

pulling for them, watching every week and dialing and texting as many votes as possible to keep them in the competition. Their local newspapers keep everyone informed of their progress on the show and their thoughts when the cameras are turned off.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Kelly and Bucky all the best. Even judge Simon Cowell cannot deny their talent and drive to compete.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLE of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THIRD CASE OF BSE IN UNITED STATES

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United States' third case of BSE or mad cow disease was diagnosed. The first case was December 2003, which was a Canadian-born cow that was diagnosed in Washington State. The second case was last June, a cow from Texas, and now this latest case, a cow from Alabama, and it is assumed that it is at least 10 years old or older. If so, this cow was born before the 1997 feed ban went into effect, and that is significant because in 1997, it was decreed that no ruminant animal feed would be fed to livestock; and, of course, ruminant feed means it contains some parts of animal within the feed.

It is assumed BSE is acquired by an animal eating part of another animal that is BSE positive. As a result, we think that this feed ban should control the spread of BSE over time, but this apparently was an older animal that may have been prior to the ban.

Also, it is duly noted that roughly 150 people in the United Kingdom have died from a related disease to eating BSE-positive animals, so it is a concern.

So this leads to some questions:

Number one, is U.S. beef safe?

The answer is yes, despite this third case. Annually we slaughter roughly 35

million cows in the United States, and we have had three positive since 2003, and our testing system is sophisticated to the degree if there is one animal that is positive for BSE in 10 million cows, we would be 99 percent certain to find that one cow. So the testing, the surveillance has been ramped up considerably. We have tested 640,000 animals since June of 2004. Also, any animal in the United States that is slaughtered has the brains and spinal tissue removed, which is the tissue that normally carries the BSE prion.

The second question: Will this hurt beef exports from the United States?

The answer is it will certainly not help, and it may hurt to some degree. However, I think people around the world have become more familiar with BSE, what it is and how it can be prevented, and so it might not be quite as alarming as it was 2 or 3 years ago.

Japan closed their border to U.S. beef 3 years ago. The border was opened last December, and it was closed again in January due to a breach in our export procedures. So we have lost that market which is roughly \$1.4 billion a year in U.S. trade to Japan. A lot of this depends on confidence on the part of the Japanese public that we have rectified the problem. So this latest case is not going to help.

Hong Kong has also suspended beef imports from one U.S. packing plant here in the United States rather recently.

That leads us to the final question: What needs to be done?

It is very important that we have animal ID in the United States. Most other countries have it. We need to be able to determine where this animal from Alabama came from, what feed yard. It has only been on this one farm for 1 year, so the previous 9 years, where was it and what animals might have been contaminated along with it? Until we have that knowledge, until we have animal ID, it is going to be very difficult for us to maintain a positive trade climate around the world. So it is imperative that we begin to work on this and get this done as quickly as possible.

URGING CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRAQ

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in order to solve the problem, you have to recognize that you have a problem in the first place.

For 3 years, the President and his administration contended that everything was going fine in Iraq, that we were winning, and they openly questioned the motivations and the patriotism of anyone who questioned or disagreed with them.

Now we are finally getting some straight talk from people who have been in the administration since the

very beginning. The U.S. Ambassador to Iraq says the country is nearing a civil war and we have opened "Pandora's box" by toppling Saddam Hussein.

Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte said, "Even if a broad, inclusive national government emerges, there will almost certainly be a lag time before we see a dampening effect on the insurgency."

And today, General Peter Pace, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "The Iraqi people themselves are standing at a crossroads, and they are making critical decisions for their country right now about which road they want to take," whether it is going to be a civil war or the road to democracy.

These are sobering assessments, but they were a welcome change from the standard White House line of everything is fine, everything is hunky-dory, we are winning in Iraq, the road to victory is in Iraq. In fact, we are at the precipice of a civil war. We are on the doorstep of a civil war.

Now that we have this honest talk finally, we are finding from people who are telling us what the beginnings were because we did not get here by accident. We got here by people not listening to the people on the ground. Our first ambassador, Paul Bremer, writes in a recent book, even on page 10, you don't even have to finish the book, he had asked for more troops. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense for years maintained nobody had asked for more troops. We had enough troops, if the generals needed more troops, they would have told us. Now the lead ambassador, the point man for the President of the United States, in fact, asked for more troops.

One of the big problems we had, we had 500,000 troops to get Iraq out of Kuwait, but somehow some genius over at the Department of Defense, that is the Secretary of Defense, thought you could do it for less than 100,000, both occupy Iraq, win a war in Iraq, and do it for less than 100,000 when we needed 500,000 just to get them out of Kuwait. In fact, somebody did ask for more troops, and the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense refused to listen to the ambassador, their point person.

That is not the only mistake they made. In fact, today, going back to one of the early days of the insurgency, we now realize from the last 2 days of The New York Times, generals were saying we had to not try to topple Iraq, we had to deal with the Feyhadeen. Otherwise, we are going to have the beginnings of an insurgency. The generals on the ground were overruled.

Again, contrary to the line, which is, we are going to listen to the generals and whatever they need, we did not listen to the generals. When we finally get to Baghdad and did finally topple the government, and there was all this chaos going on, the Secretary of Defense once again used his famous line