Those lives would not be lost in vain. Their determination for the cause paid off, and because heroes like William Barrett Travis, Davy Crockett, Jim Bowie and others held out for so long, Santa Anna's forces took such great losses they became battered and demoralized and diminished. As Travis said in his last letter, ''Victory will cost the enemy more dearly than defeat.''

He was right.

General Sam Houston, in turn, had devised a strategy to rally other Texas volunteers to ultimately defeat Santa Anna at the battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836. The war was over. The Lone Star flag was visible all across the bold, brazen, and broad plains of Texas. Texas remained an independent nation for over 9 years.

The Alamo defenders were from every State in the United States, 13 foreign countries. They were black, brown, and white, ages 16 through 67. They were mavericks, revolutionaries, farmers, shopkeepers, and freedom fighters. They came together to fight for something they believed in. Liberty. And, Madam Speaker, they were all volunteers.

In 1845, Texas was admitted to the United States by only one vote. Some have said they wished the vote had gone the other way. Be that as it may, every day, each school day, kids across the vastness of Texas pledge allegiance to not only the American flag but they also pledge to the Texas flag; and by treaty with the United States, the Texas flag flies next to the American flag but never below it.

We all know that freedom has a cost. It always has. It always will.

And we also pause to remember those who lost their lives so that Texas could be a free nation. And as we do so, we remember the brave Americans in our military that are fearlessly fighting in lands far, far away to preserve and uphold freedom from a new world threat of terrorism.

Texas Independence Day is a day of pride and reflection in the Lone Star State. Today we remember to pay tribute to heroes like William Barrett Travis, Jim Bowie, Davy Crockett, Juan Seguin, Jim Bonham, and General Sam Houston and the rest of those volunteers who fought the evil tyrant and terrorist, Santa Anna.

Madam Speaker, I hope that Congress and the rest of the country will join me in celebrating Texas Independence Day. In Colonel Travis' final letter and appeal for aid, he signed off with three words that I leave you with now. ''God and Texas.'' ''God and Texas.'' ''God and Texas.''

And the rest, as they say, Madam Speaker is Texas history. And that's just the way it is.

PORT SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, it is hard to believe, but the Bush administration, through its Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte, has given a nod and green light to the Dubai Ports World deal.

Mr. Negroponte says the Bush administration ''assessed the threat to U.S. national security posed by Dubai Ports World to be low. In other words, he said, ''We didn't see any red flags come up during the course of our inquiry.''

Now the questions I have to ask: Why should we trust the Bush administration or their analysis on intelligence on anything certainly when it comes to the Middle East? It seems to me their record on assessing risk is not good.

Let us review some of their intelligence predictions:

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, back in February, 2003, said about the war in Iraq, ''It is unknowable how long that conflict will last. It could last 6 days, 6 weeks. I doubt 6 months.'' That is what he said. His estimate was dead wrong.

Vice President DICK CHENEY, March, 2003, said, ''We will, in fact, be greeted in Iraq as liberators . . . I think it will go relatively quickly . . . in weeks rather than months.'' His estimate was dead wrong.

President Bush told us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. Well, the United States called off that search in January, 2005. There were no weapons of mass destruction. His estimate proved to be dead wrong.

□ 1400

This administration seems to make wrong decisions about a lot of things, like knowing who the enemy really is, like knowing what causes enemies to rise in the first place, and working to prevent that by avoiding cozy deals with dictatorships of all stripes.

I think it is clear to even the least interested of observers that the architects of this war, starting with the President, the Vice President and the Secretary of Defense, allowed our troops to go to war in insufficient numbers, with inadequate resources, with fantastic escalating costs and with absolutely no plan whatsoever to win the peace. Globally, their approach is yielding more terrorism every day. Their approach is yielding more anti-Americanism every day globally.

Why then should we trust the Bush administration? Why should we believe their intelligence that the Dubai Ports World deal will not risk U.S. national security? Those who seek to do us harm know a lot about ports. Two weeks ago, in Yemen, 23 al Qaeda members escaped from prison. Thirteen of them were men convicted in involvement in the 2000 suicide attack on the USS *Cole* that occurred in Yemen's harbor which killed 17 American soldiers. The others were attackers of the French supertanker Lindbergh in 2002.

Some of those who are our enemy have spent decades working the oil fields and sea lanes of the Middle East. Supertankers like the Lindbergh now wend their way to our shores because we irresponsibly are dependent on oil imports to sustain this economy. Those who want to harm us know this system well.

The quagmire in Iraq is bringing contempt for the United States around the world and our enemies seek to harm us. That is why port security must be uppermost in our minds.

America is fast becoming a dependent Nation, dependent on other countries for oil, for food, for autos, for electronics, for toys, even for clothing. Our maritime system includes over 95,000 miles of open shoreline, and 316 U.S. ports and ships carry more than 95 percent of our non-North American trade. But only 2 percent of what comes into this country is even inspected. Just last week, we saw what happened in Saudi Arabia as an al Qaeda attack occurred at their largest oil facility.

In this era, when vastly more is shipped into our ports than goes out, we had best be on the alert to protect our portals. I am introducing legislation to prohibit any foreign government or foreign-owned company from owning, leasing, or in any way controlling a U.S. port. The bill will ask our Coast Guard to assume full oversight and control over these bloodlines and all inspection of all cargo flowing into them until America is no longer at war.

The Federal Government controls and operates the agencies that admit people into this Nation. Our Federal Government controls and operates the systems and agencies that admit airplanes into this Nation. We should have the very same system of control over our port systems, one that, by the way, is increasing and expanding at a very rapid rate. In 2005, more than 11 million containers came into our country from abroad, and the estimate is that will quadruple in the next 20 years if we don't get this trade balance in line.

We have invested billions in other systems and pennies in our port system. Isn't it time to put America's national security first before any private deals?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF IDALIA LUNA SMITH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Idalia Luna Smith. Idalia was a caseworker in my district office. She was also a dear and loving friend to hundreds in our region of California. She was a community activist, and she was a loving wife and mother of three children.

Idalia passed away on Saturday, February 18, 2006, ending a long and difficult battle with cancer. She is survived by her husband, John, and her two sons and daughter: Jack, Patrick, and Veronica.

Idalia was born and raised in East Los Angeles. Her interest in politics and social justice developed early in life. At the age of 14, she was influenced by her father's involvement in the famous 1970 Chicano Moratorium, an event which raised political consciousness for thousands in the Mexican America community of greater Los Angeles. As a teenager and college student, Idalia became politically active in her community, fighting for the equal treatment of Latinos and other underrepresented people.

Idalia graduated from Sacred Heart of Mary High School, then studied premedicine at Immaculate Heart College and Chicano studies, journalism and theatre at East Los Angeles Community College. She then earned her bachelor of science degree in biology at the University of La Verne.

Upon graduation, Idalia went to work for the Southern California Edison Company. In her 20 years there, she worked in many departments, including power production, informational technology, health care, and occupational health and safety. As a testament to Idalia's good will and generosity, she organized several blood donation drives and health fairs at Southern California Edison.

In 2001, seeking to combine her love of science, children and education, Idalia went back to school to earn a teaching credential at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. From 2001 to 2003, she taught science to young children at Beatitudes of our Lord School at La Mirada, California. However, her time at Beatitudes was unfortunately cut short by breast cancer. For the next 3 years, Idalia underwent the difficult rigors of chemotherapy and other treatments. Through her strength and courage, she was determined to return to help her community.

In 2003, Idalia did just that as she joined her husband, John, in founding the Robert F. Kennedy Democratic Club in La Mirada. In this way, Idalia continued the legacy of fighting for social justice that she began in East Los Angeles 30 years earlier.

In just one year, Idalia and John Smith increased the RFK Club's membership from 20 to 112 people. In acknowledgment of her work, Idalia was named the 2005 Democrat of the Year for the 60th Assembly District of California by the Los Angeles County Democratic Party, and that same year she was honored by her local peers with the 2005 Community Service Award from the Robert F. Kennedy Democratic Club.

Over the past year, I had the pleasure of getting to know Idalia well as she worked in my district office as an office manager first and then a caseworker. Idalia's humor, optimism, and general goodwill always brightened our office and the lives of the constituents that she served. Not a day went by that she did not make us smile and laugh.

As a caseworker, she tirelessly worked to help others with their problems, all while she struggled with cancer. Despite her own health concerns, Idalia always lent an empathetic ear and dedicated herself to the individuals she helped. She was incredibly modest, humble, and charming. My staff and I will miss her greatly.

Through it all, Idalia believed in being proactive. She was committed to learning about her disease and did what she could to help others facing the same pain. I urge everyone to follow Idalia's example and make a personal commitment to ease the suffering of others as well and to help eradicate the horrible disease of cancer.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring Idalia Luna Smith. May God bless her and ease her family's pain as they mourn for their loss.

U.S.-INDIA AGREEMENT MAKES WORLD A MORE DANGEROUS PLACE

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, as if we haven't done enough damage to the cause of global peace and security in Iraq, today the President has continued to make the world a more dangerous place with his misguided agreement on nuclear energy with India. If this deal is ratified by the Congress, and, believe me, I will do everything in my power to see that it is not, we will be sharing sensitive nuclear technology with a nation that was testing nuclear weapons as recently as 1998. We will be rewarding India for its refusal to sign on to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, a treaty which has helped keep the world safe in this nuclear age for nearly four decades.

What message does the India pact send to Iran and North Korea? What leverage do we now have with these countries to give up their nuclear ambitions? Especially when, even though they are dangerous regimes, they have done nothing to violate the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

While Great Britain, France and Germany are going back to the negotiating table to persuade Iran to give up its nuclear program, the United States is giving away nuclear technology to a nation that has rejected the NPT. How can we call ourselves a responsible global superpower when we thumb our noses at established international law? Is it any wonder that America is losing credibility and respect around the globe?

How will we now deal with India's neighbor and rival, Pakistan, which will likely demand the same nuclear concessions from the United States, and which has a dishonorable history of sharing nuclear technologies with other rogue states? The India-Pakistan border, which has been called the world's most dangerous nuclear flash point, will now be more dangerous, thanks to this agreement.

The President claims that this deal is about easing the pressure on the global energy supply given India's enormous population and soaring energy demands. First of all, where does the confidence come from that there can be an airtight firewall between India 's civilian and military nuclear programs? Technology used for one can inevitably benefit the other.

Furthermore, it is laughable to hear concern about fossil fuel consumption from a President who never saw an ocean floor or wildlife refuge he didn't want to drill holes in. But I don't support nuclear power plants, because I believe it is not the answer to global energy and our energy challenge.

So if the President is serious about this issue, he will aggressively promote conservation and renewable energy right here in our very own United States of America, the world's hungriest energy consumer; and he will do it with real programs and investments, not a few lines of rhetoric in the State of the Union. But I am not holding my breath.

This acquiescence to India underscores more than ever that we need a new approach to our national security. To that end, I have offered a new strategy called SMART Security, SMART standing for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. I have been working on this idea with groups like Physicians For Social Responsibility, the Friends Committee For National Legislation, and Women's Action For New Directions.

SMART has five major components: first, prevent future acts of terrorism, not with military force, but better intelligence and multilateral cooperation; second, stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction with aggressive diplomacy, vigorous inspection and a commitment to nonproliferation; third, address terrorism's root causes with a humanitarian effort to invest in poor nations and conquer the depravation and despair that fosters terrorism in the very first place; fourth, rethink our budget priorities, in other words, less spending on Cold War weapons systems and more spending on efforts like