.

I urge a "yes" vote for this amendment.

COMMEMORATING KOREAN
AMERICAN DAY

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the arrival of Korean immigrants to the United States.

On January 13, 1903, the first wave of Korean immigrants arrived in Hawaii. Although recruited to do backbreaking work on the sugar plantations, they arrived with great hope that they would find a better life for themselves and their children in this country. The second wave of Korean immigrants arrived after World War II and the Korean War. They came in search of political and educational freedom. The third influx of Korean immigrants arrived after 1965. Many in this last group were medical professionals who came to fill the shortage of health care workers in our inner cities. Since then, others have arrived and have pursued the American Dream of owning successful small businesses. These "mom and pop" shops have helped to revitalize declining neighborhoods and provide an important economic stimulus in communities throughout the nation. Despite language and cultural barriers and sometimes blatant discrimination, Korean Americans—like so many other immigrants who arrive to this country—are helping to keep America strong.

Toward this end, the Korean American community has shown its tremendous resiliency. Racial struggles exist in all communities. But we are obligated to reflect back upon certain tragedies as important reminders. Following the loss of life and extensive property damage in the Los Angeles riots of 1992, the Korean-American community and the Nation grieved and sought out better ways to prevent future

violence. Many in the Korean-American community cite the Los Angeles riots as the historical turning point that led to the political mobilization of Korean Americans nationwide and brought about a new awareness for the need to reach out and build better relationships with other ethnic groups.

Today, as we continue to heal past wounds and embrace our differences, I can say with great pride that the growing Korean American community in this country makes up a valuable, dynamic and integral part of our diverse society. Korean Americans serve in our armed services. World War II history buffs will recall the brave and heroic acts of Colonel Young Oak Kim. He became the most decorated soldier in the 100th Infantry Battalion/442nd Regimental Combat Team. For his bravery, he earned the Silver Star Medal for saving countless American lives. As successful entrepreneurs, Korean-American business owners contribute \$45 billion annually to our Nation's economy. Korean Americans have a great influence in the fashion industry, international trade, restaurants and many other community businesses. Korean cuisine is also crossing cultural lines. Enjoyed by Americans throughout the country, kimchi, for example, is a spicy pickled cabbage that is now famous for literally bringing tears to the faint.

Overall, Korean Americans have made significant contributions to this country in a wide variety of professions, ranging from the arts to medicine to the sciences. As a Nation, we are benefiting from this tremendous wealth of knowledge and talent.

With nearly 2 million Korean Americans living in the United States, Korean immigration is an important part of our Nation's history and collective heritage. Like most immigrants, Koreans brought with them the deeply embedded and cherished American values of hard work, sacrifice, and respect for family, church and community.

This was especially apparent at the January 13 gala dinner that I attended along with my colleague, LINDA SÁNCHEZ. The beautiful affair brought to an end a year-long celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the arrival of Korean Americans to this country. The Centennial Committee of Korean Immigration to the U.S. and the Korean American Day Committee are to be commended for making the celebration possible.

I would like to thank both Committees for allowing me to be a part of this wonderful celebration and, above all, for their commitment to preserving the tremendous history of the Korean American community. Because of their efforts, current and future generations will have a greater awareness of the proud legacy of the Korean American community and its important contribution over the last 100 years to the beautiful mosaic that today makes up and binds our diverse and great Nation.