The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

God of wisdom and love, with the many issues facing the Nation regarding foreign policy, as well as national security and prosperity, Congress, this governing body of the people, by the people, and for the people, is ready to serve.

Send Your light and spirit, Lord, to teach Members the depths of truth in the pursuit of justice. Guide all their actions that the bonds of unity and civility between civilian leadership, military forces and the populace may be strengthened, and in the end, all glory, power and honor be given to Your Holy Name, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KIRK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The Chair will entertain up to 10 one-minutes on each side.

ZARQAWI AND THE WAR ON TERRORISM

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting our troops in Iraq. I have seen the damage Zarqaawi inflicted. I visited the areas where Zarqaawi lived and terrorized people. And I have met the brave soldiers who ultimately tracked him down and killed him.

I visited Amman, Jordan, where Zarqaawi killed 60 people by bombing three hotels. I toured the special operations command center in Iraq with General Stan McCrystal a three-star general in charge of tracking down Zarqaawi. All over the walls of the command center were posters of Zarqaawi.

I flew in a Black Hawk helicopter around the area of Ba’Qubah where Zarqaawi was ultimately located. I also toured Baghdad where Zarqaawi intimidated the U.N. by bombing their headquarters and where al-Jazeera TV once broadcast a videotape showing Zarqaawi personally beheading an American citizen.

I was with President Bush at the White House on June 7 when he got the message that al Zarqawi had been killed. However one feels about the war in Iraq, realize that our troops deserve our support 100 percent. God knows they have earned it.

AMERICA NEEDS TO LEAVE IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, we must get out of Iraq. But getting out of Iraq is not enough, because the same thinking that led us to Iraq, the addiction to war and fear, the misunderstanding of the nature of power, the belief that might makes right can lead us into Iran, into Syria, and put us at odds with Russia and China.

The war on terror has become a war of error. We attacked a nation that did not attack us. By pursuing policies based on lies, we have separated ourselves from the world. We must reconnect with the world with our hearts as well as our heads, with the intention of preserving not only our security, but future of all humanity.

Getting out of Iraq is not enough. This is a call for a new role for America in the world, a call for America to put aside unilateralism and interventionism, a call for an America which practices cooperation instead of confrontation.

There is a place for American leadership. Leading the way in diplomacy instead of armaments, leading the way in nuclear abolition and climate protection. The world is waiting for an America which leads by example instead of reaction. The world is waiting for an America to rise up with a new commitment to truth and justice, to truth and reconciliation, to truth and compassion.

OUR TROOPS DESERVE OUR THANKS

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday this week I had a chance to go to Walter Reed to see one of my constituents who lost a limb in the fight in Iraq. I saw many of his comrades who were similarly situated, who had lost one, two or three limbs.

What I sensed from them was not only a sense of patriotism, but a love of this country. As we begin the debate today, and I know politics seems to permeate everything, I ask that we first think about those young men and women who have risked so much for this Nation, who have lost so much for this Nation, whose families are by their side today giving them the love and dedication they need to overcome this difficult struggle.
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Mr. Speaker, they have given the full measure of devotion to this Nation and they deserve our thanks. The invectives and political discourse need to focus on their sacrifice and not on our political ambitions.

URGING RESPECT FOR THE 9/11 WIDOWS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, across the Potomac in Arlington today, we are breaking ground for the 9/11 Memorial at the Pentagon. Our Nation is rightfully honoring the victims of those heinous acts.

It has also been 1 week since I called upon my Republican colleagues to reject Ann Coulter’s vicious attacks on the widows of 9/11.

Not a single Republican elected official has stepped forward to reject her hate. So I have to conclude they are comfortable with her as their spokesman. Your silence is deafening. Apparently it is okay to exploit 9/11 to shore up your own sagging poll numbers or make a quick buck.

So rather than see 9/11 as a moment to unite America, Ann Coulter and her followers have chosen to divide and demonize fellow Americans. I am always amazed that the one casualty the American people would accept on 9/11 would be a leader in opposing President Bush’s original invasion of Iraq, was demonstrated again yesterday by a report from over 100 top foreign policy experts across the ideological spectrum.

Eighty-seven percent of them said that the war in Iraq has a negative impact on protecting the American people, that it is undermining the war on terrorism. But ignoring their advice, ignoring one retired general after another, and ignoring the good sense of ordinary Americans across this country, the Administration has consistently pursued a policy that endangers our families’ security.

The price of the Administration’s deaf ear, $229 million per day, and the price paid in the blood of others every day.

NO NEED FOR FLIP-FLOPPING IN THE WAR ON TERROR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the sound you hear on the other side of the aisle is the sound of flip-flopping. Democrats may have put off announcing their agenda, but they have managed to perpetrate the fraud one casualty you are not willing to give.

Ms. Coulter is threatened by the 9/11 widows. They threaten her simplistic world by daring to ask questions. Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 widows have courageously stood up to demand that we never forget the horror of September 11.

All Americans who lost loved ones should be honored, as we are doing in Arlington today, not denigrated simply because they do not fit your simplistic world view.

LONE STAR VOICE—C.E. CUNNINGHAM

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, down on the Rio Grande where the sage brush and juniper trees line the lawless border of the riverbank is the home of generations of Texas ranchers. Their homes, feet from the porous border, they wake up to human smugglers, drug runners and thieves that have trespassed on their soil.

On the border I met crusty rancher, C.E. Cunningham of Quemado, Texas. He has lived on the land for seven decades, and he now writes me about the border. It has also been 1 week since I called upon my Republican colleagues to reject Ann Coulter’s vicious attacks on the widows of 9/11.

Not a single Republican elected official has stepped forward to reject her hate. So I have to conclude they are comfortable with her as their spokesman. Your silence is deafening. Apparently it is okay to exploit 9/11 to shore up your own sagging poll numbers or make a quick buck.

So rather than see 9/11 as a moment to unite America, Ann Coulter and her followers have chosen to divide and demonize fellow Americans. I am always amazed that the one casualty the American people would accept on 9/11 would be a leader in opposing President Bush’s original invasion of Iraq, was demonstrated again yesterday by a report from over 100 top foreign policy experts across the ideological spectrum.

Eighty-seven percent of them said that the war in Iraq has a negative impact on protecting the American people, that it is undermining the war on terrorism. But ignoring their advice, ignoring one retired general after another, and ignoring the good sense of ordinary Americans across this country, the Administration has consistently pursued a policy that endangers our families’ security.

The price of the Administration’s deaf ear, $229 million per day, and the price paid in the blood of others every day.

EThioPia bOrDer disPuTe

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to call attention to what may become the next tragedy in Africa, the border dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea.

My constituents in Minnesota remember the destruction and death from the 1998 to 2000 war over the border that cost the lives of 70,000 people.

I urge the President and the Secretary of State to leave no stone unturned to bring a peaceful resolution to this matter.
Additionally, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Ethiopian Consolidation Act, which would advance human rights in the Horn of Africa and links U.S. foreign aid assistance to full compliance with the Gigers Agreement. We must see to it that promises made at the end of the last decade are not repeated.

HOUSE TO VOTE ON INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE
(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will have its first vote to increase the minimum wage in over 10 years. This is good news for the more than 7 million hardworking Americans who today only make $5.15 an hour. It could also be good news for millions of middle class workers who could see their hourly wage increase as a result of the minimum wage.

Despite repeated efforts by the House Democrats to expand economic opportunity for millions of Americans over the last 9 years, the House Republican leadership has refused to allow the floor vote on increasing the minimum wage. Next week they have no choice, however. Thanks to action in the House Appropriations Committee on Wednesday, the committee voted to gradually increase the minimum wage from $5.15 to $7.25.

The American people should not be surprised that the out-of-touch House Republican leadership is also voicing strong opposition to the wage hike and vows to kill it next week. This would be shameful, and millions of Americans will be affected. They need to have a living wage.

I look forward to the vote next week and hope that the House will finally take action in a new direction to expand economic opportunity for all.

POLITICAL PROGRESS CONTINUES IN IRAQ
(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in only 3 years, the world has watched the nation of Iraq transform from a brutal dictatorship to a promising democracy. Saddam’s torture chambers and mass graves have been replaced with democracy’s voting booths and legislative referendums.

Today Iraqi citizens are working tirelessly to secure their freedoms. By participating in the election of the transitional assembly in January of 2005, the drafting of an approval of the Constitution by October and the national elections in December, they have demonstrated that they refuse to allow terrorism to determine the fate of their country. Last month, Iraqis achieved another historic victory when they announced their new unity government.

U.S. troops, coalition forces and Iraqi citizens continue to face challenges in establishing a civil society in Iraq, which protects American families by destroying terrorist training camps in the central front of the global war on terrorism.

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

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY TO MILLIONS OF AMERICANS BY INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE
(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will finally have an opportunity to lift millions of hardworking Americans out of poverty. For the first time in a decade, we will have a vote on the House floor to increase the minimum wage so that 7 million Americans can finally make a living wage. I think we should be stunned to hear that the House Republican leadership has refused to allow a vote to increase the minimum wage for over 10 years now.

Republican inaction has led to the fact that the minimum wage is at its lowest level in 50 years. In fact, if the minimum wage had just kept up with inflation since 1968, it would have been $8.88 in 2005. That is still, quite frankly, a pittance for what people need to live.

House Democrats are committed to expanding economic opportunity to millions of Americans who are just trying to make a living wage. They want to provide a better tomorrow for their families. A majority of the House Appropriations Committee defied Republican leadership earlier this week and supported an increase in the minimum wage to $7.25. That is only fair.

Seven million Americans deserve a minimum wage, an increase in the minimum wage, so let us make sure they get it.

HONORING C.J. FOUTS
(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of C.J. Fouts, a businessman and community leader in the city of Smyrna, Georgia, in my district. Mr. Fouts passed away this week, leaving behind his wife, Betty, three children, eight grandchildren, four great-grandchildren, and a community full of grateful citizens.

Mr. Fouts captured the essence of the American dream, Mr. Speaker. He came to Smyrna at age 18 from rural Georgia in search of work. He started his own business, a service station that later grew into a sales shop for cars, trucks and equipment. Mr. Fouts gave his time, energy and passion to the Smyrna business community. He has the distinction of possessing the longest active business license in the city of Smyrna, 54 years. Just a few weeks ago the city honored him with a plaque commemorating him as a founding member of the Downtown Development Authority. I am so thankful to have been an attendee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Fouts’ memory.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DEBATE ON THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR
(Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today is an important day in the United States Congress. Beginning around noon this afternoon, the House will debate for 10 hours the Iraq war. The question will be should we continue on the course that President Bush and the administration has set or should we have a new plan? We will have 10 hours of debate.

Consider, over 2,500 young men and women killed, over 30,000 wounded, victims of terrorism, those who will have mental health deficiencies when they return. Retired generals have spoken. We need a new direction. The troops should be redeployed. They should be brought home at the most practical time with a plan that we don’t now have under this administration.

So, America, listen and look. Should we stay the course, should we redeploy or should we have a plan of redeployment to protect our troops and protect America?

DEBATING THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today we will hold discussion and a debate on the global war on terrorism and about the battles in Afghanistan and in Iraq. It is appropriate indeed that we do so.

This week, we are celebrating the Army’s birthday. We are celebrating Flag Day, and we are continuing to honor the men and women who serve so brilliantly in the U.S. military.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise for a moment and honor the men and women of the Tennessee National Guard. They have had deployments in the past year, and they have served with distinction. Today many of the junior officers and the commanders of the Tennessee Guard are in town. They
were honored at a reception last night, and they are visiting us here on Capitol Hill today. We welcome them. We honor them, and we thank them and their families for their patriotic service, for their sacrifice, for their commitment to freedom, for loving this Nation and for being the embodiment of that freedom on foreign soil.

LINE-ITEM VETO BILL
(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, I am glad the Budget Committee has approved H.R. 4890, the so-called line-item veto bill. H.R. 4890 is similar to the Ryan-Stenholm amendment to H.R. 4663 from the 108th Congress. I say “so-called” because it does not have the constitutional defects that led the Supreme Court to strike down the line-item veto law passed in 1996.

Instead, the legislation I introduced last year, it would simply enable the President to require Congress to vote on individual spending items or targeted tax breaks included in a larger bill signed into law. Congress would still make the ultimate decision on the basis of a majority vote. There would be no need for a two-thirds vote to override the President. This bill will not solve our budget problems, but it will promote greater transparency and accountability when it comes to taxing and spending. It deserves approval.

THE SUBURBAN AGENDA ON EDUCATION, HEALTH CARE, CONSERVATION AND THE ECONOMY
(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, Congress fulfills its potential when we address key problems facing American families. Most Americans in the 21st century live in the suburbs, and the House is now working on a suburban agenda.

The suburban agenda includes bipartisan legislation on education, health care, conservation and the economy. We unveiled the first seven bills for the agenda last month, and this morning I am here to report on the progress we have made.

Yesterday the House passed Congressman Porter’s bill allowing school boards across the Nation to check interstate criminal records before hiring a coach or a teacher. Next week, we will consider Congresswoman Johnson’s bill to deploy full electronic medical records shown to reduce errors by doctors by over 80 percent.

Action is coming in this Congress to establish 401 Kids tax-deferred savings accounts and new tools for parents to fight against sexual predators who misuse Web sites like myspace.com.

The suburban agenda, it is moving through the Congress and helping this House fulfill its full potential.

SAY NO TO PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY
(Mrs. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with so many things going on here in the House, I think it is important to remind people that a bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans from this House went across the country to talk about why we needed to make sure that Social Security stayed the way it was. We are hearing rumors in January of 2007 that they are again going to try to attack Social Security.

May I remind the American people how important Social Security is, not only to our seniors who need it to keep them out of poverty, but also to our widows who are taking care of children, for people with disability. Social Security is the one plan that has worked since it was conceived here in Congress. Democrats will protect it. I will fight for it. The American people have answered a year ago. We want Social Security.

With everything that is going on here in the House, just remember, Democrats are keeping their eye on everything.

THE UNCHECKED UNITED NATIONS
(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to take issue with some of the comments by Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, the Deputy Secretary General of the U.N. Mr. Brown recently stated in a speech that there was “too much unchecked U.N. bashing and stereotyping.”

Well, at first I was a little offended by that, and then I got to realizing we haven’t been doing enough bashing of the U.N. You look at what is going on.

We have had some problems with criminality in this body. Those are being addressed. As bad as they are, that criminality shows rank ame teurism compared to what is going on in the U.N.

We have got families in the U.N. profiting from their other family member’s positions. We have got some of the worst violators of human rights in charge of overseeing human rights violations. We even had Libya as chairman of that group back in 2003. Six of the worst, of the worst as designated last year, are on the human rights committee.

We have got problems with their diplomatic immunity. We have got people where they turn around and try to take credit for things like polio eradication that Rotary International did, when they cannot find anything else to take credit for.

Mr. Speaker, I would just close by saying this, it is time we did some more bashing of the U.N.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 861, DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 868 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) ten hours of debate equally divided and controlled among the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not include instructions.
Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and insert tabular and extraneous material into the RECORD.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of House Resolution 861.

Mr. Speaker, the rule is a closed rule providing 10 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the minority and majority members of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution and provides one motion to recommit, which may not contain instructions.

It further provides that, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the context of today's debate, I believe there are four relevant questions we must consider. First, should we have entered the war in Iraq? Second, did Saddam Hussein go, what are the stakes in terms of our involvement in Iraq? Third, what are the chances for success in Iraq? And finally, where will the battle be won or lost?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we will not be having a real debate on Iraq today. It will be a pretend debate, one that will have absolutely no effect on U.S. policy. No amendments, no substitutes, no chance for Members of Congress to actually do their jobs by making thoughtful changes to the resolution. The distinguished chairman of the International Relations Committee testified before the Rules Committee that the resolution before us will at least give Members the opportunity to 'get things off our chest.'

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in therapy. I am interested in changing this failed policy.

This process is disrespectful to the men and women of our Armed Forces, disrespectful to the people we represent, and disrespectful to the traditions of this House.

The Bush administration is trying to encourage, cajole, and sometimes even strong arm the Iraqi Government into being more inclusive, to respect the rights and privileges of that minority, to embrace the democratic process. Well, I hope the government of Iraq is not watching today, because the Republican majority certainly has no intention of teaching by example.

We are all committed to a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq. The important question remains, to achieve this goal, is the United States committed to keeping 150,000 or 100,000 or
50,000 American military men and women in Iraq for an indefinite amount of time, perhaps even decades into the future?

Under the current policy, the mission in Iraq is neverending. The resolution before us asks us not just to stay the course, but to stay forever.

The reason why so many of us, Democrats and Republicans, want to have a meaningful debate and meaningful votes on the war in Iraq is because the Bush Administration has lost our confidence and our trust.

For too long this Congress has given the administration blank checks and unchecked authority. We have abdicated our responsibilities. We have not done our job, which is to legislate, to conduct oversight, and to shape the policy of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of our policy in Iraq is one characterized by corruption, mismanagement, incompetence and self-delusion. 2,490 American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have died since the beginning of the war, 94 percent of them since the President declared, “Mission Accomplished.”

And despite unanimous congressional agreements against permanent military base funding, the Republican majority stripped these provisions from the emergency supplemental conference report presented to the House on Tuesday.

In a period leading up to the war, the President said, “Imagine a terrorist network with Iraq as an arsenal and as a training ground.” Unfortunately, we do not have to imagine that anymore. The State Department now reports that Iraq is indeed a terror haven. The very thing we wanted to prevent by going to war was actually created by the war.

Certainly the death of terrorist Abu Musab al Zarqawi is welcome news. We did not create Zarqawi, but it was the war in Iraq that offered him the opportunity to kill American soldiers and innocent Iraqi civilians and to inflame sectarian hatreds.

But as we all know, foreign terrorists represent only 6 to 8 percent of those committing violence in Iraq. By far, most attacks are carried out by Iraqi Sunni insurgents and by the growing Shia and Sunni sectarian groups battling each other.

The American-backed effort to arm tens of thousands of Iraqi soldiers and officers, coupled with a failure to curb a nearly equal number of militia gunmen, has created a galaxy of armed groups, each with its own loyalty and agenda. Sectarian violence has become almost as serious a threat as the insurgency. As former commander of U.S. Central Command General Anthony Zinni said in April, “These militias will be a fact of life after we are gone. No one seems to have a plan for these militias.”

It is a disturbingly familiar refrain, Mr. Speaker: No one seems to have a plan.

On the ground, reconstruction is not going well. A plan to build 150 health care clinics has not resulted in much more than empty shells and uneven walls. Power blackouts remain a constant frustration. Only 19 percent of Iraqis today have working sewer connections, down from 24 percent before the war. While most Iraq reconstruction projects are way behind schedule, there is one construction effort that is right on target: the $952 million U.S. embassy, which will be the size of about 80 football fields.

The recent report by the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction found massive corruption and mismanagement of U.S. aid. Billions of dollars have been lost or squandered through fraud and corruption, much of it by a handful of corporate contractors with special, privileged ties to the administration and a near complete lack of systematic oversight of funds.

And still, Mr. Speaker, there is no accountability for the corruption taking place in our reconstruction projects? Where is the accountability for our troops receiving faulty body armor and other equipment? Accountability for the lack of funding to provide services for all the veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan who are dealing with post-traumatic stress and other needs? Where is the accountability for the creation of death squad-type militias within the Iraqi police and security forces? Where is the accountability for the abuse of prisoners and detainees which is costing the United States so much of its credibility and standing in the international community?

It is not the role of the Congress to turn a blind eye to whatever the administration wants to do. Quite the opposite. It is our responsibility to oversee every single taxpayer dollar that is being spent on this war.

The total bill for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan stands at $450 billion. If we stay in Iraq for just one more year, we will have spent, off budget, off the books, half a trillion dollars on this war; a debt that President Bush and the Republicans intend to pass on to our children and our grandchildren.

Leadership, Mr. Speaker, requires courage. It requires taking responsibility. It requires accountability. It demands competence. In every single one of these areas, the White House, the Pentagon, this Republican Congress score an F for failure.

Instead, all the American people are getting is a world class PR and spin campaign coming out of the White House.

Make no mistake, H. Res. 861 requires no accountability from the White House or the Congress on the war in Iraq. It will not provide any increased protection for our troops on the ground. It will not protect our tax dollars from further waste, fraud, or abuse.

It won’t demand direction, let alone a plan, from the President about how and when our troops will return home.

So here we are, treating the issue of war and the safety of our troops with a resolution that carries the same force of law as a resolution congratulating a sports team. Quite frankly, this process is an outrage and it should be rejected by this House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker. I remember the inexorable slide towards the absolute irrelevance of the international system during the decade of the 1990s and the first few years of this decade, Saddam Hussein having in fact purchased just about every relevant United Nations leader and world leader, in fact, even in our friendly continent of Europe, except of course for President Bush and Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Aznar. Saddam Hussein and, we must remember, Mr. Speaker, the Oil-for-Food program and its billions of dollars siphoned off to purchase world and United Nations leaders. Saddam Hussein flouted his disdain for the international community and its, according to him, silly norms, laws, and resolutions. Almost 20 of them, Mr. Speaker, he systematically ignored and laughed at.

He called in al Zarqawi of al Qaeda to Iraq, joining next door Afghanistan as a base dedicated to the fostering of international terrorists. In Afghanistan, as my late father Rafael Diaz-Balart would tell me, my late father whose wisdom far exceeded his formal education of five degrees from universities in Europe and one on this continent, he would tell me, “There in Afghanistan is the Taliban, the Taliban who torture women and who have opened that country to the training camps of international terrorists.”

And in 1993, we saw the attacks coming from those international terrorists to here, to New York City, the World Trade Center, and then the bombings of American embassies in Africa, and even an attack on a United States ship, the Cole. Nothing happened. But then came 9/11. Mr. Speaker, and it became evident that we could no longer allow despots like Saddam and the Taliban to ignore international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council, no matter how many billions of dollars they spent pursuing global legitimacy.

This is, Mr. Speaker, the debate of our era. We cannot wait until international terrorism attacks us. We must
take the war to international terrorism and defeat international terrorism before the terrorists attack us. That is the debate of our era, as President Bush has reiterated so often. And that is a debate that we as a country and as a Congress must engage in, and I am pleased to see that we are doing so today.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. MOORE.

Mr. SKELETON. I rise to speak against the rule. I take a back seat to no one in supporting our American military and their families. No one. But before us is a resolution that is not the fulfillment of a promise that we were given. We were told we would be able to have a debate on Iraq. That is not the case. This resolution covers the waterfront. Iraq is a singular war that we should discuss at length by itself.

You see, there are two ongoing wars: The war against terror, which has genesis in Afghanistan, and we did the right thing going in there. We are still chasing bin Laden, and some day we will get him. We toppled the Taliban. And then, of course, we went into Iraq based upon the threat of weapons of mass destruction, and we are there.

I sent two letters to the President of the United States warning about the aftermath, warning about what might very, very well happen after our national victory, and it came to pass. We have an insurgency there which is different and distinct from terrorists.

The insurgency is composed of Baathists, Fedayeen, and Sunni, who were basically in charge under Saddam Hussein. This is their attempt to knock down the government that is there and to establish their own, far from being the terrorists that we went after in Afghanistan.

Twice, of course, we were engaged in a global war that we did not seek but that was brought to our shores by actions of terrorists on September 11, 2001. The Global War on Terror is unlike all other wars. In past wars the United States fought a clear enemy state—today, we fight an enemy without borders that threatens our free way of life.

When George Washington was elected as our first President, there was a king in France, a czarina in Russia, an emperor in China, and a shogun in Japan. The American President was the only elected leader at that time. Today, countries in every continent elect their own leaders. The number of democracies currently stands at an all-time high and has been growing without interruption for some time. Freedom and self-government is on the march around the world.

Mr. Speaker, why is this important? It is important. Mr. Speaker, but it is also history. I believe that those countries who elect their leaders are less belligerent than those who do not. Democracy and freedom are a threat to the terrorist ideology, which is why they fight so hard to keep self-government from taking hold.

The Middle East is an area where democracy has faced significant challenges. It is a region where we have seen entrenched dictatorships, continued violence, and civil unrest.

In an article from the Washington Times on June 12, Mark Steyn cites four separate and recent incidents that took place in Baghdad, London, and Mogadishu. He goes on to say, “The world divides into those who think the above are all part of the same story and those who figure they are strictly local items of no wider significance . . . .” I believe these events are all root and in the same ideology, and the United States, as the leader of the free world, stands in the way of this ideology.

We must not forget the sacrifice our military is making for the security and support of our ideals. They are fighting the enemy abroad so we will not have to fight there. We must continue to support our troops and stay focused on defeating terrorism in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying resolution. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 868 and the underlying resolution declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, which is essential to the security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a global war that we did not seek, but that was brought to our shores by the actions of terrorists on September 11, 2001. The Global War on Terror is unlike all other wars. In past wars the United States fought a clear enemy state—today, we fight an enemy without borders that threatens our free way of life.

When George Washington was elected as our first President, there was a king in France, a czarina in Russia, an emperor in China, and a shogun in Japan. The American President was the only elected leader at that time. Today, countries in every continent elect their own leaders. The number of democracies currently stands at an all-time high and has been growing without interruption for some time. Freedom and self-government is on the march around the world.

History has shown that those countries who elect their leaders are less belligerent than those that do not. Democracy and freedom are a threat to the terrorists’ ideology, which is why they fight so hard to keep self-government from taking hold. The Middle East is an area where democracy has faced significant challenges—it is a region where we have seen entrenched dictatorships, continued violence, and civil unrest.

In an article from the Washington Times on June 12, Mark Steyn cites four separate and recent incidents that took place in Baghdad, London, and Mogadishu. He goes on to say, “The world divides into those who think the above are all part of the same story and those who figure they’re strictly local items of no wider significance . . . .” I believe these events are all root and in the same ideology, and the United States, as the leader of the free world, stands in the way of this ideology.

Mr. Speaker, this Global War on Terror is protecting the freedoms that terrorists seek to destroy by any means necessary. Throughout this war, the terrorists have been emboldened by weakness, but fortunately it is the brave actions of our military men and women who are proving to our enemy that America will persevere. We must not forget the sacrifice our military is making for our security and in support of our ideals. They are fighting the enemy abroad, so that we will not have to fight them here.

I am proud of the soldiers from my area in Central Washington who have stepped forward to defend our nation’s security. In addition to contributing to the Global War on Terror in my district is home to the Yakima Training Center—where the soldiers of the Stryker Brigade train in settings designed to simulate real battlefield conditions in the War on Terror. They are helping to transform our military into a force that can meet the readiness demands of this new conflict.

Our troops employ the latest techniques to combat terrorism in this modern war—they clearly demonstrate the dedication and honor of military men and women before them. This has been apparent the two times I have traveled to Iraq, and when I visit with troops returning from the front.

Mr. Speaker, the Global War on Terror is not a war we sought, but it is one we must continue to fight and is vital we win. We face a clear choice today. Do we back down in the face of a determined enemy for a temporary reprieve, or do we stand firm and fight the terrorists abroad? I believe the answer is obvious. We must stand firm on the Global War on Terror.

While more work remains—thanks to our troops, America is safer. Saddam Hussein is being brought to justice and Iraq is being stabilized so that it is not a haven for future terrorist activities. We must continue to support our troops and stay focused on defeating terrorism in Iraq and around the world in order to keep American families and communities safe at home.
were being routed, bloodied, and were told to run for their lives.

Today, our brave Union forces are again in the field, are suffering great casualties, and what is happening today when we finally get around to talking about the war 4 years after it happened? We are going to have a picnic. So later today everybody will stop and go to the White House and discuss the picnic. There is something so surreal and Alice in Wonderland about all the things that have been going on around here, but let me tell you of a different time.

In 1991, leading up to the first Gulf War, this Congress had a real debate about that conflict, one that was said to be one of the best of the 20th century, because in 1991 the House was a real deliberative body. We had three resolutions to consider; actually, the minority resolution, there were two Democrats and one minority leader resolution, was the one that passed in a Democrat of debate and every Member who wanted it had it 5 minutes to speak their mind. We debated for 20 hours on that, and it was a wonderful time because we all took part in something we cared so deeply about.

Contrast that with what this Republican leadership is giving us now, a day not about policy or progress but about politics and posturing. It is a day designed to provide the majority with a chance to make cheap political attacks against those who oppose the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have not yielded to the assertions of a Republican, I implore every Member, everyone to take a stand for the values of democracy and respect for the troops. It is about re-

questions in a forthright way? There are certainly problems to be addressed. Let me give you one example.

Yesterday, I joined a group of Democrats repeating our call for the creation of a Truman Commission to over-
sight. The Rose短短的 war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces.

The brave men and women of our military are often called upon to travel great distances away from their families and loved ones to fight for the freedom that all Americans hold dear. Each time one of them enters into battle, it is with the knowledge that they may be asked to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country, giving their lives to secure our great Nation.

In recognition of these heroes, we have dedicated a memorial display in the Rayburn horseshoe foyer featuring the name of each and every member of our forces who has fallen as a result of the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is my hope that the many Members, staff, visitors, students, and constituent groups who visit the House office buildings each day will take a moment to stop by the memorial and reflect on the gift of freedom given to us by these honored individuals to every American.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. Matsui), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. Matsui. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today’s debate while we discuss the merits and perils of our involvement in the war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces. The brave men and women of our military are often called upon to travel great distances away from their families and loved ones to fight for the freedom that all Americans hold dear. Each time one of them enters into battle, it is with the knowledge that they may be asked to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country, giving their lives to secure our great Nation.

In recognition of these heroes, we have dedicated a memorial display in the Rayburn horseshoe foyer featuring the name of each and every member of our forces who has fallen as a result of the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is my hope that the many Members, staff, visitors, students, and constituent groups who visit the House office buildings each day will take a moment to stop by the memorial and reflect on the gift of freedom given to us by these honored individuals to every American.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. Matsui), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. Matsui. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today’s debate while we discuss the merits and perils of our involvement in the war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces. The brave men and women of our military are often called upon to travel great distances away from their families and loved ones to fight for the freedom that all Americans hold dear. Each time one of them enters into battle, it is with the knowledge that they may be asked to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country, giving their lives to secure our great Nation.

In recognition of these heroes, we have dedicated a memorial display in the Rayburn horseshoe foyer featuring the name of each and every member of our forces who has fallen as a result of the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is my hope that the many Members, staff, visitors, students, and constituent groups who visit the House office buildings each day will take a moment to stop by the memorial and reflect on the gift of freedom given to us by these honored individuals to every American.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. Matsui), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. Matsui. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today’s debate while we discuss the merits and perils of our involvement in the war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces. The brave men and women of our military are often called upon to travel great distances away from their families and loved ones to fight for the freedom that all Americans hold dear. Each time one of them enters into battle, it is with the knowledge that they may be asked to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country, giving their lives to secure our great Nation.

In recognition of these heroes, we have dedicated a memorial display in the Rayburn horseshoe foyer featuring the name of each and every member of our forces who has fallen as a result of the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is my hope that the many Members, staff, visitors, students, and constituent groups who visit the House office buildings each day will take a moment to stop by the memorial and reflect on the gift of freedom given to us by these honored individuals to every American.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. Matsui), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. Matsui. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today’s debate while we discuss the merits and perils of our involvement in the war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces. The brave men and women of our military are often called upon to travel great distances away from their families and loved ones to fight for the freedom that all Americans hold dear. Each time one of them enters into battle, it is with the knowledge that they may be asked to make the ultimate sacrif
I was not a member of this body. Yet this is the first extensive public debate Congress will have had on the most important issue of the day.

Even now, however, the rule put forth by the House leadership asks Members a simplistic question: Do you accept the President's vague appeal to stay the course and be patient? Such a narrow focus does a disservice to our role as representatives of the people.

The people want to hear practical, well-thought-out ideas from their elected representatives. Today we could have had that honest, engaged and realistic debate.

I had hoped to discuss the reality of Iraq right now and how we may best help a political solution to emerge. This isn't a debate we should be afraid of. We can have this debate and can have it respectfully. But the House Republican leadership has decided to pass on this opportunity.

What should we be debating? I believe there are several things upon which all Members can agree, Republican and Democratic alike.

The first is that the United States has no desire to control Iraq's oil supply. The second is that we will not build permanent bases in Iraq. Taken together, these statements say clearly to the Iraqi people that the United States presence in Iraq is not permanent. And it says clearly to the administration that our strategy in Iraq must reflect the fact that we will not be there forever.

But, Mr. Speaker, the focus of this House must move beyond these specific details and rapidly toward our broader policies on Iraq. We all want a free, stable and prosperous Iraq, and we have an important diplomatic role to play. But ultimately, it is up to the Iraqis to achieve those goals through the political process.

The United States should continue to offer support for Iraqi security forces; and regardless of our troop deployment, the United States must maintain its responsibility to assist in rebuilding the country's economy and infrastructure.

But beginning to draw down troops stationed in Iraq can be done while keeping all of these goals in mind. I respect several redeployment proposals put forth by Members of this body for those reasons.

The President's exhortations to "stay the course" remain disconnected from the reality on the ground and from a sincere engagement on the policy details.

In contrast, the proposals put forth by several Members of the House were developed after much thought. The Members struggled to mold the chaos in Iraq into a workable solution that upholds the best interests of the Iraqi people and that of the American people.

These proposals and ideas deserve to come to the floor. They deserve to be debated, and they deserve a vote. Unfortunately, under the rule reported out, this will not happen. Instead, we will have a gripe session that yields no results. Congress is part of this government. In fulfillment of its responsibilities, this House should reject this rule and bring real policy to the floor.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to wish to address the first of the four points that Mr. COLE presented when he introduced this particular rule.

I, like the gentlewoman from California who just spoke, and those of us who were elected for the first time in the last two cycles, was not here for the 1998 debate and piece of legislation passed by 360 of our Members and signed by President Clinton which outlined our foreign policy objectives with Iraq. nor was there for what I was told was the 17-hour debate on the vote that authorized use of force in Iraq.

Those two, in my opinion, should have been the definitive debate and vote on what our common policy would be as we move forward.

What I would like to talk to you about now is what I find most compelling, and that is the legal rationale for what we are doing in Iraq.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq violated 17 U.N. resolutions, three of which demanded use of force for the violation of those. Saddam Hussein's Iraq had violated the treaty he signed with the United States. His forces were shooting at American servicemen. He put a bounty on the head of every American airman that could be brought to him. He had offered a cash bonus to every family of a suicide bomber who would blow up either an Israeli or an American at the time.

When a foreign country violates its treaty with us and shoots at our servicemen, that is a legal justification for our actions. In fact, it is odd enough that we probably have a greater legal justification for this war than any other conflict with which this country has been involved in the last 50 years.

In Korea, we were in after one U.N. resolution, not 17.

In Vietnam, we made it a national priority because of a treaty we had, not with Vietnam but with an ally, France.

We bombed Serbia and went into Bosnia, not because of a legal pretext or compelling national interest, but because of an appeal that asked us to assist them with their particular issue.

The quarantine during the Cuban missile crisis was an aggressive act of war that was condemned by the U.N. Secretary General and protested in dozens of countries about the world, but was, in my mind, not a legal act but a right act of President Kennedy.

In Iraq, what we are doing is both legal and it is right.

Every war we have had has been littered with protests. Historians tell us in the Revolutionary War a third of Americans were opposed to it and a third were indifferent.

The War of 1812, Mr. McGovern's State tried to secede from the Union. In the Civil War, we had the greatest riots proportionately we have ever had in this country, and the Governor of New York inflammatory said President Lincoln's goal was to kill all of them.

In the Spanish American War, the Speaker of the House postwar resigned in protest.

In World War I, the Secretary of State prewar resigned in protest.

Only World War II has been atypical in those concepts of what we had.

As a history teacher, I see mass amounts of parallels with what we are doing now and what has happened in history. I don't have the time to go into any of those.

What I simply hope is for this House and this Nation is that we don't have the tunnel vision of short-term policy and we do not reject the lessons of history that will help us understand what should be the definition of our potential future and policy towards Iraq.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democrat on the International Relations Committee.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I urge all my colleagues to reject this rule.

Mr. Speaker, as we embark on this debate, I believe it is important to recall the debate we had during the first Persian Gulf crisis.

In 1991, we were on the brink of war with Iraq over Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait. Emotions were high, and the parties were divided. We Democrats were in the majority then, and we allowed over 30 hours of debate on three different measures representing profoundly differing points of view.

I wish to repeat this, Mr. Speaker: we allowed over 30 hours of debate on three different measures representing profoundly differing points of view.

And the critical vote, Mr. Speaker, was on a proposal of the Republican minority sponsored by the Republican minority leader, Bob Michel. It was supported by some of us on the majority Democratic side, myself included, and it prevailed.

And in 1999, Mr. Speaker, as the people of Kosovo bled from the wounds of Serb bullets, this House had a highly emotional debate over three different resolutions relating to proposed U.S. action to end the humanitarian disaster. Again, the minority was afforded an alternative which barely lost on a tie vote.

Today we are purportedly debating how to end the war, rather than whether to begin one, and an equally vital debate given the lives at stake. But the Republican leadership has thrown out all precedent and instead of giving the House a chance to work its will, they are forcing us into a charade.

Members will not be given a chance to offer amendments or alternatives to
Mr. Speaker, I tried to work on this resolution with my good friend, Chairman Hyde, on a bipartisan basis as I always have. But the Republican leadership expanded the original draft far beyond what we voted on in 1991 during the first Iraq debate, our Democratic leader, Nancy Pelosi, should have the same opportunity to offer a Democratic alternative with the same chance of prevailing in this House.

Instead, the Republican leadership has turned what could have been a serious debate into a charade.

I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just 15 seconds.

I want to make note for the record, we did offer the minority an opportunity for a substitute resolution.

Mr. McGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. And no, I will not yield. My time is very tight, and you have time to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mr. Putnam).

Mr. PutNAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of American efforts to rid the world of terrorism and help democracy take root in a region long controlled by hostile dictators and murderous regimes.

All around the world we are working to eradicate terrorists and their organizations. Iraq has emerged as a central battlefield of this war, a battlefield where Saddam was captured in a hole and is now in jail, where Zarqawi met his demise, and where insurgents and jihadists are fighting and losing to the might and skill of coalition forces.

Most importantly, it is a battlefield far, far from the shores, schools, neighborhood, and cities of America.

I recently traveled to Iraq with our Speaker and was able to meet with the Prime Minister and other key government officials as well as our U.S. commanders overseeing the operations. I was impressed by what I saw, but I was more impressed by what I heard from the servicemen and women themselves. Morale is high, and they are confident in the success of this mission.

Iraqi citizens have embraced freedom and have now voted in three national elections, each garnering wider and broader support. Iraq now has a constitution, a parliament, a president, a prime minister and a fully formed cabinet. What is more, this new government reflects a broad ethic and seculararian balance, a balance that will help ensure the needs and voices of all Iraqis are represented.

Ultimately, it is that freely elected government that is the most important success of this effort, elected leaders who are Iraqi first, and all other identities second, interested, invested in the future of their own country, of their own country’s own founding fathers face great challenges, no doubt. But what opportunity is more powerful than freedom from tyranny?

We must remain committed through patience and hard work to help this new government succeed.

I support this resolution. I support the rule that is allowing this resolution to come forward and the manner in which it was created. And I urge my colleagues to join in passing this important and necessary hard work of America’s servicemen and women.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me correct something that has been said on this floor. In the testimony before the Rules Committee, the Democrats not only asked for an open rule, we asked for a substitute. We were denied that. We were shut out. It is here in black and white in the testimony.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Doggett).

Mr. Doggett. Mr. Speaker, this war was launched without an imminent threat to our families. It endangers them more every day, creating new generations of terrorists. Radical ideologues here in Washington bent facts, distorted intelligence, and perpetrated lies designed to mislead the American people into believing that a third rate thug had a hand in the World Trade Center and was soon to unleash a mushroom cloud.

From the start, House Democrats overwhelmingly voted against this war. But radical ideologues rushed headlong anyway, ignoring professional military advice about the number of troops and equipment needed. One general after another has indicted this Administration for its misjudgment and mismanagement.

But now, almost 3,000 Americans lie dead, with another 20,000 seriously injured. Every day, every single day, American taxpayers are forced to spend $229 million in Iraq, and they pay again every time they go to the gas pump. All that is in sight is an endless, civil war quagmire.

Today’s resolution pins these Administration failures on the coattails of our courageous servicemen and women. Administration ineptness is falsely attached to a resolution honoring our troops.

Americans are increasingly realizing there is a better way to honor our troops than by sending more of them off to be killed. Would that there were more than a little of our troops’ courage right here in Washington from those, who refuse to challenge this Administration’s arrogant, myth-based policies and who choose instead to cut and run from their responsibilities.

Instead, the Republican leadership today I voted no vote.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Doggett).

Mr. Doggett. Mr. Speaker, this war was launched without an imminent threat to our families. It endangers them more every day, creating new generations of terrorists. Radical ideologues here in Washington bent facts, distorted intelligence, and perpetrated lies designed to mislead the American people into believing that a third rate thug had a hand in the World Trade Center and was soon to unleash a mushroom cloud.

From the start, House Democrats overwhelmingly voted against this war. But radical ideologues rushed headlong anyway, ignoring professional military advice about the number of troops and equipment needed. One general after another has indicted this Administration for its misjudgment and mismanagement.

But now, almost 3,000 Americans lie dead, with another 20,000 seriously injured. Every day, every single day, American taxpayers are forced to spend $229 million in Iraq, and they pay again every time they go to the gas pump. All that is in sight is an endless, civil war quagmire.

Today’s resolution pins these Administration failures on the coattails of our courageous servicemen and women. Administration ineptness is falsely attached to a resolution honoring our troops.

I recently voted against what is really an fraudulent resolution, which cannot be amended or changed, to alter this Administration’s deadly pursuit of a desert mirage. Neither paper resolutions, nor more Administration arrogance will defeat terrorism.

I sought to give voice to the thousands of Central Texans who communicated their concerns about making the terrible weapon of war a predominant instrument in our foreign policy.

With this grave decision on war and peace though, I knew I would have to answer to more than those I am privileged to represent—I would have to answer to myself, my children and to my community.

War now would only increase the danger to American families. The house-to-house urban combat that would likely result from an invasion in Iraq would touch thousands, divert precious resources from our ongoing war on terrorism and expose our families to more terrorism from among the many who would perceive this as a crusade against Islam. From the information provided to Congress, I do have some insight into issues about which so many are understandably uncertain and fearful. No evidence has been shared to connect Iraq to the Sept. 11 tragedy, nor to show that Iraq now poses an imminent threat to American families.

Former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said, “Saddam Hussein is probably on Osama bin Laden’s hit list.” From Central Intelligence Agency reports, secret until last week, we know that the unfinished job of overcoming al Qaeda represents the real threat. The CIA concluded that invading Iraq is more likely to drive our now separate enemies together against us and certainly more likely to make Saddam Hussein use any weapons of mass destruction that he may possess.

In addition to the cost in lives, the costs of war, to differing degrees, will touch us all. President Bush’s top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated the cost of waging this war may rise as high as $200 billion. At a time of chronic deficit spending,
rupting the hope for international law and eliminate the occasional villain, but only at recently announced President Bush, in 1998, wrote:

dent choice remains hopes that invasion may yet be averted. of our hopes and dreams for this country and that risks wars without end. superior to the new of Iraq, we would have been like the dinosaur direct: would have been a dramatically different occupying power in a bitterly hostile land. It occurred incalculable human and political into an occupation of Iraq . . . would have in-

"Trying to eliminate Saddam, extending the ground war into an occupation of Iraq . . . would have incurred incalculable human and political costs. . . . [We] could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land. It would have been a dramatically different—and petrifying—situation.

Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf was even more direct: "I am certain that had we taken all of Iraq, we would have been like the dinosaur in the tar pit."

Apparently, Iraq represents only the first step in implementing the administration's recent "first-strike" defense strategy. Over-reliance on packing the biggest gun and having the fastest draw will not make us safer. Rather, it is a formula for self-defeating security. A quick draw to eliminate the occasional villain, but only at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hope for international law and order, and endangering all of us.

President Reagan used containment effective against another "evil empire," the Soviet Union, and from Cuba to Libya. A quick draw to eliminate the occasional villain, but only at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hopes for international law and order, and endangering all of us.

With the prospect of war overshadowing all of our hopes and dreams for this country and the world, we must continue to thoughtfully and calmly gauge our opposition in hopes that invasion may yet be averted.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule, H. Res. 861. I firmly believe that the installation of democratic governments in Afghanistan and Iraq, coupled with the recent completion of Iraq's National Coalition government and ratification of a Constitution, the elimination of Abu Musab al Zarqawi, and the continued success of our reconstruction efforts in these countries are tremendous accomplishments in the global war on terrorism.

We are at a point in Iraq where we can build on these successes. We can advance democracy and freedom and stand by the Iraqi people while honoring the commitment that we have made. Or we can withdraw, as many on the other side are suggesting, leaving the progress we have made and the future of Iraq to chance. Just as in Europe and Japan following World War II, there is only one option, Mr. Speaker, and that is to stand by the Iraqis until their government, police, military can ensure the security of their own nation. Then, and only then, will be the appropriate time to disengage, leaving a strong ally and a foothold for the kind of a peaceful and free nation to others in the Middle East region.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot give in to the anti-war rhetoric which only serves to embolden our enemies, while we hope for and little vision. Rather, we must continue to advance policies which make our Nation safer, which are responsible for the liberation of over 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan. It has led Libya to abandon their weapons of mass destruction program, and it makes every new year worse than the previous one for the terrorists.

In this fight for the future of peace, freedom and democracy in the Middle East and around the globe, winning should be our only option.

This past Friday we heard Prime Minister Maliki of Iraq make the following statement: "With our allies we will persevere to make Iraq a prosperous democracy in the heart of the Middle East."

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see great hope and potential in the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people. Unfortunately, the minority party offers no hope. All we have seen are shortsighted strategies which threaten any chance of Iraq becoming a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this rule and the resolution, which sends a clear and positive message to the new Iraqi government and its citizens. But just as importantly, Mr. Speaker, it sends a clear message to those soldiers who have been injured or killed and their families: this Congress will never break faith with them.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NOWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this rule, which I support, will allow one of the most critical actions to date in the war on terror. Hardly a charade.

This is not a battle of opinion; it is a battle of nature. It is entirely political. But it will determine victory or defeat as surely as any battle in Iraq.

Our troops can defeat any enemy on earth. Our volunteers, our patriots, our heroes, our warriors, under any conditions they can win if we have the will, if we have the backbone to do what is right.

That is what we debate under this rule. Do we have the will to win?

Many, not all, of the other side of the aisle lack the backbone. The American people need to know precisely who they are. If there are any on this side of the aisle who hold the same view, this will allow them to be found out as well. Then the public can decide the course of this war in November by hopefully throwing the defeatists out of office.

This debate under the rule is as critical as any other war could have on the battlefield. No one has any doubt our soldiers will win any fight we send them to. That is not the question. The world’s doubt is entirely over the backbone of this Congress. On the statements of Members of this body, not their votes, but what they say today, and of the Senate, that have given substantial propaganda assistance to the enemy, this rule, this debate is absolutely essential to preserve the victories of our troops that they have won with their blood and their lives.

It is time to stand up and vote. Is it al Qaeda or is it America? Let the voters take note of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of history the 73rd Airborne in 1968–69 Vietnam, I saw how the words of Senators and Congressmen undermine the hard-fought victories and sacrifices of our soldiers.

While who today sit in Congress publicly trashed the troops on the front back then, comparing our American soldiers to the barbarian Genghis Khan.

American media overlooked decades of Communist torture and atrocity against Vietnamese civilians. I couldn’t overlook it. As a dental surgeon I had to reattach the tongues cut out by Viet Cong terrorists.

Where was our media? They instead chose to focus the world’s attention on isolated American failure at My Lai. Through carefully planned international media and political manipulations, the NVA and Viet Cong were encouraged to keep fighting, regardless of their defeats in the field. American media fell right into line with the enemy’s public affairs plan.

Our troops and citizens were told over and over by the press and politicians that their efforts were futile, our countless victories pointless, and every reverse, no matter how slight, disastrous.

The result of this psychological warfare was that the same Nation that had prevailed in World War II against heavy odds, numerous battle defeats, and our enemies’ military parity, simply walked off the field in Southeast Asia.

It was a lesson in strategy our enemies have learned well, one that is now being used against us in Iraq.

It is of great interest to note that the same reporter who “broke” the story on My Lai also “broke” the story on Abu Grahib nearly four decades later—while overlooking the thousands of executions, beatings, and other atrocities of the enemy.

Coincide or planned strategy?

Same players, same actions, seeking the same result—unconditional U.S. withdrawal of forces. It didn’t start, allowing barbarians to slaughter millions of innocent civilians, with the end result our Nation humiliated and compromised on the world stage.

The lesson we should have learned from Vietnam is that we can fight our enemies in this House by sending an unmistakable message that America will not run.

The day that our enemies in Iraq believe this, the war will be won.
It’s time for this body to start fighting for our soldiers. The 173rd has been back in action in this war, and I will be darned if I will let what happened to us in Southeast Asia happen to these guys in the Middle East, if I can help it. Let us not create the ghosts of Vietnam by committing to victory. In doing so, we greatly reduce the need for future military action, as potential enemies will no longer doubt our national resolve in a showdown.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, I just recently sent 850 Oregonians off to Afghanistan to fight the resurgent Taliban and Osama bin Laden, the perpetrators of 9/11. September 14, this House, on a proud day, with one exception, voted to authorize the war in Afghanistan to take out the Taliban, take out the perpetrators of 9/11, al Qaeda. That was nearly unanimous.

But sadly, the Bush administration and the various defense bills in Congress distracted us onto a path of a war in Iraq 1,143 days ago. 2,497 servicemen killed, 18,490 wounded. First it was weapons of mass destruction. Then it was about 9/18,490 wounded. First it was weapons of mass destruction. Then it was about 9/11. Then it was about building democracy. But now the Republicans want to pretend that it has to do all about the war on terrorism. They mentioned al Zarqawi. They had him in their war on terrorism. They mentioned al Qaeda. But are we defeating terrorists. Islamist terrorists is exactly what the 9/11 Commission said we are confronting. If you agree, vote for this resolution and explain why. If you disagree, vote against the resolution and explain why.

When I support this rule, I support the resolution. I support our efforts in Iraq, and I look forward to the 10 hours of debate. When I ask individual Iraqis what is their biggest concern, it is not the bombing. It is not the loss of electricity or anything else other than this. It is, and I quote, “that you will leave us. That you will leave us before we can grab hold of democracy and defend ourselves.” I pray we will not let them down. I look forward to the 10 hours of debate. I look forward to our being absolutely resolute in helping Iraqis have an opportunity they have worked so hard to achieve.

In just 11 months, Iraqis have had three elections that put their elections to shame. They have a new government. They only need more time to develop their security, to defend themselves and a democracy they dearly love.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Kind).

Mr. Kind. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately rise to this position to this rule because I believe it is a missed opportunity for this Congress to substantively have a say in the most important issue facing our country today and that is the course of the war in Iraq, but also our strategy in combating global terrorism.

But instead of offering a real policy discussion, the Republican majority today offers a political document just before the fall elections.

My question to my friends across the aisle is very simple. What are you afraid of? Why are you not allowing any other amendment to be offered during this 18-hour debate? Why are you not allowing our side to have an alternative so that we can get into the very troubling aspects of this administration’s conduct of war in Iraq and our strategy on global terrorism.

Many of us have grave concerns about how this administration has based its decisions in Iraq. These concerns are shared by many Americans and our constituents throughout the country today. Yes, we can kill Zarqawi, but are we defeating Zarqawism?

Many of us today have grave doubts. Yet, instead of having an open and honest debate, we get this charade. We deserve better. The American people deserve better.

I encourage my colleagues to defeat this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Oklahoma has 6 1/2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am the last speaker on our side.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I am prepared to close whenever you are, Mr. McGovern.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, let me say simply in closing that we will not be having an open debate on Iraq policy today. No one from either side of this body will be allowed to offer policy alternatives that will be debated and voted upon. No one will be able to offer amendments to increase accountability over the hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars that have been poured into this war. Just like the last 3 years, there will be no debate that might actually affect the direction of U.S. policy in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, Democrats and Republicans have come to the Rules Committee with amendments to various defense bills that would have required greater accountability and modified our policies in Iraq. The Republican majority in this House has routinely denied these amendments the right of debate. They have routinely kept them from being offered on the floor of this House for votes. So when the Republican leadership says they have offered us a debate on Iraq, it is simply not true.

This is not what we asked for. We do not need therapy. We do not need time to get things off our chests. We need real debate and meaningful votes on U.S. policy in Iraq.

At best, the Republicans have structured a glorified 18-hour Special Order on Iraq. But let us not dignify it by calling it a debate when no Member will have the opportunity to vote on competing policy proposals.

Mr. Speaker, to our troops who are in harm’s way, to their families and friends and to the people, I offer my sincere regrets that once again the Republican-led Congress is failing to address the war in Iraq in the serious manner it deserves and has instead chosen to create this sham of a debate.

Mr. Speaker, the great British conservative Edmund Burke once said, “A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood.” Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority of this House would heed those words.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of my close, I simply want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle the simple fact is, despite their insistence to the contrary, our side never received a substitute amendment to consider. The Rules Committee received four amendments, of which was a Democratic substitute. We cannot make in order what is not submitted to the Rules Committee.
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Let me say that I suspect that this procedural problem really represents the fact that there is not a cohesive alternative presented by the other side. We have watched again and again and again as the Democratic Party has struggled to come to grips with this issue and find a united position, and so far no united position has emerged.

As I pointed out in my opening remarks, we do indeed have a united position in that you can agree with or disagree with, but it is a resolution that we can put forward and we can command the overwhelming majority of our Members to support. And, frankly, I hope and trust that many Members on the other side will also be supportive of that position.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. What is at stake in Iraq is the war on terror, whether or not we will be successful. That is the central battle of our time.

Everybody on both sides agrees that removing Saddam Hussein was a good thing to do. He was an evil man, a dangerous man, a tyrant to his own people, a threat to world peace. That removal was not going to come about by accident or by internal revolution. They had indeed tried to do that. Unfortunately, they had failed. It took direct military intervention by the United States of America to rid the world of one of the worst tyrants we have seen in the second half of the 20th and the opening of the 21st centuries. Once there, the terrorists, our enemies, made this the central battlefield. And, frankly, over the course of the last 3 years, they have inflicted enormous damage on the Iraqi people.

I, for one, am enormously proud of how the Iraqis have responded to that challenge. To see a people who, in the face of terror and death and destruction, have gone out to the polls not once, not twice, but three times with ever increasing numbers of participants; to see them write a constitution in the midst of turmoil and challenge; to watch them create a permanent government; to watch that government take control; and to see their people, thousands of their people, stepping forward to defend their country and fight their enemies who are also our enemies, is, frankly, an inspiring and a noble sight. We think there has a terrific chance to succeed in Iraq because of the Iraqi people, because of the valor and the skill and the professionalism of the American military.

The real battle and the real arena, as my friend Mr. SHAYS suggested, is here on the floor of this Congress and in the court of public opinion in the United States. If we maintain the resolve, if we maintain our commitment, if we keep our promise to the Iraqi people, we will be successful. If we do not, we not only will fail, we will strengthen and harden our enemies and, frankly, will bring dishonor on ourselves.

I am extraordinarily proud of this President, I am extraordinarily proud of this Congress with its bipartisan commitment to succeed in Iraq.
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE
A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreement between the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4939) “An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.”

ALLOCATING CONTROL OF TIME ON H. RES. 861
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated by House Resolution 868 to the ranking minority member of four committees instead be controlled by the minority leader or her designee.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR
Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 861
Whereas the United States and its allies are engaged in a Global War on Terror, a long and demanding struggle against an adversary that is driven by hatred of American values and that is committed to imposing, by the use of terror, its repressive ideology throughout the world;

Whereas for the past two decades, terrorists have used violence in a futile attempt to intimidate the United States;

Whereas it is essential to the security of the American people and to world security that the United States, together with its allies, take the battle to the terrorists and to those who provide them assistance;

Whereas the Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other terrorists failed to stop free elections in Afghanistan and the first popularly-elected President in that nation’s history has taken office;

Whereas the continued determination of Afghanistan, the United States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be required to sustain a sovereign, free, and secure Afghanistan;

Whereas the steadfast resolve of the United States and its allies on September 11, 2001, helped persuade the government of Libya to surrender its weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas by early 2006 Saddam Hussein and his criminal, Ba’athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat and caused peace and security in the Middle East to be in violation of mandatory United Nations Security Council Resolutions;

Whereas the mission of the United States and its coalition partners, having removed Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors; Whereas the terrorists have declared Iraq to be the central front in their war against all who opposes their ideology;

Whereas the United States and other Coalition partners, have a permanent, representative government under a newly ratified constitution;

Whereas the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East;

Whereas United States Armed Forces, in coordination with Iraqi security forces and Coalition partners, have scored impressive victories in Iraq including finding and killing the terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi;

Whereas Iraqi security forces are, over time, taking over from United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight to secure Iraq;

Whereas the United States and Coalition servicemembers and civilians and the members of the Iraqi security forces and those assisting them as the ultimate sacrifices or been wounded in Iraq have done so nobly, in the cause of freedom; and

Whereas the United States and its Coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as part of the Global War on Terror: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives
(1) honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the Global War on Terror, whether as first responders protecting our servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, or in other roles;

(2) honors the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and of partners in the Coalition, and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside them, especially those who have fallen or been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and of others who risk their lives to help defend freedom;

(3) declares that it is not in the national security interest of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq;

(4) declares that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq;

(5) congratulates Prime Minister Nuri Al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating, in increasing numbers, in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq’s new Constitution;

(6) calls upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other Coalition partners and working to remove the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom; and

(7) declares that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 868 and the special order of today, debate shall not exceed 10 hours, with 5 hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairman of the Committees on Inter-American Relations, the Judiciary, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and 5 hours controlled by the minority leader or her designee.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is recognized to control 75 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE
Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 861.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the Speaker of the House (Mr. HASTERT).

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest Presidents, Ronald Reagan, was fond of saying that “Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.” President Reagan’s wise words are still true today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 861. This resolution is about more than war in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is about a global war to protect American ideals, and the democracy and values on which this great Nation was founded.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, like this war itself, is about freedom. Just 12 days ago I returned from Iraq. I can tell this House that the morale of our fighting men and women there is sky high. They are fighting from doubt and “second guessing.” And they are certainly not interested in the political posturing about the war that often goes on in this city. They know what they are doing and they are liberators doing good. And they believe passionately in their mission.

It is not possible to talk to these men and women without being inspired by their courage, their determination, their professionalism and their patriotism.

I came home from Iraq believing even more strongly, that it is not enough for this House to say “we support our troops.” To the men and the women in the field, in harm’s way, that statement rings hollow if we don’t also say we support their mission.

The clarity with which our men and women in uniform understand the reason they are in Iraq is a stark contrast to some here at home who talk about this as a “war of choice.”

The facts are clear. America has been struck repeatedly. Despite the life-ending attacks on Khorab Towers, our East African embassies, the USS Cole and the first World Trade Center bombing, U.S. policy tended to confuse these attacks with isolated law-enforcement events. We failed to recognize them as...
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the escalating strikes that they were. We failed to identify the networks behind the bombs. We convinced ourselves that these attacks were just somehow random acts of violence. And yet the attacks continued.

The terrorists did not admire or appreciate our limited response. They did not come to the table to discuss points of political concern, and they did not de-escalate, demobilize or disappear. Our response was inconstant and limited, but their reactions were not. They plotted and they practiced, while we hoped for the best and fired an occasional cruise missile into the desert. We were wrong and we slumbered in denial.

And then came the day when terrorism slapped us in the face, awakening us to a stark reality. I remember it as a crisp, fall day. Where the clear blue sky was filled with fluffy white clouds. But that peaceful scene was transformed in an instant when planes went crashing into buildings and the clear sky turned to choking ash and soot.

I stood in my Capitol office, just a few yards from where I am speaking here today. I saw the black smoke rising from the Pentagon. The third plane had hit just across the river from this Capitol building.

On 9/11 the terrorists were not a distant threat, they were in our front yard, and they were very real and very deadly. In that moment, we were afraid. None of us had anticipated the lengths to which our enemies would go to destroy our American way of life, our ideals and our belief.

Of course, we knew that foreign terrorists had caused trouble elsewhere, maybe in Israel or in Northern Ireland, but we found it hard to imagine that they came to our shores hoping to kill tens of thousands of men, women and children, innocent, unarmed people, peacefully going about their daily lives.

It is hard, even now, to comprehend such enormous evil.

As we watched some of our fellow citizens leap from burning buildings to their deaths, our fear turned to anger and then anger to resolve determina-

America’s response started high above a corn field in rural Pennsylvania. Brave men and women, armed with nothing more than boiling water, dinner forks and broken bottles, stood up, as Americans always do when our freedom is in peril, and they struck back.

We know from the messages they left behind that their final thoughts were for their families and their loved ones, but they also spoke of their love of their country.

"Freedom is never more than one generation from extinction." Perhaps the brave souls on United Flight 93 reflected Ronald Reagan’s words because the generation represented on that plane, like the patriots at Concord Bridge, were not going to let freedom be extinguished, not on their watch.

We in this Congress must show the same steely resolve as those men and women on United Flight 93, the same sense of duty as the first responders who headed up the stairs of the Twin Towers.

We must stand firm in our commitment to fight terrorism and the evil it inflicts throughout the world. We must renew our resolve that the actions of evildoers will not dictate American policy. And we must decide, right here, today what kind of a Nation we want to leave for our children and their generation.

We are not alone in the fight on global terror. I cannot list them all, but they include countries large and small, rich and poor: Great Britain, Japan, Canada, Jordan, Portugal, Denmark, Mali, Latvia, Romania, Italy, Poland, South Korea. In fact, the number of countries where our common enemy continues to grow.

Pakistan, a nation that once recognized the oppressive Taliban regime, has changed its course and now works closely with the coalition to round up terrorists. The Gulf countries working closely with the coalition to round up terrorists. Libya has given up her nuclear capability.

Today, more than three-quarters of al Qaeda’s known leaders and associates have been detained or killed.

There is no doubt that since 9/11 our military, as well as our law enforce-

ment intelligence agencies, have made great strides in uprooting terrorism. Nearly a dozen serious al Qaeda plots have been stopped since September 11th. But there is good reason for ongoing vigilance because the threat is still very real.

Just recently, our neighbor to the north, Canada, foiled a terrorist plot to storm that country’s parliament. The terrorists planned to behead those they captured.

Mr. Speaker, today in parts of the Middle East, where once oppression choked out freedom, we are now seeing democracy take root.

Afghanistan was once a safe haven for the al Qaeda terrorist network. In remote training camps, terrorists planned attacks on the United States and other freedom loving peoples. Those camps are now gone. In their place is a developing democracy with an elected President and a new Constitution that gives unprecedented rights and freedoms to all Afghans.

Just 3 years ago, Afghan women were whipped in the streets; schooling was denied to girls. Today, women have the right to vote, and two Afghan cabinet ministers are women.

In Iraq, just 3 years ago, a brutal dictator sat in palatial luxury. Unhampered by the United Nations, Saddam and his family stole the Oil-for-Food money from starving Iraqi children in order to support their lifestyle of debauchery and brutality. Schoolgirls were raped. Iraqi patriots were thrown alive into meat grinders. Unspeaking atrocities of all kinds were common, including the use of chemical weapons on Saddam’s own people, the Kurds.

Saddam invaded the sovereign nation of Kuwait. He harbored terrorists in his midst, and he defied 17 United Nations Security Council Resolutions. Just a few days ago, I was listening to the radio, and a pundit remarked on the sectarian violence in Iraq. He observed that perhaps the Iraqi people were better off under Saddam. Given the unspeakable and systematic brutalities of Saddam’s regime, such a remark either reflects a serious misreading of history or a very naive and forgiving nature.

It might have been easier for us in America to turn our heads and look the other way, as many in the rest of the world did, but I would submit that Sad-
dam was an evil cancer on the world. He was a threat to our country, and Mr. Speaker, America, not just Iraq, is better off today because Saddam Hussein is in a court of law, answering for crimes he committed against humanity.

While I was in Iraq, I met with Prime Minister al Maliki as well as my coun-
terpart, the Speaker of the Iraqi Par-

liament. We talked about the birth of democracy in Iraq.

I looked at the Speaker. I looked him in the eye and I said, “Mr. Speaker, I admire you. The Iraqi people represent an ancient civilization, but your democracy is just beginning. Your challenges are great, but so too are your opportunities.”

I urged the Iraqi people to look forward and not back, to listen to the voices of reconciliation, not division. I urged them to choose unity.

They told me that they were succeeding in putting together a unity cabinet, and shortly after my return, they announced the last three ministers that deal with critical security issues.

Each Iraqi official I met with, even the Iraqi Speaker, who originally viewed the U.S. presence in Iraq negatively, thanked me for the help Amer-
ica has given their country. He went further and urged us to stay with them while they build up the capacity to take over the task of providing security for their people.

Today in Iraq we are working together with Iraqi patriots, men and women elected by their fellow citizens.

Along with brave Iraqi soldiers and police, we are moving toward a day when the Iraqi Government on its own has the resources to protect the people, a day when our men and women, and their coalition partners, can come home.

The “stand up” of this new Iraqi Government, which is the fruit of three elections where Iraqi citizens held up their ink-stained fingers and resisted intimidation, brings us closer to that day.
President Bush told us from the beginning that this road would not be easy. We have lost many American lives, and each one is precious to us.

But our fighting men and women remain committed to the effort. Active duty and reserve recruiting is meeting or exceeding all objectives, and we are making progress toward our goal, but the battle is not over.

It is a battle that we must endure and one in which we can, and will, be victorious. The alternative would be to cut and run and wait for them to regroup and bring the terror back to our shores. When our freedom is challenged, Americans do not run.

"Freedom is the very essence of our Nation," President Reagan said in 1990 when a section of the Berlin Wall was presented to his Presidential library. America, he said, "remains a beacon of hope for oppressed peoples everywhere."

President Reagan also observed that freedom is not passed on at birth. It must be fought for and protected and handed on. That is happening. Freedom is being handed on.

Our soldiers, sailors, Coast Guardsmen, airmen, marines, and our Reserves are serving proudly and bravely in harsh conditions, far from their families.

When I was in Iraq, I told them that their task was important and how proud we all were of their service. But frankly our men and women in uniform did not need to be told. In fact, it is we who should listen to them.

They know their sacrifices on foreign shores are keeping the battle against terrorists out of our cities. They know that by going into harm's way they are keeping American freedoms safe, and they know that they are helping a proud but brutalized people to throw off tyranny and stand tall once again. They know that they are liberators, not occupiers.

Our men and women in uniform know all this, and they are proud of it. It is time for this House of Representatives to tell the world that we know it too; that we know our cause is right and that we are proud of it.

Stand up for freedom. Adopt this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELETON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the media just reported the sad news that we have just reached a sad milestone: 2,500 Americans have lost their lives in the Iraq war. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask at the outset of this very important debate that the House observe a moment of silence for all those who have given the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our country.

The gentleman is out of order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself.

All of us know, all of us understand stability in Iraq is important, not only to the United States but to the world.

It is no secret that Iraq is of particular importance because of its oil. The United States consumes 20.6 billion barrels of oil per day. Yet we produce only 5.1 billion barrels of oil a day. China is the second largest consumer, with 6.9 million barrels per day, followed by India, 1.4 million barrels per day. Iraq has the fourth largest oil reserve in the world. Saudi Arabia is number one, Canada number two and Iran number three. So all of us agree that Iraq is important. But how do we get to a conclusion?

Let me compare Gulf War I with Gulf War II. In Gulf War I, Kuwait was attacked by Saddam Hussein. It was a brutal attack. President Bush I immediately reacted. He sent his emissary, Secretary Cheney, to Saudi Arabia. They got an agreement from Saudi Arabia to use their land to put troops in. He immediately sent in the Airborne Division, and he immediately sent in F-16 fighters to deter Saddam Hussein from doing what he wanted to do. I do not see a possibility at that time that he would have complete control of the oil in the Middle East. So we knew how important it was.

Then President Bush started calling up the Reserves. He called a number of Members of Congress over to the White House, and he consulted and talked to them. I do not remember if the gentleman from Illinois was there, but there were seven or eight of us went to the White House. We talked to him about calling up the Reserves and having other people pay.

This is important not only to the United States. This is important internationally. This oil supply, this stability in the Middle East is important to the whole world, and he went to work. He called every major nation. He called Egypt, and this was no easy task for these countries to come around to decide to support the United States.

Matter of fact, President Mubarak said to the effect that he was going to do whatever he wanted. They were going to go along with us. Then they talked about the need to have a U.N. resolution, which we did have. Then we had to have a resolution in the Congress of the United States. But the big thing that he promoted was he got a coalition together, and this coalition ended up with 400,000 American troops and 140,000 coalition troops.

And I remember during this debate, I remember Secretary of Defense Cheney calling General Scowcroft saying, you have got 250,000 troops over there, you don't need any more. Let's get this war going. And General Scowcroft said something I have never forgotten. He said, we are going to give General Schwarzkopf what he wants. He wants more troops, we are going to give him more troops. And Secretary Cheney called me and said we are going to have to send another 180,000 troops. We are going to have overwhelming force when we go into Kuwait.

And they did have overwhelming force. It went on for 6 months. The troops were out in the field, they were spending time, and when they did a magnificent thing. It was overwhelming. And it was paid for by other countries. Sixty billion dollars came from other countries. President Bush I convinced other countries that they had to pay for it. Because it was not only important to the United States, it was important to them, the stability in the Middle East.

Now, let me talk about the second Gulf War. The second Gulf War we had intelligence that said there were weapons of mass destruction; there was an al Qaeda connection. I believed that. As a matter of fact, I listened to the reports, and I was hesitant about the al Qaeda connection, but I believed that they had biological weapons. Matter of fact, a week or so before that started, Ms. Pelosi, as the new minority leader, wanted to go overseas on her first trip. She wanted to visit the troops. Even though she had been against the resolution to go to war, she wanted to tell the supported the troops. And anybody that votes for the Defense Subcommittee appropriations, anybody that belongs to the Armed Services Committee shows their support of the troops.

We went over, and we hoped that on our way over we stopped in Turkey. Imagine, the 4th Division was sitting outside Turkey. It was supposed to outflank the Iraqis. And the State Department asked me, okay, talk to the Turkish government about letting us go through. Now, we had the most modern division, the most technologically advanced division in the whole world sitting there off Turkey. I talked to them and I became convinced they weren't going to let us through, even though they had voted the very day I was there, and they voted by a majority, but not the supermajority that they needed to allow the United States to go through.

I went then to Kuwait and we listened to the commanders. The commanders told us that there is a red line drawn around Baghdad and if we cross the red line they are going to use biological weapons. And I believed that. I believed. As a matter of fact, they said if you cross this red line we have already verified this by monitoring their telephones, by monitoring their cell phones. When we monitored cell phones of Saddam Hussein's headquarters they said use biological weapons. The troops believed it. They were prepared. They felt like they could go in there with protective gear, they could go in there with what they needed and the hot air, the winds, would dissipate the weapons. And, of course, they crossed the red line and nothing happened.

But I still thought there were weapons of mass destruction. I still thought there were biological weapons. I came back and we sent a team over there.
And the team went over and the team looked for those weapons of mass destruction. Matter of fact, at first a fella named Kay, that was so strong about it, former CIA, said, we will find them. And he looked for months and couldn’t find anything at all. Absolutely no information of any kind of mass destruction. No biological weapon, no capability, no nuclear capability, no al Qaeda connection.

When we go to war, we should go to war. The reason we went to war is that there is a threat to our national security. It was a threat to our national security when you talk about the first war, because it destabilized and he would have controlled all the oil in the Middle East, which is so important to the free world. The second time was no threat to our national security. Now, we didn’t find that out, those of us who voted for it, didn’t find this out until after we had gone to war.

The second thing is you go with overwhelming force. I talked to one of the commanders who was in a meeting with five officials; there was him, there was Secretary Rumsfeld, there was Secretary Wolfowitz, General Pace, and General Myers. And he said we recommended 350,000 troops. And as you know, they gave him a lot less troops than that. The coalition troops at the most were up to 30,000 and now they are down to 20,000.

The first war, 100,000, and the first war was enough. It cost us $5 billion. The reason I remember this so vividly is I was chairman of the committee at the time the money came through our committee, and we then sent it over, reprogrammed it over to the defense department itself. But the discrepancy that we have seen, the mischaracterization, the optimistic predictions are the problems that I have had.

Now, I sent a letter, with DUNCAN HUNTER and a number of other people, and I said to the President, we need 100,000 more troops. Well, the President and I said to the President, we need 100,000 more troops. Now, imagine this, we are on the ground and we have won the war. The troops did a magnificent job, as we knew they would, but they completely miscalculated the problems that we were going to have afterwards.

Now, I talked to a tribal leader the other day in Anbar Province. He told me that when he had 1,600 one day in Anbar Province. He told me that, as far as he saw, the first 6 months we had occupied Anbar. Now, Anbar is the province we are having the most trouble right now. It is where Ramadi and Fallujah are. Those are the areas where there is the most contention. In the first 6 months there wasn’t a shot fired. And there wasn’t a shot fired. I said, let me ask you right now, what kind of progress have we made economically? No water, no electricity, no jobs in Anbar Province. Two million people.

And we talk about Saddam Hussein. Almost 900,000 people left when Saddam Hussein was there. They left the country as refugees. The time we have been there 900,000 people have left the country. They voted with their feet. The President went in the other day, he says he was glad to see democracy in action. You know where he went? The same place I go, in the fortress. In the Green Zone. That is where he went. They are afraid to go outside the Green Zone.

When I first went there, the first two or three trips I went, I could go anywhere. I drove around all over Iraq. The last time I landed at Baghdad Airport, they flew me provided turn in Haditha, and we flew so low because of the threat we had to come up over the wires in order to get down, and I didn’t see a person the whole time. There were 2 million people in Anbar Province. Not one project. Not one.

I said on the floor of the House the most important thing in that first supplemental, in the $87 billion, was the $18 billion that went for reconstruction. And of course there are so many projects that have been finished. Now, after we sent the letter about the 100,000, and during that period of time, we asked a fella named Hamro, who was the former Under Secretary of Defense, who went over to Iraq and he did a study of Iraq and of troops. He came back and said, you have got 3 to 6 months to get this straightened out.

And what did he suggest had to be done? They weren’t big projects. He suggested we had to have trash picked up, sewage taken care of, electricity, and jobs. Those are the kinds of things he talked about, and securing the border. Those are the things he said had to be done in 3 to 6 months, and if it is not done, it will go the other way. And all of us know what has happened. All of us know what has happened with the insurgency.

Now, let me go through why I get so distressed by the reports that I get about how well it is going. First of all, the only poll taken of U.S. civilians in Iraq had gone to war. The second thing is you go with overwhelming force. The reason we won the first Gulf War, first of all, if it is a threat to our national security when you talk about the first war, because it devastated al Qaeda. But we are caught in the first war, because it devastated al Qaeda. And he looked for months and about it, former CIA, said, we will find into a place we kill them inadvertently. And when we kill people inadvertently we make enemies, and Abu Ghraib was the biggest public relations disaster we had since My Lai during the Vietnam War.

The number of complete or reconstructed projects, as I said, in al Anbar Province, imagine now, this is one-third of the geography of Iraq, and they have 2 million people, zero. Zero. Number of civilians who died in Baghdad last month, 1,600, in sectarian violence. What is the definition of sectarian violence? A civil war.

All of us want to end this thing. All of us want to find a way to prevail in Iraq. This is a civil war and we are currently in a civil war with more than a thousand al Qaeda in Iraq. They have diminished al Qaeda. But we are caught in this civil war between 100,000 Shiias and 20,000 Sunnis fighting with each other.

The average monthly U.S. war expenditure in Iraq: $4.4 billion in 2003, $5 billion in 2004, $6.1 billion in 2005, and $8 billion. The average monthly expenditure, $8 billion. Now, think what we are spending. The war in the first Gulf War, and DUNCAN HUNTER remembers this, they paid internationally. We paid $5 billion. He was on the Armed Services Committee. He knows what I am talking about. We paid $5 billion and they had 190,000 troops in the first Gulf War.

Now, let me talk about the sentiment and talk about the polls taken. We all look at the polls to see what is going on. Now, the only poll taken of U.S. forces in Iraq, about 3-1/2 months ago: 72 percent of the American troops serving in Iraq think the U.S. should exit the country within a year.
Now, I can understand that. Let me tell you, it is hot, they are wearing 70 pounds every day when they are out there in the field, and I can certainly understand that. Forty-two percent say they do not know what the mission is. And that is devastating when they do not understand what is in the circle.

A public opinion Iraqi poll, a segment of 18 provinces, all 18 provinces: More than half the Iraqis say they are head- ed in the wrong direction, and 82 per- cent say the economic situation is ei- ther poor or fair. Now, these are the Iraqis. Ninety percent say the security situation is poor or fair.

And who do they trust? Who do they trust for personal security? Forty-three percent trust the Iraqi police, 35 percent trust the Iraqi army, 6 percent trust the insurgents, 6 percent trust the insurgents, 4 percent trust the armed militia, and 1 percent, 1 percent trust the multinational force. In an- other poll taken at the beginning of this year, 97 percent approve the at- tacks on the United States forces, and 87 percent of the Iraqis endorse a time- table for withdrawal.

Our global image couldn’t have been higher after the first Gulf War, with 80 to 90 percent of the people in the world thinking the United States did a mar- velous job. We had recovered from Vietnam, finally, in the first Gulf War. Ten of 14 countries polled said the war in Iraq has made the world more dangerous, and most of the countries rated the U.S. troops in Iraq a bigger danger to world peace than the threat posed by Iran. Britain, France, Ger- many, Spain, Russia, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Jordan, and Turkey all have more favorable ratings of China than the U.S.

Now, this resolution is a restatement of the failed policy of this administra- tion, and it is no surprise that that is what this is.

We can’t win this. This cannot be won rhetorically. We cannot sit here, stand here in an air-conditioned office and say we support the troops, say we support the policy.

Mr. Speaker, I can’t help but commen- t on my good friend Mr. MURTHA’s eulogy for the first Gulf War. The prob- lem we have had there is we quit too soon. We quit before the victory was secure. We left the Republican Army, we left Saddam Hussein; we just washed our hands and left. I hope we learned a lesson from that, what a mistake it was and it led to later difficul- ties.

Mr. Speaker, so much of what we do in this Chamber is inconsequential; but the subject of this debate is anything but trivial. Let us then be serious as life and death are serious.

The capacity to reproduce that fear- ful mushroom cloud that was first terror- ized the world in 1945 is multiplying and becoming the deadly playing of rogue nations across the globe.

Partisans have charged the President with misleading us into war, “mislead- ing” being a pale euphemism for lying. The acquisition is made more grave by the assertion that he con- coted the war for purely political pur- poses.

By any measure this is a monstrous charge, but questions persist that must be answered if we are to honestly ex- amine the President’s rationale for interven- tion. It is essential to first un- derstand the context in which the deci- sion was made.

President Bush has cited two factors for his decision to intervene in Iraq: the first, his belief that Saddam was reconstituting his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction; and, secondly, that the Iraqi dictator was cooperating with al Qaeda and other terrorist orga- nizations.

The threat from Saddam Hussein stretches back much further than many of today’s critics care to remem- ber. Saddam’s effort to develop a nu- clear weapon began in the 1970s, cen- tered around the nuclear reactor being constructed at Osirak.

Despite the alarming evidence of its purpose, the world casually contem- plated what we saw as a distant, perhaps even benign, development.

But the luxury of inaction was not available to Israel because her leaders knew that the country was certain to be among Saddam’s first targets. They also knew that the responsibility for Israel’s safety was theirs alone, and that the world would do nothing to save their country if they failed to act.

So act they did, launching a bold at- tack in 1981, destroying the reactor complex and setting Saddam’s nuclear quest back many years. But far from praising this heroic act that benefited humanity, the world community re- sponded with condemnation, even out- rage. Yet, in hindsight, is anyone so foolish as to assert that Israel should have waited for the United Nations to confirm that a threat existed, that Israel should not have taken action to destroy the reactor in defiance of the international community?

Had Israel not acted, the future of the Middle East and the West would likely have unfolded quite differently and far more tragically.

Unchastened by this setback, Sad- dam continued his aggressive campaign to dominate the region and control the world’s oil supply, launching a decade- long war against Iran in 1980 during which over a million people were killed, including millions of innocent civilians. The world watched with horror as Saddam unleashed poison gas and other means of mass slaughter.

After being beaten back from Iran, his attention then turned to Kuwait,
which he invaded and annexed in 1990, assuming the world would meekly accept this fait accompli.

Many forget that for a time that outcome was a real possibility. Much of the initial response in the world community, and in this country, was one of let’s look the other way and hope for the best.

Only when the United States decided to forcefully eject Saddam from Kuwait and to assume the principal burden for doing so was the international community finally persuaded to go along. We refused to allow our fate and that of the world to be shaped by a dictator, and all sensible people are glad of it.

What we providentially discovered after that war astonished the entire world. Despite years of inspections and the best efforts of numerous intelligence services, Saddam had managed to secretly construct a massive program to develop nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The experts now estimate that he was only 6 months from an operational nuclear device. Had he postponed his invasion of Kuwait by half a year, the world would now be a much darker place.

This was not just a擴entent aggression and implacable menace was the only context in which a reasonable person could view Saddam’s future designs. This was the background in which the events of 9/11 occurred.

Imagine you as President, confronting the fact that an unknown group of terrorists had incinerated 3,000 Americans in an attack carried out by individuals who gladly committed suicide to create this horror. We had no idea how extensive their resources were, how global the threat was, who were their allies, how massive were the hidden terrorists to come.

In this context, let us consider the alternative to our intervention in Iraq: The President is presented with evidence that once again Saddam Hussein has developing weapons of mass destruction, that he once again refuses to cooperate with international arms inspectors, that he has had contact with al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations, that he is even harboring terrorist organizations. And yet the President decides not to act. He decides to wait, to see if those same inspectors who had previously been deceived by Saddam will again give him a clean bill of health in 4 or 5 years in the future, to wait until our allies or the United Nations grudgingly grant us a narrow warrant to act. To wait until Saddam perhaps gives up some terrorist organization a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon to detonate in some U.S. city.

To trust our fate to those who would destroy us is to die and leave no descendents.

Is it possible to imagine the storm of condemnation that would justifiably fall on a President who, by not acting, allowed Saddam to arm himself once again with nuclear, chemical or biological weapons? To allow the possibility that these might be made available to a terrorist organization, to acquiesce in the death of thousands, tens of thousands, perhaps of millions of Americans simply because the available evidence was not 99 percent, no, 100 percent.

For if al Qaeda had had a nuclear device, there can be no doubt it would have used it on 9/11 and we would be mourning the death of 3 million Americans, not a tragic 3,000.

Which then was the greater risk in the face of decades of evidence? To act or not to act? To trust Saddam? Who in this body is willing to assert that it is ever wise, that it is ever moral to risk the destruction of the American people? That is the context in which the decision to intervene in Iraq was taken.

Was our intelligence imperfect? In retrospect, that is obvious. But when is it ever perfect? Nor was this shortcoming unique to ours. Exceptional intelligence service in the world assumed that Saddam was once again engaged in developing weapons of mass destruction. After the invasion, we learned the astonishing fact that even Saddam’s own generals believed he possessed a weapon of mass destruction, that he once again refused to cooperate with international arms inspectors, that he was only 6 months from an operational nuclear device.

It is certainly worth noting that among the shrillest voices condemning our intelligence failure are many who once devoted their efforts to weakening our intelligence capabilities, who employed their energies towards imposing restrictions, cutting budgets, sounding alarms about imaginary “rogue elephants.”

For, aware of its responsibilities, aware of the horrific consequences that might occur from indecision and a reliance on trust and hope, President Bush acted to remove the threat posed by Saddam. What he did is called leadership. And for doing his duty for all of us, he has been denounced by many of the same people who would have denounced him had he not acted, denounced by people who bear no responsibility, who take no responsibility, even for their own actions.

Saddam is no longer a threat to anyone. That is a salutary lesson for those around the world who watch and wait for opportunities for unopposed aggression. They now know that their invulnerability has vanished. Even more important, and almost entirely unnoticed amid the torrent of criticism focused on President Bush, is that his actions have greatly enhanced the credibility of the United States. For the next time this or any President warns a foreign despot to cease actions we believe are threatening to us, there can be little doubt that we will take decisive and forceful action, no matter how great the opposition of the world community.

No one can credibly question this greatly enhanced credibility paid off with Libya’s decision to abandon its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Qaddafi understood what President Bush’s critics would refuse to acknowledge, that this administration is determined to eliminate threats to our country, both actual and potential, and if necessary, will use force to do so.
That is in sharp contrast to the passivity of the previous administration, whose failure to react to the repeated attacks on the United States only encouraged our enemies to make further attacks. What other conclusion could al Qaeda and others have reached from our abject retreat and response to their assaults on our embassy, on our military, on us? They were taught the false lesson that they were free to slaughter us and we would do nothing.

Incredibly, senior officials from the administration have shamefully condoned this President for taking decisive measures to address the threat that they themselves could not be brought to contemplate. By acting first in Afghanistan, and then Iraq to remove Saddam, President Bush has rendered the need for future interventions much less likely.

It is unfortunate that the quest for political advantage and a high decibel partisanship have intruded into the national discussions of how best to address the problems we face in Iraq. But there can be no doubt that the more we appear disunited, and the more volatile our dissent into weakness, dissension and inaction, the greater the aid and comfort our enemies.

The world of predictability and relative safety we once knew is gone. We are now engaged in a cruel, brutal struggle with those who would destroy us, one unprecedented in its challenge to our people and our country. "These are the times that try men’s souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shrink from the service of their country. But he that stands by it now deserves the love and thanks of men and women, Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. Yet, we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.”

Charles De Gaulle once said, “France would not be true to herself if she were not engaged in some great enterprise.” Our great enterprise is the defense of freedom, and may we be worthy of the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me comment on a couple of things the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SKELTON, has said.

He talks about early exit. This war has gone on, Mr. Chairman, this war has gone on longer than the Korean War. It has gone on longer than World War I, and it has gone almost as long as the European War.

If I believed we were making progress, we can’t win this militarily. What I am saying is to redeploy, to get our troops out of harm’s way is the key. I see no progress at all in this operation. I see the opposite.

When I see, you talk about al Qaeda being encouraged by what we say, Al Qaeda has gone from 15,000 to 20,000, Incidents have gone from 50 a day to 90 a day. That is the thing that worries me. And we are not making progress. We are losing progress.

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOOD). The Chair reminds Members to respect our colleagues by being on time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this issue today, this important issue for so many Americans across the country, from my home State of Missouri. So many young people in uniform. But this resolution before us today is not what we requested, nor is it what we were told we would have before us to debate. We expected a resolution confined to the country of Iraq and the conflict there. That is not what the resolution is. This resolution covers the Middle East waterfront, trying to blend together the Iraqi war and the war against terrorism, which has its genesis in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, these are two separate and distinct wars. We did the right thing by going into Afghanistan, toppling the Taliban, which supported and protected the al Qaeda terrorists. And then came along the discussion, the international discussion about Iraq and Saddam Hussein and the weapons of mass destruction.

We made the decision, as a country, to go into Iraq. At that time, Mr. Speaker, you and I wrote the law that the United States will, in the face of the law that we passed here, the defense bill of 2005 said this: “Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq.”

That is the law of our land. That is what the defense bill said last year. And we are creating conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq.”

What does this mean to us in the long run? Well, farmers in Missouri know that the quality of the corn that they plant will bring about the quality of the corn that grows. And we find ourselves militarily eating our seed in the country of Iraq.

And it arose. And here we are, some 3 years later.

Despite the fact that this resolution is a broad one, let’s talk about Iraq, which should be the complete subject of the resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at a strategic crossroad. We are spending $8 billion a month, over $300 billion on this war. And more strikingly, we are losing, Mr. Speaker, a battalion’s worth of casualties killed or injured between Iraq and Afghanistan. By far, the most of them are, sadly, in Iraq. And there are increasing insurgent inspired attacks.

Now, what makes this resolution so interesting is the fact that it flies in the face of the law that we passed here in the Congress of the United States and the President signed. The bill, the defense bill of 2005 said this: “Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq.”

That is the law of our land. That is what the defense bill said last year.

And it arose. And here we are, some 3 years later. And here we are, some 3 years later.

And we are creating conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq.”

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at a strategic crossroad. We are spending $8 billion a month, over $300 billion on this war. And more strikingly, we are losing, Mr. Speaker, a battalion’s worth of casualties killed or injured between Iraq and Afghanistan. By far, the most of them are, sadly, in Iraq. And there are increasing insurgent inspired attacks.

Now, what makes this resolution so interesting is the fact that it flies in the face of the law that we passed here in the Congress of the United States and the President signed. The bill, the defense bill of 2005 said this: “Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq.”

That is the law of our land. That is what the defense bill said last year.

And it arose. And here we are, some 3 years later. And here we are, some 3 years later.
And what will it take? It will take the Iraqi government to stand up on its own, and it is on its way there, to transfer the security problem and situation to their police force and to their military, and we have some 250,000 Iraqi forces, either fully trained or nearly fully trained. We have to hand the baton over to them. We as a country, whether militarily or not, cannot determine the fate of Iraq. The Iraqis have to do it themselves, their own government, their own military, and their own police force. We can be of help. We have been of help. We have been there some 3 years. I think it is time for us to seriously look at where we are, where we are going, and do our very best to keep ourselves militarily strong for those days that are bound to happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Members I have been in Congress 29 plus years thanks to those wonderful folks from Missouri. I think it has been a pleasure to work with them. We have had 10 military confrontations with other countries. History being what it is reflects that, and the future may hold something similar. We hope not. But the question is will we be militarily prepared when the time comes?

The Iraq adventure needs to be looked at in light of the law that we passed last year. The calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq. That is the law. That is what the Congress passed. That is what the President signed. And that is where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD at this point my letters in full to the Secretary of Defense dated September 4, 2002, and March 18, 2003.


The Chairman.

The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for inviting me to the briefing this morning. I share your concern about the continuing threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his efforts to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD). I would like to offer my assistance as the administration considers how to deal with this threat.

Before Congress can authorize any military action that might be part of the administration’s plan, we must have answers to more questions than were able to be raised, at today’s meeting. Our constitutional duty requires us to ensure that all implications of such action are considered in advance. The case has not yet been fully made as to what the threat is, why military force is an appropriate way of addressing the threat, and why action must occur now. In short, Congress and the American people must be clear on you. My colleagues here in Congress have different views on the wisdom of action in Iraq and the severity of its consequences. But we are united in our support for all the men and women who serve this nation.

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we have seen in other military actions. The administration’s answers and working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,

Ike Skelton, Ranking Democrat.


The Chairman.

The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is a critical week for our nation and for the world. As you prepare to make the most difficult decisions regarding our future, the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with you. My colleagues here in Congress have many different views on the wisdom of action in Iraq and the severity of its consequences. But we are united in our support for all the men and women who serve this nation.

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we have seen in other military actions. The administration’s answers and working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,

Ike Skelton, Ranking Democrat.


The Chairman.

The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is a critical week for our nation and for the world. As you prepare to make the most difficult decisions regarding our future, the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with you. My colleagues here in Congress have many different views on the wisdom of action in Iraq and the severity of its consequences. But we are united in our support for all the men and women who serve this nation.

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we have seen in other military actions. The administration’s answers and working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,

Ike Skelton, Ranking Democrat.

Secretary Rumsfeld frequently talks about the list he keeps of things that could go wrong in an Iraq war. I have kept my own list—of things that could go wrong after the war is over. The list below is indicative of this broader list. My hope is that this will be helpful to members of your administration as you continue to plan for all possibilities. These scenarios are designed to cover a series of possible problems that could occur in some combination.

**INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND EXTERNAL PRESSURES IN IRAQ**

Without access to Iraq through Turkey, U.S. troops are not present in northern Iraq in large numbers. Turkey enters northern Iraq to enforce zone and border breaks out between the Turks and Kurds. A significant U.S. military force is needed to separate the groups, complicating the governmental transition and international support.

An uprising in Kirkuk leaves the Kurds in control of areas of the city and surrounding area. This provokes difficulties. Iran is in favor to protect the Turkmen minority and to prevent Kurdish control of oil resources. Again, this would require U.S. military resources with another force to protect the Kurds and restore peace. These tensions resurface during attempts to build a federal and representative government.

Urban fighting in the south brings Shi'a into conflict with Sunnis. The resulting devastation causes a refugee crisis as Shi'a make for the border with Iran. The results of Saddam’s policy of forced Arabization of areas like Kirkuk yield dangerous consequences. Groups like the Kurds flow back into these areas seeking to reclaim their former homes and land, sparking conflict with Iraqi Arabs.

Attempts to fashion a federal government in Baghdad prove difficult. Iran is keen to establish proxies for its influence among the Shi'a representatives. Once in Iraq, infighting breaks out among members of the former Iraqi opposition. The United States is unable to transition the administration of Iraq effectively and has to remain in place, with military backing.

The war involves lengthy urban combat, particularly in Baghdad. Most infrastructure is destroyed resulting in massive humanitarian problems. There is an emphasis on humanitarian aid, but efforts to establish a government have failed. Once the government faces massive political pressure from the sustained humanitarian crisis.

**WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION**

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons against advancing U.S. troops, but also inflicts substantial civilian casualties. Efforts to stabilize and to establish a government are complicated by the need to deal with the large number of dead and to decontaminate affected areas.

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons directly against civilian populations or against another Arab country and seeks to affix blame for civilian suffering to the United States. In the period of occupation, this resentment complicates U.S. efforts to maintain support for reconstruction efforts. U.S. forces are able to quickly find all of Saddam’s capabilities, requiring a long, labor-intensive search and anxiety as to when the task is complete.

Regional leaders, for money or to gain influence, retain caches of WMD and transfer some to terrorist groups.

Saddam attacks Iraq with missiles containing weapons of mass destruction. Israel retaliates. Arab countries, notably Saudi Arabia and Jordan, come under intense political pressure to support Israel from the U.S. war effort. U.S. forces are forced to reposition operational centers into Iraq and Kuwait, complicating reconstruction and transition efforts.

**OIL RESOURCES**

Saddam sabotages a significant number of wells before his defeat. Current estimates indicate he may already have wired up to 1,500 wells to contain at great economic and environmental cost and removes a major source of reconstruction funding.

Internal growing concern as the Kurds, seize oil-rich land before American troops reach the area, causing internal clashes over these resources. Militant Shi’a seize other wells in the South.

**INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT**

The United States takes immediate control of Iraq’s administration and of reconstruction. The United Nations can’t agree on how to proceed. The divisions among the Security Council about the need for conflict. The lack of UN involvement in invading the Eocene and others less likely to give. This situation delays reconstruction and puts more of the cost on the United States and a smaller number of people.

U.S. reconstruction efforts that give U.S. corporations a great role at the expense of multilateral organizations and other participation—was detailed in yesterday’s Wall Street Journal—spur resentment and again limit the willingness of others to participate.

**AMERICAN COMMITMENT**

Stabilization and reconstruction prove more difficult than expected. U.S. troop requirements approach 200,000—the figure General Shinseki has mentioned—for a sustained period. This puts pressure on troop rotations, reservists, their families, and employers and requires a dramatic increase in end-strength. Required funding reaches the figure suggested by a recent Council on Foreign Relations assessment—20 billion annually for several years. During a period of economic difficulty, the American public calls for greater burdensharing.

It is my hope that none of these eventualities comes to pass. But as you and all military leaders know, good planning requires consideration of possibilities. It also requires advance preparation of the American people. You have regularly outlined the reasons for why the United States must disarm Iraq. I urge you to do the same in explaining why we must stay with Iraq for the long haul, even with the economic and military burdens this will entail.

As always, I am willing to help in any way I can to make this case to my colleagues and the American people.

Sincerely,

**IRE SKELETON, Ranking Democrat.**

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

**Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Intelligence Community for coming a little early in this debate, although I know the Armed Services Committee is going to come up a little later.**

And I wanted to talk about this war and touch on some of the subjects that my good friends and I brought up over the last 15 or 20 minutes.

I was a new Member of Congress in 1983 when I went over to Beirut with a lot of those great members of the Armed Services Committee, and we got over there a couple of weeks before the Marines were blown up in the terrorist act that all Americans now have heard about and understand. And the reaction of the United States was basically to move out. And I know we all remember the Khobar Towers going up and a similar nonreaction from the United States. And we remember the embassies going up in North Africa and the national decision to send back a couple of cruise missiles, one of which was alleged to have hit a drugstore, which was at most a symbolic response to the blowing up of those embassies in Africa. And I remember the Cole, and we all remember the Cole, and the destruction of that ship and the ensuing American casualties and the nonaction by the United States.

And then we were struck on 9/11, and we realized that it was wrong for us to have done these tenuously formed, a compartmentalized acts that were unrelated. And at that point we struck back. And we undertook a mission first to Afghanistan, secondly a mission to Iraq.

And I do not think we have to play low ground around Iraq. I think everybody understands Saddam Hussein, Gulf I. But I think it is important and it is good that my friend Mr. MURTHA has pointed out that, in fact, even as we talk about this, that we recognized that Saddam was involved in terrorism, in these terrorist networks, and that we have to think about the broader picture and ask ourselves how we benefit from the terrorists in the world.
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And I remember, as we were driving that armored spearhead north, and the Marines taking a piece of it, the Army taking a big piece of it, we had a number of experts appearing on national forums on a daily basis saying there were not enough troops. They used the term we are going to get "bogged down," and what was interesting is even as they were on talk shows saying that there were not enough troops, the talk show would be interrupted with a news flash to the effect that Tommy Franks had taken yet another stronghold. And it was stated at the end of that drive toward Baghdad with what was described by some of the observers, some of the so-called experts, too few troops, that that lightning attack taking Baghdad would go down in history as an example of a low casualty level, and we did have an extraordinarily low casualty level, and a lightning advance in which the enemy in many cases was destroyed long before the American column reached it.

Now let us talk about troops in the occupation and the level of troops in the occupation because that has been brought up a number of times, and General Shinseki's statement about needing one-third of the number of troops that we had there has been used many times. There have been two arguments: one, that we needed to have more troops to make sure we could suppress the insurgents; and the other statement that was made, sometimes in the same speech, would be that we needed to put an Iraqi face on the security apparatus. Well, you can't have it both ways. You cannot have an American on every street corner and have an Iraqi face on the security apparatus.

And let me just say one last thing, which is a hard, tough truth for this House. But when the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I, as we watched the last of the 1990s unfold and the Clinton administration left the White House, we noticed in our defense committees that we went into that administration in the early 1990s with 15 American Army divisions. We came out of that administration with 10, count them, 10. Roughly 33 combat brigades. That is a fact of life. That is what we had to go into this operation with. Now we are moving and we are building toward 43 combat brigades right now. But we cut the military, we cut the U.S. Army, by almost that is what we had to go into this war with.

Now, with respect to the gentleman's statements that in the first war we got lots of folks to chip in and pay for this thing, that is right. On the other hand, you had lots of self-interest. You had Saddam Hussein's tanks in third gear before we threw the 82nd Airborne in between him and his objectives, and you had everybody that had an oil well in that region scared to death and willing to pour money into this operation. So it is that component of self-interest will pile on and will help out. It is also no surprise that we have had lots of times in our national history when it has been tough to bring allies on board, when we had to have big pieces of this operation by ourselves and go it alone. And yet we were able to bring at least 20,000 coalition members into this operation.

And it is true we did not have the French or the Germans. But the French and the Germans were looking forward to major oil contracts with Saddam Hussein, and they did not want to go this time against their pocketbooks, and that is a fact of life.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleagues' yielding.

You and I have had a great opportunity to work together in the defense arena in recent years. My chairing our subcommittee in Appropriations brought in clear form to me the contribution you have made to the strength of America and our role in the world.

I may not be able to speak later, but let me say to the gentleman that very early on in this process, one of the things I have ever taken pride, with General Franks, was a cross-section of this House, people who voted against the war, people who were in the center somewhere, people who supported the President from the beginning, all of them over a long weekend. And together we saw Saddam Hussein for what he was, visiting killing fields with 500,000 people that this guy murdered, of his own people, while he was building golden palaces.

As we left, we came together to see what we would do about that big supplemental on the war. To a person, Democrat and Republican, one of our Members summarized it by saying this: All of you know where I have been coming from. I voted against the war. It is going to be very unpopular when I go home. But what Saddam Hussein is really about, how could we do anything else?

And all 13 of those Members came in that great debate and supported the President's fight against Saddam Hussein because it was a fight against the war on terror.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. And, you know, that takes me to another point, which is the Iraqi Army. It has been said many times, and probably will be said again in this debate, that we should have kept the Iraqi Army intact.

Now, the road that is not taken is always the smoothest. But looking at the Iraqi Army, at Saddam Hussein's army, he had 15,000 Sunni generals. How are you going to maintain an efficient Iraqi Army that is responsive to a new fledgling civilian government with 15,000 Sunni generals running this thing?

We have had to build this army from the ground up. I think that history will show that that was the right thing to do. To have an efficient army, you have got to have a couple of things. You have got to have an army that has a chain of command which is responsive, that means that the private does what the sergeant says and the sergeant does what the platoon says and right up the chain of command.

And you have also got to have an army that is responsive to the civilian government, to that new defense minister that was just put in place. I do not believe you are going to have an army with 15,000 Sunni generals. I have seen that statement tossed around so much that I hope to be able to talk to some of the folks a couple of years down the line when it is reflected.

Incidentally, people like Barry McCaffrey who have not been great friends of the administration's operation have said that looking at the Iraqi Army now, they see a core of strength, they see leadership emerging, and that an Iraqi Army that is becoming effective.

So what are we doing? We have a mission, and the mission right now for the military is to provide a shield for this fledgling government as it goes into place, this new government, to that new defense minister, to that new platoon leader, to that new captain that goes on when that maturity takes place.

Let's rely on their judgment as to when they can hand that load off to them and let them bear the burden.

Why should a Senator from Wisconsin or a Congressman from California try to impose an arbitrary date on when that maturity takes place. You cannot do it. So I would just ask my friends to give to those great Americans who are over there working this mission right now, let's send a united statement to them that there is value in this mission, there is value in their operation.

So let's use that same judgment of those combat commanders who are training those Iraqi units in their areas of operation who say, okay, this battalion is just about matured, this one is not, this one needs more equipment, this one needs some more training. Let's rely on their judgment as to when they can hand that load off to them and let them bear the burden.
War II had a united American public. When the 101st went into Northern Eu-

trope, they had a united American public. Let’s give the 101st Airborne now in

Mosul, and in that tough Sunni Tri-

angle, let’s give them the same support we

gave them in Europe, a united American public and a united American

Congress.

Let’s give the 1st Marine Division that is out there in that tough province in the al Anbar Province out in

Fallujah the same support we gave

them when they were fighting Guadal-

canal. The 1st Marine Division deserves a

united American public and a united American Congress.

So let’s send a message. The main

message that is manifested in this res-

olution is that we should not have an

arbitrary cut-off point, an arbitrary
deadline, and, secondly, that we will

complete this mission. Let’s send this
temporary to every soldier, every marine who is watching this thing from the

mess halls in Mosul and Tikrit and

Baghdad and Fallujah, the message that the United States House of Rep-

resentatives stands with them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of

my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield

myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we send them a

message when we vote on the armed

services bill. Very few people voted

against it. I believe we voted, in the de-

fense subcommittee of appropriations,

only 15 or 16 people voted against it. But Theodore Roosevelt said, “If you

disagree with a policy and you do not say anything, you are actually treason-

ous.” I disagree with the policy. I do not
disagree with supporting the troops. There is no one that supports the

troops better than the Members of this Congress. And that is shown by the few

people that vote against the bill.

Once I think the gentle-

man made a mistake when he said

we are for the war, against the war on
terror. We are actually fighting for the

war on terror is what we are doing. But

I appreciate what the gentleman is say-
ing.

I appreciate the fact that he and I both asked for more troops at one

point. He was the lead sponsor at that

particular time.

I recognize the gentleman from Cali-

fornia for 13 minutes.
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fraud, false claims, theft, bribery and kickbacks. Some of the worst problems in Iraq are almost beyond comprehension.

The U.S. management of the Development Fund for Iraq, which was the fund that held the proceeds of Iraqi oil sales, is a classic example of what not to do. The Coalition Provisional Authority handed out over $3.8 billion in cash, in cash, to Iraqi ministries. And they had no idea what happened to the money; $8 billion in cash simply vanished.

One former U.S. official who was in Iraq at the time, Frank Willis, described conditions as the Wild West. He said the lack of controls effectively created a free fraud zone.

\[ \text{[345]} \]

Iraq was awash in brand-new $100 bills with no accountability to prevent corruption. All the while, the White House looked the other way and Congress put its head in the sand.

Under the Constitution, we are supposed to hold the balance, but we have abdicated this responsibility. The Republican majority is terrific at applauding the President, and they are proving it again today with this dishonest resolution.

Congress isn’t doing the serious and important work it must do to protect our troops, rebuild Iraq, look out for American taxpayers. Congress must be more than a cheerleading section for the White House.

The fiasco in Iraq was a windfall for some. Halliburton made more than $2 billion in profits last year. Its total revenue has increased by 66 percent since 2002. Another beneficiary was Brooks. He is the CEO of a company that makes bulletproof vests. In 2001, Mr. Brooks reportedly earned $525,000. In 2004, he earned $70 million. Last year, the U.S. Marines recalled more than 5,000 of the company’s armored vests. But by that time Mr. Brooks had pocketed $186 million.

Well, the American people might think that Congress would rise up in the face of such unconscionable profiteering. When our troops are willing to sacrifice so much, and they do sacrifice so much, how can we let others create cynical fortunes off their blood?

As we debate this resolution, 2,500 of our bravest men and women, have been killed in Iraq. Over 18,000 have been wounded, and the total cost of the Iraq war is over $300 billion. Those of us privileged to serve here have been spared any of the personal consequences of being on the front line, but we should not be spared the responsibility of doing our job.

We owe more to our troops than slapping “I support our troops” bumper stickers on our cars and extolling their courage. Instead of wasting time on bipartisan charades, we should acknowledge and fix our mistakes so that Iraq’s generation is saved and our troops in Iraq can come home.

We owe more than empty promises to American families who are paying for this costly war in Iraq. They count on us to make sure that their money is spent well, and we haven’t done that.

An honest unsparring look at the record of the past 3 years tells us a stark truth. The White House and Congress have fobbed off our troops, the taxpayers and the Iraqi people. They deserve better than a partisan resolution that pats ourselves and the White House on the back.

It is shameful that we are squandering money on Halliburton at the very same time that we don’t have enough money to protect our troops. It is shameful that Congress has abdicated its oversight and legislative responsibilities to rein in the incompetence and corruption that has undermined our efforts in Iraq.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution in front of us today is about an urgent proposition. We are a nation at war, a nation at war with radical Islamic terrorists. The war was not of our choosing, but it is the central struggle of our time, the first major conflict of the Information Age.

This debate is a defining one for the House and for our Nation. It is important to begin by explaining that the threats that we face are real. They are serious, and they are ongoing. We must address these threats by continuing to confront them aggressively rather than shying away from them because they are difficult. We are framing four fundamental issues that define the war with radical Islam.

First, our Nation is engaged in a long-term war. That war didn’t begin on 9/11. We should maybe look back to February 26, 1993? That was when the World Trade Center was attacked for the first time.

Second, al Qaeda views Iraq as a central front in the battle with Western democracies. Bin Laden’s stated goal is to establish a global Muslim caliphate whose historical center includes Iraq, and Zarqawi was operating in Iraq long before American troops entered that country.

Third, al Qaeda is a sophisticated enemy in the first war of the Information Age. In a war against terrorism, a critical battle is over intelligence. We must use every means at our disposal to obtain information about our enemies and counter the sophisticated information war.

Fourth, our Nation must recognize how this battle is evolving. We need to recognize the threat of home-grown terrorism, home-grown terrorism that has already been experienced in Spain, the United Kingdom, Australia, the Netherlands and, most recently, Canada.

We are a nation at war. America has been in an armed struggle with radical Islam for at least 15 years. The first clear declaration was the attack on the World Trade Center, 6 dead, 1,000 wounded. The Khobar Towers were attacked in June of 1996. Our ambassadors were attacked in Kenya and Tanzania in August of 1998 and the USS Cole was attacked in October of 2000.

In 1996 Bin Laden declared war against the United States in its fatwa. Throughout the 1990s, al Qaeda murdered our troops. Almost 300 people were killed, and there was a minimal U.S. response. No one in the 1990s connected the dots.

But this war is not just limited to the United States. It is a global war against Western democracies. Our enemies are active across the globe, and they must be countered across the globe, not just by the United States but by our allies.

I would like to yield to my colleague from New Mexico, the chairwoman of our Technical and Tactical Intelligence Subcommittee, for a further explanation about the long-term focus of this war.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is important for Americans to understand that the war on terror did not begin on a cool September morning, that this was something that had been building over a decade or longer, that in February of 1993, radical Islamic terrorists drove a truck into the basement of the World Trade Center and blew it up. One thousand people were injured and six people died, and we treated it as a crime, not an act of international terror.

On June 25, 1996, American airmen who were conducting operations in the southern no-fly zone in Iraq were settling in for the night in their quarters in Saudi Arabia in a building known as the Kobar Towers when a sewage truck drove into the compound, backed up to the wall of that building, and the people who drove it fled in a white car.

They were seen from the roof of the building by the security forces, and they started evacuating the building. They were about three floors down when the truck exploded and 19 airmen were killed.

In August of 1998, we were here in this House when we got word that our two embassies, one in Kenya and one in Tanzania, had been attacked by bombs.

The U.S. Attorney in the District of New York got 17 indictments, one of them for a man whose name wasn’t really well known at the time. His name was Osama bin Laden.

In October of 2000, the USS Cole was in port in Aden, in Yemen when a small boat came up to it and exploded, tearing a gash 40 feet by 60 feet long midship on the USS Cole, and 17 sailors died.

All of these actions we treated as isolated instances. We played defense ineffectively against a transnational, loosely connected movement against extremists who exploit Islam and use terrorism to bring about their dark visions.

The adherents to this movement are parasites who thrive in weak states and in failed regimes. That is why the terrorists made Iraq a central front in
every girl that now walks in Iraq and
Baghdad and goes to school, for every
young mother that goes to a medical
clinic to get treatment where there
was none before, for every dead ter-
rorist in Iraq, we make progress every
day.

One platoon sergeant in Iraq, and I
quote, I have yet to speak to an Amer-
ican here who thinks we are losing.
Trust me, no soldier wants to be here.
No one wants to cut and run either.
Leaving would send the wrong signal to
our enemies.

There are only two groups of people
who want America to leave and with-
draw in humiliation, Mr. Speaker, from
Iraq.

President Bush met with the Shia,
the Sunni, the Kurds just recently,
just this last week. None of them, even
the Sunnis, wanted the United States
to leave. As a matter of fact, they
asked for reassurance that we would
stay with them in this difficult and
tough struggle for freedom.

That would leave only the terrorists
who want an early American with-
drawal and some politicians in this
town.

I would listen to what our enemies
said when Zarqawi declared, “We have
declared a bitter war against the prin-
ciple of democracy and all those who
seek to enact it.”

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we
should stand with our soldiers. We
should stand with our families here
that helped take the fight to the ter-
rorists overseas. We should stand for
victory, and we should stand with the
United States of America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my col-
league from Michigan for those com-
ments.

The other thing that we have learned
is that this is the first war in the Infor-
mation Age. The Information Age pro-
vides some unique opportunities to our
enemy. As we work to deny the terror-
ists their physical sanctuary, radical
Islamists, using the tools of the Infor-
mation Age, are working actively to
develop a virtual sanctuary on the
Internet which enables them to grow
their movement around the globe.

Some have said, well, this is a battle
that should be fought in Afghanistan.
That is true. But it is not only a battle to Afghan-
istan or Iraq. Tell that to the people in
Spain, the Netherlands, the U.K., Can-
da or Australia that this is really just
a battle about Afghanistan.

The Information Age is making this
a very, very different battle than we
have ever fought before. To explain
that in more detail is my colleague
from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY).

I yield to Mr. THORNBERY.

Mr. THORNBERY. I thank the
chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Abu Nidal found safe
haven to plan, to train and to develop
their movement around the globe.

Terrorist Abu Nidal found safe haven
in Iraq and was killed in Baghdad in
April of 2003. Iraq was on the State De-
partment sponsor of terrorism list.

After 9/11, al Qaeda affiliated groups
operating in Baghdad and the Kurdish-
controlled region of Iraq a year at least
before the start of the war. As a matter
of fact, from that base of operations,
they executed the assassination of an
American diplomat in Jordan in 2002.

Our troops found a suicide vest fac-
tory that had 800 suicide vests equipped
and ready to go in south Baghdad in
April of 2003. Iraq was on the State De-
partment sponsor of terrorism list.

Saddam Hussein paid $25,000 cash
to a family of suicide bombers in Israel.

You know, with every sacrifice made
by our great American soldiers, for
their war. If they could foment civil
war, if they could keep self-govern-
ment in Iraq from being born, then
they could thrive in the chaos and con-
tinue their attacks on us.

That is why it is important to see it
through. We made a decision after 9/11 that we would play offense
and not defense. As Americans, we
know the enterprise that we are en-
gaged in is difficult and requires per-
sistence and resolve. That is very hard
on some days. It is very hard for us to
understand why it is important to stay
the course.

But we know this. Our enemies are
persistent and will stay the course.
They will not stop if we ignore them.

So that is the choice we face as a na-
tion and why this debate today is so
important. It is a choice between re-
solve and retreat. For me and my fam-
ily, I choose resolve.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my
time, I thank the gentlewoman for her
comments.

A quote from Zawahiri to al Zarqawi
in July of 2005: “It has always been my
belief that a victory of Islam will
never take place until a Muslim state
is established in the manner of a proph-
et in the heart of the Islamic world,
end of quote.

Al Qaeda views Iraq as a central part
of the war on terror. I would like to yield to my colleague
from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Thank
you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is the central front
in the war on terrorism, despite what
you hear and, despite the pointing out
of problems in a very difficult task, we
ought not to be asking politicians here
in Washington, we ought to be listen-
ing to our enemy.

Osama bin Laden, quote, this third
world war is raging in Iraq. The whole
world is watching this war. It will end
in victory and glory, or it will end in
misery and humiliation.

With that in mind, we have talked about
earlier, Mr. Chairman, from that letter
from Zawahiri to al Zarqawi, he went
on to say that prophet in the heart of
Islam world, specifically Egypt, neigh-
boring states of the peninsula and Iraq,
they have declared war against the
United States and all those who seek
to find democracy and peaceful solu-
tions.

Terrorist Abu Nidal found safe haven
in Iraq and was killed in Baghdad in
2002. He and his network were op-
erating in Baghdad and the Kurdish-
controlled region of Iraq a year at least
before the start of the war. As a matter
of fact, from that base of operations,
they executed the assassination of an
American diplomat in Jordan in 2002.

Our troops found a suicide vest fac-
tory that had 800 suicide vests equipped
and ready to go in south Baghdad in
April of 2003. Iraq was on the State De-
partment sponsor of terrorism list.

Saddam Hussein paid $25,000 cash
to a family of suicide bombers in Israel.

You know, with every sacrifice made
by our great American soldiers, for

But the other thing that they are trying to do is to develop the concept of homegrown terrorism, and it is something that is evolving.

I would like to yield to our chairwoman of the committee, Mrs. Davis.

Mrs. Davis of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, some of the worst acts of radical Islamic terrorism have been committed by homegrown terrorists, and homegrown terrorists are citizens or residents of the Western countries who, without any direct contact with al Qaeda, adopt a militant radical Islamic outlook, and they seek to conduct acts of terrorism in support of the global jihad.

Propaganda on the Internet, as we heard from you and from Mr. Thornberry, drives the movement. Groups like al Qaeda and the Zarqawi network use it to distribute their slick videos, to glorify the violent jihad.

Homestorms committed, as I think you have said before, recent acts in Spain, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

The Madrid attack, for instance, on March 11, 2004, a group of Moroccans living in Spain attacked passenger trains killing 190 people; and the plot was conceived, it was organized, and it was equipped with no support from international terrorist groups.

Recent events have demonstrated that Europe is not the only place where homegrown Islamic militants can develop.

On June 4, 2006, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police arrested 17 Canadians for planning to attack Canadian government buildings.

We have seen homegrown Islamic extremist groups in the United States. Our Federal, our State, and our local law enforcement agencies have so far been able to stop them before they could launch attacks.

In August 2005, for instance, the FBI arrested four members of the JIS plotting to bomb military recruiting offices and synagogues in southern California, and this is the interesting part: The JIS was founded by an inmate at the California State Prison in Sacramento, and most members of the JIS are American citizens who were born and raised in the United States. They were radicalized and recruited into JIS while they were in prison; and as far as authorities know, none of these members had any contact with foreign terrorist groups.

Last February, the Justice Department indicted three men in Ohio for aiding insurgents in Iraq and planning to attack U.S. troops there. Two of the men were naturalized U.S. citizens, and one was a permanent legal resident. The men learned their craft by downloading terrorism instructional videos from jihadist Internet sites. They had all left the United States with al Qaeda. Had they not been arrested, they may have started looking for local targets that they could attack.

We cannot ignore the threat of homegrown terrorism. It is imperative that we understand which elements of our society are vulnerable to jihadist propaganda, how radicalization occurs, and how we can prevent Americans from becoming involved with terrorist groups.

The British House of Commons concluded that the U.K. counterterrorism community did not anticipate the March 2005 suicide attacks because it did not understand homegrown terrorism and the radicalization process. We cannot make that mistake.

At the same time, we cannot let our concern about homegrown threats breed suspicion and distrust of our fellow Americans. The diversity and the harmony of the American people is our country's greatest strength, and the global jihadist network we are fighting wants to divide us by inspiring homegrown terrorists whose attacks will spread.

And I think Mr. Thornberry said it best, they are using that media, the Internet. They are using that to divide our country, and that is what will take us down, Mr. Speaker. That is why it is imperative that we continue on this course and we continue to fight this war on the way front, not the home front.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague.

Reclaiming my time, it is why this resolution is so important, to send a clear signal that we are going to win this global war on terror; that we are going to be successful in Iraq; that we are going to fight the enemy where they are using all of the techniques that they use in an Information Age; and why we need to redouble our efforts to make sure that they cannot attack us; and that we stop the development of homegrown terrorism in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I present the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This all sounds good. It is all rhetoric. It is rhetoric. The number of daily attacks in Iraq have gone from 2004, 53 attacks per day; May 2005, 70 attacks per day; May 2006, 90 attacks per day. Electricity is less than prewar level. No water available to all, only 1 hour a day, Mr. Speaker, and the oil production which was supposed to pay for the war is less because we could not turn it on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no more pressing issue in our country today than bringing an end to the war in Iraq as quickly as possible.

I thank my colleagues on the other side who just completed their discussion of the war on terror. They remind us that it is a war in which we can never yield and about which we have no choice. They also remind us that Iraq has become a recruiting ground for those international terrorists; that Iraq has become a proving ground for those international terrorists; and that in Iraq, we have become a target for many of those international terrorists, none of which existed before the President's choice to go to war, a war not of necessity, a war that was unjustified based upon falsified intelligence.

And I can see the testimony of the CIA Director said that intelligence that the administration used to make the case for war was wrong, inaccurate, and misleading. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and there was no connection between 9/11 and Saddam Hussein.

The administration used fear to scare this country into war based upon those lies. He refused to properly prepare for the home front; that was the soldiers, our families, and our Nation are paying an enormous price for this President's tragic blunder.

Two thousand five hundred Americans soldiers, we are informed today, have died in Iraq, the 250 soldiers have been wounded, many of them missing limbs and suffering other very serious debilitating injuries that will afflict them the rest of their lives. The war has cost almost a trillion dollars in taxpayer money, and America's international reputation and respect in the world has been severely damaged.

The President often says that he makes decisions about the future of Iraq based upon what the generals say; but when the time came to listen to the generals prior to Iraq, the President refused to listen to them. He refused to listen to them when they questioned the force structure that was available to us to go into Iraq at that time, but he went anyway. He refused to listen to them when questions were raised the day after we seized Baghdad.

What we now see is massive national shame for which our soldiers were not trained, not given any instructions on how to deal with, and certainly did not have sufficient numbers to deal with. The President sent the troops into that war with that poor planning, that poor structure, and that poor understanding of what would take place afterwards.

The American public had to witness soldiers being forced to buy their own body armor, have their families buy it because we did not have a proper supply prior to going into that war. Many men and women were sent into battle with unarmored, old Humvees that were used for flood control in the California rivers before they showed up in Iraq. It is those same scenes of that inadequate equipment and because of the roadside bombs that are the number one killer in Iraq.

We see the torture of detainees was approved at the highest levels in the Pentagon; and this, again, has led to an undermining of our position in the world, our moral position in the war in Iraq and the war against terrorism.
This is a policy blunder of historic proportions by this President, and it is very important that we understand that we are paying a huge price for these mistakes by this administration. Tragically, we stand here on the floor of the House 3 years after the beginning of this war, but for 3 years questions were not raised in this Congress about that force structure, about that preparedness, about the detainee policy, about these actions that have so severely undermined America.

Yes, we saw the taking of Zarqawi, and what do we have there? We have the real use of smart intelligence on the war against terror. As you pointed out, they are not going to come after the 130,000 troops. They are not going to come after our strengths, but that is what people have been saying for a long time. That is what people have been writing about at the military schools, about the networking of terrorism and how you had to go after it. We went after it exactly the wrong way, in exactly the same way, as people who made these historic blunders throughout history, when confronting this kind of terrorism.

Yes, we should provide the special ops; yes, we should provide the surveillance; yes, we should provide the intelligence and we should work together. In the case of Zarqawi, we saw, once the Jordanians were insulted enough by the attacks on their land, they put their intelligence sources to work, combined with ours, and Zarqawi was run down, and we provided the 500-pound bombs. We provided the special ops.

That is not what is happening day to day in the war in Iraq, and our troops are paying a horrible, horrible price for the lack of preparation, the lack of planning and the lack of prosecution of this war. As a result, Iraq is engaged in a civil war, and for whatever real reason we attacked Iraq, did not have the means to attack us, and had no intention of attacking us.

Jack Kemp wrote before the war, “What is the evidence that should cause us to fear Iraq more than Pakistan or Iran. Do we reserve the right to launch a preemptive war exclusively for ourselves or might other nations such as India, Pakistan or China be justified in taking similar action on the basis of fears of other nations?”

Mr. Kemp said, based on evidence that he had seen, there were not “a compelling case for the invasion and occupation of Iraq.” William F. Buckley wrote that if he had known in 2002 what he knew then in 2004, he would have been against the war. Last year he wrote another column against the war saying: “A point is reached when te-naciously conveys not steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride.”

The very popular conservative columnist Charley Reese wrote that the war was “against a country that was not attacking us, did not have the means to attack us, and had never expressed any intention of attacking us, and for whatever real reason we attacked Iraq, and that was not America from any danger, imminent or otherwise.”

Many years ago, Senator Robert Taft expressed the traditional conservative position: “No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted to the protection of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.”

Millions of conservatives across this Nation believe that this war was unconstitutional, unaffordable, and, worst of all, unnecessary. It was waged against an evil man, but one who had a total military budget only two-tenths of one percent of ours.

We are not going to be able to pay all our military pensions, social security, Medicare, and all the little things we have promised if we are going to turn the Department of Defense into the Department of Foreign Aid and attempt to be the policeman of the world. This is contrary to every traditional conservative position on defense and requires huge deficit spending.

The conservative columnist Georgie Ann Geyer wrote: “Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe.”

Mr. Speaker, we need to start putting our own people first once again and bring our troops home, the sooner the better.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our chairwoman, Mrs. DAVIS.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an issue that hasn’t received enough attention in the debate on the war in Iraq is the war on terror is what happened to American intelligence during the 1990s.

To effectively wage the war on terrorism, we need a robust intelligence community that is capable of gathering intelligence, eliminating the terrorist threat. Unfortunately, as the war escalated in 2001, the intelligence community was still reeling from policies that were implemented in the 1990s which undermined the ability of our intelligence agencies to predict 9/11 and to effectively fight the war today. Simply throwing people and money at the issue, it doesn’t solve the problem. Developing expertise to replace what was lost in the 1990s is a long endeavor. It takes 5 to 7 years of training and experience to bring an operations officer up to full performance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list a few examples of what happened in the 1990s that hampered our intelligence community efforts leading up to and at the onset of the war.

Between 1992 and 1999, the CIA’s presence overseas declined by almost one-third. Our intelligence agencies had their hands tied by the Deutsch Doctrine, forbidding the recruitment of sources that had shady backgrounds, limiting our ability to get information on potential terrorist attacks. The number of officers declined and overseas facilities were closed. And as a result of the crises in the Balkans and in Africa, we cut funding to areas where many times they had little knowledge of the issues there and, in some places, the targets had little and sometimes no presence.

As a result, overall intelligence collection was decimated. James Pavitt, the former CIA Deputy Director for Operations, told the 9/11 Commission in April of 2004 that we were vastly underfunded and did not have the people to do the job, and noted that spending on CIA human collection was cut by 20 percent during the Clinton years.

Analysis suffered equally in the 1990s, with low priority accorded to terrorism analysis. Intelligence analysts were
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discouraged from writing original out-of-the-box assessments that might have raised awareness to terrorists staging unconventional attacks. And, instead, our analysts were pressured to craft politically correct analysis.

The Bush administration and senior military officials are not alone in their culpability. Members of Congress defaulted in fulfilling their Constitutional responsibility of oversight.

General Anthony Zinni, former Commander of the U.S. Central Command in the Mideast: “We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan. Ten years of planning were thrown away.”

Major General Batiste, who commanded 22,000 soldiers on the ground in Iraq. “Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.”

Eight generals have raised serious questions concerning Secretary Rumsfeld’s leadership. I don’t know, maybe the Pentagon suffers from the soft bigotry of low expectations and social promotion as a policy. Maybe these generals were selected because they might, just maybe, they had to speak up because the Republican Congress was silent. You have adopted an approach of “see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil” with abandon.

America was told this would be a quick war, and it turned into a long war. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told 130,000 troops would be enough, but more were clearly necessary. This Congress, the Republican Congress, walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told this would be a conventional war. It turned into an insurgency. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told oil would pay for reconstruction, and the taxpayers are left with a $480 billion tab. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told we would be greeted as liberators, but they have become and are treated like occupiers. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility.

And then Don Rumsfeld, a man who expressed contempt for the idea of nation-building, was assigned the responsibility of rebuilding Iraq and mismanaged the war against the insurgency, this Congress, the Republican Congress, walked away from its oversight responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans want to portray the greatest foreign policy challenge of a generation as simply the choice between more of the same or a new direction. Democrats welcome that. The debate today is about whether the American people want to stay the course, with an administration and a Congress that has walked away from its obligations, or pursue a real strategy for success in the war on terror.

Twenty-five hundred brave Americans, male and female, have given their lives in trying to stabilize Iraq. Last month was the bloodiest in Iraq’s history. According to Major General Rick Lynch, attacks against civilians in creased 80 percent since November 2005. We cannot achieve the end of victory and continue to sit and watch, stand pat, and continue the Republican policy. Democrats are determined to take the fight to the enemy. In the words of President John Kennedy. “We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.”

Democrats will never put American servicemembers in harm’s way without a plan and without support. For that, you need the sit-and-watch complacency of a Republican Congress.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. This Congress will not walk away from a mission, it will not walk away from its troops, and it will not walk away from you.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit saddened by the comments of the gentleman from Illinois. You know, our enemies do not have a first Tuesday in November plan. They have a plan for a caliphate. They have well established themselves to murder Christians, Jews, Muslims, women, and children. They will behead you, they will shoot you, they will blow you up. They do not care.

To have the talk of rhetoric, because the electricity isn’t where it is, let’s come home in defeat; because the oil isn’t where it is, let’s walk away from our allies; because we would like it, let’s come home in defeat; that is no standard for victory.

What is the standard for victory? Where were we 4 years ago? Let us look at it in the global war, this World War II that Obama bin Laden declared in his own words, Pakistan. 4 years ago, was the only government supporting the Taliban in Afghanistan. They were working against the United States in Afghanistan. They supported, financed, gave as much comfort as they could. They drove into proactivity to attack Americans and Westerners all over the world. In Iraq, we know that Zarqawi was there a year before the war; that they used that operation to kill an American in Jordan, a diplomat of great service to our country. In Libya, they had a nuclear weapons program and self declared they would share it with anyone.

So 4 years later, not because I gave a great speech on the House floor but because the United States military put on the uniform and fought the terrorists with a military uniform so our children wouldn’t have to fight it in a school uniform here at home, and now what has happened? Pakistan has joined us in the fight against terror. There are our allies just 4 years later in hunting down al Qaeda.

Afghanistan is now an ally in the war on terror. Their intelligence services, their military, as a matter of fact just this morning, large troop crackdown on terrorists. This morning. Last week, Iraq launched a 70,000 security personnel crackdown on terrorists. This week, they are our allies now in the war on terror.

Libya is the components of the nuclear weapons program of Libya. It is now in the possession of the United States of America. They gave it to us not because we stood here and debated but because we had brave men and women with boots on the ground who challenged and committed and said we will take the fight to you. We will not allow you to take the fight to us.
Which country would you have go back? Which one would you say, ah, it wasn’t important that they became an ally? Four Muslim nations have stood up against the ravages and the terror and the brutality of terror today because of actions our brave soldiers take overseas.

So don’t get confused in every little problem that happens, and there are a lot of them. Sir, you served in Vietnam. You know this challenge. They are great, they are hard, and sometimes they are disappointing, yes. But at the end of the day, every great victory every great victory ends with our heads held high and safety and security for the United States.

Let us not come home in humiliation. Let us not tell all of those families that their loved ones died in vain because we have a November time frame and not a time frame for victory.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This is rhetoric. It is not getting better. I spoke out November 17, and things go worse than that. It was 6 months ago. They are worse today than they were then.

When I left Vietnam in August of 1967, they gave me this bullet, and they said in this bullet that everything is going to be all right. The President of the United States said we just had an election, and we have a new election in Vietnam, and this was a month after I got out of Vietnam, and everything is going to be all right. We lost 37,000 people.

It is not a matter of whether we want to prevail in this operation, it is a matter of how we are going to do it, and I disagree with the way we do it. I disagree with the policy. That is what I disagree with. But our troops have become the targets. Incidents have increased every day, and more Americans are being killed every day. And we are going to pay a heavy price in people being killed and also we are going to pay a heavy price for the individuals in the future with the debt increasing at $8 billion a month.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO).

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, it is my good fortune, like this the President of the United States does not seek to unify the country. He does not use these moments to bring people together, to strengthen us. He does not rally the country behind our men and women in arms and in harm’s way.

We applaud our troops. Thank God for their willingness to sacrifice for our Nation. I take every moment to support them and their families. But the President and the Republican leaders, within moments of our soldiers’ valiant efforts in eliminating one of the worst terrorists, is rushing for some political advantage, some way to hurt the Demo-
Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished so much in the global war on terror, highlighted by the recent death of Zarqawi. We have significantly degraded the al Qaeda network by denying them a safe haven in Afghanistan and capturing or killing many of their leaders and associates. We have also built an unprecedented international coalition to combat and prevent terrorist financing and dismantle terrorist support networks.

Mr. Speaker, America is safer, but we are not yet secure. The enemy we are fighting is determined about its desire to kill Americans. We cannot allow Iraq to become a breeding ground for terrorist activity. A free and democratic Iraq is absolutely essential to fighting the terrorist threat and building long-term peace and stability in the region. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. I was in Beirut the day after the attack, and I recommended to President Reagan, I recommended to the President of the United States, get out of Beirut because we didn't have enough troops; 2 months later he got out of Beirut because he didn't have enough troops.

I know where I am talking from, and I know what fighting on the front lines are. I know the difference between them. I know that standing here does not solve the problem, and it has gotten better, it has gotten worse. That's the problem. And you are not talking about Iraq. The gentleman up there was talking about the war on terror. I am talking about Iraq. That's what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 4 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank Mr. MURTHA for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I visited the Johnson VA Medical Center in Charleston, South Carolina. That medical center is named for a young man who is the recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor because just out of high school he went off to fight in Vietnam, killed himself on a grenade to save the others in the foxhole with him.

I went to the hospital last Saturday to visit one of my heroes, Joseph Henry Washington. Joseph Washington was on the USS Arizona on that fateful day at Pearl Harbor. I went because I wanted to report to Joseph Henry Washington on my recent trip to Iraq because he questioned the wisdom of my being there.

I said to Joe that I was very pleased with what I had found militarily in Iraq. I told him that I thought that our military forces were doing an admirable job, and I thought they were meeting with significant success.

But Joe, Uncle Joe, I am very, very disappointed in what I have found on the domestic front. We are not going to win the hearts and minds of the people of Iraq until we can give them a police force that believes and is committed to law and order, not one that is 80 percent corrupt.

I said to him that I did not think that we were going to be successful in Iraq until we involved the Iraqi people in the reconstruction efforts. We see $9 billion that we can't account for. We see construction going on up in the northern part of the country. But in Baghdad, in and around that part of the country, we see a failed policy. That is the problem in Iraq. We must begin to involve the Iraqi people in the reconstruction of their country.

Eighty-five percent of the country is without electricity. Almost 60 percent of the country is out of drinking water. We are never going to be successful until we tackle these problems, and that is where we are falling because there is no accountability on the domestic front in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to Charleston the day after tomorrow because we are going to bury Uncle Joe. He stayed alive long enough for me to make my report to him. And for over 45 years in my consultations with him, he never wanted to talk about experiences on the USS Arizona or his experiences after returning home. Why? Because he was never sufficiently included in the building of this great Nation. And the people of Iraq are not being sufficiently included in the building of their country until we do that. We will never be successful with this policy.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), my colleague from the conservative wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for us to have this debate on the necessity of the global war on terror, a war that we did not ask for, but a war that came to us.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out that after Beirut, we left. We did not react to it. Several other instances like that occurred during the 1990s. We did not react to Khobar Towers; we did not react. We were attacked at the Kenya embassy; we did not react. We attacked the first time at the World Trade Center; we did not react. The Tanzania embassy was bombed; we did not react. The USS Cole was bombed; we did not react. What did it yield us? A continuing battle against terror around the globe.

I would remind my fellow colleagues that one such incident of attacking Americans occurred in the Philippines when Gracia and Martin Burnham were kidnapped, along with a constituent from Representative Bono's district. The leader of the Abu Sayyaf Group, ASG, was trained by al Qaeda in Afghanistan. That training occurred because we did not respond to these prior attacks. We left them alone.

In the Indonesian al Qaeda training papers they found, they said one of the things that America is vulnerable about it is they don't follow up. You can attack them, and they withdraw. They withdrew from Vietnam, they withdrew from Beirut, they withdrew from the Cole, the Kenya embassy, and Khobar Towers. They did not react the first time when they attacked the World Trade Tower. We have continued to make ourselves vulnerable by not responding to the worldwide war on terror.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution. Thanks to American training and intelligence aid, the Philippine Government was able to rescue Gracia Burnham. Martin Burnham died in the rescue attempt. It was probably because we couldn't get close enough into the fight. But what is important is that we need to remember is if we back off now, according to the paper, or the letter that was written from al Zawahiri to the now-deceased al Zarqawi, it will be considered a victory for al Qaeda if we leave. Al Qaeda is the one that has decided to bring this war to Iraq and to fight Americans. That information is available on their Web sites and in the information that we collect. It is what the captives tell us when we interview them.

They want to take this fight to the Americans in Iraq. I tell you, if we are going to have to fight terrorists, I would rather fight them at a place where every American carries a gun rather than on the streets of New York or Washington or Wichita because they have brought the fight to us. It is not we who decided to do this.

I think it is very important as we pursue this worldwide battle against terrorism that we insist on doing it with our full resources, with full dedication, and that we disrupt their finances, that we disrupt their places of safe haven, that we disrupt the countries that are providing protection for them, and that we go to the terrorists and find the root causes of this terrorism and sever the root.

I think the reason we have seen so much money from al Qaeda going to Iraq, the reason that they have sent so many people into Iraq, the reason so many foreign fighters have gone into Iraq is because that is where they want to fight this battle.

If we leave now, it would be giving them a victory and we would be once again putting another picture on the board here saying we should have fought harder; we should have stopped it back in 2006.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple problem: that the opposite is happening. That is the problem we have. We can stand here and say we want to fight the terrorists in Iraq. Actually, al Qaeda we think is less than 1,000.

But what we think we are caught in is that we are fighting in a civil war. It is the way that we are doing it. The military cannot win this war. The military commanders, even General Pace admits we cannot win this military war.

Then what we are caught in, we have become the target of the insurgency of the sectarian violence. It is the way that we are doing it is what I disagree with.
Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Larson).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MURTHA for having the temerity to speak truth to power, for having the temerity to separate the war on terror from the travesty that is taking place in Iraq.

It is amazing to me, and this used to be a place, as Professor Remini writes, where Members would come down, unrehearsed, without charts or graphs. They would speak from their heart. They would talk about this institution and what it means to democracy all over the world.

What a sham today. We should all glorify in the aspects of democracy that take place all around the world and in Iraq. But what a sham this is today when we are denied any alternative resolution.

Mr. LANTOS eloquently stated that earlier today, when he talked about Bob Michel and his eloquence standing on this floor, talking about speaking truth to power. And that is what is so upsetting to the American people and why Mr. MURTHA has been recognized all around this country for standing up and speaking the truth to the American people, something this administration and, frankly, this Congress, has been unable to do. Level with the American people. Let's start with levying the American troops, leveling with all of those families of reservists and National Guardsmen who I speak with on a regular basis, who have been deployed, redeployed, deployed and redeployed again many times because we haven't had a plan.

Here we are in a race between cooperation and catastrophe, and you guys bring to the floor a political document not designed for a new direction or to bring the country together to discuss the way it should be done but instead as talking points outlined by Karl Rove in New Hampshire, sandwiched in between the President's photo op and a picnic this evening.

Americans are outraged that we don't have a citizenry and Members here who are willing to stand up and have accountability. We all support the war on terror. And this party, from Roosevelt to Truman to Kennedy, to Johnson, to Bush, are willing to stand up and do what's right. They would talk about this institution as Professor Remini writes, be a place, as Professor Remini writes, as a place where Americans lie in rest, Americans lost their lives in that vicious attack on the Pentagon. They would talk about this institution as a place where Americans are outstanding because they will tell you what they want is to be healed from their injuries and to get back to the fight because they believe in their country. They love their country, and they believe that it is important that we stop the threat to this great Nation of ours from those terrorists, those terrorists who attacked us on September 11 in New York, in Pennsylvania, at the Pentagon, those terrorists who attacked the USS Cole, killing many of our sailors and wounding many more, those terrorists who blew up the Khobar Towers, which was a hospital for the Americans in Saudi Arabia, those terrorists who blew up the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. These young troopers, these warriors understand the threat. America understands the threat. And ladies and gentlemen, let us stand up to that threat and that America that we know is the America that our kids will know and that our grandkids will know in the years to come.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) for 30 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and, as prior speakers have done, I commend him for speaking truth.

Mr. Speaker, 1,184 days ago American troops invaded Iraq to rid Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction. The weapons weren't there. But American troops still are. I have met some of those troops on my three trips to Baghdad and Afghanistan, as well as Pakistan, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. Our Armed Forces and intelligence personnel are extraordinary. Many are on their third or fourth tours. I am proud to associate myself with Ms. Cole and Mr. Larson.

As a mother of two sons and two daughters, and as a newly minted grandmother, my heart goes out to families who have lost their dear ones. I am deeply moved by the courage, dignity and patriotism of the men and women recovering from grievous wounds at Walter Reed and other U.S. hospitals. And I have visited with them.

Our action in Iraqi created a failed state and, tragically, our postwar mission, as presently defined, cannot succeed. There are too few troops to stabilize the country. They are inadequately equipped.
They are fighting an insurgency we didn’t predict, at constant risk from IEDs we can’t find, with no clearly developed goals to help the new Iraq government achieve political and economic security, and no exit strategy.

Two major failures led us to war, and we have learned less than risk making the same mistakes again. As ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, these failures haunt me.

Had we got the intelligence right, I believe we would have made different choices, and the pain and loss and anger many feel could have been avoided.

First was a massive intelligence failure in assessing Saddam’s WMD capability. The second, equally grave, was the politicization of intelligence by the President and a White House determined to push us toward war.

The failure to assess Saddam’s WMD capability accurately has been well documented. As CIA weapons inspector David Kay put it, documented. As CIA weapons inspector capability accurately has been well mined to push us toward war.
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Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to lead. This resolution, in my view, is a press release for staying the course in Iraq. It does not signal a change in policy, and thus I cannot support it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Arizona, a member of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. RENZI.

Mr. RENZI. I thank the chairman.

I have respect for the gentlewoman from California, I took her words carefully, and I want to remind her that on October 9 she spoke about Saddam Hussein and his development of weapons of mass destruction, saying that he is impulsive, irrational, vicious, and cruel and that left unchecked, he will grow stronger, only to develop the capability to match his disdain for America and his Middle East neighbors and that he poses a clear and present danger.

Those were the words of the ranking member. That was the belief of Bill Clinton. That was the belief of HILLARY CLINTON. That was the belief of Madeleine Albright. And yet we are told today that this is a press release.

al Qaeda is a cancer. It has metastasized itself throughout the world. There is a lot of negativity, whether or not we want to join and take the war in Iraq and link it with terrorism. It is a cancer. It needs to be cured. We have to show the will and the endurance. Our troops do. Our people at home, I believe, have that will. I believe there should be no arbitrary date set for withdrawal and yet no permanent, unending deployment. No cut and run, yet measured progress in helping a people who want to be free without an illusion of overnight success.

The enemy wants us to take the fight into the later rounds. They want to prey on what they perceive is our lack of concentrated focus, and their captured documents refer to the U.S. being worn down and quitting. Iraq’s resolution is very similar to Rosie the Riveter. We bring out and ask the American people to stay strong. During World War II, we fought an enemy whose goal was to invade and dominate the land and the geography and to gain power and spread fascism. Victory cannot be achieved within the different tactics may be in place, Islamofascists want to establish a caliphate covering Southeast Asia,
Southern Europe, and North Africa, very similar to the same geography that we saw in World War II. Zarqawi died in Iraq. Saddam was pulled out of a spider hole in Iraq. The Taliban was defeated in Afghanistan. Taking the fight to the camps. With continued defeat of the insurgency, coalition and allied sharing of intelligence, the Iraqi people working with us to identify safehouses, and the greatest group of unsung Americans sequestered in the backrooms of our intelligence agencies. This resolution is about prevailing against our enemies, about achieving a shared success, Republicans and Democrats with the Iraqi and the Afghan people. This is about taking the fight to those who will strike America again and will wound this Nation and kill our innocent civilians.

America must endure, endure and prevail.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California control the 30 minutes and yield to people.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time of my 30 minutes remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 21 minutes remaining.

Ms. HARMAN. It is now my intention to yield to members of the minority of the House Intelligence Committee who are here.

First, I would yield 3 minutes to Representative BOSWELL who is ranking member on our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence.

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, first off, I want to say to Mr. MURTHA, I salute you, sir. We both served in Vietnam. I had two tours. I never told you this. I don’t go around talking about it much. You don’t either. But Charlie Beckwith, you remember that name, don’t you? In the Iron Triangle? Sometimes we had those assaults and sometimes we had to go bring them out. When we had to bring them out, there were lots and lots of casualties. We did not like to do that.

So this exercise we went through a few months ago, saying that you wanted to make an immediate withdrawal, that is not what you said. I know that, and we all know it because that would be chaos. It needs a plan.

So I come today to share that little bit with you. I finished up my tours in the military as an instructor at the Command Staff College, Department of Tactica. We rewrote 101-5. We might want to talk about that sometime. You might find it interesting. And I would say to Mr. REYES, I would say Mr. REYES, I would say to Mr. BOSWELL, we agreed, and probably everybody in this Chamber support our troops, absolutely, 100 percent. That is not on the table, as far as I am concerned. They are in a difficult mission. They are performing superbly. And we are very, very proud of them. That is not the question.

Last December IKE SKELTON and I, do not know how I got invited, but we got invited to the White House to meet with the President, the Vice President, Mr. Rumsfeld, Ms. Rice, General Pace. And the whole conversation was everything is going really, really good in Iraq. And as I got to engage in conversation with the President, and I said it seems to me what I am hearing here is we have got 90-plus battalions, at that time, and now it is over 100, 20-something brigades, several divisions, armed, equipped, and in the field. And I have been to Iraq. A lot of us have. I am not sure about that, but if that is true, then why don’t we start a withdrawal program carefully?

Do you know when we do best? We do best when we are under a little bit of pressure, when we know we have got to perform, we got to get the job done. And I think that applies to everybody in my life experience, Iraqis included. Under pressure, we went through the liberation of Baghdad. - and that is the problem of how we decided to make the decision. We can debate that if you want to, but I do not want to do that. I supported the resolution based on what information I had. But regardless of that, if we would look at it in these cases we have liberators like the people from Saddam. He is in jail. He is on trial. Now we are occupiers. We want to help them get settled. They had a great election. We all understand that. They have established a government. And it is pretty tough. They got it done, I am told. You know, it is kind of like putting the team on the field. You haven’t seen them play yet together. Maybe they will do well, or maybe they won’t. I don’t know. We don’t know. But we wish them well. We want them to succeed absolutely.

My point is this: they need to take some responsibility and the pressure is on to do it. They have got 254,000 troops trained, equipped, and in the field. We have a right to do, orderly, with a plan, bringing our troops home. We ought to do that. Not run, but an orderly withdrawal.

And I salute you for that, Mr. MURTHA.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a senior member of our committee and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for that. And I salute you for that. My friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that this is a simple choice between retreat and resolve. This is a false choice. It is a political stunt. This is about respect. This is about respect for our role to do our jobs as a Congress in oversight.

We can win this war with a comprehensive and reasoned approach to deployment of our troops. But the President’s supporters characterize any disagreement as cutting and running. It does not wash. This is unfair and it is disingenuous and this is unpatriotic.

The real choice is between blind adherence to Secretary Rumsfeld’s ill-conceived strategy of the small assualt force to fight against an insurgency. Congress has an important role to play in this process, and that is what today’s debate should be about.

In my role as a member of both the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, I traveled to Iraq and paid a great deal of attention to the effects of this war and their impact on our military, on their families, and our intelligence apparatus. There have been and continue to be challenges in our intelligence system in this war.

When the Vice President says that our troops will be greeted as liberators, I have to think that we were not prepared. When the Army’s chief of staff and Secretary Rumsfeld say, we should go to the cities, that a campaign would require many more troops than we were planning to deploy, I have to think that we were not prepared. When the administration cannot get its story straight about the rationale for war and the connection between Iraq and al Qaeda, I have to think that we were not prepared for this war.

These mistakes, these gaps in our knowledge, frankly, cry out for oversight. It is not about resolve versus retreat. It is about respect for this Congress doing its job in oversight. This Congress could have and should have done a better job of conducting oversight and vigorously questioning the statements that have been made by this administration: statements about the presence of WMD or about connections to 9/11 or about the war taking no longer than 6 months.

In fact, when I asked the administration, before we went to this war, whether there was a connection between al Qaeda and Iraq, the answer was no. We could have made America safer by conducting vigorous oversight, but we as a Congress have failed to do that.

At the same time, while most of our men and women have served honorably and bravely, the unsustainable pace of our operations combined with an over-stressed force has led to major problems. It led us on the road to Abu Ghraib and to some of the most heinous allegations lodged against our American troops in history.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the conduct of this war has made us less safe. This is what this debate should be about. It has distracted us from the global war on terrorism. It has hurt recruiting and retention in the military. It has broken our Army for possibly the next decade or more. It has hurt
Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Mr. HOLT of New Jersey, ranking member of the Intelligence Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. I salute Mr. MURTHA, and I salute the servicemen and -women in the field, recovering at Walter Reed, and waiting for whatever that means. Well, today I was meeting with some seventh and eighth graders. And I asked them to help me put in perspective what we are talking about here today, what would we say that 10 years from now we wish that we had said about the war in Iraq.

The first one said, too many lives have been lost already. The second one said, the reasons for going to war were wrong, maybe even deceptive. The third said, the Iraqi people are worse off today than they were when they came. We should ask ourselves how posterity will regard Congress for giving President Bush everything he asked for without oversight, without accountability. There are shifting rationales for war: weapons of mass destruction; oh, no, it was retribution for September 11; no, actually it was about human rights abuses under Saddam; no, actually it was containment and disarmament and the U.N. were not working.

No. No. It was to stand up a democracy that could be emulated throughout the Middle East. No, it was to protect America's strategic interests, including oil. And today we have heard over and over again a response that this is about terrorism.

No, it is not about terrorism. This is not about Khobar Towers. It is not about the USS Cole; it is not even about the World Trade Center. Today's demonstration of how we should have acted when al Qaeda attacked the American forces and harmful to the resistance for the following reasons.

We go on to talk about the formation of the National Guard. He goes on to talk about the impact on the resistance of various improvements there. He goes on to talk about how we the Americans and the Iraqis have undertaken a media campaign against the resistance and it is working.

He goes on to say, the resistance has had to be financed out of the national treasury and restricted. He talks about how, in fact, we have been effective in creating big divisions among the ranks of what he called the resistance.

He then plots to find a way to get America embroiled in yet another conflict with another enemy. And he is speaking of Iran. He then plots on how he might convince us that Iran was further along in its weapons of mass destruction. He then plots no more. Mr. Speaker, we have to get our priorities straight.

Number one, the even, middle-road thing we have to do. We did not go into this war the way we went into, as Congressman MURTHA said, Beirut, only a little bit, only not enough, and only for a little while.

We have gone into the war on terrorist threats with committee, from this Congress, in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in the South of the Philippines, wherever the terrorists may be; and we said we will stay the long haul in each of these places.

My time is short. I just want to do two things. One is, to say that, unlike Congressman MURTHA, I did not serve in combat. But I entered the Army in
1970, and I entered as a grandson of Lebanese immigrants.

And throughout the 1970s and 1980s, and 1990s, I visited Lebanon, and I visited the region, and I got to know my fellow Arabs of the world. And I knew there was a problem and they knew there was a problem where they were addressing. We are now addressing it.

So we will be punished by the opposition any time we either do nothing or do something. But I would rather do something in the interests of freedom. Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, many on this side advocate a strategy for success.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER of Maryland.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, whether you are for or against the war in Iraq, the fact is we are there now and we must support our troops. We must give them the resources they need to do their job.

In Congress and across the country, we all want the same thing. We all want the Iraqi military to be able to take control of their own country and secure their cities so that we can bring our men and women home that are in uniform.

What we disagree on, though, is strategy. We have been staying the course and continuing down a bumpy, dangerous and deadly road for a long time. The American people are losing confidence in the war in Iraq. Americans are turning on the news and opening up the newspaper to see more and more stories about troops being killed by roadside bombs and suicide bombers.

The Department of Defense released today that 2,500 troops have died in the war in Iraq since it began more than 3 years ago, and more than 20,000 have been injured.

The only people sacrificing in this war are the troops and their families. I have been to Iraq four times and just returned from my most recent trip over the Memorial Day recess. I also serve on the House Select Intelligence Committee where I am briefed often on the situation in Iraq and the global war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need a new strategy in Iraq. I believe we must have the Iraqi security forces take on more responsibility in securing their country. We must move American troops to the perimeter of the urban areas and let the Iraqi military patrol the streets in their cities.

Under this perimeter strategy, the American military will still back up the Iraqi military in an emergency. This will reduce the Iraqi dependence on Americans and help them gain confidence in their own ability to secure their country.

This perimeter strategy will free up American troops to start the process of bringing our service members and women home. Having the Iraqi military patrol their own streets will show the Iraqi people that their new government has been created and their own forces are now protecting them.

It will also give the American public new hope that the Iraqis are taking more control of their country and U.S. troops are not put in the dangerous situation of patrolling the Iraqi streets every day.

This perimeter strategy will allow the American military to do what it does best. Our intelligence analysts can use technology to locate insurgents and al Qaeda operatives.

Our special operations forces can focus on high-value targets, and our air power can be used to take them out. Changing the mission of U.S. forces, redeploying them to perimeter areas, and lowering the profile of the U.S. forces in urban areas will break the dependency the Iraqi military has on U.S. forces.

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is not about being a Republican or Democrat. It is about having the right strategy, it is about having the Iraqi military secure its own cities, and it is about bringing our men and women in uniform home.

I believe this new perimeter strategy will help us do that. I also, with the remaining time I have, want to talk about the issue of the Iraqi war versus terrorism. There is no one that I know in the Democratic Party that is not behind the United States fighting the war strongly against terror.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, regretfully this debate on America’s role in Iraq has been converted into a debate on the war on terror.

The Republican leadership has mimicked this House and sought a political squabble instead of a policy debate. The majority leader’s memorandum that was circulated directing his Members to politicize and name call and obfuscate the issue is a disservice to this House and to the country as a whole.

Nothing was gained when the administration first conflated the issue of Osama bin Laden and terrorism with Iraq, and nothing is gained here today by this bald attempt to avoid discussion. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to try to conflate the issue of international terror with Iraq’s insurgency.

Our country’s democratic system requires the active involvement of Congress on key policy questions, particularly the issue of war. Its Members have a patriotic duty to hold the executive branch accountable, especially during a time of war. Troops as well as our citizens at home deserve and expect no less.

Back in 2001 this entire Congress went into Afghanistan against al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, the Taliban and essentially every Member, Republican, Democrat or Independent, agreed with the international community, raling to the side of Americans, rallying to our aid. Our intelligence personnel, special ops forces, military and our allies were there.

But it was not the same case in Iraq where this President, President Bush, prematurely diverted troops and resources out of Afghanistan, before that mission was completed, before Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda and Taliban leaders were captured, and before Afghanistan was stabilized.

President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld chose to start the Iraqi conflict on selective and incomplete intelligence when there was no imminent threat to the United States, without letting the international inspections run their course, without building international support, without a plan to stabilize and rebuild the country and bring our troops home, and ignoring the advice of the top generals about troop strength and strategy.

As a result of those failed judgments made over and over again, our troops have suffered in the field, not having adequate body armor and vehicle for what they have been deployed an unreasonable number of times, and they are under unbelievable stress and danger. Our veterans have received inadequate care, some $3 billion short of what they should be having, and we have experienced a harmful lack of oversight and accountability.

The Iraqi people, more than half of them, are without clean water, 85 percent lack electricity, oil production is lower than what it was before the war started, and there is unemployment of up to 40 percent and billions of dollars American taxpayer money being spent without getting it where it is supposed to go, our troops not getting the safeguards, Iraqis not getting the reconstruction done, and the American taxpayer $360 billion out of pocket. The policy of the Bush administration has done more to harm our military strength and more to harm and misdirect resources away from terror.

United States troops have done their jobs. They got rid of Saddam Hussein, they allowed for the constitution to be drawn and elections to be held, and they trained Iraqi security. The time has come for Iraqis to have the incentive to take control and responsibility for their own security. This idea of an open-ended commitment to stay the course just impedes this goal.

The troop presence our country impedes success and fuels the insurgency. Nine out of 10 Iraqis want a timeline for withdrawal. Seventy percent, including the Prime Minister, want the time set for it. It appears that the Bush-Rumsfeld group wants to be more Iraqi than the Iraqis. It is time to shift the focus to political and diplomatic solutions. It is time to disavow any intention to permanently remain or to keep permanent bases. It is time to revitalized our military, refocus on Afghanistan and Osama bin Laden and the Taliban, and
secure our own country by fulfilling the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Zarqawi’s document:
However, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be of service to the American forces, harmful to the resistance, for the following reasons. Time is on our side. We are making progress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard a lot about who is right and who is wrong. Let me refer, at the outbreak of the Civil War, from Leroy Walker, who later became first Confederate Secretary of War. He said that he could wipe up with one handkerchief all the blood that would be spilled by that bloody conflict. Despite that, he stood in line to be heard. Word is that despite the insurgents’ best efforts, voter turnout may be as high as 72 percent across the country, even in the States, that would be a great turnout.

All I can say is that together we, the United States and the Iraqis, that we didn’t do all that this doesn’t solve everything. Sure, there will be tough days yet to come. But for today, we won, we all won.

Our returning military personnel tell us something else: Iraqi and Americans have the same enemy, bin Laden. They want American forces to come home, but not just yet. Members, now is not the time to go wobbly. Let’s give victory a chance and a lasting peace will surely follow.

Mr. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to explain to our colleagues that this side is not trying to go wobbly. We are trying to articulate what we believe would be a better strategy for success in Iraq.

For our final 2 minutes, I will yield the first minute to Representative CROWLEY of New York, a member of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thought we should start this debate this evening to talk seriously about the problems we are facing in Iraq and begin to talk about our constitutional oversight powers to begin to address this situation. I was wrong.

The American people want a change in our Iraq policy, and as their representatives, we have an incredible opportunity to speak to those concerns. But, quite frankly, we won’t do that today.

As a New Yorker, and as the only Member of this House to lost a relative on 9/11, I am sickened that once again my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to try to spin this as an answer to 9/11.

If we thought that Ann Coulter’s criticism of the Jersey girls who fought for an independent inquiry into the 9/11 attacks was bad, today Ms. Coulter pales in comparison to this Republican-led Congress. Ms. Coulter’s position on 9/11 as a reason for being in Iraq in the first place, when all evidence, all evidence says otherwise.

When I hear my colleagues continue to talk and say that Iraq is a stop in the war on terrorism, we need to ask how do we get to the next stop? What happened to Osama bin Laden? Five years later, we have yet to capture or eliminate the person responsible for that action in the first place. But yet we find ourselves in a quagmire in Iraq. I intend to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHugh), a member of the committee.

Mr. McHugh. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I just want to make a couple of observations. To my colleagues on the minority side, ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you what you wish to debate. No one is telling you what to debate here today. All I have heard you do is complain about what you can and cannot say. I very much want to hear your strategy.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the committee.

Mr. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the final minute of the Intelligence Committee’s time to Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, a member of the National Security Subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee.

I thank Mr. MURTHA for yielding me the 30 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we can say what we want on the floor of this House. We can debate and vote on nonbinding resolutions like this. But what is most important to the American people is not what we say here but what we do here.

This resolution does not commit this House to do anything. It does not require this Congress to take any measures to hold the Bush Administration or ourselves accountable for what is happening in Iraq.

The Bush administration was totally wrong about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. No one is held accountable. The Bush Administration totally miscalculated the number of troops that would be required to provide greater stability on the ground in post-invasion Iraq. No one was held accountable. The Bush Administration got the costs of the war totally wrong. Again, no one was held accountable.

It is a simple principle. If you reward and ignore failure today, you are going to get more failure tomorrow. This House has ignored those failures. While our men and women have been fighting bravely in Iraq, this House has been AWOL when it comes to providing oversight.
We Americans cannot continue to be free if we spend all our time questioning our mission. Many Americans want to debate the validity of prewar intelligence or weapons of mass destruction. Whether one nation or another supported al Qaeda, how many troops we should have to look beyond the tactical challenges.

We must do as Tony Blair did. The people who are fighting us, he said, know what is at stake. The question is, do we?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 60 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) from the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I ask unanimous consent she control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this resolution as the chairperson of the 72-member Out of Iraq Caucus of the House of Representatives. Tomorrow will mark the 1-year anniversary of the Out of Iraq Caucus.

My colleagues and I joined together to form the Out of Iraq Caucus to protect the Bush administration into telling the truth about what is going on in Iraq, to admit their mistakes, and to force them to devise a plan to bring our troops home.

The Bush administration cannot deny that they misled the world about the reasons we invaded Iraq. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. There was no connection between the unfortunate destruction of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. We have not been welcomed with open arms in Iraq. We have no substantial support for this war by other countries. Yet, Mr. Bush, Mr. Cheney, Mr. Rumsfeld, Ms. Rice, Mr. Wolfowitz, and Mr. Karl Rove continue to squander the American taxpayers’ dollars on a war that cannot be won with a military solution.

Here we are 3 years later, 2,500 American soldiers dead, 18,498 U.S. soldiers seriously injured, and Congress has appropriated over $320 billion for this war, and the costs will only continue to rise. Even Condoleezza Rice admitted there have been thousands of missteps. The American people are increasingly aware of this mismanaged, corrupt, and bungled war.

The company that Vice President CHENEY served as CEO of, Halliburton, has been awarded no-bid contracts for billions of dollars, and they have had over $400 million in unsupported costs and another $1 billion in questioned costs. In simple words, they are cheating the American people. Yet they are not held accountable for their criminal actions, and the administration has facilitated these illegal actions.

We formed the Out of Iraq Caucus to oppose any permanent bases in Iraq. We support H.J. Res. 73 to redeploy U.S. forces from Iraq, commonly referred to as the Murtha resolution.

There are a lot of misconceptions about what the Murtha resolution is. So let us take a minute and explain clearly what the resolution says.

Section 1 says: “The deployment of United States forces in Iraq, by direction of Congress, is hereby terminated.” That means a resolution to bring our troops home. Oh, they want to make us sound as if we do not support our troops. We love our troops. We are as patriotic as anybody, and so I would implore my colleagues not to get caught into this trap.

This resolution is not intended to solve any problems or chart a new course that will permit us to preserve the lives of our troops or to be successful in Iraq.

I know what is happening. My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are getting frightened. They went home on the break, and they heard the American people. They saw the polls, and they came back with a Karl Rove-constructed resolution to try and make it seem as if now they get it. But this resolution does nothing. It will only continue to mislead.

We formed the Out of Iraq Caucus to oppose any permanent bases in Iraq. We support H.J. Res. 73 to redeploy U.S. forces from Iraq, commonly referred to as the Murtha resolution.

There are a lot of misconceptions about what the Murtha resolution is. So let us take a minute and explain clearly what the resolution says.

Section 1 says: “The deployment of United States forces in Iraq, by direction of Congress, is hereby terminated and the forces involved are to be redeployed to the earliest practicable date.” They would have you believe this is meant to withdraw immediately. That is not what it says, and let us get that straight today. What that means is there will be no more U.S. troops sent to Iraq and that the troops in Iraq will be redeployed as soon as possible, a judgment that should be made by military officials on the ground. So stop misrepresenting this what the resolution is all about.

Section 3 says: “The United States of America shall pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.” This war cannot be won through military means alone. We must put the full weight of the United States behind diplomacy in order to end bloodshed in Iraq.
The Murtha resolution endorses these principles, and there is no reason why the entire Congress of the United States cannot get behind this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Out of Iraq Caucus supports the Murtha resolution as the clear path for America. We support bringing our troops home, and stop saying we do not have a plan. We have a plan. It is a good plan. It is the Murtha resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be able to control the remainder of the Intelligence Committee's time on this side of the aisle.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, and I commend the brave American and coalition soldiers who have risked their lives to fight terror and promote freedom around the world, including the 14 courageous Delawareans who have lost their lives while honorably serving their State and this Nation.

Despite weeks of significant progress, we are now facing a critical stage in the war on terrorism. I believe an immediate withdrawal or the establishment of a hard deadline to withdraw will be comparable to an abandonment of the new Iraqi Government and would encourage the terrorists and violent factions to bide their time, inviting mayhem and guaranteeing chaos. Such a decision may also embolden our enemies to, once again, attack our homeland and interests abroad, thus further endangering American citizens.

The future of the Middle East and the security of free nations around the world depends upon the development of a strong and stable democracy in Iraq.

Therefore, in order to reach an acceptable level of stability in Iraq, it is extremely important that we intensify our efforts to reduce the influence of militias, destroy electricity, rebuild schools, and assemble a modern and sustainable economy for the benefit of all Iraq's citizens. A greater emphasis on the development of the Iraqi security forces—with a focus on the selection and education of effective military officers, is absolutely imperative so that we may begin supplanting our forces in the region with Iraqi troops at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and I commend the brave American and coalition soldiers and all other personnel who have risked their lives to fight terror and promote freedom both at home and abroad. These courageous men and women have made tremendous sacrifices to ensure our security, and we deserve our utmost respect and appreciation.

There have been three successful elections held in Iraq since the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime, and in recent weeks significant progress, both politically and militarily, has been made in the former enemy of the United States. As a former member of the House Intelligence Committee, I firmly believe that the elimination of al-Zarqawi will prove to be a key psychological and organizational blow to al Qaeda's terrorist network.

Still, the facts are undeniable—progress in Iraq and Afghanistan has come at a tremendous cost. My small State of Delaware alone has lost fourteen brave soldiers, each of whom honorably served their State and Nation. My heart goes out to these noble Delawareans and their families.

And while elections and military victories are crucial, many challenges still lie ahead. We are now facing a critical stage in the war on terrorism, and it is essential that the international community come together to support Iraq's efforts to develop a strong, unified government capable of steering the country toward a path of peace and democracy.

Although, several of my colleagues have suggested that the U.S. should set a hard deadline for withdrawal from the region, I believe an immediate withdrawal or the establishment of a hard deadline to withdraw would be comparable to an abandonment of the new Iraqi government and would encourage the terrorists and violent factions to bide their time, inviting mayhem and guaranteeing chaos. Such a decision may also embolden our enemies to once again attack our homeland and interests abroad, thus further endangering American citizens.

The future of the Middle East and the security of free nations around the world depends upon the development of a strong and stable democracy in Iraq.

Therefore, in order to reach an acceptable level of stability in Iraq, it is extremely important that we intensify our efforts to reduce the influence of militias, destroy electricity, rebuild schools, and assemble a modern and sustainable economy for the benefit of all Iraq's citizens. A greater emphasis on the development of the Iraqi security forces—with a focus on the selection and education of effective military officers, is absolutely imperative so that we may begin supplanting our forces in the region with Iraqi troops at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. Speaker, the thousands of Americans who have served in the war on terrorism exemplify the very courage and honor on which our Nation was formed. It is essential that we recognize their service by continuing to work with our international partners to promote democracy and protect freedom around the world.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership and her strong voice over the years on so many issues, especially with regard to this unnecessary war.

It has been almost 4 years since Congress authorized this unnecessary war, and we are really still not having a debate on Iraq policy. So, quite frankly, this debate is a sham. It attempts to, and you have heard this before and you will hear it again, it attempts to link the war on terror with the bloodshed and violence and killing in Iraq. How deceptive can you be?

As a founding member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I believe that we should be debating and passing the Murtha resolution today. The Murtha resolution would redeploy our troops from Iraq at the earliest practicable date and pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.

Instead, the Republicans continue to play political games at the expense of our brave troops.

This resolution is a disingenuous attempt by the Republicans to really rewrite history by claiming that Iraq is linked to the terrible tragedy of 9/11. This is deplorable. We know now that Iraq had nothing to do with the tragic attacks of 9/11. Yet, the President misled the American people into a war of choice, with no end in sight.

We could have avoided this, and you really wonder Congressman in house and myself, we introduced substitutes to the use of force back in 2002, which would have allowed the United Nations' inspectors to ensure that Iraq was not developing weapons of mass destruction.

And what is the cost of finding out that there are no weapons of mass destruction? Today, we reached the sad milestone of 2,500 American brave troops who have given their lives; and at the end of the war, we have committed close to $900 billion.

Are we any safer as a result of this purposeless war in Iraq? Not according to the 9/11 Commission, whose report gave the administration a failing grade in virtually every category relating to terrorism preparedness.

The Republicans try to claim that Iraq is the central front on the global war on terror, but the fact is that it has undermined our ability to protect our nation. National security professionals recognize this, Mr. Speaker, and let us be clear: we are spending billions of dollars to occupy a country that did not have weapons of mass destruction or terrorist ties. At the same time, we are cutting programs to secure our ports and keep nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists. There is something really wrong.

Worse still, this President and the Republican majority really refuse to level with the American people about when our troops are coming home, also really if they are coming home.

While we are debating this very bogus resolution, the most substantive
decision on Iraq policy in very recent days was taken out by the Republican majority behind closed doors. They stripped from the war supplemental an amendment that we offered to prevent the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq.

The American people do not want an open-ended war and occupation. Quietly removing a measure that was approved by both the House and the Senate is a gross abuse of the democratic process and is further evidence that Republicans are afraid to level with the American people about their real plans for Iraq.

Let me tell you, there will be a day of reckoning. The American people are demanding answers. They deserve a truthful accounting of how we got into this unnecessary war, how the billions of dollars have been misspent and when our troops are coming home, and also, they really deserve to know if our troops are going to be driven from the table.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American people will not forget that, instead of answers to their questions, the Republican majority keeps giving them rhetoric and posturing like they are doing today, and the American people deserve better.

This sham resolution, it really should be rejected. We should support the Murtha resolution. That is what we should do today. That will take steps to end this war. It would take steps to bring our young men and women home; and I tell you, if we do not debate this, we do not know when the opportunity to debate or to have a real debate will take place.

It should have been a real debate today. Unfortunately, this has deteriorated into posturing into rhetoric and into misrepresenting what the facts are.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Maryland, I yield myself 30 seconds to read a quote I mentioned earlier in this debate from Osama bin Laden. He said, “This Third World war is raging in Iraq. The whole world is watching this war. It will end in victory and glory, or misery and humiliation.”

That is not the outcome of the aisle. That is Osama bin Laden.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHRIST).

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we debate the war in Iraq, Afghanistan and the war on terrorism, there will be strong, heartfelt feelings and expressions on this House floor. Let us, however, as we debate have a powerful sense of our resolution, a powerful sense of urgency, a powerful sense of urgency to end the war and to end the war successfully.

A stable, free Iraq, a stable, free Afghanistan will be a blessing to the Iraqis, a blessing to the Afghans and a blessing to the region and the world at large.

The war on terrorism is the next stage of the Cold War. Civilized people who believe in the rule of law, justice, equality and freedom cannot allow self-anointed fanatics to rape, pillage and murder at will around the globe.

A great Islamic theologian once said, “One hour of justice is equal to a hundred years of prayer.” The world wants to hear us. It is our job to end the war in Iraq successfully. The United States, with the assistance of and for the good of the civilized world, can and will defeat terrorism. This debate is our hour of justice.

General Eisenhower said, “The emphasis of the military is on authority and obedience; the emphasis on public office is communication and consent.” As we craft this resolution, I urge you to keep these themes in mind.

And as we will eventually walk across the graves in Arlington Cemetery, we will see the dead. Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved and were loved. And now we lie in Flanders Field.” Let us work together through this debate to figure out how to end the war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, Representative WOOLSEY, 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us voted against this war from the very beginning. In fact, 60 percent of the Democrats voted “no” to the war in Iraq. Since then, we have hosted informal hearings, we have founded the Out of Iraq Caucus, we forced a debate and vote on the House floor, Mr. Murtha overturned his dismissal of redeploy our troops, and last night I gave my 151st 5-minute speech on Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 39 months since our troops were sent to Iraq, and today, more than 37 months after the President declared “Mission Accomplished,” our troops are still there.

Just this week, the President of the United States said this about Iraq, and I quote: “My message to the enemy is don’t count on us leaving before we succeed.” Mr. Speaker, his intelligent proposal to rearm, retrain and redeploy our troops, and last night I gave my 151st 5-minute speech on Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, a leader on national defense affairs, Mr. WICKER.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, what is the status of the President’s program to bring our troops home?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, what is the status of the President’s efforts to bring our troops home?
me that our mission is succeeding and that their sacrifice is accomplishing a valuable service for our effort and for our people. I haven’t surveyed many seventh graders, but the soldiers I see express support for what we are doing and frustration over the coverage they see in the media.

Now, as to the question of where we go from here, two things are certain: Iraq is ground zero in our global war on terror. And the decisions we make will affect U.S. credibility for decades to come.

Al Qaeda attacked our homeland unprovoked on 9/11, and it is that same al Qaeda we fight today in Iraq. We must defeat them there and anywhere else until their terrorist threat has ended. But make no mistake, this is the same enemy that demolished the World Trade Center and attacked the Pentagon.

Another argument we have heard today is that this war was a mistake to begin with. That was unnecessary; it was in fact based on a lie. This view, of course, ignores the fact that intelligence agencies not only in the U.S. but from Israel, Great Britain, Germany, and France, to name a few, were confident in their conclusions that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. President Bill Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright cautioned that it was a real possibility Saddam would use these weapons or share them with terrorists intent on attacking the U.S. again.

But if you think about it, Mr. Speaker, what such an argument really advocates is a present day Iraq with Saddam Hussein still in power. That would have been the logical result of their point of view. An Iraq still ruled by intimidation, humiliation, rape, and torture. A Saddam Hussein still free to continue his proven network of chemical and biological weapons research. A Saddam Hussein still free to advance designs for long-range missiles to threaten our allies and our interests.

To some, this may be an acceptable alternative. But it is not to me. The world is a better place because Iraq is free of Saddam Hussein, and the world will be safer if we maintain our resolve. The administration has embarked on a sound plan for freedom and stability in the region and for better security for our citizens, the cause.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Washington, Representative MCDERMOTT, 5 minutes.

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

Mr. McDermott. Mr. Speaker, this debate begins with one fundamental truth. We are in Iraq and our leaders have no plan to get us out of Iraq.

The President says U.S. soldiers will stay in harm’s way for as long as he says so. “We will stand down,” our leaders say, “when the Iraqis stand up.” In other words, Iraqi clerics and the factions they control and the decisions they make about whether to cooperate with the Iraqi government will determine what we can do. The extent of our involvement, the length of our stay, the number of our dead is controlled by religious clerics in Iraq because they have the ability to alter the resolution before us. This is not an honest debate, an honest attempt to seek answers for our problems in Iraq. It is a debate about a letter of endorsement for the President, not an examination of our options.

Jack Murtha has emerged with a battle plan, and it is no surprise. He is a decorated combat soldier who reflects what the best military minds believe. As a veteran myself of the Vietnam era, I must say that Jack is a soldier, a combat hero who has one and only one goal: To defend our Nation with the finest military and the best plan.

Jack has a plan: Strategic redeployment. It is smart, proud, honest and effective. You can’t win a war with rhetoric and resolutions. You win with a thoughtful plan. I support the Murtha resolution that puts in place a plan to protect our soldiers, protect America’s interests in the Middle East, and protects American people here at home. It is a battle plan that resolves to bring our troops home on a timetable driven by the United States, not subject to the approval of Iraqi clerics. It is a commitment to secure the peace by being smart about the war.

The American soldiers need a battle plan, not a resolution that reflects a bunker mentality of the Republican Party, losing its grip on political control.

Two grim things came out of the Pentagon today. When the President declared “mission accomplished,” 141 people had died. Today, the 2,500th person died. The other thing that came out was a 74-page booklet to help Republicans manage spin control during the Iraq debate on the floor. It is called “The Iraq War Debate Prep Book.” The Defense Department is putting out PR pieces. That is an affront to the American people. It is not a front on the war. The American people want change because the Pentagon under this administration distributes PR pieces about coalition, coalition, coalition. What is the military doing with that kind of stuff up here on the Hill in this body? We see no military plan.

Support U.S. soldiers by passing Jack Murtha’s plan to get out of Iraq.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murphy).

Mr. Murphy. After September 11th, Mr. Speaker, bin Laden’s deputies said, “People of America, your government is leading you into a losing battle. Remember, your government was defeated in Vietnam, fled in panic from Lebanon, rushed out of Somalia, and slipped across the face in Aden. Your government today is leading you into a losing war.” And no wonder. Look at our past. November 1979: 52 Americans taken hostage at the U.S. embassy in Iran. We had a failed response. April 1983: 17 Americans killed at our embassy in Beirut. We took no action. October 1983: 241 Marines killed, 100 wounded. Our Marines were redeployed. April 1986: 259 killed in the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. We sought indictments. February 1993: Six killed and a thousand injured after the explosion of the first World Trade Center bombing. We took them to court. October 1993: 18 U.S. servicemen were killed and 84 wounded in Somalia by our troops. August 1998: 224 killed at U.S. embassies. We fired cruise missiles in Afghanistan and Sudan.
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October 2000, 17 U.S. killed and 30 wounded in the USS Cole attack. We took no action.
However, since September 11 we have been much different. We fought the Taliban in Afghanistan, and now we are fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, and the U.S. is sending a message to the terrorists and the world, and we are different and we are winning.

Now, there will be disagreements between leaders who are retired and current ones. This is part of history. Witness the disagreements between Lincoln and McClellan, Patton and Montgomery, MacArthur and Truman.

But having success. Our troops are being redeployed outside of the cities of Iraq. We are transferring the battle to Iraqi security forces and their police, and now they have a government where they must face the scourge of al Qaeda, and we cannot let them face it alone.

I wish we could finish quickly, but I know we cannot finish hastily. I think one wounded soldier said it to me, summed it up best, he said, I want to go back to the job. I want to finish to fight them there, not in our suburbs.

I know we cannot fight them in our courts. I know we cannot fight terrorists with our police in our streets. I know surely we cannot fight terrorist murderers with diplomacy. Let's finish the job of terrorism, then we bring them home.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as a founding member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I rise in strong support of our brave troops and in strong support of Congressman MURTHA's plan for a responsible redeployment from Iraq.

Americans want the truth about the Iraq war. Americans deserve the truth, and despite all the talk from those who declared this war, inpetibly pursued this war, and still today justify this war, the American people in overwhelming numbers determined for themselves the truth about this war.

Polls taken even after the killing of al Zarqawi show that only 33 percent of American adults think that the results of the war were worth the loss of life and other costs. Only 33 percent approve of the way George W. Bush is handling the situation in Iraq. Only 26 percent of Americans feel that the United States is better off because of the war.

The American people in their wisdom have been able to distinguish reality from rhetoric. The truth has been a major casualty in the war of Iraq.

It is worth reviewing just a few of the statements presented as truth that have been proven to be not true, never tried, and still today not true:

DICK CHENEY said in August 2002, "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction."

And Donald Rumsfeld on the cost, "Well the Office of Management and Budget has come up with a number that is $20 billion for the cost. How much of that will be the U.S. burden and how much will be other countries is an open question."

DICK CHENEY said May 30, 2005, "I think they are in the last throes, if you will, of the insurgency."

And what happens to those experts who tell the truth? Are they heeded and embraced by the Bush administration? Hardly. Although it is now universally agreed we didn't have enough troops to avoid the chaos and violence after the initial invasion, when the Army's top general, Eric Shinseki, testified in February 2003 "something on the order of several hundred thousand soldiers" would be necessary to achieve victory in Iraq, he was immediately fired by Secretary Rumsfeld who said that "the idea it would take several hundred thousand U.S. forces I think is far off the mark." Shinseki was quietly ushered into retirement, and Secretary Rumsfeld remains in place leading the failed Bush administration policy in Iraq.

When Dr. Lawrence Lindsey, former assistant for economic policy to the President, told the Wall Street Journal in September 2002 that the war's cost could reach $400 billion, he was fired by the President.

Yet by the end of this year we will have spent $450 billion in Iraq. Some say at the end of the day the war will cost $1 trillion taxpayer dollars.

Since the time the President announced on May 1, 2003 that "major combat operations in Iraq have ended," more than 2,350 U.S. soldiers have lost their lives, and the President has not attended a single one of their funerals.

And the United States is spending in excess of $8 billion a month to wage the war. That is $266 million a day, $11 million an hour, $185,000 a minute and $3,100 a second, every second for this war.

Certainly we could have afforded body armor and proper Humvees for our soldiers.

We could have insured 165 million children for 1 year, provided more than 13 million American students with 4-year scholarships at public universities, fully funded global anti-hunger efforts for 11 years, give basic immunization to every child in the world for 92 years, and I believe that would have bought us more security than invading Iraq has done.

Our military men and women have done a magnificent job in the Iraq theater and deserve better. The civilian leadership in the White House and the civilian leadership in the Pentagon have failed. Time after time they have been wrong. They projected the cost of the war, and they got it wrong. They projected the length of the war, and they got it wrong. They predicted the existence of weapons of mass destruction: wrong. They predicted the Iraqi reaction to our occupation: wrong. They got the reconstruction of Iraq wrong. When it came to providing needed equipment, they got it wrong.

And who will pay the price for those mistakes? None of the architects of this war. No one of them has been held accountable. The only ones paying the price are dead and wounded soldiers, our men and women in uniform.

We need a new direction in Iraq. The majority has nothing to offer in terms of a plan, just more political ploys, more talk, more mistakes like those cited today.

It is time to redeploy our troops from Iraq. There is a plan, the Murtha plan; and we should make sure that we are not establishing a permanent military presence there.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEG).

Mr. SHADEG. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to terrorism and in support of honoring our commitments. I rise in support of this resolution.

It is clear that one-half of those engaged in this debate believe we need to get out of Iraq and believe we need to get out soon. In support of their position, they cite mistakes that were made leading to the war and mistakes that have been made in conducting the war, and they cite the recent increase in terrorist attacks and incidents.

Let me make it clear. Mr. Speaker, reenging on our commitment to defeat terrorism in Iraq now would be a mistake of monumental proportions for which future generations would pay a high price.

Of course mistakes have been made. In every human endeavor, mistakes are made. That is the nature of human endeavors.

I personally am convinced we had too few troops in Iraq when Baghdad fell. I joined my colleague JOHN MCCAIN in visiting Iraq. I have been there multiple times, and it was obvious to me...
we needed more troops there. I have joined his call for sending more troops repeatedly, and I join those who call for sending temporarily more troops now to take advantage of the defeat of Zarqawi as an opportunity to crush the insurgents. And no doubt, other mistakes have been made, but if other mistakes have been made, they do not justify cutting and running.

Recently, a constituent of mine, a Vietnam War helicopter pilot, approached me in Phoenix and said, This war is unlike Vietnam. It is unlike Vietnam, he explained, because were we to abandon this effort without succeeding, make no mistake about it, the consequences would be far reaching and disastrous.

Let’s talk about some of those.

First, it would be a humiliating defeat for the United States. Look no further than the words of Osama bin Laden. He said: “The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries. It is either victory and glory, or misery and humiliation.”

Future commitments by the United States could be scoffed at by our allies and by our enemies around the world for generations to come. It would shatter the trust we have built amongst our allies in the region. The newly elected Iraqi Government, and I find it ironic that we are having this debate within days of its selection, would collapse and we would have the creation of a radical, oil-funded terrorist state. But sadly and most importantly, to fail now would establish beyond a shadow of a doubt that our brave soldiers, men and women, who gave of their lives or suffered grave injuries that will be with them for the remainder of their lives did so in vain.

Most importantly, it is not necessary. We can succeed, but the path to defeating terrorism in Iraq is not surrender; it is resolve. The opponents argue that we have suffered recent increases in violence and insurgent attacks. The increase in those attacks is not proof that we are losing, and it is certainly not proof that we cannot prevail. Rather, I submit to you it is proof that the insurgents understood that the period leading up to the election of a permanent representative government in Iraq was their best chance, and they took their best shot. And they failed.

For all that is rational, for that is honorable, we must not now within days of the election of that new permanent government cut and run. No, indeed, we must give it an opportunity to do its job, an opportunity to succeed.

Now, those who say that we are losing the war, by their own admittance, Al Qaeda in Iraq is acknowledging that it is falling in Baghdad. I urge us not to cut and run now for our children and for our grandchildren.

Mr. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first let’s note what a degradation of democracy is taking place here.

The majority party has put forward a resolution that allows no amendment. There will be a debate in which those of us who think some things are good and some things bad, contrary to every reasonableness, to this procedure, will have no opportunity to say so.

Here is the tactic that is being used: they take a number of things that people agree with, they mix in with them things which are quite controversial. They take them as if they were not separable.

Let me say what I have said again before. The majority party thinks the way to legislate is the way you feed a pill to a dog: you take the unpalatable with the popular.

Now I will have to say this: one of the things we are trying to do is to persuade the people in Iraq to be able to work together and make democracy work. We are trying to persuade, we are asking the Sunni to work with the Shiites. We are trying to tell the majority Shiites to share power.

Mr. Speaker, how can you and your party believe that we inspire people to share power by giving the example of its monopolization in an abusive fashion? I just hope that the members of parliament in Iraq who may hear about this will remember a very important point: please do not try this at home.

This war in Iraq came after September 11. It was not the response to terrorism the war in Afghanistan was. I am struck in listening to the Members on the other side of the aisle that Afghanistan appears to have too many syllables for them to pronounce. What is in fact happening is that the war in Afghanistan, which was the response to the terrorist attack, which was almost unanimously supported here and by Democrats in the Senate is in fact not going as well as it should.

One of the prices we are paying for the war in Iraq is the deterioration in Afghanistan. Now, the war in Iraq was launched based on a couple of lies we were told. And I am struck to hear people still defending the arguments about the weapons of mass destruction. It seems my colleagues on the other side have decided to adopt a Marxist idea. The Marx in question, of course, is Chiao, and that is that you are going to believe, me or your own eyes? Having been repudiated overwhelmingly by the facts, they stick to the rhetoric.

Here is the price we are paying. We shouldn’t have gone in. Of course having gone in, we are victimized by one of the most incompetently administered examples in American national security history. But here is the price we pay: the war in Afghanistan deteriorates our ability to protect ourselves at home. Every day that we say that we can’t afford communications, we can’t afford more people at the border, we can’t afford port security, every time people hear that we can’t afford something that would enhance our security at home, understand that it is the war in Iraq that makes it impossible for this Nation to afford it.

If we did not have these hundreds of billions being drained there, we could take care of the agenda.

Finally, it constrains us elsewhere in the world. It has led to an increase in anti-Americanism which I deplore, with which I disagree, but it is a fact.

Our ability to deal with the potential Iranian nuclear weaponery is constrained by the fact that we are in Iraq. In fact, the Iranians have been among the major beneficiaries of what we have done in Iraq.

So you went into a war on the basis of two lies. You have handled it incompetently. We are now at the point, well, does that mean you pull out? And here is the point. You have one hand that there is great success. We have built a government, et cetera, et cetera. But also, you tell us simultaneously that if we withdrew American troops the house of cards fails. Well, which one is it? Have you successful entity in Iraq? If you have, why can’t we pull out? Why can’t 28 million people in Iraq, with a couple of hundred thousand Iraqis under arms deal with 15 or 18,000 terrorists?

The fact is that this is a failed policy that gets worse every day.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Dr. WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, the President’s plan, and our troops.

In recent days U.S. and Iraqi forces have dealt terrorists in Iraq a decisive blow. The brutal leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu al Zarqawi, responsible for thousands of deaths and widespread anti-Americanism which I deplore, has met his end, and none too soon, thanks, mainly to our troops, courageous men and women in the field who got the job done.

And let us not forget, Ramzi Yousef, the man who plotted and attempted the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center that could have led then to tens of thousands of deaths, was an Iraqi intelligence agent.

And let us remember the great accomplishments of our troops in the field. It is far too long that has focused only on the negative and has chosen only to report bad stories, stories of terrorist attacks. Indeed, for every story that reports heroism and accomplishment of our troops in the field, our American news media ignores it and instead looks for a negative story to report.

Well, let us report on one good story, a great story that shows that we are getting the job done and the Iraqi people are with us. And indeed, this
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, especially after my recent visit, that progress is being made in Iraq. But much of that would be lost if we prematurely remove our troops before the Iraqi people are fully capable of governing and securing their own country.

Success in the global war on terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan is the defining challenge of our generation, whether some war opponents like it or not.

As bin Laden’s deputy has declared Iraq to be the place for the greatest battle, where he hopes to expel the Americans and then spread the jihad wave to secular countries neighboring Iraq. Such statements reaffirm why withdrawing our troops would be a disaster for the future of Iraq.

Our own national security can actually embolden those who hate our way of life to further harm us. A premature withdrawal or premature deployment home would represent a clear defeat for American interests, not just in Iraq, but in the wider region around the globe. Terrorists everywhere would take heart at this serious blow to our credibility.

Frankly, if we were to abandon the Iraqis now, who in the world would openly assist us in the global war on terror? What country would allow our military to deploy and operate on its territory? Worse yet, who would dare to be seen as our partner, ally or friend?

As even the Washington Post said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in its lead editorial, Iraq’s new democratic government deserves a chance to succeed. And yes, this is the time to support our brave young warfighters, who are truly doing the work of freedom, and not undercut their service and sacrifice.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Ms. SIMA rising in support of the resolution. I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I agree with most of what has been said.

I support the Murtha proposal for an immediate and orderly redeployment. There is much here, however, and that is the role of the American oil barons who have contributed greatly to the colossal mess of the war in Iraq.

Our troops today are as good as they were when they were labeled the greatest generation and defeated Hitler. But in Iraq, today’s counterparts of Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, the Colin Powells, the John Murraths, they were not allowed to take charge. Lust for control of the oil made the oil barons push everyone capable of carrying out a reasonable destruction of Saddam Hussein’s regime. This administration encouraged the oil barons to overrule the military professionals. Lust for oil is still the problem. Seduced in America, but very much on the minds of the people of Iraq. We cannot succeed as long as the ordinary Iraqi people see us as oil thieves responsible for the terror and their daily misery.

We went into Iraq fighting fanatics, fighting Saddam Hussein and his oligarchy of brutal, decadent killers. No great crowds greeted our troops with flowers. But there is good reason to believe that the masses of citizens were hoping for some real improvements. But we guarded only the oil wells, while the water systems and the electricity grids collapsed.

As the Iraqis observed our preoccupation with oil, the insurgency began to grow. The leadership of the oil barons could not run a country, and they could not manage an occupation.

Oil revenue must be addressed in order to regain the confidence of the Iraqi masses. We need a transparent, open, full discussion of what are the arrangements that have been proposed, what is being proposed or what contracts are already in place.

Chevron, BP, Exxon, they are there. Contracts have been written. Is there a committee in this House or a subcommittee that knows what kinds of contracts have been written? What will the Iraqi people have left after these contracts are executed before the government was in place.

Oil is the greatest resource that Iraq has, of course. They are number four among the nations of the world. To what degree is Halliburton going to control the revenues as their payment for reconstruction of some of the oil wells? To what degree are the foreign oil companies going to control revenue because of their arrangements for the pipelines and the shipping and retail outlets? What is going to happen to the oil? These are the questions that the Iraqi people are asking. Everybody in every section of the country wants to know how are the oil revenues going to be distributed? If I live in a province where there is no oil, will my area benefit?

These questions need to be answered honestly. Congress must seize the initiative from the American oil barons and demand justice for the Iraqi citizens. The oil belongs to them. We must win their trust and separate the masses of the Iraqi people from the fanatical murderers. Follow the logic of the Murtha resolution. Give the people control of their oil revenues and get out of Iraq. We can do that when we have the trust of the Iraqi people.

When the Iraqi people have their own revenues, they can equip their own police forces. They can take charge of their government in a competent way. They can use these funds to build their country.

Out of the Iraq. Give the people control of their oil revenues.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the defense appropriations subcommittee from gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

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

Mr. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I might offer that I am proudly a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus out of a duty and a sense of patriotism and love of my country. And so this is a very somber debate.

And I remind my colleagues of the very tense moments of the presentation of Secretary Powell before the United Nations. All of us were in a sense of awe, listening to the devastating evidence of why we should go to Iraq. So I come to this podium today with a very heavy heart because we are constrained, not Members of Congress, because we are of no relevance, but the American people are constrained in not allowing a debate or dissent. That is what this administration is trying to do. And we should not allow that to happen. We should allow the American people to have their say, and then we can have no dissent, we can have no recognition that Democrats and others, we do have a plan.
And so, on the birthday of the Army, I want to salute the Army. Mr. Murtha, I want to salute you for your service and your plan. And I want to salute all of the United States military. And might I say that our soldiers are doing their job. They have done their job. And one of the things that they need is a mission, a mission for the casualties are some 19,000, and today, I am very sad to say that 2,500 of them are now dead.

And so I come with a heavy heart to suggest that there are myths that we need to overcome. And one of them is that there is something called “cut and run.” It is not “cut and run.” It is the opportunity of involvement, debate and patriotism, a belief that we can put forward a plan that the American people will believe in.

The Bush Iraq policy has harmed the United States military, and I might say that I am glad to stand with a retired Marine Lieutenant General, Greg Newbold, who says, “my sincere view of the American military is the war forces to this was done with a casualness and a swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results.”

And so I come again to suggest that there is no “cut and run.” There is reality. A Pentagon commission study concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operation in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force. We realize that the large and extended deployment of the National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. We realize that resources are being diverted and, therefore, we are not able to fight the global war on terror.

I don’t want my friends to pigeonhole us. We want a debate and a plan to save lives—lives without a free, independent, and democratic Iraq. That can happen with a new change, a new day, Democrats and others, who believe in leading this country to a new future. I don’t want the same old plan, and I am not ashamed of saying so. That is why I am here to open the doors to dissent, tell the American people to come marching into the United States Congress. Don’t let us talk for you. You want redeployment. You want the troops out. You don’t believe the Democrats are in ‘cut and run.’

You understand that the General, Lieutenant General, has said we are careful about this war. Come home.

Murtha plan, the Out of Iraq Caucus is proud of our patriotic stand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleness for yielding. I rise to speak on H.R. 861, a resolution which declares that the “United States will prevail in the Global War on Terrorism.” I believe that it is the resolve of all Members of this House and of all Americans. But to prove the global war on terror, we must remain focused on the global war on terrorism, and not allow ourselves to be diverted or distracted.

Unfortunately, we have been distracted from waging a full-scale, all-out global war on terrorism by the President’s fateful decision to go to war in Iraq. Before and after 9/11, Iraq was not a part of the global war on terror, much less the central front. It only became so when the President launched his ill-advised preemptive attack on Iraq.

I am proud to be among the majority of House Democrats who voted against the Resolution Authorizing the Use of Military Force, AUMF, in 2002, which authorized the President to use military force to disarm Iraq of its alleged weapons of mass destruction, WMD. I voted against going to war in Iraq because I thought it a diversion from the important task facing the Nation and that was winning the global war on terror. History has shown that we were right. The ill-advised rush to war in Iraq has not only been a diversion from the war on terror but a strategic disaster of epic proportions. As Thomas Jefferson would say, to prove this let facts be submitted to a candid world.

We just learned today the sad news that the 2,500th soldier has been killed in Iraq. More than 19,000 others have been wounded. The Bush administration’s open-ended commitment of U.S. troops to Iraq has weakened the U.S. Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserves. The extended deployments in Iraq have eroded U.S. ground forces and overall military strength. A Pentagon-commissioned study concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operations in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force. So more than 3 years of a continuous deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq has:

1) Contributed to serious problems with recruitment, with the U.S. Army missing its recruitment targets last year;
2) Forced the Army to lower its standards for military recruits; and
3) Led to military equipment shortages that hamper the ability of U.S. ground forces to do their job in Iraq and around the world.

The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard’s high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.

(1) War in Iraq has diverted resources and attention from other fronts in the fight against global terrorist networks.

The killing of Musab Al-Zarqawi last week was a major success for U.S. troops, but it is not likely to diminish Iraq’s insurgency. Iraqis make up 90 percent of Iraq’s insurgency, unlike foreign fighters like Zarqawi, and a primary motivation for Iraq’s insurgency is the U.S. troop presence. Even after the Samarra shrine attack in February threatened to push Iraq into all-out sectarian civil war, the vast majority of attacks still target U.S. forces.

Outside of Iraq, the Bush administration has failed to present a realistic strategy for countering the threat posed by global terrorist networks. In a recent survey of more than 100 of America’s leading foreign policy experts conducted by Foreign Policy magazine and the Center for American Progress, eight in 10—84 percent—do not think that the United States is winning the war on terror. The war in Iraq has not helped America win the broader fight against global terrorists.

By invading Iraq without a realistic plan to stabilize the country, the Bush administration created a new terrorist haven where none had previously existed.

By maintaining an open-ended military presence in Iraq, the Bush administration is presenting U.S. terrorist enemies with a recruitment tool and rallying cry for organizing attacks against the U.S. and its allies.

According to the National Counter-Terrorism Center, the number of large-scale terrorist attacks in Iraq increased by over 100 between 2004 and 2005, with a total 8,299 civilians killed in 2005. Osama bin Laden remains at large and Al Qaeda offshoots proliferate.

By diverting resources and attention from Afghanistan to an unnecessary war of choice in Iraq in 2003, the Bush administration has left Afghanistan exposed to a resurgence of the Taliban and Al Qaeda. The United States needs to complete the mission in Afghanistan and cannot do it with so many troops bogged down in Iraq.

By focusing so many U.S. resources on Iraq, the Bush administration has taken its eye off the ball in places like Somalia, which was overrun by Islamist militias tied to Al Qaeda last week.

(2) The War in Iraq has increased the burden on U.S. taxpayers without stabilizing Iraq or making Americans safer.

Over the last 3 years, the United States has spent more than $300 billion in Iraq, yet the investment has failed to stabilize Iraq or improve the overall quality of life for most Iraqis. According to the Congressional Research Service, total assistance to Iraq thus far is roughly equivalent to total assistance, adjusted for inflation, provided to Germany—and almost double that provided to Japan from 1946 to 1952. Yet on key metrics like oil production, Iraq has failed to advance beyond pre-war levels, and quality of life indicators remain dismal:

- Oil production is below pre-war levels—2.6 million barrels per day in 2003 vs. 2.1 million barrels per day in May 2006;
- The majority of water sector projects and health care clinics planned in 2003 remain not completed, despite spending hundreds of millions of dollars;
- One in three Iraqi children is malnourished and underweight, according to the United Nations Children’s Fund.

Rather than a record of progress and achievement, the Bush administration’s record is one of corruption, waste, and terror. The war in Iraq has cost Americans $8.8 billion given to Iraqi ministries by the Coalition Provisional Authority, CPA, remains unaccounted for, according to the Congressional Research Service;
Iraqi Defense Ministry officials spent $1 billion on questionable arms purchases; the Interior Ministry has at least 1,100 ghost employees, costing $1.3 million a month. In short, we have no strategy, no support from our allies in the region, a nascent civil war in the country we are supposed to be helping, an overstretched military, a misdirected counterterrorism effort, and a massive diversion of funds in support of a failed effort.

The Bush administration and its rubber-stamp Republican allies in the House have politicized national security in the past. They have used national security as a wedge issue to divide the country and push for policies that have not made Americans safer. But today a majority of Americans are now skeptical about the Bush administration’s Iraq policy.

Myth 1: Democrats want to quit while we are ahead and the Iraqis are just getting started. Conservatives argue that Democrats who criticize and offer alternatives are snatching defeat from the jaws of victory,retreating just as the Iraqi Government needs the most help. Fact: The time has come for the United States to give Iraqis the incentive to stand on their own two feet and take control of their own destiny. A few short months, the U.S. military involvement in Iraq will be longer than it took the United States to win World War II. The open-ended commitment of U.S. troops fuels as much as it retards the insurgency and civil conflict in Iraq. Nearly 9 in 10 Iraqis approve of the U.S. withdrawing, and 70 percent of the Iraqi public supports the withdrawal of U.S.-led forces by the end of 2007. A growing number of Iraqis, including the new prime minister, are saying that Americans must begin to leave. U.S. troops have done their share. By getting rid of Saddam Hussein, they have given Iraqis an historic opportunity to take charge of their destiny.

By fostering the birth of the constitution and the holding of elections, they have assisted in the beginning of a new democracy. They have trained more than a quarter of a million Iraqi security forces. It would be self-defeating for the United States to want Iraq to succeed more than Iraqis do.

Myth 2: Democrats offer only “cut and run” and “retool and defeat.” Facts: Beating opponents will not divert attention from a failed policy. Staying the course and offering a vague and open-ended commitment of U.S. troops gives Iraqis a blank check and a veto of America’s national security.

The key question is: Where is Iraq now, and where does it go from here? And the many mistakes made by the Bush administration—including sending in too few troops to secure the country and invading without a clear and realistic plan for Iraq’s reconstruction—have made the situation in Iraq much worse off than it should have been. Iraq has become a failing state and is suffering from several major internal conflicts—in large part the consequence of the Bush administration’s failure to plan for the post-war situation. And moving forward requires Iraqis, not Americans, to be in charge of the future.

Myth 9: Democrats just want to criticize and politicize Iraq and do not have plans about what to do. Facts: This is simply not true. A growing number of leading Democrats and other progressive leaders have offered realistic alternatives about what the United States should do next to set the right course in Iraq. Nearly all progressive plans recognize that the United States must intensify its political and...
Mr. Chairman, I close by quoting from the Declaration of Independence and the motto of the U.S. Army, which marks its 231st anniversary today and goes together. But I do so because real patriots have courage—courage to face the truth and the courage to speak truth even when it is unpopular. The Declaration of Independence, with its affirmation of the inalienable human rights of liberty, with its pursuit of happiness gave patriots the courage to fight for a cause that was just but at the time thought by most to be unattainable. A motto of the U.S. Army is “We will not falter, we will not fail.” The war in Iraq does not help us in the global war on terror. There are only two directions to take in Iraq: President Bush’s plan of staying the course and letting a future President clean up the mess, or the Murtha plan to change the direction of that course. I stand with Representative Murtha in calling for the redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq to make our country safer, our military stronger, and the region more stable. I support the Murtha plan. It is the only plan for success in Iraq that is worthy of the sacrifices made by our troops. And I support a plan for greater coalition support for Iraq as it moves to protecting itself as a sovereign nation.

Our troops in Iraq have never faltered and they have never failed. They were never defeated in battle. They won the war they were sent to fight. They completed their mission. They accomplished magnificently. Well done. Well done. Well done.

Our troops have earned the right to return home and be reunited with their families and loved ones. Now is not the time for us in Congress to falter or fail. Now is the time to embrace a plan for our troops in Iraq that offers a chance of success. We need a plan that will work. There is only one such plan. It is the Murtha plan that allows for redeployment of our troops as soon as practicable and allows for redeployment of troops at the perimeter of Iraq to be useful in time of crisis. This is a plan that will work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution of unconsent capacity as chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Health. I was fortunate enough to visit the American cemetery in Normandy, France that is located overlooking Omaha Beach. Our brave soldiers during World War II were in France not to fight the French, but to fight the Nazis that had occupied France.

Today our soldiers are not in Iraq and Afghanistan to fight the citizens of those countries, but we are there to fight the insurgents and the Taliban. In listening to the debate today, it reminded me of my visit and reading some of the names of the brave soldiers that fought for our Nation during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 9,300 patriots buried in Normandy today. Those brave souls fought in a war against the forces of evil then, just as our soldiers in Iraq are fighting against the forces of evil today. We realize all too well what happened to those brave soldiers fighting in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I think many of us today are trying to share some of the good stories and recognize all the positive things that our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are doing for us.

The good news is that now women in Afghanistan are able to vote in democratic elections for the first time in their lives. The good news is that Iraqi citizens are now able to protest and let their opinions be heard in public.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I support the Murtha resolution.

This war of choice so far has cost us the lives of close to 2,500 American men and women, let alone tens of thousands of Iraqis living off $320 billion, and has weakened the United States’ prestige and brought our interests and our values into question to a degree not seen since the Berlin Wall divided Europe.

It is our failure here in Congress to perform our duty of oversight which has cost America most. From the beginning of the march to war, the President and his advisers blinded into failure after failure. False claims about African uranium and mobile anthrax labs were pursed in Iraq. Dick’s Olds, Saddam’sisseals to al Qaeda.Stubbornly ignoring the advice of the uniformed military about troop levels. Turning a blind eye to the venal corruption that swallowed $9 billion of Iraqi money, U.N. Oil-for-Food, with an trace. Shame on us.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers in their wisdom gave us a mechanism, a defense against tyranny called congressional oversight, and it is about time we start doing our duty to the American people. It is about time we have that oversight. While I welcome this debate, it is a poor substitute for what we really should have been doing.

I call upon you to withdraw this empty resolution, this meaningless, self-congratulatory, fraudulent scam and let us work together to examine our mistakes, fix them, and bring our troops home. Let Iraqis rebuild their own nation.

The President says we need to stay in Iraq until the mission is complete, but the President cannot explain to the American people exactly what the mission is, let alone tell us when he expects to complete it. Let us take credit towards victory by sighting the completion of a democratic government in Iraq and killing the biggest terrorist there, claim these as a victory, and keep our word by honorably deploying our forces. Three and a half years is hardly cutting and running.

We all share the same dream that the Iraqi people do. We want them to live in peace in a secure and prosperous society where they are free to choose their government. But the presence of our troops and our occupation of Iraq has become such an obstacle to that future that we can no longer ignore reality. How can we win a war against terrorism when terrorism is a concept? You must change the hearts and the minds to succeed.

So let us work together to bring our courageous troops home and put an end to this devastating war of choice.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Ms. WATSON of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I would speak on this issue. I do support this resolution, but more than that, I would like to remind people why we are here.

There are not many in this room, but there are a few that remember 1939. I lived in that era and I listened to people speak about “Hitler’s really not a bad guy. He’s just minding his own business. He’s taking care of his people. We shouldn’t be involved.” Fifty-two million people later, we won World War II. We should have knocked him in the head when we had a chance instead of listening to Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of Britain. We should have aggressively pursued him as we did Saddam Hussein. In my heart of hearts, I believe that we would be, in fact, in a nuclear war if we had allowed him to continue his trek.

But this President stood up and he was a leader and he stopped it. Now we have done the deed and we are in a place where we should continue and finish this job.

Someone said this is not a cut and run, that we have been there 3½ years. But I ask you to ask your military people, ask those people out at Walter Reed, as I have. Most of them are proud of their service and their duty. And I salute each one of them, him or her,
and the commanding officers who fulfilled their duty.

If you believe in democracy and believe in peace, we must continue this trip that we started. We must finish it and make sure that democracy reigns in the Middle East. If we do not do so, we would have lost our very raison d'être to our armed services and America as a whole. Remember, "He's really not a bad guy. He's just minding his own business. It's his country." Fifty-two million people later, the war was ended. Our people, their families, many in this House are not happy about this. The Bush administration has failed to fulfill its responsibilities to our troops, veterans, and all Americans. This resolution falls them.

It is a sad day when this resolution is the only thing that can be offered for our servicemen and women. Francisco Martinez Flores did not die in vain. He deserves the very best. The American people deserve a real debate.

Bring our troops home and no permanent bases in Iraq.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the families of East Texas, especially those with loved ones serving overseas, I strongly support this resolution.

Despite what the national media portray, the inconvenient truth is this: Terrorists have been attacking America since before the 1970s. We should have learned we cannot push America's security forward by retreating from terrorism. We cannot strengthen the world by weakening our resolve, and we cannot support our troops by belittling them at every turn.

It is clear to all but perhaps us that the terrorists' strategy is not to defeat America in Iraq. They cannot do that. Their strategy is to defeat America in America. They are counting on the American public to lose its will and for Washington politicians to undermine the morale and support of our troops overseas.

The truth is if America quits, if America turns back now, no nation, no community will be safe from terrorism again. Terrorists will learn that they can wait us out one public opinion poll at a time. And the next time America is attacked, the next time innocent people die and we vow justice, who will believe us then? Who will support us then?

I stand with the President. We must persist in Iraq and Afghanistan until these nations are no longer safe havens for terrorism. We have "taken the hill" against the terrorists. Too many Americans have sacrificed their lives for us to give it back now. Americans like Chief Warrant Officer Chuck Fortenberry of Woodville, Lance Corporal Shane Goodman of Orange, Staff Sergeant Christopher Everett of Huntsville, Specialist Michael Weger of Spring, and Specialist Hoby Bradfield of The Woodlands, among many.

Our troops have proven they will not quit. The question is will we? Our troops' holdout is at stake. The question is do we?

Let us not snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Let us put aside our partisan politics and unite until terrorism is truly and soundly defeated.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding and for her leadership on a real strategy against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. It contains no plan, no solution, no way forward. I support the Murtha plan, which clearly offers more strategies to leverage U.S. forces to redeploy and be ready.

Indeed, the invasion in Iraq has diverted our Nation from the war on terrorism and created a new terrorist training platform. Across the Middle East, Central Asia, Africa, and the Pacific, United States policy has engendered more hatred, yielding a counterreaction of more radicalism and protest.

In Egypt, the most populous Arab nation and a key ally in the Middle East and Africa, recent parliamentary elections yielded a quantum leap in representatives from the Muslim Brotherhood, a radical anti-Western party. This group now comprises 88 members of their parliament, up nearly 25 percent from 17 in the 2000 election.

In the Palestinian Authority, the peace process with Israel is dead. Rather than parties moving toward peace with Israel, we witness another tragic breakdown as Fatah and Hamas mass in the streets and Israelis and Palestinians shoot and kill with abandon.

Mogadishu, Somalia has just fallen into the hands of Muslim extremists. That failed state is another breeding ground for terrorism.

In Afghanistan more loss of life has resulted this year than at any time since the U.S.-led invasion and President Karzai remains a prisoner of circumstance, unable to move freely without heavily armed guards.

Mr. Speaker, we are not winning the war on terrorism. The situation in Iraq teeters on all-out civil war between the Sunnis and the Shiias.

To win the war on terrorism, the United States must use our military assets wisely, not just robustly. We must transfer policing to Iraqi forces and remove ourselves as a source of friction.

Secondly, we must decouple ourselves from the repressive oil dictatorships that create regional antagonisms there and become energy independent here at home.

Thirdly, the Palestinian-Israeli standoff must be elbowed to the peace table, because it is a primary lightning rod for unrest across the region.

Our current presence in Iraq is counterproductive in the broader war on terrorism. Meanwhile, diplomatic efforts are not currently funded by this administration. Unfortunately, this resolution offers no plan. It offers no solution. It offers no way forward.
This Congress should support the Murtha plan for our military forces, redeploy and be ready.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself the remainder of the time allocated to the Intelligence Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2½ minutes.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the first 5 hours of this debate, trying to listen carefully to each speaker. And it seems to me that some people try, as best they can, to isolate Iraq from the rest of the war on terror.

Now, that may be politically convenient for them to do, but it is not what the real world is like. As a matter of fact, it was not long ago that we found a letter from Zawahari, Osama’s number two, to Zarqawi in Iraq talking about tactics.

Just as the Cold War had several battlefronts, the war on terrorism has several battlefields across the globe. And I believe that it is clear from their own words, the terrorists see Iraq as the central front in our war against them now and into the future.

Secondly, we seem to have a lot of armchair strategists who want to redeploy this way or redeploy that way, because they say nothing is going right. I would recommend they read the document found this morning, or released this morning, that was found in Zarqawi’s house.

It says that things are going pretty well for us, and not so well for them. I think it is a little early to give up.

Thirdly, there are a lot of people who want to debate the procedures or debate Congress’s job or debate past decisions. And it is true, history will have to pass judgment on decisions that the military commanders and the President and the Congress have made in the past. They will do so when the air of partisanship has faded.

But the truth is, however you feel about where we are, we are where we are. And the question is, do we leave a job half done? Do we leave early, and leave those Iraqis who are willing to put their lives on the line by being part of the government or part of the police force or part of the military, do we abandon them when they are trying to build a country? I think that would be a mistake.

In fact, I think to retreat at this point, whether you call it a strategic retreat, a strategic redeployment, or whatever word you want to use to back up now, will only embolden the terrorists. We have seen time after time, when they sense political vacillation, they strike. They struck in Istanbul in 2003, in Madrid in 2004, in London in 2005.

Where they sense weakness, it is like an animal. Where they sense fear, they attack. We have got to do better and make sure we win this war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, ground zero on the global war on terror is not, never was Iraq. It was Afghanistan: 9/11, it was planned in Afghanistan by Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda, with the complicit help of the Taliban.

In a near-unanimous vote on the floor of this House, we voted to go in there and root them out and end that threat once and forever. But something happened on the road to victory, the defeat of al Qaeda and the eradication of the Taliban and al Qaeda, and the capture, dead or alive, of Osama bin Laden. Remember that.

We got the middle of Iraq. And today the Taliban, al Qaeda, and Osama bin Laden are still at large and they are re-surgent. I just saw 800 Oreganians off to Afghanistan. We need more troops there. We need to finish the job we abandoned to go into Iraq.

But 1,093 days ago, a complicit, compliant Republican-dominated Congress acceded to the Presidential demand to divert our energy into an unnecessary war in Iraq. I was one of the 60 percent of the Democratic Congress who voted against this.

Here we are, 2,497 troops have died, 18,490 seriously wounded. We all honor those troops and do not question that. But we disagree, not on the noble service of the troops, but the competence of the leadership of President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretary Rumsfeld in initiating an unnecessary war in Iraq and insisting on an open-ended, indefinite commitment of U.S. troops in Iraq.

The President has said, “Bringing U.S. troops home from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents.” That means after 2009. That is what George Bush is talking about. That is not acceptable.

At its core, this resolution says stay the course indefinitively. We should be debating a real policy on Iraq, not a nonbinding politically motivated resolution. We should be debating the Murtha resolution.

As a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I resent the fact that we have here a meaningless, nonbinding Karl Rove-politically inspired resolution on the floor, not amendable, no substitutes allowed; and they call that a debate on the policy in Iraq.

They say they are honoring the troops. That is a dishonor to the people of America and those who serve us. And they walk out and run. We have won. Saddam Hussein, he is on trial. They have a Constitution. They have a government. They have succeeded. We have succeeded.

But they have a sectarian problem. They have been in the war for 1,400 years. And they are going to continue fighting. We need to negotiate a timetable with their legitimate government to get the U.S. troops redeployed, out of Iraq, to other hot spots and bring the remainder home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Middle East and Central Asia Subcommittee, I have traveled to Iraq, having led a delegation just this last January. And I met with officials again and received a wealth of congressional testimony here that all confirm that the liberation of the Iraqi people is having a positive reverberation throughout the broader Middle East.

Iraq is a catalyst for hope, a vivid example that the future of the broader Middle East belongs to freedom and democracy. To fully comprehend just how far Iraq has come with the assistance of U.S. and coalition forces, we must consider the horror that was Iraq under Saddam Hussein: chemical attacks, reprisal regarding thousands of Iraqis who fled Saddam’s persecution; the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi refugees who fled Saddam’s persecution; the deaths of 400,000 Iraqi children in his regime’s final year; the ever-increasing voter participation each time. The Iraqi press is free and it is growing. Iraqi women are playing an increasingly pivotal role in their society.

A market-based economy is being established as Iraq emerges from three decades of Saddam’s neglect. Over 260,000 Iraqi police and security forces have been trained and have been educated. Iraq is now democratically elected government for the first time in its history that includes all ethnic groups.

We should therefore focus on what we need to do to help ensure a free and secure Iraq and not on how soon we can leave it, ignoring that it is in our national security interest to succeed there.

The jihadists are determined and threats have declared Iraq to be the central front of their campaign of terror. Are we to waver in front of these challenges? Absolutely not. Terrorist mastermind al Zarqawi, now dead, acknowledged in a February 2004 letter to al Qaeda the threat that success of the Iraqi forces and success in Iraq posed to the extremist effort.

He said, Our enemy is growing stronger by the day, by God, this is suffocation. One of Osama bin Laden’s closest associates wrote about Iraq a couple of years ago. And he said, a far more dangerous threat is sectarian democracy, because it drives Muslims to refuse to take part in jihad.
Mr. Speaker, this clearly demonstrates that our efforts in Iraq are serving long-term efforts of spreading democracy as an antidote to Islamic terrorism and extremism.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of President Ronald Reagan’s words in his first inaugural address when he said, “Above all we must realize that no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenal of the world is so formidable as the will and the moral courage of free men and women.

Every day the Iraqi people are proving how true that statement is. We too must demonstrate the will to press ahead. Leaders from the Arab world have confided their views on how important it is for their own efforts to have the U.S. in Iraq. However, the best evidence that we are on the right path comes from those closest to me, including my stepson, Dougie, and his fiancée, Lindsay, both marine officers, both who have served as fighter pilots in Iraq.

And I hear it from one of my subcommittee staffers, Matt Zweig, who is currently deployed in Iraq. Their unwavering belief that success in Iraq will make us safer at home confirms that our strategy is correct and that our goals are sound.

They remind me that we must heed the advice issued by Winston Churchill when he said, “One ought never to turn one’s back on a threatened danger and try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly and without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half.”

Mr. Speaker, we must not, we will not flinch in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution because we should not be echoing the lies we have been fed to justify this cruel and deceitful war. We should not continue pretending that by fighting the war in Iraq we are advancing the war on terrorism.

Our intelligence tells us that only 7 to 8 percent of those we are fighting in Iraq are Islamic terrorists. The other 92 to 98 percent are fighting a war for power between contentious religious groups.

There is no compelling reason to send our young people to die to determine how to divide the spoils between the Sunnis and the Shiites. We should be redeploving our resources to counter all of the real war on terrorism, going after Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, fighting jihadist ideas all over the Muslim world, getting the loose nuclear material out of the former Soviet Union before it is smuggled to al Qaeda to make nuclear weapons, securing all of the shipping containers before they enter our ports, and protecting our chemical and nuclear plants against sabotage that could kill tens of thousands of Americans.

But the Bush administration and this Congress will not vote the funds to fight the real war against terrorism. And every reason we were given for invading Iraq has been shown to be false, Weapons of mass destruction. Not there. Saddam Hussein working hand in glove with al Qaeda. Not true. And the more information that leaks out, the more apparent it becomes that these were not mistakes, but deliberate lies.

But does this Congress get to the bottom of this? Not this Republican Congress. This Republican Congress sees no evil, hears no evil, and speaks no evil when it comes to a war that has already killed 2,500 of our young men and women and promises to kill thousands more.

This Republican Congress asks no questions and then possibly achieve that can justify the continuing slaughter.

I ask you, if the President had gone to the American people and said, we must invade a country that poses no imminent threat to us, we must sacrifice thousands of lives in order to create a democratic government in Iraq, would we have agreed? I think not.

As the President now says to us that we should continue indefinitely to expend American blood and treasure to support one side in a sectarian civil war, a side, moreover, that is increasingly committing crimes in Iraq, who do pose a threat to us, should Congress continue to consent? I think not. This Congress should agree with the Out of Iraq Caucus. We should say enough already. Enough with the lies. Enough with the evasion. Enough with the useless bloodshed. We should ensure the Iraqi people that we desire no U.S. military bases in Iraq.

This Congress should adopt the Murtha resolution. We should adopt a swift timetable to get our troops out of Iraq and bring them home and let the Iraqi oligarchs know they cannot depend on the United States forever.

It is our crucial moment in American history to concentrate our resources on the real threats that face us around the world and at home and put an end to this bloody, senseless and diversionary war.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. The gentlewoman has been a leader for freedom all around the globe, and this country should appreciate her for that.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to lead a bipartisan all-female congressional delegation to Iraq.

It was one of the most emotionally overwhelming experiences of my official life. We met women of enormous courage and hope. They told us they want to work, they want to vote. They want to be a part of their society, a democratic society. But we also heard about what life was like before the coalition came. We heard about the treatment of women under Saddam Hussein and during torture, oppression, that most of us could not imagine.

We were told of the heart-wrenching stories of husbands torn from their homes in the middle of the night by brutal, secret police, and the women left behind, usually with children, faced with the impossible burden of providing for their families in a society that doesn’t even allow women to work. Some were raped, some were tortured, but that was before liberation.

The road to liberation has been a rocky one. But our troops are doing good work every day in Iraq. We saw soldiers building schools and hospitals, vaccinating hundreds of children. They coach soccer. They tutor. They make a difference. They risk their lives every day to protect the newly acquired rights of Iraqis, but especially the women.

If we were asked to give one good reason why we should stay in Iraq, I would tell you to stay. We need to stay for the women.

Well, I saw women of diverse ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic classes. They were empowering each other with education, with hope, with friendship, just like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. Another courageous woman I met, Nasreen Barwari, the Minister of Public Works, was later the target of an assassination attempt. Her crime, being an outspoken woman in a important position. Thankfully she survived, but her bodyguard was killed.

Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. She was tragically gunned down.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we stay in Iraq, one of the major reasons is to stay for the women.

Just over two years ago, I was privileged to lead a bipartisan, all-female congressional delegation to Iraq.

We were told heart-wrenching stories of husbands torn from their homes in the middle of the night by a brutal secret police.

The women left behind, usually with children, faced the impossible burden of providing for their families in a society that didn’t allow women to work or remarry.

Some were themselves raped and tortured. But that was before liberation.

The road since liberation has been a rocky one.

But our troops are doing good work every day in Iraq.
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We saw the soldiers building schools and hospitals, vaccinating thousands of children, and putting an archaic infrastructure back in operation.

They coach soccer, they tutor—they make a difference! And they are risking their lives to protect the hard-earned rights of all Iraqis—but especially women.

If I were asked to give you one good reason why we should stay in Iraq, I would tell you we should stay for the women.

If we can make the values of a free society—freedom, hope and friendship—the foundation for the women of Iraq, we create the conditions for these new democratic values to take root and spread.

While there I saw women of diverse ethnicities, religions, and socio-economic classes empowering one another with education, hope and friendship—much like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.

In Mosul, we met with the Women’s Social and Cultural Society. They had been meeting secretly, but now felt safe enough to be public and actually welcome our delegation.

They were accompanied by their wide-eyed daughters, creating a new Iraq as they promote social, political and educational equality for all Iraqis. But they’re not alone.

One of my favorite stories of the trip was of two local women who arrived one day at a fountain in the town center of Hillah dressed in traditional Muslim women’s clothes but with a decidedly non-traditional mission.

A courageous woman I met, Nasreen Barwari, the Minister of Public Works later was the target of an assassination attempt.

Her crime? Being an outspoken woman in an important public position. Thankfully, she survived, though her bodyguard was killed.

Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. She was tragically gunned down outside her home.

The dangers Iraqi women face can’t be underestimated, nor can the obstacles put in their path to liberation. But these women remain undaunted.

We also visited the police academy in Baghdad where 29 women were training to be the first female police officers ever in Iraq.

These wonderful women told us how excited they were to use the skills to hold their jobs. Many had barely been out of the home setting before. Their exuberance was infectious.

We also went to a residential area in Mosul with a group of neighborhood women—some educated, but many not. We met in the crowded living room of one of the members. All the rooms were packed. The electricity was only on for half of our afternoon together. But that was more than they had had in years.

The curiosity of the men on the street outside was so thick you could cut it with a knife.

The women’s group had many questions for us.

“Do we see our voice?” they asked.

“How do we organize other women to make an impact? How can we affect the direction of this country?”

They were asking the most fundamental and basic questions of civic involvement—how to construct the foundation of the democratic process. As we left, their children came forward with flowers for us.

I think it’s fair to say that U.S. soldiers have liberated more women in the last 4 years than anyone or anything else in the last 20—maybe longer.

Still, changing 2,000 years of tradition isn’t going to happen with stroke of a pen. It will take time and patience.

This is not the time for us to abandon these courageous women—not when they have come so far.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague, whose resolution I support, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution before us. Let us be clear from the outset that those who have opposed the Iraq war stand solidly and proudly in support of our troops and their families. To suggest that calling for the return home of our brave troops somehow denigrates their service and their sacrifice is absurd.

We can best support our troops by bringing them home.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible numbers we have been given here are not mere statistics. Each one represents the tragic story of a ruined life and a shattered family, 2,500 troops dead, more than 18,000 wounded, many so grievously. The average tour for National Guard members has been 342 days, turning the lives of countless American families upside down.

The material cost of the Iraq war is about $230 billion. But you can never put a price on its toll in human suffering, nor can you realistically argue, Mr. Speaker, that in Iraq has made our country safer or advanced our effort to combat global terror.

Those that come to the floor and link Iraq to 9/11 are certainly wrong. They are factually wrong, because there remains no evidence that Saddam was involved in the al Qaeda attacks on our Nation, and they are morally wrong to invoke the memories of the victims of September 11th to justify this indefensible war of choice.

I am pleased that al Zarqawi is dead, but his death does not change the fact that Iraq has become a haven for terrorists and the best recruitment tool we could have handed our enemy. No, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this war are not soft on security. We believe strongly and passionately that keeping the troops in the middle of this increasingly bloody civil war only weakens our security.

It is a disgrace it has taken so long for Congress to spend a few hours of this day debating the Iraq war, but the American people will not be fooled. They recognize that a debate on a cynical and politically motivated resolution is no substitute for a thoughtful Iraq policy that advances our national interests and those of our allies. Let us vote “no” on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KOLLENSBERG), chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Transportation and HUD Appropriations.

Mr. KOLLENSBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us. I want to convey a very simple message. We must stay the course. At this crucial point in our history, it is unacceptable to enact a policy of passivity, resignation or defeatism in the face of terror.

We have that fight over there so we don’t have it back here.

Like many of my colleagues, I have visited Iraq and seen firsthand the revitalization of country. The men and women our Armed Forces are fighting terrorists who are trying to claim Iraq for their own. Without their valor and dedication, the progress made in Iraq would not be possible. It takes time, will, patience and perseverance to transform a country once ruled by a tyrannical despot.

Terrorists who seek to eliminate anyone who provides hope for the future have infested Iraq, but they will not succeed. The Iraqi people are committed to freeing their country from these fanatical invaders, and we are too. The Iraqi people’s future is in the hands, and right now they want the U.S. help.

Just this week, Iraqi army and police forces backed by U.S. troops launched Operation Forward together. This operation was created by Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki and his parliament, and it is their first major security action since a new government of national unity was sworn in on May 20.

Mr. Speaker, the resolve of the United States should never be questioned. The world must know that the United States finishes what it starts.

We will win the fight against global terrorism, including in Iraq.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for an unanimous consent request.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and submit a statement for the Record in opposition to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in opposition to this resolution, as illustrated by the House Majority Leader’s memo establishing this debate as “a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats,” the primary intent of this resolution is political—shifting attention from the real issues behind the slow progress in Iraq. In this election season, Republicans are using this resolution as a divisive strategy rather than holding a substantive debate on Iraq.
Today’s debate, which should have been an opportunity for Members of Congress to have a serious discussion on the war and to pose tough questions to the Administration on Iraq, has regrettably become nothing more than a partisan ploy. While I do not hesitate to applaud certain aspects of the resolution honoring the courage and sacrifices of our countrymen who are risking their lives in Iraq, I cannot be supportive of capitalizing on these very sacrifices for political gain.

I also disagree with the dangerous analogy made in this resolution between Iraq and the Administration’s “war on terror” policy. There is not, and never has been, any credible intelligence linking Iraq to 9/11 and Al Qaeda. Focusing the discussion on the war on terror and victories won, rather than on workable policies to bring our troops home, reduces this debate to no more than a justification for maintaining the Administration’s status quo agenda in Iraq.

Seizing the political momentum after the killing of Zarqawi, Republicans are offering a resolution which does little more than tout recent “impressive victories” in Iraq. While the death of Zarqawi must be recognized, we must be careful not to pat ourselves on the back prematurely for another “Mission Accomplished.” Terrorist cells are still numerous and active, violence is still prevalent, and our brave men and women still continue to fight.

Although I voted against the initial resolution approving the war in Iraq, I have consistently voted to support our troops with much-needed armor and supplies. However, this should not be construed as favoring continued occupation and the continued supply of resources that allow Saddam Hussein and his cohorts to regroup and continue their terrorist activities. They must be held accountable and made to answer for their crimes against humanity.

With the成果 of Zarqawi’s death, we must also be sure that we do not lose sight of our real end goal in this debate: to bring our troops back home as quickly as possible.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you, Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. The war on terror and the global war on terrorism have become the status quo agenda in Iraq. The President will not bring an end to this war. He says it is a decision for the American people. I say that it is a decision for their future, giving up their future resources for education, for health care, for housing, piling it all high on the altar of war and worshipping a false god of destruction.

When we begin these proceedings with the reminder, Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, we are not talking about any nation. We are talking about a force which is above all of us. The world is not ours to conquer. There is no glory in the abuse of power. It is time for a responsible exit strategy. We must ensure that we do not lose sight of our real end goal in this debate: to bring our troops back home as quickly as possible.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong, strong support of H. Res. 861 and to show my support for our troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan who are fighting at the front lines of our war on terror.

I commend our forces for the recent actions in targeting Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the insurgent leader killed in an airstrike June 7. I also commend President Bush for his visit earlier this week to Iraq to meet with Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki and encourage the work of the new Iraq government.

I share the deep concerns about the continuing violence in post-war Iraq, which is taking the lives of U.S. military personnel and civilians. I continue to pray for the protection of the men and women who are putting their lives on the line every day to help the Iraqi people as they build their own government, and also for their families here at home who continue to make tremendous sacrifices.

I recognize there were good and reasonable people on both sides of the decision to send U.S. forces to Iraq. For not you agreed with that decision, we are there now and cannot just walk away. Too much is at stake. The success of our efforts in Iraq and the success of the Iraqi people in establishing their own government are critical to the overall war against terrorism and to the security of our country and the world.

Our efforts in Iraq, many believe, are an important campaign in the global war on terrorism. Our world is a dangerous place, and as we learned on September 11, 2001, terrorism is a constant threat. We must end this war. We were attacked on our own soil, and this war is a different kind than any our Nation has ever fought. But it is one we are fighting to make our own nation and the world more secure. It is critical that we remain resolute in this fight.

I believe a case can be made that the war on terrorism really began more than 20 years ago with the attacks against America at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. The bombing there in the spring of 1983 killed 63 and injured 220. Later that year, two Japanese servicemen—220 Marines, 18 Navy members and three Army members—were killed when a truck bomb exploded at their barracks in Beirut. Those attacks were followed in 1993 by the first World Trade Center bombing in New York City, in 1996 by the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia, in 1998 by the U.S. embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, and in 2000 in the attack in Yemen on the USS Cole.

After the attacks on the two embassies in August 1998, I became very concerned about the U.S. response to terrorism and authored the legislation creating the National Commission on Terrorism. On the cover of that report is a photo of the twin towers in New York on fire after the 1993 attack. The foreboding nature of that photo is now all too real. It is as relevant today as it was in my day at the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001.

Late last summer I returned to Iraq for a third time. I have now visited all but the Kurdish areas in northern Iraq. With each successive trip I have seen improvements—renovated schools, cleaner water systems, new Iraqi army constituted. I also have seen the continuing and serious security problems and other challenges facing a liberated Iraq, and I
have heard caution from varied sources about the potentially cataclysmic consequences of America withdrawing before our mission is complete. I had the opportunity to speak with our troops who are performing their duties with professionalism and dedication. They are positive about their mission and are doing an outstanding job in fulfilling it.

One interesting comment I heard on that trip is that we can’t expect to rebuild Iraq on our timetable, but rather it must be on Iraq’s timetable. Our current timelines—in Iraq are not the same as in the United States. This is a very key point, and one the Bush administration needs to do a better job of explaining.

It also is important to remember that the United States had its share of growing pains. While our revolution was in 1776 it was 11 years before our forefathers began to draft a constitution and it wasn’t ratified until 1789. Few remember that our constitution was debated in complete secrecy. Delegates knew that they would generate heated differences and countries were divided. It was in the sittings or putting arguments into the mouths of the opposition. We also had leaders like George Washington, Ben Franklin, George Mason and James Madison who had the benefit of understanding British history in addition to being present for the workings of the House of Commons. Democracy and an elected government is truly a foreign concept to the Iraqi people.

The Bush administration also needs to do a better job of explaining what the continued sequences of “failing” in Iraq would mean to the average person in Chantilly, VA, Topeka, KS, or Portland, OR. I repeatedly asked people I met during the trip—from generals, to State Department officials, to members of the Iraqi government—and they thought “failing” would mean. The responses were frightening.

I heard references to Somalia—think of the movie “Black Hawk Down”—and the former Yugoslavia with all its ethnic cleansing. The images that flashed in my mind when I heard these references were the beginnings of the working of the House of Commons. Democracy and an elected government is truly a foreign concept to the Iraqi people.

Failure also could have serious impact on the world’s economy. Japan gets more than 75 percent of its oil from the region, Western Europe, 30 percent, and the United States, 22 percent. We saw what happened in the wake of the September 11th terrorist strikes on our economy. Failure in Iraq would make oil costs go up in busy marketplaces—to disrupt our progress and turn the Iraqi people against us. They believe it is not a “political” war but rather a “political” war and American public opinion will dictate when the United States leaves, not military success.

There is a general belief among terrorism experts that the top priority of terrorists is to seek chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons. The video of two commercial airliners being flown into the World Trade Center is ingrained in every American’s mind. I shudder to think what terrorists would do if they obtained a biological or chemical weapon.

Many I spoke with also said failure in Iraq could destabilize the entire Gulf region and possibly lead to the downfall of the governments of Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Failure also could have serious impact on the world’s economy. Japan gets more than 75 percent of its oil from the region, Western Europe, 30 percent, and the United States, 22 percent. We saw what happened in the wake of the September 11th terrorist strikes on our economy. Failure in Iraq would make oil costs go up in busy marketplaces—to disrupt our progress and turn the Iraqi people against us. They believe it is not a “political” war but rather a “political” war and American public opinion will dictate when the United States leaves, not military success.

Others said they believe the United States has a moral obligation to the people of Iraq to continue to help them as the country’s stabilization continues. They asked how the American public would feel if civil war were to break out and thousands upon thousands of innocent Iraqis were slaughtered in the subsequent fighting?

Finally, many believe the United States’s credibility is at stake. In a piece in the Washington Post’s Outlook section last September, Victor Davis Hanson, a military historian at Stanford University’s Hoover Institution and the author of “A War Like No Other,” wrote: . . . If we fied precipitously, moderates in the Middle East again believe American assurances of support for reform and would have to retreat into the shadows—or find themselves at the mercy of fascist killers. If the latter were to stall or stall their defeat of the American infidels. Our forward strategy of hitting terror- orists hard abroad would be discredited and replaced by a return to the pre 9/11 tactics of a few cruise missiles and writs. And loyal allies in Eastern Europe, the United Kingdom, Australia and Japan, along with new friends in India and South Pacific republics, would find themselves leaderless in the global struggle against Islamic radicalism.

Failure cannot be an option in Iraq nor can creating an arbitrary deadline for pulling out U.S. troops. The ramifications on our country and other countries in the West would be huge. Our withdrawal must be event driven and not artificially tied to a calendar. Many I talked to said we must set conditions for victory, not dates for withdrawal.

The Bush administration needs to do a better job articulating just what is at stake and the potentially catastrophic consequences. No one believes we will lose the war on the ground in Iraq; it’s here at home that there is a concern. I had one general officer say point blank that the center of gravity for our success in Iraq is the American public.

That said, I strongly believe that it would be of great value to have an independent review of ongoing operations in Iraq. I call this effort “fresh eyes on the target” and offered this suggestion following my latest trip to Iraq. On March 15, I was pleased to attend the announcement of the formation of the 10-member bipartisan Iraq Study Group, being led by former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, who co-chaired the 9/11 Commission. The members, and their co-leaders, are America’s most honorable and venerable citizens: former CIA Director Robert Gates, former U.S. Attorney General Ed Meese, former Clinton adviser Vernon Jordan, former Clinton Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, former Defense Secretary William Perry, former Virginia Senator Chuck Robb, former Wyoming Senator Alan Simpson, and former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor.

The study group was launched in partnership with the United States Institute of Peace, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Center for the Study of the Presidency, and the Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University. Its mission is to undertake a bipartisan, forward-looking assessment of the current and prospective situation on the ground in Iraq, its impact on the surrounding region, and its consequences on U.S. interests and values, and it will focus on political, military, security and reconstruction in Iraq. The group will travel to Iraq and report to the American people. I understand they will meet with President Bush this week.

It will assess what is working and what changes should be made in helping the Iraqi people to establish their own government and stop the terrorist insurgency which is continuing to foment the violence of the Saddam Hussein regime. One of the most critical jobs of this panel is to determine the ramifications of failure to accomplish our country’s mission in Iraq and to explain that to the American people.

In the 1930s, the world failed to stand up to fascism. When we—with our allies—did stand up and fight, we defeated fascism. It also took some time for the world to stand up to communism. But when we did, we crushed it. Now we face al Qaeda and its leader Osama bin Laden, who in his own words has said he will use chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons against us. We must continue the determined effort now that we have had in the wars over the years as we stand together. I believe we can defeat this threat to the freedoms and liberties and way of life we have fought to maintain for well over two centuries.
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHERY).

Mr. HINCHERY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us, House Resolution 661, is an unfortunate farce. It is part of an orchestrated political propaganda, which has come from the Republican Party in defense of their so-called war on terror. It is not the first example. We have had many others.

Some of the highest-ranking members of this administration have purposefully and intentionally misled this Congress and the American people by providing them with wrong information. We saw it right here in the House of Representatives when the President himself talked about how the British had learned that Iraq was importing enriched uranium from Niger.

He was told before he delivered that speech that there was no evidence that that was true. Yet he came here and said it and put the responsibility on Great Britain knowing that what he was saying was untrue. It is a criminal violation of Federal law, two criminal violations of Federal law to consiously, purposefully, intentionally, mislead the Congress, particularly when you are trying to obtain actions from the Congress which result from that purposeful and intentional misleading.

What has been the cost? So far, 2,500 American service men and women killed in Iraq. We hear today from the Republicans how they honor the service of those who have fallen. How can they honor the service of those who have fallen, and yet refuse to say that they were told a lie and that they should have been told the truth and that their service was not in vain?

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, there are few certitudes in these complicated times. Anyone who was not conflicted in the original decision to invade Iraq or who does not see a downside to all courses of action today is not thinking. But I am hard pressed to believe anything other than that the case for a steady, measured drawdown of troops in Iraq is compelling. The neocon desire to establish a semi-permanent presence in a divided Muslim country is foolishly.

It is true that there are circumstances that matter; the need to fight over there than here at home. Afghanistan is a case in point. But we should not be so naive as to fail to recognize that there are also circumstances where fighting over there can increase the likelihood that conflict will spread to our shores. A decision to prolong unnecessarily our intervention in Iraq could be a case in point, as could a military confrontation with Iran.

There are tipping points in all struggles. The al Qaeda has been given by our intervention in Iraq, and whether the ideologically advocated policy of establishing long-term bases or one of returning our troops home is likely to be the more effective strategy in prevailing in the world-wide war on terror. It should not be hard to understand that a policy of holding a country under an occupation is intolerable for Muslims. The longer we stay, the greater the prospect that anarchistic acts will multiply and spread, perhaps to our shores.

The issue is no longer, as is so frequently asserted, the need to stay the course. It is to avoid overstaying our presence. Sometimes it is harder to know how to end a war than to start one. Just as it is important to think through the "why and how" of committing troops to conflict, we must also think through the "why and how" of ending an engagement. Timing is a key element of both considerations.

For many Americans, including me, the war in Iraq has been difficult to justify. But all Americans, except perhaps a few who may be apologists for Western evangelism to the effect that the end justifies the means, have a stake in the outcome of this engagement. Whether we have been drawn into this conflict as a result of the situation we now face. The decision to go to war may have been misguided and strategies involved in conducting it mistaken; nonetheless there should be clairty of purpose in ending the conflict, with the goal neither to "cut and run," nor simply to cut losses. At this junction of involvement we should define cogently our purposes and by so doing create a basis both for a viable future for Iraq and for a U.S. disengagement that respects the sacrifices of those who have served so valiantly in Iraq and freedom for those who are our occupation allies.

Americans understand that three rationales were given at successive stages for the war. The first involved Iraq's complicity in 9/11; the second was the imminent threat of Iraqi WMD; and the third was the desire to replace the despotic regime of Saddam Hussein with a free, democratic government. The first two arguments have proven frail. The third has some legitimacy, but to many of us it never seemed compelling, particularly in relation to the costs of the conflict.

In any regard, whether or not democracy provided a compelling rationale for starting the war, it offers the most appropriate rationale for ending it. If we do not prepare to leave Iraq on our terms, stating clearly that now that a Constitution has been adopted, elections held, and a government formed, we are prepared to proceed with a comprehensive and orderly drawdown of our troops, we will be viewed as an occupying power lacking credible motivations. When we eventually leave, the other side will realize that it is now critical to define the rationale for our disengagement as the reason for going to war. And democracy is the only rationale I know that can be used as a basis for ending our involvement in this conflict with any hope of success, which to all indications, The key is that we must control and be seen as controlling our own fate.

All Americans should be respectful of the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform. They have been placed in an untenable situation. If they had not been so heroic and in many cases so helpful in rebuilding neighborhoods and schools, the U.S. would face a far more difficult dilemma today.

But we have no choice except to assess whether Osama Bin Laden and his movement have been given a new lease on life by our intervention in Iraq, and whether the ideologically advocated policy of establishing long-term bases or one of returning our troops home is likely to be the more effective strategy in prevailing in the world-wide war on terror. It should not be hard to understand that a policy of holding a country under an occupation is intolerable for Muslims. The longer we stay, the greater the prospect that anarchistic acts will multiply and spread, perhaps to our shores.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) who am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations. (Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
for years to come, and the demise of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi makes prospects of expanding influence through terrorist tactics less likely. Joining the political process, on the other hand, would guarantee Sunni a role in governing the country.

Though the national and civilizational choice may seem obvious to us, a continued American military presence in Iraq gives Sunni radicals a popular cause—ridding the country of the occupier—for rallying popular sentiment in Iraq and elsewhere and justifying continued violence. Announcing the commencement of an orderly drawdown of our troops, and trumpeting it widely, would rob radicals of this powerful cause, allowing moderate Sunnis to join the government and pursue sectarian interests through the constitutional process.

In the realm of policy timing can often be as important as substance. Just as Senator Dink

- sen once noted that a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon you're talking about real money, in foreign affairs a week here and a week there can soon add up to a policy dilemma. It is only as a result of civil strife will ensue when we withdraw, but this is just as likely to be the case in 2026 as 2006. In any regard, civil union is for the Iraqi people to manage. It's not for American soldiers to sustain. The authorization this Congress gave to the Executive force contemplated a clear prospect of military intervention in Iraq. It did not, however, contemplate prolonged occupation. If this is not understood by the Executive branch, the current overwhelming Iraqi polling sentiment favoring American troop withdrawal will be more than matched by shared American sentiment. And in a democratic

- racy no one can be a leader without followers. The older I get, the more central I consider the human factor to be in international relations. Logic is never totally dominant. No one knows the exact origins of the seven deadly sins, but to the degree human nature is the least changed aspect of the human condition, it is relevant to today's debate to contrast two human foibles: avarice and pride. Let me suggest that avarice, the weakness of business classes, is fundamentally more pragmatic than pride, the weakness of politicians, and pride is fundamentally more dangerous than avarice.

For example, if a bookstore owner were to read two books and strongly prefer one to the other, he might inventory half a dozen of the one he prefers and one of the other. But if his customers buy the one he likes least, he will not reorder the one he likes. He will put it on the discount shelf and reorder the public's choice. His pride isn't hurt. In politics, on the other hand, the tendency is to avoid embarrassment, never acknowledge error. Mistakes are often repeated to avoid political inconsistency.

An anecdote comes to mind. In one of my early terms in Congress I was invited to the Library of Congress to a seminar Henry Kissinger was asked to give on the 1973 Paris Peace Accords. Before going, I perused one of his autobiographical tomes and was struck by a singular paragraph. In December 1968, Kissinger as the National Security Council Advisor-designate met with Richard Nixon, then the President-elect. They agreed, he wrote, that they would disengage from Vietnam. After Kissinger had delivered his lecture, I asked him about his pre-Presidency strategy talk with Nixon. Why, I inquired, didn't he take advantage of the Nixon administration immediately do what he said they had decided in December 1968, to do? Kissinger looked at me and responded: "We meant with honor." I asked him if honor required escalation. "Absolutely," he replied. "Honor" and "pride" do not have the same meaning. But in some circumstances they are clearly first cousins.

I mention this incident as a reflection of human nature and the psychology of decision-making. LBJ was too much of a Texan to reverse gear on his own policies; Nixon was too much a product of the Cold War to risk being perceived as less tough than his Democratic predecessor.

All wars evoke analogies to prior conflicts; Vietnam is on everyone's mind. My sense is that references to our Southeast Asian experience are somewhat unproblematic, but important to ponder. Of particular relevance is the advice of a former Vermont Senator, George Aiken, who suggested we just declare victory and get out of Vietnam. Aiken's advice was rooted in frustration, but wise as it was, represented more spin than reality. Given the strategies then in place, Congress wasn't closer than this. Today, on the other hand, despite the escalation of world-wide violence and the precipitation of widespread mistrust of the United States, particularly in Muslim societies, the Administration can point to positive political developments, from the movement toward change in Afghanistan to the beginnings of a more intrusive revolutionary in oppressed societies than interventionist policies.

Caution and restraint are better models for 21st Century statecraft than naive adventurism. When this admonition in mind, it is critical that Members of the Executive Branch must understand that how and what they say to justify various policies determines how others respond.

Anyone who ever studied physics may recall that Sir Isaac Newton set forth three fundamental laws, the second of which was that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. A decade ago when the Congress was led by an extraordinary upstart whose first name was Newt, I suggested, at first as a pun, the existence of a fourth "Newt-onian" law, this one of social physics: reaction is greater than action. My thoughts at the time related to the partisan bickering within Congress. But with the passage of time I have come to the conclusion that international slights have graver consequences than domestic.

When, for instance, we use words like "reference events," "inflation," "vexation," and "violence, and employ tactics designed expressly to "shock and awe," should we not expect others to think and respond in like or escalated terms, although the methods employed might in the current vogue be described as asymmetric?

This brings me to several broad precepts, one of which is that that which is intended to form a theoretical and practical framework for a recalibrated foreign policy.

First, the trite. Every society has a sage who cautions that wise leaders should put themselves in the shoes of their adversaries before reaching self-centered judgments. The profoundest illustration of this comes from literature rather than Clausewitz or Sun Tzu.

When speaking to constituents of the ration-ale for and against the Iraq War, I have over the past couple of years referenced a set of books that provides more geo-political wisdom than balance of power strategists: the Alexander-ria Quartet by Lawrence Durrell.

Set in inter-war Egypt, each of Durrell's four books chronicles the same series of events through the eyes of a different participant. With each novel the repetitive, the stories are profoundly different. The same data, but that one set of eyes, one set of interactions, is insufficient to gain a full grasp of what is happening around us. Likewise, in world politics one
country’s perspective is not enough. The views of others matter. If we are to manage prudently the affairs of state, we have to use more than just our own eyes, rely on more than just our own experience, and reference more than our own historical circumstance. The West, for instance, gives substantially less weight than the Western experience to the two cataclysmic wars of the 20th century. Despite Lawrence’s involvement in Arabia and the battles between Allied forces and Rommel’s tanks, the engagements in the Middle East and North Africa were skirmishes compared with the struggles in Europe and the Far East. Not only do Muslims see the 20th century differently from Westerners, but Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of common experience to current challenges in the Middle East.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, historians and political strategists in Europe rightly concluded that the European alliance system had been too rigid and the assassination of a relatively minor figure, an archduke, should not have precipitated a war. The sequence of diplomatic actions and reactions was too easily spring into a clash of civilizations. Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of historical wisdom necessitated initial accommodation with Hitler’s adventurism. Too little flexibility caused one war; too little spine led to another. In the current context, the current controversy of the sequence of historical events should be avoided. Bush sees himself as Churchill rather than Chamberlain, but Europeans see 9/11 as more analogous to the shots fired at Archduke Ferdinand than as a cause for a doctrine of preemption or war with Iraq, a war that could too easily spring into a clash of civilizations.

If we’re ever going to have a chance to shape or deter the actions of others, we must understand their reasoning. Failing to understand or respect Muslim culture, for instance, resulted in the greatest intelligence failure of our era. It is, however, not the sole intelligence failure. In one of the greatest judgmental errors of our time, we appear to have attempted to combat the ideological pos- turing of others by ideologizing our own intel- ligence. Based on what is known today, pol- icymakers who suggested the United States would be welcomed as a liberating rather than conquering or, worse yet, colo- nizing force in Iraq. Estimates of the costs of war, of the ramifications of our involvement, of the expected reaction of the population and of the likelihood of foreign respect and support were dead wrong.

Now faced with the anarchy that has mushroomed in the country, Washington is swept by occupation analogies of World War II. Japan and Germany, it is noted, were occupied for more than five years after hostilities ceased. Hence, many are suggesting, we must be prepared to stay at least this long in Iraq.

I have seldom been more apprehensive about an historical analogy. Japan and Ger- many were the instigators of war; their citizens understood this. The Muslim population throughout the world does not see it this way. They see the U.S. as the aggressor. Images from Al-Jazeera portray a country under siege. In the Moslem world Iraq looks more like a po- lice-cordoned West Bank than a great and an- cient society on the move to a better life. Out- siders are viewed as unwanted intruders act- ing out of great power self-interest, disrespect- ful of the culture and values of the country being occupied.

Yet if we take the most difficult geo-strategic issues of the 20th century, how we seem to misunderstand the fundamentals of human nature. Publics in many parts of the world are crying out for two aspirations: re- spect and hope. But our policy response is an entirely parochial one, rooted in the so-called ‘clash of civilizations.” Explanations which neo- cons do not define as a refining a shining City on a Hill but as the right of a superpower to place itself above the legal and institutional restraints applied to others.

In the Neo-con world, values are synonyms with power. The implicit assumption is that American security can be bought and managed alone, without allies, without consid- eration of contrasting international views or the effect of our policies on others. Treaties like a Comprehensive Test Ban, which every Presi- dent since Eisenhower has propounded, have been questioned. We must renew efforts to strengthen the verification provisions of the Bi- ological Weapons Convention.

Legitimacy is critical for all countries. There may be times and circumstances in which the U.S. national interest requires action without allies or without United Na- tions sanction. But the U.N., in particular, is ig- nored at great risk, especially when the inter- national community is largely at odds with American policies. In this context, recent rhe- torical attacks by ideologues in and out of gov- ernment on the U.N. and other multilateral insti- tutions would appear to particularly ill-serve the American national interest.

The diplomatic issue our government has to come to grips with today is the problem of se- quencing. Which comes first—the chicken or the egg—is the most cheerful and abstract philosophical discussion Americans engage in. But which precedes the other—talk or war—is neither cheerful nor abstract. Experience would seem to indicate that while war may not be averted by negotiations, it is less likely to break off if the dialogue succeeds beforehand.

In adversarial situations public results can sel- dom be achieved without human interaction. That is why our founders clearly contemplated that the new American Republic would have diplomatic relations with underdeveloped states. It is why Prime Minister Rabin, when faulted for talking to Arafat, noted that you don’t make peace with friends.

There are few examples in history where empty chair diplomacy has proved effective. Indeed, it seems impossible to reach mutual under- standing and a modicum of trust and respect which only personal relationships can provide.

The sequencing dilemma is particularly evi- dent with regard to Iran. Not only should we not fear to negotiate, we must understand that as the stronger party, we can afford to put on the table steps, particularly related to process, that weaker parties are less able to initiate without seeming to capitulate. Unfortunately, we have over a number of Administrations chosen to isolate rather than engage Iran. The question is whether isolationist policies drive a wedge between the two sides. A stumbling block to constructive dialogue is the authoritarian refusal to interact has characterized our policy toward Iran for a generation and, just as hap- pily, Cuba, for two.

Some of us have fretted for a long time that a more forthcoming U.S. diplomatic approach might have produced a more stable Persian Gulf. Five years ago Senator SPECTER and I invited to Capitol Hill the Iranian Ambassador to the U.N. In a long meeting over dinner in the City on a Hill but as the right of a superpower to place itself above the legal and institutional restraints applied to others.

The slight hope implicit in this position may or may not have reflected Tehran’s real posi- tion at the time, but it is apparent that Ahmadinejad is far more radical today than Khatami was yesterday. While neither has nor had the power of the Ayatollahs, the hard- ening of Iranian public attitudes toward us and future American policies is repressive, more in keeping with the image of an American that is seen as a superpower rather than just a superpower. The U.S. needs to conserve its strength and keep our options open.

In the current context, President Bush and Sec- retary of State Rice and their allies in the National Security Council have let it be known that we should be prepared to stay at least this long in Iraq. It is our job as the elected majority to see to it that this is the case.

That is why we are faced with a substantial threat in the Middle East. Some of us have fretted for a long time that a more forthcoming U.S. diplomatic approach might have produced a more stable Persian Gulf. Five years ago Senator SPECTER and I invited to Capitol Hill the Iranian Ambassador to the U.N. In a long meeting over dinner in the City on a Hill but as the right of a superpower to place itself above the legal and institutional restraints applied to others.

The slight hope implicit in this position may or may not have reflected Tehran’s real posi- tion at the time, but it is apparent that Ahmadinejad is far more radical today than Khatami was yesterday. While neither has nor had the power of the Ayatollahs, the hard- ening of Iranian public attitudes toward us and future American policies is repressive, more in keeping with the image of an American that is seen as a superpower rather than just a superpower. The U.S. needs to conserve its strength and keep our options open.

In the current context, President Bush and Sec- retary of State Rice and their allies in the National Security Council have let it be known that we should be prepared to stay at least this long in Iraq. It is our job as the elected majority to see to it that this is the case.

That is why we are faced with a substantial threat in the Middle East. Some of us have fretted for a long time that a more forthcoming U.S. diplomatic approach might have produced a more stable Persian Gulf. Five years ago Senator SPECTER and I invited to Capitol Hill the Iranian Ambassador to the U.N. In a long meeting over dinner in the City on a Hill but as the right of a superpower to place itself above the legal and institutional restraints applied to others.

The slight hope implicit in this position may or may not have reflected Tehran’s real posi-
of a few weeks duration—one to three weeks of intensive bombing. The Iranians may be thinking of a multi-decade or multi-century response. Western history has known a 30-year war. Eastern peoples carry in their hearts the burden of centuries of crusades, and many Islamic countries would like the next century to be a continuation of what they consider to be a struggle against Judeo-Christian intervention. Sequencing is a historical as well as diplomatic term of concern.

The Iranians, too, are in a quandary. They recognize that no American President can take the force option completely off the table. They suspect DOD has made extensive contingency plans and they see a President who has little hesitancy to take difficult, unpopular decisions. They know he is in his last term and does not want to pass on strategic problems to his successor. They may reason that a U.S. decision to attack is irrational because it would solidify a radical reaction in Iran, in other Muslim countries, and perhaps even within the U.S., but the government of Iran cannot be certain that the President will conclude the war passing on a bigger mess if he attacked rather than engaged.

The Iranian challenge is stickier than many Americans assume. The President may see himself in a position analogous to that of John Kennedy in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Kennedy was caught in a web of thrushchee and Sputnik, a system that had many despotic dimensions. But while communism was manipulated in such a manner as to become a quasi-state religion, it is fundamentally about political and economic rather than spiritual relationships. Iran, on the other hand, is a theocracy in a region where religion and, too frequently, its version are dominant themes. Just as the Iranian government must understand the strong will of the President, Washington has to come to grips with the pride and principles of an adversary which is the inheritor of one of the oldest civilizations on earth. Each side may understand the consequences of individual actions, but that does not mean that decisions in one or the other country will not unfold dominion-like in a manner that could be catastrophic for all. The 10-old Western human interrelationship—diplomacy—is so key.

Let me suggest a corollary to Lord Acton’s maxim that power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. The Leach corollary is that military power tempts and excessive power tends to tempt excessively. America’s enormous military strength is critical at this stage in history. But while we are obligated to recognize that its maintenance is imperative, we must also realize that its utilization may not fit, and may indeed be counterproductive, in certain strategic settings.

Analogies between all wars exist, but comparisons between Iraq and Vietnam are frail. What must be understood is not that Iraq could be as bad as Vietnam; rather, that it is becoming far worse. Vietnam, after all, involved no WMD issues; and while the North was predominantly Buddhist and the South Catholic, there were no implications of a world-wide religious struggle; nor of a conflict that might last many decades, if not centuries.

The issue at the time was Communism and fears that if Vietnam fell, neighboring governments in his Southeast Asia might last many decades, if not centuries. When had there is nothing to lose. When life, as Hobbes described, becomes nasty, brutish, and short in a jungle of hopelessness, and humiliation, it becomes easily expendable, sometimes by martyred self-choice.

Finally, a note about principle. Never has it been more important to return to the basics. Whether it be tax policy or foreign policy, the concern must be for justice and the common good, what the 19th century British utilitarian described as concern for the greatest good of the greatest number.

The public wants its leaders to unify and uplift. Elections are about whether political leadership is up to the task. Democracies provide continual verdicts. This fall will be one measurement.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank all the members of the Out of Iraq Caucus who have spoken so eloquently this afternoon.

I rise in opposition to H. Res. 861 and in support of Representative MURTHA’s proposal to redeploy our troops.

Since this war began, we have seen nearly 2,000 Americans. This number does not include the nearly 20,000 who have been wounded. I would like to take a moment to talk about the significance of those casualties and wounded because I often feel that we gloss over those numbers and forget that each one is or was an actual person. They were somebody’s son or daughter, somebody’s mother or father, somebody’s brother or sister.

They are real people, as real as 19-year-old Private Brandon Sloan and First Sergeant Robert Dowdy, who were the first soldiers from my congressional district to become casualties in the 507th Maintenance Group incident. They are as real as the 325th Marine Regiment of Brookpark, Ohio, who suffered multiple casualties. I attended those funeral services and those memorials.

They are as real as Sergeant Shurvon Phillip, an East Cleveland resident and Senior High School graduate, who recently returned to Cleveland after suffering serious injuries in Iraq and enduring weeks of recovery. Shurvon is now paralyzed, and because of a brain injury, he cannot talk. We welcomed him home last Saturday at the Louis Stokes VA Medical Center.

Shurvon’s mother, Gail, had this to say: “That Jack MURTHA, he came to see my son three times and each time he treated Shurvon as his own son.” Shurvon’s mother, Gail Ulerie, had this to say about President Bush when he came to see him to give the Purple Heart to her son while he has at Bethesda Naval Hospital: “I am glad for
my son to receive a Purple Heart, but he was in no condition to appreciate it. He was in bad shape. I also said some things to President Bush that he, President Bush, did not like. I basically told him he should end this war and bring our troops, like my son, back home. He did not answer, just walked away." I say we should not walk away from the young men and women who are left over in Iraq and Afghanistan. We should stay and do what Shamrock, the soldier's mother said. Bring our troops home. Bring our troops home. Bring our troops home. She said she did not want to see any more young men or women laying back like this, and if you saw Shurvon you would know what I meant. He is in a chair, where he is sat up like this. His lips are swollen, sticking out. He can hardly say a word. We are saying to him, you know, Shurvon, we are sorry you are a casualty; you stood up like this; you stood up for the United States of America. But he cannot stand up for himself.

Let us stand up for the young men and women of America. Bring our troops home, redeem them, and let us think of America first.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, of our International Relations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of U.S. forces have performed their mission in an exemplary, professional fashion and deserve both our praise and profound thanks.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Iraq remains a dangerous place today because hate-filled fanatic, perhaps even psychotic, mass murderers bomb and shoot innocent men, women, and children. They have a morbid fascination with all things violent. There is nothing whatsoever benign or noble or praiseworthy about these people. They are mass murderers.

If left unchecked, the terrorists would impose dictatorship once again on Iraq and Afghanistan, which would result in more mass killings, systematic torture, rampant fear, political prisoners, and an end to freedom and liberty.

While I respect the right of those who criticize America policy and our solidarity with the Iraqi people, I remain deeply disappointed that many of those who protest U.S. policy outside of this chamber seldom—if ever—criticize the terrorists.

No harsh, mocking thoughts of condemnation of President George W. Bush are left unspoken. You hear it on TV, talk shows, and at war protests, but no such angst is directed at the mass murderers who blow up our soldiers or incinerate pious worshipers at prayer in Mosques or who kidnap, torture, and kill humanitarian workers trying to save and enhance the lives of innocent people.

American and coalition soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are peacemakers and they have the toughest assignment in the world. They are peacemakers who put their own lives at risk to create sufficient space and order so that democracy and respect for human rights can grow and peace can be established and grow.

American coalition soldiers in Iraq are peacemakers who have the toughest job in the world. They are peacemakers who put their own lives at risk to create sufficient space and order so that democracy and respect for human rights can grow and peace can be established.

I want our soldiers to come home—and to come home soon. But that fervent hope must be tempered with realities on the ground. What do our military commanders on the ground think? To leave prematurely or pursuant to an arbitrarily arrived at deadline established by members of Congress may unwittingly put more lives at risk and strengthen the fanaticism and hopes of the terrorists.

Still, public debate on exit strategy is important—even necessary—because it puts pressure on us all to figure out how to prudently accomplish redeployment and it puts constructive pressure on Iraqi leaders to move more quickly to take ownership of their own security.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House wants our Nation and our coalition partners to succeed in helping the Iraqis establish a democratic government that respects human rights and abides by the rule of law and to succeed in standing up Iraqi security forces that can maintain order and protect their citizens.

We pray, of course, for the safe return of our brave servicemen and -women who are fighting for freedom half a world away, and we applaud their success last week in eliminating the terrorist murderer Zarqawi. The professionalism, bravery, and sacrifice of our Armed Forces are indeed awe-inspiring.

This year, Mr. Speaker, 2006, should be a year of transition in Iraq; and it is my expectation that the United States will be able to reduce the American troop deployment over the ensuing months and transfer the risks and responsibilities to the duly elected government of Iraq. That is what has been proposed.

Today, it is regrettable that this Republican majority seeks to exploit this critical issue of national security for political advantage. The resolution before us, like the Hunter resolution that was debated last December, was drafted, in my view, for political reasons. Majority Leader BOEHNER explained, its purpose is an opportunity to create "a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats."

For our country's sake, for our troops' sake, the majority should have offered a resolution that sought unity, rather than division.

There are provisions in this resolution, of course, with which all of us agree. I, for one, strongly share the resolve to prevail in the war on terror. However, this resolution misstates, in my opinion, the facts about why the Bush administration instigated our military action against the Hussein regime in 2003. It paints a picture of Iraq today that does not comport with the reality on the ground, and it ignores the fundamental responsibility of this Congress to conduct meaningful oversight of the administration's conduct of the war.

The political motivations underlying this resolution have been laid bare; and, thus, I will be forced to vote "no."
The American people will not be deceived by this exercise today which our Republican colleague of North Carolina (Mr. Jones) labeled a charade.

The American people know, as Lieutenant General Gregory Newbold, the former commanding general of the 1st Marine Division, has said: "What we are living with now is the consequences of successive policy failures."

The administration manipulated intelligence on weapons of mass destruction. It ignored the advice of top military commanders and sent too few troops to accomplish the task; and, consequently, we failed to stabilize Iraq after Hussein was rightfully removed from power.

It fired police and security forces and oil workers, which fueled the instability and initated war before making alternative plans to shut off escape routes to the north when the Turks would not let us come in.

It had no effective plan to quickly get infrastructure repaired and rebuilt. It failed to properly equip our own troops, as Mr. Murtha has observed, 2,500 of whom have given the ultimate measure of sacrifice in this war.

It grossly underestimated the costs of the war at about $60 billion, which now stands six times larger and more.

And when confronted with concrete evidence of widespread mistreatment of detainees in American custody, the President failed to hold anyone in his administration accountable.

Saddam Hussein, according to the Pew Research Center, the global credibility of the United States has sharply declined.

The record of the Republican Congress is, in my opinion, no less disturbing. This proud body, the people's House, has abdicated its oversight role and failed to root out waste, fraud and corruption so prevalent in Iraq today.

Nearly $9 billion in reconstruction funds are unaccounted for. No-bid contracts are awarded to private contractors such as Halliburton. Detainees in American custody have been abused and, in some instances, killed, and still, still, there is no effective oversight on these matters in the Congress of the United States.

In the face of one of the most important issues before our country, we have been presented with politics as usual.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is good that the American people are able to hear this debate and judge for themselves who should be making the policies and which policies are best for our country. I have been through this before. I worked with Ronald Reagan for 7 years, and I heard some of the same shrill voices that we hear today in those days. I heard the same gettling of the President of the United States for political purposes, but also for personal reasons during those days. I heard Ronald Reagan called a warmonger. I heard all of the charges that we hear today aimed at our President aimed at Ronald Reagan, and by some of the same people, I might add.

We have voices who are ideologically opposed to war and are in fact affected in their heart, perhaps more than others, when war does come, as it comes to all free people because without strength of purpose and willingness to fight there will be no freedom in this world. But when we fought communism, President Reagan stood firm when the shrill voices of defeatism and retreat attacked him personally and attacked our effort. And I tried to undermine that effort in the same way our effort today is being undermined by nitpicking, backbiting, and defeatism.

Yet, he stood firm and, guess what? The world was shocked when the evil of communism collapsed.

Well, today we are in a war with radical Islam, which is every bit as much a threat and hates Western democracy every bit as much as the Communists did. We have made a stand in Iraq, and I would hope that people understand that had Ronald Reagan backed down, we would still be in the middle of the Cold War. And if we back down today, as is being advocated, what I consider to be aOrganizing, defeating, and attacking our effort and tried to undermine that effort in the same way our effort today is being undermined by nitpicking, backbiting, and defeatism.

We cannot forget that the goals of Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden are to destroy western culture in all of its forms and manifestations. All across America, our constituents live their lives—take their kids to school, go to work, earn a living—and this is the strength of our Nation. However, we still live in the shadow of a real and looming threat to our way of life. We must remain vigilant of that threat and stand firm in our vow to dismantle it. While we have not been attacked on our own soil since September 11, we cannot afford the ramifications of complacency. The recent arrest of bombing terrorists across the border in Canada is clear evidence of that. We have forced the terrorists into making this an "away game," the battlefield pushed from our homeland, but nonetheless the outcome must be in our favor. Yes, the victories in this battle are many, but we must keep the resolve and determination to defeat terrorism here at home and abroad. To succeed we must be absolute and have constancy of purpose.

For decades Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq with an iron fist of repression. In the midst of that oppression was the intense yearning of the Iraqi people to taste freedom. They were forced to keep their hopes hidden, wrapped in a cocoon that they could one day blossom into the living principles from which they could rebuild their nation. They have emerged from that cocoon and are attempting to fly. The elements that were forming in it have manifested themselves in the formation of their new government, two successful national elections, and a successful national constitutional referendum.

Iraq cannot continue to succeed in the transition from war to building their Nation without our continued help. The people of Iraq have appealed to us in this critically important period. We have pledged our commitment to them and we need to see it through. The Iraqi people are proud of their accomplishments thus far, but they have asked for a steady hand of reassurance from us to help guide them in this transition.

The pride and motivation that the Iraqi population has demonstrated to this point are key elements to making their young government a success. We must continue to nurture their growth of confidence so that they can effectively govern, defend, and sustain themselves. The motivation to man a completely volunteer Iraqi army is one point of evidence that these people have pride and faith in their new republic. We cannot fail the security of our own Nation and the people of Iraq in a time of such dire need. The consequences of walking away at this point are too great to fathom. We must continue our resolve to uphold our commitment to the people of Iraq and in the global fight to free ourselves from the grip and fear of terrorism.
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SKELETON), and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time and yield the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATTL.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his indulgence and for the recognition, and I want to focus on something that has been little discussed in this debate, and that is how much this war is costing us.

Cost is not the ultimate determinant. When we have troops in the field, we should be unstinting in their support. But the cost in terms of billions of dollars, it has to be a consideration. The greatest cost, of course, is counted in human lives: 2,514 killed so far, 17,774 wounded so far. The dollar cost is not nearly so precious, but it is substantial.

First, for comparison, here is what the first Persian Gulf War cost us: $61 billion. But our allies contributed $10.6 billion in kind, $48.4 billion in cash contributions, and so out-of-pocket we were $2.1 billion. That, my friends, is the benefit of having allies.

Now, look at the annual cost of the war we are fighting. Notice that it has increased by almost 100 percent from 2003 to 2006, from a baseline when we were ready to stand down, to this year, 2006, an increase from $51 billion to $104 billion a year, annually.

The next chart then sums up the expenditures year by year, and you can see the bottom line. Thus far through this year, the cost is $318 billion. Thus far, Iraqi Freedom alone is $318 billion. To express that in monthly terms, something the Pentagon calls the "burn rate," the average expenditure per month for the troops we are maintaining there, 130,000 strong, is running at $8.4 billion a month. That is $8.4 billion a month.

Now, we have asked CBO, and CBO itself decided to set up a model to estimate what the outyear cost of this deployment would be, assuming that after this year there is a substantial drawdown to the point where 50,000 troops remain in theater, Afghanistan and Iraq. This covers both. The total cost of this, over a period of 10 years, is $371 billion, assuming a modest increment in our deployment to that of 50,000 additional troops. This is CBO speaking.

Now, if you add $371 billion to $318 billion, you get $689 billion. That is what this war could cost us if it goes on at its current level. And we have not reflected in this number the accrued costs we are incurring daily due to the harsh environmental conditions in the Army says it will cost $24 billion alone over the next 2 years to restore and repair and replace equipment.

Now, as I said, cost is not the ultimate determinant, but it has to be a consideration when it reaches this magnitude. I do not think we can debate the deployment in Iraq in existing troop levels in a vacuum, as if the cost does not matter, as if we had infinite resources if we were ever to balance our budget. Cost matters in meeting other military needs for operations elsewhere in the world, for transformation, and for modernization.

It is too bad we cannot have a full debate where we can fully all of the grave issues facing us due to the deployment in Iran.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation of our International Relations Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. It becomes clearer by the day, Mr. Speaker, that we are confronting a broad-based, sourceful enemy: Islamist terrorism, as the 9/11 Commission identified it.

We have seen messianic, violent ideologies before, but al Qaeda and its ilk represent a more severe threat. In today's world, we will acquire weapons of mass destruction. Bin Laden has made clear his intention to do so. It was such a concern that led President Bush to remove Saddam Hussein from power, and Iraqis are better for it.

We have heard legitimate debate of choices made in Iraq: Disbanding the Iraqi army, troop levels, and we have heard other critiques. Looking back, it is clear that this mission's difficulty and expense were underestimated. Hopefully, we have improved our intelligence. But dwelling on past choices does not get us ahead.

Looking ahead, I don't see how we succeed by immediately withdrawing, and that's an important position that our troops should stay longer in Iraq makes us all uncomfortable. But an alternative, an immediate withdrawal, concedes that Iraq will fall into chaos, because there is no way that the Iraqi security forces could stand alone yet. That is the judgment of our military professionals. So if you are going to argue that the costs of staying are too high, you are obligated to calculate the cost of withdrawing or the cost of what most certainly would be our defeat.

The real world is dangerous, and unpleasant choices must be made. An honest appraisal is that we don't know Iraq's future, but we know with far greater certainty that an American withdrawal would spin Iraq into chaos. Bedlam in the region would likely follow. This outcome would be a stunning boost for jihadists, the forces determined to deliver as big a blow as they can against the American people. We have seen this before. We saw our forces the Iraqi people our continued effort.

We know Iraq today is a central front in our struggle against terrorism. Al Qaeda has said it, and last week's killing of al Zarqawi in Iraq made it clear that our success there and our success in the high stakes fight against terrorism go hand in hand.

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ).

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, you know, this budget decision begins where this Nation stands in the two wars that we are prosecuting today, and in particular Iraq. I think that we owe this to the American people who are risking their lives on a daily basis. We owe it to their families, to the American people who are our allies.

Supporting our troops means more than bumper stickers on trucks, though of course we appreciate those people that put on the bumper stickers. We appreciate that. But it is time to talk about the high cost of soldiers, their blood, their future, their hopes, hopes for the young people of this great country and the people in Iraq, their young people.

I wish the resolution before us provided the context for this debate. Honest discussion must include the nuts and bolts of this policy, literally what we are expending daily in Iraq. You know, when we talk about the policy, are we going to allow for us to conduct another preemptive attack? Was this the wise thing to do? Was the planning correct? Do we need to correct our mistakes? Do we need to change the training? These are the things we need to look at.

If we truly want the Iraqis to stand up and protect their country, and if we are ever ready to stand down, to stand down, are we ready to put the money in the budget? I just came from a hearing a few moments ago and we are having the important conversation about our soldiers. We don't have a uniform policy on what helmets will protect the soldiers. Our soldiers don't have the equipment that they need, and for us to stand down, we need to provide the Iraqi army what they need, the equipment that they need, and we wonder because we haven't been able to do that for our troops.

Our military is the best. It has been feared throughout the ages for our ability to respond immediately anywhere in the world, to be ready to defend our freedom. I do support our troops.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes...
the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER), who has been to Iraq three times.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I attended my oldest son’s eighth grade graduation, and graduating with him was Jennifer Davis, the daughter of Karen and Major Miles Davis, who could not attend because he was deployed to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I believe we owe Americans an account of our progress in the war on terror, an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq, as well as an affirmation that we will defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle for survival. Unfortunately, this resolution fails to do so, for it is strategically nebulous, morally obtuse, and woefully inadequate.

This resolution sanitizes the hard truth that the enemy is trying not only to intimidate us but to kill us. It provides an abashed defense of our Nation’s sovereign right to preemptively eradicate the terrorists and their state sponsors before they kill us. It implies our preemption of this threat must meet with our legitimacy. But it further fails to affirm the battle for Iraq was waged because Saddam Hussein’s regime was a direct threat to the United States of America and was in violation of mandatory treaty obligations or said United States of America.

It fails to stress our mission is to ensure a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with the United States, its coalition partners and all other peaceable nations.

It fails to stress that terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for the United States of America, Iraq, our coalition partners, and the broader Middle East.

It asserts how despite the enemy having declared Iraq a central front in the war on terror, the United States and its coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as only a part of the war on terror.

It omits any mention of the battle for Iraq’s difficulties and does not offer a comprehensive strategy on how to conquer them. It overlooked the fact our troops’ return home hinges upon creating Iraqi security forces and destroying the enemy’s insurgency.

Finally, this resolution calls the terrorists our adversary, not our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, at the graduation I did not try to comfort Karen Davis by declaring her husband, Major Miles Davis, who was defending global peace and security or enforcing United Nations resolutions. No, I thanked Karen for her family’s sacrifice because Miles was in Iraq honoring his solemn pledge to God and to us to support and defend the will of the United States against all enemies.

So in this time of war when we ask the best of our troops and we ask the best of their families, we must ask the best of ourselves. We have not done so with this resolution, and that is why I will be voting “present,” because I am committed to victory in the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, recently, I attended my oldest son’s eighth grade graduation. Graduating with him was Jennifer Davis, the daughter of my childhood friend, Major Miles Davis, who could not attend. That night, I talked with Miles’ wife, Karen, who told me how painful it was for their family to have Miles so abruptly deployed to Iraq.

Such heart rending scenes throughout our land are why I believe we owe Americans more in this resolution than a simple declaration of our resolve in Iraq. We owe them an account of our progress in the world War on Terror; an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq; and an affirmation we will defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle for survival.

Thus, I rise to express my profound disappointment with this resolution before us, because it is strategical nebulous; morally obtuse; and woefully inadequate.

To begin, this resolution’s purpose is limited to “Declaring the United States will complete the mission in Iraq and prevail in the Global War on Terror and protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.”

This is patently inadequate to the task at hand; and, unfortunately, under continued examination the resolution fares no better. To wit, the first “Whereas” clause informs us: “the United States and its allies are engaged in a Global War on Terror, a long and demanding struggle against an adversary that is driven by hatred of American values and that is committed to imposing, by the use of terror, its repressive ideology throughout the world.”

This clause elicits elementary questions: what “values” of ours cause our enemy to hate us; and what, precisely, is the enemy’s ideology? Sadly, this clause provides no clues.

The second clause recounts how: “... for the past two decades, terrorists have used violence in a futile attempt to intimidate the United States.”

This clause is too sanitized. The hard truth is the enemy has not tried to intimidate us. The enemy has tried to kill us and too often succeeded. The enemy does so because our very existence as sovereign citizens of a free Republic constitutes a beacon of hope for all who are—and all who yearn to be free; thus, we are our enemy’s paramount obstacle to world dominion.

Next the third clause right asserts: “... it is essential to the security of the American people and to world security that the United States, together with its allies, take the battle to the terrorists and to those who provide them assistance.”

Agreed. But this clause must stress both a philosophic principle and a strategic tenet. Philosophically, any state-sponsor of terror is a threat to the United States, because terror is an attack upon the self-evident, inalienable human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Strategically, this clause falters as an oblique and abashed defense of our Nation’s sovereign right to preemptively eradicate terrorists and their state-sponsors before they kill us. Instead, the clause must reaffirm our Nation’s full right of self-defense.

The seventh clause decries how: “... by early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal, Ba’athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global peace and security. The war on terrorism, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against the United States of America and was in violation of mandatory treaty obligations to the United States of America.”

By omitting the fact Hussein’s regime deemed the United States not as just a part of the global community, but as a mortal enemy, this clause wrongly implies our preemption of his threat must and does meet a “global test” for legitimacy.

The eighth clause reiterates: “... the mission of the United States and its coalition partners, having removed Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors.”

Again, the point is missed. Our mission is to transform Iraq from a rogue dictatorship aiding terrorists into a representative democracy eradicating terrorists; and into a sovereign, free, secure, and united nation at peace with the United States, its coalition partners, and all other peaceable nations.

Next, clause eleven’s belief: “... the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East,” also misses the point. As an American, I believe the clause should read: “the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for the United States of America, Iraq, our Coalition partners, and the broader Middle East.”

Now, at last, we reach the resolution’s three lethal failings: To start with, taken together, the ninth and fifteenth clauses raise a stark conundrum. Ignoring that the United States, in word and deed, first targeted Iraq as a “central front” in the Global War on Terror, clause nine notes: “the terrorists have declared Iraq to be a central front in their war against all who oppose their ideology.”

Later, clause fifteen asserts: “... the United States and its Coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as part of the Global War on Terrorism.”

These clauses’ collective conundrum is this: if, after we militarily deposed Hussein, the terrorist enemy now deems Iraq a central front in its war against all those who oppose their ideology, why do we now view Iraq in the same regal measure as the “Global War on Terror”? Upon this critical question and its ramifications, the resolution is silent.

The resolution’s second lethal failing is found, interestingly enough, in clause twelve, which offers hopeful news of how we, our Coalition partners, and the Iraqis have: “... scored impressive victories in Iraq, including finding and killing the terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.”

Well said. But nowhere does this resolution explain the battle for Iraq’s past, present, and future difficulties, or proffer any concrete or comprehensive strategy as to how U.S., Coalition, and Iraqi forces will confront and conquer
We know their choice of the place: an American outpost in the Pacific. We know their choice of the method: the method of Hitler himself. For Japan’s next thrust goes back a century. It was not merely a policy of seeking living room—it was a plan which included the subjugation of all the peoples in the Pacific, the domination of all of Asia, the domination of the great section of the world which here prevails bodes ill for those who are content to passively sit by and watch their dreams of empire be dashed. We must strike at the common enemy wherever the greatest danger may develop.

The militarists of Berlin and Tokyo started this war. But the massed, angered forces of the United Nations have been at work, and the manhood of the world has assumed the burden of the struggle.

We know the spirit of the American people was never more deeply determined to face the solemn tasks before it. And they could not tolerate that. They have not been stunned. We have not been terrified by the dreams of empire of the Japanese. Deterioration of the material and spiritual centers of civilization—this has been and is still the purpose of Hitler and his Italian and Japanese chums. Their goal is the destruction of the material and spiritual centers of civilization—this has been and is still the purpose of Hitler and his Italian and Japanese chums. Their goal is the destruction of the material and spiritual centers of civilization.

For the first time since the Japanese and the Fascists and the Nazis started along their blood-stained course of conquest they now face the fact that superior forces are assembling against them. Gone forever are the days when the aggressors could attack and destroy to an extent that we would not only lengthen the time required to accomplish the mission in Iraq and welcome our troops back. But the dreams of empire of the Japanese and Fascist leaders were modest in comparison with the gargantuan aspirations of Hitler and Mussolini.

When Hitler operated his Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance, all these plans of conquest became a single plan. Under this, in addition to her own schemes of conquest, Japan’s role was obviously to cut off our supply of weapons and to the power of the British Commonwealth and Russia and China and the Netherlands—and then combine all their forces to achieve the ultimate goal, the conquest of the United States.

They say that democracy means freedom. They say that democracy means freedom. And they did not understand that. The words and the deeds of our fellow citizens to provide adequate living room for both Hitler and God. In proof of that, the Nazis have now announced their plan for enforcing their new German, pagan religion all over the world—a plan by which the Holy Bible and the Cross of Mercy would be displaced by Mein Kampf and the swastika and the naked sword.

Admittedly, we have been faced with hard choices. It was bitter, for example, not to be able to relieve the heroic and historic defenders of Wake Island. It was bitter for us not to be able to land a million men in a thousand ships in the Philippines. But this adds only to our determination to see to it that the Stars and Stripes will fly again over Wake Island. We say that the brave people of the Philippines will be rid of Japanese imperialism, and will live in freedom, security, and independence. Powerful and offensive actions must and will be taken in proper time. The consolidation of the United Nations’ total war effort against our common enemies is being achieved.

The superiority of the United Nations in munitions and ships must be overwhelming—so overwhelming that the Axis nations can never hope to catch up with it. And so, in order to attain this overwhelming superiority the United States must build planes and tanks and guns and ships to the utmost limit of our national capacity. We have the ability and capacity to produce arms not only for our own forces, but also for the armed forces of the 26 nations united against the Axis powers.

We submit for the RECORD President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Ninth Annual Message to Congress, June 1, 1942.
munications which are vital to the United

States must be raised far above present lev-

erals, even though it will mean the dislocation of the lives and occupations of millions of our own people. We must raise our sights all along this line. Let no man say it cannot be done. It must be done—and we have undertaken to do it. . . .

Our task is hard—our task is unprece-
dented—and the time is short. We must
strain every existing armament-producing facility to the utmost. We must convert every available plant and tool to war produc-
tion. That goes all the way from the greatest
plants to the smallest—from the huge auto-
mobile industry to the village machine shop. Production for war is based on men, on
women—the human hands and brains which
collectively we call Labor. Our workers stand ready to work long hours; to turn
out more in a day’s work; to keep the wheels
turning and the fires burning twenty-four
hours a day, and seven days a week. They re-
alize that speed and efficiency of their
work depend the lives of their sons and
their brothers on the fighting fronts.

Production for war is based on metals and
raw materials—silver, lead, iron, moly-
denium, zinc, tin. Greater and greater quan-
tities of them will have to be diverted to war
purposes: Civilian use of them will have to be
cut further and still further—and, in many
cases, completely eliminated.

War costs money. So far, we have hardly
even begun to pay for it. We have devoted
only 15 percent of our national income to na-
tional defense. As will appear in my Budget
Message tomorrow, our war program for the
coming fiscal year will cost $56 billion or, in
other words, more than half of the estimated
annual national income. That means taxes
and bonds and bonds and taxes. It means cut-
ing back on everything we need. In a word, it means an ‘all-out’ war by indi-
vidual effort and family effort in a united
country.

Only this all-out scale of production will
hasten the ultimate all-out victory. Speed
will count. Lost ground can always be re-
gained. Speed is the key to the future.
Speed will save the lives of our heroes;
speed will save our freedom and our
civilization—and showmen has never been an
American character.

We cannot wage this war in a defensive
spirit. As our power and our resources are
fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack
against the enemy—we shall hit him and hit
him again wherever and whenever we can
reach him.

We must keep him far from our shores, for
we intend to bring this battle to him on his
own home grounds.

American armed forces must be used at
any point where it is advi-
able to engage the forces of the enemy. In
some cases these operations will be defen-
sive, in order to protect key positions. In
other instances they will be off-
ensive, in order to strike at the common
enemy, with a view to his complete encircle-
ment and eventual total defeat.

American armed forces will operate at
many points in the Far East.

American armed forces will be on all the
oceans—trying to guard the essential com-

munication which are vital to the United

States.
an insurgency through making the right planning decisions, by making the right decisions to give the Iraqis what they need to be upfront to keep their own security in that country. You give the Iraqis what they need to make their own determination of what their country will be. And then, the time has come for the United States to move into the background and bring our men and women home.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), a member of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. McCaul of Texas. Mr. Speaker, September 11 changed our lives forever. But the war on terror started long before that. The year 1979 changed the world. When Iran took our embassy hostage, the seeds of Islamic jihad were spread all over the Middle East.

These seeds planted hatred and contempt for freedom in the souls of men like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul), a gentleman who expressed his concern that the American people would soon forget about Byron and his sacrifice for freedom. Whether it is Bill and Janet Norwood or the wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Hospital or the soldiers I met with in Iraq, they all tell me the same thing. Congressman, finish the job. And finish the job right.

I would like to close with a message that Byron’s father gave to me to deliver to this Chamber. Byron’s father said, “Byron understood the meaning of Semper Fi (always faithful), as did all marines who were there that day in Fallujah. He willingly gave his life, and others were seriously and permanently wounded as they sacrificed for their band of brothers and their country. He would never have traded honor for political advantage.”

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to indicate to one and all who cannot be here today that our legislative hands are tied. We have no opportunity, even though we plead- ed with the Rules Committee to give us an opportunity to be able to speak on alternatives to this resolution.

You have heard that this resolution is in support of the troops. It is not. You have heard that this resolution is in support of the war on terrorism. It is not. And I will tell you why it is not, and I will tell you why we have to have an alternative and why we need to vote “no” on this resolution, because it doesn’t support the troops, and it does not support the war on terrorism.

The people in this resolution that are referred to, the honored sacrifice that has been made by the Armed Forces of the United States, is supposedly on behalf of somebody called Prime Minister Blair. That is because he was going to engage in conversations with terrorists who have murdered Americans to give them amnesty. This is the amnesty resolution.

To vote for this resolution is to vote for those who support amnesty for those who kill American troops. This is the government we are supposed to be standing up and defending, the very freedom that gives that prime minister the possibility of speaking to the terrorists. It is the blood and sacrifice of American troops. This is the amnesty bill. This is the amnesty resolution.

There are people on this floor who will not grant amnesty to people who cut their lawns, who wash the dishes in the restaurants they eat in; but they are willing to vote for a resolution that says that they support a government that is willing to give amnesty to people who murder the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States. And if you disagree with that interpretation, give me the right to put it on the floor for a vote and let’s see who wins the hearts and minds of the American people, not the Iraqi people, as to who is really supporting the troops and who is really willing to fight a war on terror.

This is nothing but a resolution confirming the existing administration policy. Whether you are Democrat or Republican, you deserve the opportunity on the floor of the people’s House to have a real debate, not a discussion, not to echo sentiments, but to have substantive words on the floor. We do not have that right.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to clarify for the record that this resolution honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders, protecting the homeland, as servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, and in other roles.

And further, it honors the sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces and of partners in the coalition, and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside those, especially those who have fallen or have been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and of others who risk their lives to help defend freedom. This is a resolution to honor their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield ½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Harris), a member of the House International Relations Committee.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this strong, proactive defense of our liberties and freedoms from the preying forces of Islamic radicals in their jihad against the core values of our Western Civilization.

We did not choose this war. They picked the fight. The events of September 11 represented the final moment of spending our days as bystanders.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about the choices which precipitated the war in Iraq. The choice we face today, and Americans will face in November, is between two visions: full commitment to protect our Nation and prosecute the global war against terrorists, or complete surrender to Islamic extremists who want to destroy us. There is no middle ground.

Without maintaining pressure upon this global war, we face the grave risk of rekindling terrorism. These radical Islamists would rather take their fight to our streets, our communities, our neighborhoods.

The necessity of a proactive, robust strategy recently was reiterated by an ally: a willingness to face the threat posed by radicalized forces.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair said: “We have to act, not react; we have to do so on the basis of prediction, not certainty; and such an action will often, usually indeed, be outside our own territory.”

America has acted. Our troops have responded honorably and successfully.
Are we safe for today? Absolutely. Should we cut and run from Iraq? Never. As Winston Churchill said: "We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long-drawn trial of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. This afternoon, regrettably, we are talking about the cost of this war, the cost of the commitment of the American people: the cost in money, and the cost in lives, over 2,500 to date; the cost in wounded, over 18,000, very little or no oversight, very little or no accountability, and certainly very little or no shared sacrifice in this country.

This resolution that we are discussing, because it is not even a debate, is more about politics than about practical solutions. Anyone that doubts that, all you have got to do is read today's paper which sets out the political strategy by the majority leader in terms of this resolution.

Oversight, oversight, oversight. Where was our armor, both body armor and vehicle armor? What was in our plan post "Mission Accomplished" press conference? Where were we during the issue of Abu Ghraib rendition and so many other things that have come up?

In fact, last night I went home and I switched on the TV and I just happened, by chance, to catch the program on HBO, Last Letters Home: The Families. And it occurs to me this afternoon that we owe those families from that HBO program, and the 2,500 other families, an apology, because they have made sacrifices. They understand the cost of this war, and they must be wondering where the accountability and where the oversight is. We need to apologize to them and to the American people for not doing our job.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT), who has traveled to Iraq and has witnessed the progress firsthand.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about facts and figures tonight. We have talked about whether we have got the right number of forces and how much money we are spending. But we can talk about facts and figures all the time. This is more than that.

This is about faces. This is about faces in the fight on global terror. This is about the faces of leaders like Maliki and Karzai, guys that are worried whether the United States is going to keep its pledge and its word to be with them.

This is about the faces of citizens who want to raise their families, who want to live and worship in a country that is free, where they can walk down the street without the fear of being blown up.

This is about the faces of families who are concerned about whether we are going to do everything we need to do to make sure our soldiers, sailors, airmen have everything they need in this fight.

This is about the faces of the enemy, cold blooded murderers with red eyes who have only one mission in life, death or victory.

And this is about the faces of soldiers, dirty, tired, hungry, scared sometimes, but soldiers with a resolute mission, a mission of victory.

Mr. Speaker, every day I thank God that we have men and women worldwide willing to do something bigger than any of us here today, willing to fight for freedom and justice and to keep America safe and strong.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution contains phrases such as "we will prevail," words like "determination," "resolve," "we are committed to the completion of the mission." It is a good, well written pep talk. But where is the discussion of how?

As Mr. GILCHREST, our colleague from Maryland and a decorated Vietnam war veteran said, where is the urgency in figuring out how we are going to do those things?

We should be having a debate and a discussion on how we will prevail, not just that want to prevail.

Specifically, how are we going to equip a very poorly equipped Iraqi army? How are we going to set up a system of support and supply and repair for the Iraqi army? How are we going to ensure that more Iraqis are employed and develop the economy?

How are we going to increase electricity production, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to increase access to potable water and sanitation, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to improve oil production and the oil production sector?

How are we going to finish putting together the provincial reconstruction teams? How are we going to increase and improve the training of police? How are we going to help create and improve local courts and the judicial system?

How are we going to improve the refineries? Iraq is an importer of gasoline. How are we going to improve the accountability for contractors? That means how are we going to quit wasting billions of U.S. tax dollars?

How are we going to find more allies to share in this burden? How are we going to keep our Army, our military from breaking down? How are we going to strengthen our Reserve component, our blessed Guard and Reserve people?

How are we going to set up the volunteer Army? How are we going to increase our public diplomacy, so that people will quit hating America all around the world? How are we going to make our troops safer?

These are the kinds of discussions we should be having. But what are we doing? We are rehashing the past. We are talking about the 1990s. We are talking about the war resolution. Let us look ahead. How are we going to prevail? How are we going to keep this commitment to the completion of this mission?

Specifically, I think we need to do far better oversight. I am a member of the House Arms Services Committee. We are abysmal in our oversight, abysmal.

Years ago when the Republicans took over, and maybe it was a good move at that time, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations was eliminated. It has not worked to do that.

I see friends over here. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to bring back the Subcommittees on Oversight and Investigations so we can ask these kinds of questions. How are we going to do the things? How are we going to achieve this pep talk that is going to be voted on today or tomorrow?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe), a member of the International Relations Committee, who has traveled to Iraq, has met with our U.S. coalition, and Iraqi troops.

Mr. Poe. Mr. Speaker, I went to Iraq in 2005. I was one of two Members of this Congress to view the first free elections in their history, and I watched in awe and admiration as more than 8 million people went to the polls and elected a government. Men and women, young and old, courageously cast their ballots in the face of the violent terrorists.

I spoke to many Iraqis and they showed great defiance against those outlaws that wished to disrupt those elections. Despite facing 300 attacks across the nation that day, more than 60 percent of the Iraqis went out to vote. Not even 44 murders by the terrorists could remove the resolve of these people.

Men and women waited in line to cast their vote. They took the historic ballots, entered a cardboard booth and made their choice. With that simple but noble action, they pushed tyrants and terrorists aside and set Iraq on a path to freedom. Then they marched down the street holding their ink stained finger up high in defiance of those terrorists.

I talked to Iraqis. I talked to a woman who came up to me with tears in her eyes after she voted and said how grateful she and her family were for the America that we live in, for giving their sons for their family's freedom.

I went on to reveal her husband and her brother had been murdered by the devil of the desert, Saddam Hussein.

There have been more successful elections since the first, and the skepticism of the critics get it wrong with each new free and successful election.

Democracy is the enemy of terrorists. They hate democracies as much as
they hate the human life of the innocents that they murder.

We cannot give in to these madmen. The insurgents have discovered that the United States and her allies cannot be defeated on the battlefield. They now also see it as their primary mission to resolve the Iraqi people to create a free and fair and inclusive government cannot be broken. Liberty and freedom are overcoming treachery and tyranny and violence. We will not fear nor flee nor flinch from a battle to be fought.

And our mission statement was stated 40 years ago by President John F. Kennedy when he said, “Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.

And that’s just the way it is.

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity, in light of the gentleman from Arkansas’ comments, Dr. Snyder, to remind the body, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Investigation Subcommittee for the Armed Services Committee that produced the all important legislation we now call Goldwater-Nichols, which brought about jointness within the armed services.

And I also might mention that all 29 Demoerats sent a letter to the chair of the Armed Services Committee, from which we have not received an answer, recommending and asking that the Investigations Or Oversight Subcommittee be reestablished.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this debate on this resolution, and the resolution itself, continues two very dangerous patterns that have sort of governed all of our actions in Iraq for far too long.

First of all, there are no specifics, as Congressman Snyder said quite articulately, as to how we are going to achieve this victory.

When this debate was billed, we were told this was going to be the floor of the House, the People’s House talking about how to deal with the very tough challenges that now present themselves in Iraq. Even the President admits that things have not gone the way we had hoped, and we need to step up and figure out how to fix the problems.

And yet, this resolution doesn’t say a thing about that. It says, terrorism is bad, our troops are good, and we want to win.

This House is failing in its mission with such an open statement that does not get at the how of winning. How are we going to deal with an open-ended commitment to Iraq? How are we going to pay the price for that? Is it even in the best interest of our goal of a stable and peaceful Iraq to say that our troops will stay there for as long as is necessary?

Those questions are not answered. Unless we in this House are willing to step up and put policy forward, we shouldn’t say that this is a debate about the future of Iraq. It is not. We have many hard questions that need to be answered. This resolution does not do that.

And the second dangerous trend is the pattern of the President and the majority in this Congress to say anyone who disagrees with them is somehow unpatriotic and defeatist, which I think is really just a way to avoid a real refresher course on why democracy is important. We are all very good at saying that it is important. It is important so that we hear all the voices, not just those who disagree with us. That way we can learn from our mistakes, which we desperately need to do in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in disappointment—though I must say, not in surprise—about the exercise the House is engaged in today. This is not a true debate about our policy in Iraq. A real debate is now how to consider alternative proposals and vote on meaningful amendments that could help us improve the very difficult situation there. Instead we have before us an un-amendable, rhetorical document about the-war on terrorism that will certainly do nothing to help us in the very real challenges we face there. This process is an offense to our democracy.

What is even more troubling, Mr. Speaker, is that this kind of undemocratic approach is precisely what led to the Bush administration’s many costly mistakes in Iraq. Americans have seen how the administration’s stubborn single-mindedness and refusal to consider alternative views and dissenting opinions have cost us dearly in Iraq. The facts are all-too-well-known:

When General Shinseki said that far more troops would be needed to secure the peace in Iraq, he was ignored and soon retired—and the result was that the troops we did send struggled unnecessarily to prevent and control a massive insurgency.

When advisors warned the administration not to de-Baathify and disband the Iraqi military and security forces, they were ignored. As Prime Minister Tony Blair has publicly admitted, this was a grave mistake that effectively pushed thousands of military-trained, disempowered Sunnis into the streets, fueling the post-war insurgency.

And the administration’s refusal to heed dissenting views on Iraq continues to this day. Now that the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction has brought to light many more costly mistakes and abuse in the reconstruction contracting, I understand that the administration and the Republicans in Congress are trying to prematurely end his mandate.

This is a clear pattern, Mr. Speaker, and the consequences of this arrogant, undemocratic approach are real. It has cost us dearly in American lives and resources, undermined our efforts to build peace and stability in Iraq, and delayed our departure from the country.

Mr. Speaker, I support the use-of-force authorization in October 2002 in order to give the President the leverage to hold Saddam Hussein accountable for his threatening behavior and refusal to submit to weapons inspections. And that is what makes it all the more frustrating that the President misused that authority by rushing to war and committing so many grave and costly mistakes in Iraq.

So no, Mr. Speaker, this is not a real debate. A real debate would allow us to consider the important questions in Iraq: Can we afford to make an open-ended commitment to staying in Iraq? Has our troop presence there reached the point where it is inhibiting a successful transition to full Iraqi sovereignty? Can our strained military and ballooning national debt support such an approach?

How can we accelerate the transition to Iraqi sovereignty and responsibility for their own country? How best can we engage in more robust diplomacy with our allies and key regional players who can help bolster the new Iraq government and contribute to its reconstruction?

How can we improve Congressional oversight so that we can identify and rectify the enormous mistakes the administration has made in Iraq?

These are the questions we should be debating, Mr. Speaker, because they directly affect our ability to achieve success in Iraq. We owe it to our brave men and women in uniform and to the American people to ask these questions. But instead, we have a resolution before us today that in no way deals with the important issues when it comes to the real issues in Iraq. It says, essentially, that we support fighting terror and that we are committed to achieving success in Iraq. I agree with that, but that doesn’t say anything about how we get there.

Mr. Speaker, today Congress is continuing to utterly abdicte its oversight responsibility. Since the outbreak of war, this Congress has done little more than endorse the administration’s policy in Iraq, instead of asking the tough questions and scrutinizing that policy, as the Constitution requires us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, despite this Congress’ refusal to conduct oversight, that we can be honest today as we look ahead in Iraq. We all want to see an Iraq that is stable, secure, and free. Our troops are doing an outstanding job, and they deserve our full support and respect. But the fact is that success or failure in Iraq increasingly depends on the decisions of Iraqi leaders, and they must understand that. In order to achieve success in Iraq we must accelerate the transition to Iraqi sovereignty.

I believe that significantly reducing our military footprint is critical for making that happen. While we cannot simply abandon Iraq at this point, drawing down our forces levels in a responsible way in the coming months will force the government in Baghdad to take greater responsibility for their own security and reduce their dependence on U.S. forces. It will also send an important message to the Iraqi people that Americans are not there to occupy the country, but rather seek to begin leaving as Iraqis take control of their own country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as we move forward in Iraq, both the future and the past matter. We must make the best of a difficult situation by working diligently to help Iraqis take full responsibility for running their country so that our overburdened troops can come home. And we must do so in a manner that does not give the violent Islamic terrorists in the world any greater strength. Yet we must also be willing to acknowledge and learn from our mistakes.
so that we can chart a new path forward. That requires holding the Bush administration and this rubber-stamp Congress accountable for their failures."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I would like to give myself a bit of time right now as I might consume.

We have a strategy, and it is a strategy for success, Mr. Speaker. Every day in Iraq and in Afghanistan is proof positive that we are making progress and that we will prevail.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say we need to have a debate on how to win. And I would point them to the Intelligence, to the Armed Services Committee, our own International Relations Committee, the countless hearings and meetings we have held to address the issues that have been raised here. And while I will let Armed Services discuss their oversight, I would like to read just briefly some of the sessions held by our International Relations Committee on Oversight.

Full committee hearings in the 109th Congress, in the 108th Congress, full committee Members only meeting, subcommittee hearings in the 109th Congress, subcommittee hearings in the 108th Congress, classified briefings in the 108th and 109th Congresses, as well as a total of 9 resolutions of inquiry on Iraq referred to our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. Terrorism, as a method of achieving political goals and settling political differences, is intolerable to the civilized world. Inevitably, terrorists will gain access to chemical, biological and even nuclear weapons. Never has a non-government organization been able to deliver weapons of mass destruction. That will be unprecedented, and it is truly intolerable. So terrorism, as an organized system of political action, must be defeated.

Within the Palestinian Authority, for the first time, the issue of terrorism as a method of political action is now the issue between Mr. Abbas and the Prime Minister. Very specifically, they are debating not the legitimacy of a national army or diplomacy, but the legitimacy of political armies, factional armies and terrorist action—that is, violence unpowered by national interest or law.

And in Iraq, the same issue is being joined. The new Prime Minister recognizes that there can be no government if political organizations (even if ideologically different) are to each have their own armies governed only by the unlimited rights of terrorists to kill others and terrorize those committed to public service.

Iraqis had the courage to vote to adopt an interim government, to adopt a constitution, and to elect their first democratic government. The prime minister, as well as communities throughout Iraq, get it, that governing themselves is what they want, and they are in varying degrees. We as a people know the power of freedom of choice. We as a people know the strength of the principles of liberty throughout the world. Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I rise today to give voice to a few of those outside views about Iraq, those of several former general officers who have the courage to speak out about how this war has been mishandled by the President and this Republican Congress.

Take, for example, General Anthony Zinni, former commander of the U.S. Central Command. He says, ‘We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan. Ten years’ worth of planning were thrown away, troop levels dismissed out of hand — and these were strategic missteps, mistakes of policy.’

Or how about Major General Paul Eaton, who led the initial effort to create the Iraqi Army. He says that the ‘failure to build coalitions with our allies has imposed far greater demands and risks on our soldiers in Iraq than necessary.’

The list goes on and on. These generals have served our country with...
honor and distinction, and we would be foolish not to heed their counsel. But this administration and this majority refuse to listen to any views other than their own.

I agree with many of my colleagues who say that the failure in Iraq is not an option. But unless we take a long, honest look at how we got where we are right now and demand some kind of accountability for the mistakes that were made and learn from those mistakes, there can be no success.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Lewis).

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for House Resolution 861.

Answering questions at a September 27 Pentagon press conference, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Myers, said, "If we are not successful in the global war on terrorism, then our way of life is, indeed, at stake. If terrorism gains in Iraq, the next 9/11 is right around the corner. It's just that simple," he said.

This is the sober reality we face. Our safety at home and the cause of freedom abroad is largely contingent upon our success in Iraq. Our enemies would like nothing better than to seize upon the unrest in Iraq, drive coalition forces away, and take refuge in another autocratic regime like the former Taliban and Al Qaeda, and the Baathist Parties, from which they could have greater wherewithal to kill Americans and our allies.

We must fight and win the battle against terror overseas so we never have to fight it here at home.

As we have moved to restore order and stability to the region, our temporary presence has drawn thousands of al Qaeda disciples to Iraq to capitalize on what began as a small and antiseptic uprising by Saddam Hussein's fiercest loyalists. Now Iraq is al Qaeda's center of gravity, and we must do all that we can to secure and stabilize Iraq and its promising new government, defeating agents of terror on fronts abroad so they never again strike us here at home.

We must also remember that it is not a war of our choosing. al Qaeda declared war against the United States more than a decade ago and launched attacks against us and our interests throughout the 1990s. Whether or not Iraq was directly involved in the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States, our operations in that nation have become a war against terrorists who have already attacked this country.

It is essential to the security of the American people and to the world's security that the United States together with its allies take the battle to the terrorists wherever they may be and ensure those who provide them assistance.

Therefore, I do not believe it is in our national interest to arbitrarily set a date for withdrawal until our mission is complete. House Resolution 861 makes it clear that the American people are determined to prevail in Iraq and other fronts to protect our freedom and defeat terrorist enemies. To achieve this goal, we must remain engaged, patient, and persistent.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Davis).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, our military, in uniform have shouldered the enormous tasks we have asked of them; and they should be commended for it, especially considering the careless way this war was planned and conducted.

Our soldiers would never complain about the mistakes of their Commander in Chief. The military just does not work that way. We all know that. Without any second guessing, they will always do the jobs assigned to them.

But we are the Congress. It is our job to raise questions and our troops should not be used and cared for. It is our job to identify and to look into mistakes that are made by the executive branch. It is our job to consider and learn from the lessons of Iraq. But what have we learned today? Not new words and we are not fixing problems.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, just does not cut it. Our soldiers are doing their jobs. They have earned and deserve a Congress that does its job.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Platt), who has been to Iraq four times, to Afghanistan twice, and I had the honor of traveling to both places with him as well.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 861.

The debate we are having today serves as an important reminder to all Americans that we are a nation at war. This war is against an enemy that embraces hate and intolerance over life and liberty. Like other wars in our history, the human and financial costs are high. We mourn the loss of each and every American who has made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our nation. All Americans are forever indebted to these courageous citizens and their families.

It is understandable that Americans worry for the safety of our troops and have doubts as reports of suicide bombings and other attacks air regularly on television. But, as in the war against fascism in the 20th century, and as demonstrated by the tragic attacks of 9-11, the stakes for our nation and our democratic allies throughout the world could not be higher.

I have traveled to Afghanistan twice and Iraq four times over the past four and one-half years. During these visits, there have been two constants that have instilled confidence in me about our mission and progress in these countries.

First is the professionalism, courage, and sense of duty displayed by our men and women in uniform. Whenever you thank our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen for their service, they humbly reply, "I'm just doing my job."

Their job, of course, is to protect our way of life. To protect the lives of our nation's citizens and the principles for which our great nation stands.

Our troops have removed truly brutal regimes from power in Afghanistan and Iraq.
They have denied terrorists two safe havens. They have eliminated the threat that a murderous dictator who used weapons of mass destruction on his own people—a dictator who continued to defy United Nations resolutions and shoot at American planes enlisting the no-fly zones in northern and southern Iraq—would use these areas to plan and direct operations once international support for sanctions broke down.

Our men and women in uniform are fighting in schools and roads, training police and soldiers, and hunting down terrorists. They are fighting not only in Iraq and Afghanistan, but also in the United States, where we don’t have to fight them here at home. They are helping the Iraqi security forces stand up so we can stand down. In place of the regimes of terror and torture in Iraq and Afghanistan, we now have duly elected constitutional governments. Governments that are working to promote democracy in a region of the world that has rarely embraced it. The citizens of these nations have demonstrated their intense desire for freedom through their willingness to face down threats of violence and death in casting their votes in numerous national elections in both countries.

The devotion to duty of our men and women in uniform is truly inspiring. The sacrifices of these patriotic Americans on the front lines of the Global War on Terrorism, as well as the sacrifices of their family members on the home front, have earned the respect, admiration, and eternal gratitude of all Americans, as well as that of 50 million Afghani and Iraqi citizens who are free today because of the sacrifices that are working to promote democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan, we now have duly elected constitutional governments.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, we are building a new future. The Global War on Terrorism in the broad sense and the specific battles in Iraq and Afghanistan will not be won according to a specified timetable, and our enemy cannot be appeased. But we can and will win this war because our cause is just and right. And winning this war will ensure the democratic gains made in Afghanistan and Iraq are not lost. Winning this war will also have a far-reaching and critically important impact in other Middle East countries.

The security of our nation and its citizens, along with the defense of the ideals of freedom, democracy, and justice, is what is at stake in this global struggle of good over evil. This struggle requires us to go beyond Democrat and Republican, Liberal and Conservative—just as previous generations did to defeat the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century. And, as Franklin D. Roosevelt at the beginning of the Second World War, it means going forward, “with confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people,” in order to “gain the inevitable triumph.”

But the facts that cannot be debated are that Saddam Hussein had brutally repressed his own people, that he had used chemical weapons against his own people, that he had sanctioned the rape and murder of his own citizens with rape rooms and mass graves standing as a testament to that fact, that he had harbored terrorists within his borders and supported terrorist organizations throughout the region and the entire world, that he defied the world continually by violating United Nations Security Council resolutions. Saddam Hussein was a threat to world peace and security, and it was a correct decision to go in and remove him from power.

And now we must complete the mission to bring freedom to the Iraqi people. And freedom is taking root. We have seen recently the completion of the freely elected Iraqi unity government serving under a Constitution written by the Iraqi people and approved by the Iraqi people. And last week American forces, with the cooperation of Iraqi citizens and security forces, eliminated al Zarqawi, the terrorist leader. And according to the Iraqi national security advisor, the elimination of Zarqawi has delivered his government, he said, a huge treasure of information on the terrorist operation. And we have already seen the results with raids across Iraq where hundreds of terrorists have been killed or captured. The Iraqi national security advisor also said that he thought the security situation in the country was improving enough to allow a large number of U.S. forces to leave Iraq by the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House, every American, we all want our troops to come home. Lord knows our troops have performed brilliantly and have sacrificed great leaders have done throughout our history when defending our freedom. But they do not want to come home before their mission is complete.

And simply put, you cannot say that you support the troops without allowing them to complete their mission.

This resolution declares the United States is committed to the completion
of that mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have the privilege of working closely with our troops, the best fighting force the world has ever known.

And I am proud to support this resolution, because if people will just sit down and read it calmly, you will see that it expresses the strong support for our troops and for victory. Now, it is being used here today as some sort of political Rorschach test. I regret that, because the great leaders in American history have used our times of war to unite our country instead of divide our country.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are probably wondering why we are debating the Iraq war now 3 years after the beginning of that conflict. We should have had a good debate at the start of the war. I was not serving in Congress then. But it has gone down in history as one of the worst debates in American history.

And the was not what we should have done, but rather, what do we do now. And the same is true I think in regard to Iraq. We need to be proactive, not reactive. Like many Members of Congress, I have traveled to Iraq multiple times, and I met with many of these brave men and women who have been to Iraq four times, former Army Ranger, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) who has been to Iraq four times to visit with our troops.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I spent many years in coaching. Every Monday morning after a Saturday game, I got lots of mail telling me what I should have done. None of those letters helped me very much, because the game was over; hindsight was always perfect. And that is why I think it is so important that we are debating this resolution now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee yields the floor to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as I thought about today’s debate, Tom Paine’s words in the crisis came to mind: ‘These are the times that try men’s souls.’

It is not that the Army is in tatters. Our Army in the Revolutionary War was in tatters at the time; it was just before the Battle of Princeton and Trenton, which were successful and pulled us back together.

It is that we seem to be in tatters. I am extremely disappointed that this resolution, the process for the resolution, and some of the whereases in the resolution have invited Members of this House to become angry and to oppose the resolution.

The resolution is something that we all should be supporting. I support the resolution. The ‘resolved’ part of the resolution is quite reasonable. And it expresses the sense of this Congress and this country that we will be resolved with regard to this engagement. We cannot afford to do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, it is with disappointment that I participate in the debate today, a debate that is designed intentionally to divide us, when in fact we ought to be showing a great deal of unity as a country in support of our troops and in support of the effort in Iraq.

We are making progress there. It is a slow go. These kinds of insurgencies typically take 9 to 14 years to deal with. If we hang in there, the Iraqi people ultimately will get control of the security situation in that country.

If we fail, our security situation gets worse. Theirs is awful. It is a huge threat to Israel. It is a threat to Europe, and a threat to the world. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the resolution, even though they may be disappointed in the process that has been offered us today, in the ‘whereas’ clauses in the resolution.

Mr. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous speaker for the vote of confidence. I am sure that the troops are very happy with that support as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, my Florida colleague, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, who has been to both Iraq and Afghanistan and has spent Thanksgiving with our troops and our coalition forces.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is fighting bloodthirsty monsters like al Zarqawi, monsters that behead civilian hostages and that blow up innocent women and children.

And if many of our Democratic colleagues across the aisle have their way, we would already have cut and run from Iraq and Zarqawi would still be alive beheading innocent people. Thankfully, our brave troops understood the kind of enemy that we are facing.

This is an enemy. Mr. Speaker, that kidnaps and beheads hostages. This is an enemy that walks into a mall full of innocent people and explodes bombs. This is an enemy that declared war on the United States decades ago, Mr. Speaker, and refuses to stop until liberty has been snuffed out.

But the United States cannot and will not allow that to happen. Hard work remains in Afghanistan and Iraq. The stakes are high. The Afghan people understand that. The Iraqi people understand this as well. So do the terrorists who murder on a daily basis.

But we are steadily working towards success, not defeat. Because, you see, the more that we are helping people over there. This is about protecting our country from rogue states and terrorists over here.
This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes it clear that the American people are determined to prevail in protecting our freedom from terrorist. We will not cower to these thugs. We will continue to support our honorable troops and prevail over this evil. Mr. Speaker, as we maintain our resolve, Mr. Speaker, and do not cut and run, we will win, we will defeat the terrorists.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, in response to pressure from both sides of the aisle, the Republican leadership promised a full debate on Iraq. What we are is certainly a long debate, but it is far from full.

A full debate would mean that Members would be able to offer alternatives to this resolution. We would then be able to debate the merits of all of the resolutions offered. I had hoped to offer a bipartisian resolution that I had introduced with my colleague, JOE SCHWARZ of Michigan, that recognizes political progress in Iraq, including the establishment of a national unity government, but also recognizes that more progress must be made and that the Iraqis must meet their own deadlines for modifications to their Constitution.

As it is, today’s debate has been tightly controlled, and our only choice is to vote up or down on a “status quo” resolution that does not focus on Iraq and does not reflect reality on the ground. This resolution does not bring us together, Mr. Speaker. And I regret that this debate is driving us further apart.

We were led into war as a divided Nation, and today we are even more divided. A successful conclusion in Iraq can only happen, it can only happen if we work together. And I believe that progress is possible. But we can’t wait progress so much that we blind ourselves to the reality on the ground.

This debate is driving us further apart.

Mr. OSWALD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who has traveled multiple times to Iraq.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in the days after 9/11, the United States took the last action that our enemies thought we would take, we took the fight to them. They believed that our partisan bickering would provide them with the protection they needed to continue to operate. But they were dead wrong.

Today, we have them on the run. Saddam Hussein has been captured, and Zarqawi is dead. In their place stands the very thing our enemies fear the most, democracy. Instead of a fascist dictator is a newly elected prime minister. And fear and oppression have been replaced with an emerging economy.

But our enemies continue to fight. Why is that? Do their resolve stem from some military, political, or strategic error on our part? No. To the contrary, it is our failure to give them strength. al Qaeda has declared Iraq as the battleground between democracy and their hatred of our way of life.

But they know that their war cannot be won by us. And I look forward to the day when our friends in the Middle East can stand on their own. They have already proven to be allies, and the future of our friendship still hangs in the balance.

So I would rather abandon our friends and everything we have accomplished, hoping this act of good faith would somehow appease a foe proven to be without mercy. But I know our borders and our communities should not be our front line. Some of us are on the job to keep our Nation safe, and we will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes left, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 8 minutes left. Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution talks about how much we honor our troops and the sacrifices they and their families have made to help defend freedom. No matter how much each Member chooses to vote today, there’s no question that we all honor and support our troops.

But I would argue that if we really cared for our troops, we would make sure they had the equipment and training they need. We wouldn’t try to make them to meet some future mission. No one wants a new mission for our troops, but if we have to fight somewhere else, we wouldn’t have the equipment or forces to do it.

Therefore, if we are going to be debating in a resolution today, not the “feel good” messages included in the Republican resolution. We all want to feel good about Iraq and believe that progress is possible. But we can’t wait progress so much that we blind ourselves to the reality on the ground.

This debate is driving us further apart.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), who served in the United States Air Force from 1953 to 1979, decorated combat veteran with two silver stars, and as all of us know is a living hero, a prisoner of war during the Vietnam War. We welcome him and we thank him for closing up our segment of the debate.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the question of the day is this, do you support the war against terrorism or don’t you? You know, our enemy brutally attacked the World Trade Center in 1993, and we did nothing. In 1998, they attacked two American embassies in East Africa killing 80 people. We did nothing. We were attacked again on USS Cole. We did nothing.

Well, now we have a strong President with courage and conviction who is bold enough to say enough is enough. If you are going to attack the United States, then we are going to fight back, and we will not tolerate terror.

There is a high cost of my life to the Air Force, flew 62 missions in the Korean War, 23 in Vietnam, and spent 7 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam, more than half of that in solitary confinement. When I say I revere freedom, I mean that with my whole heart. I know what it is like not to have it. Every single day, since I left that God forsaken place, I thank God for my freedom.

Some people here in America take the countless blessings of this Nation for granted. However, freedom is the touchstone of democracy, and America means business when we say we want to help people in Iraq experience the rich taste of freedom. When we say we are with you, our word is golden. It is through the lens of a life-long fighter pilot that I step back today and marvel at some of the tremendous accomplishments of the last several years in the promising democracy of Iraq. It gives me hope and provides just a glimpse of how the best is yet to come.
Mr. Speaker, we are making great progress in Iraq. I have been there, and I have seen it. What a difference a few years makes. For generations, the people of Iraq only knew hate, fear and death. The former leader of Iraq gassed his own people by the thousands and hang people in his very own death chambers.

Remember just days ago looking at the image on the television of Zarqawi, the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq? He was cornered and killed. Better yet, from that day forward, the image of al Qaeda ended. We are hunting down terrorists, and they are going to pay.

According to the Associated Press, American and Iraqi forces have carried out 432 raids just since last week’s killing of al Zarqawi and 104 insurgents were killed during those raids. They also resulted in the capture of 759 anti-Iraqi elements. As a result, we discovered a treasure trove of al Zarqawi’s information, almost ensuring a defeat against the remnants of al Qaeda.

Americans are training and working with Iraqi forces nationwide. There is over 260,000 Iraqi security forces serving their country. Another exciting facet of the development in Iraq is the budding democracy. Remember last January we saw the pictures from the first election? The news media predicted gloom and doom. What did we see? We saw bold images of people patiently waiting in lines for hours, defying death threats just to cast a vote.

Today, people are working tirelessly to guarantee their freedoms. Participation in many Sunni areas of Iraq went from as little as 25 percent in January 2005 election to 75 percent in December. That is tremendous. Wouldn’t we like that here in the United States?

The people of Iraq have created a framework for their own future, their very own constitution. They have annulled non-democracy governments, and the people of Iraq refused to allow those who rule by hate and fear stop them from forging ahead for the future.

They are already tasting the fruits of our freedom. Their strong resolve will pay off in the long run. They know what a difference several years of budding democracy makes. This is what democracy looks like in Iraq today.

Schools and hospitals have been renovated, over 3,700 schools. In May, oil production reached 2.1 million barrels a day. In 2003, barely anyone had a cell phone. In Iraq today there are 6.4 million telephone users, and 1 million land-line connections. There are over 100 privately owned newspapers and magazines and more than two dozen radio and television stations. That is just the beginning.

Our men and women in uniform are doing a tremendous job bolstering this new democracy and planting the tree of freedom in tyranny’s backyard. Our men and women are making a difference, and making progress. They are lifting up the people of Iraq, so ultimately the people of Iraq can help themselves. We must stay the course and see this through. We must be patient and persevere. I think President Bush said it best, quote, this is going to be freedom’s century.

God bless you. God bless America. I salute you one and all and praise the people of Iraq.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield

1 1/2 minutes at this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Mr. SCHIFF. With all due respect to my colleagues in the majority, Mr. Speaker, I think the question posed by this resolution is whether you support accountability and oversight by this body of the war in Iraq or whether you do not. This resolution is not a substitute for oversight and accountability.

Our brave men and women in Iraq deserve more than this rhetorical pom-pom. Even as we celebrate the killing of Abu Musab al Zarqawi and the completion of the Iraqi cabinet, we cannot turn away from the grim reality that the war President Bush declared over in the spring of 2003 has had an impact and continued to get more difficult than the administration anticipated or planned for.

We need a new way forward in Iraq, a fact that seems glaringly obvious to everybody but the President, his advisors and the majority in this House.

Last fall the Senate voted 79 to 19 for a resolution sponsored by Senator JOHN WARNER, the Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which stated that 2006, quote, should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with full Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

Earlier this year, House and Senate Democrats unveiled our “Real Security” agenda that laid out a blueprint for protecting our nation in the 21st Century. Our plan calls for the establishment of full Iraqi sovereignty during 2006, provides for responsible redeployment of our forces to better protect our troops and facilitates the transfer of authority, and holds the Administration accountable for the terrible mistakes that have been made in the prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of Iraq. In response to our plan and the overwhelming bipartisan majority of our colleagues in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House has reopened the debate on the administration’s resolution that the “stay the course” policy in Iraq—a policy that he has reiterated in recent days.

At a time when Congress needs to inject itself—forcefully—into the process of determining what our course of action in Iraq should be, the Republican majority is again prepared to rubber-stamp a policy that national security experts across the political spectrum recognize as plagued with misjudgment and malfeasance.

I have three times to visit with our troops there and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything that we have asked of them and they have done it magnificently. Whatever success we have had in Iraq—every village that is secured, every public works project that is completed, every school that is reopened—is due to the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

We owe our men and women serving in Iraq lot more than this rhetorical pom-pom. We owe them nothing to hold the administration accountable for its conduct of the war. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, the former commander of the 1st Marine Division. General Newbold is one of a growing number of general officers who have courageously voiced their concerns about Iraq. General Newbold told me what he told Time Magazine in April when he said, “We are living with now [in Iraq] is the consequence of successive policy failures.”

When any other variable under the control of Congress, our failure to perform oversight has been a major contributing factor to these failures and to the difficult situation we find ourselves in.

Regrettably, I must vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, even as we celebrate the killing of Abu Musab al Zarqawi and the completion of the new Iraqi cabinet, we cannot turn away from the grim reality that the war that President Bush declared over in the spring of 2003 has been profligate, costlier, longer and more difficult than the Administration anticipated or planned for.

We need a new way forward in Iraq—a fact that seems glaringly obvious to everybody but the President, his advisors and the majority in this House. Last fall the Senate voted 79–19 for a resolution sponsored by JOHN WARNER, the Republican Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which stated that 2006 “should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.”

Earlier this year, House and Senate Democrats unveiled our “Real Security” agenda that laid out a blueprint for protecting our nation in the 21st Century. Our plan calls for the establishment of full Iraqi sovereignty during 2006, provides for responsible redeployment of our forces to better protect our troops and facilitates the transfer of authority, and holds the Administration accountable for the terrible mistakes that have been made in the prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of Iraq. In response to our plan and the overwhelming bipartisan majority of our colleagues in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House has reopened the debate on the Administration’s resolution that the “stay the course” policy in Iraq—a policy that he has reiterated in recent days.

At a time when Congress needs to inject itself—forcefully—into the process of determining what our course of action in Iraq should be, the Republican majority is again prepared to rubber-stamp a policy that national security experts across the political spectrum recognize as plagued with misjudgment and malfeasance.

I have three times to visit with our troops there and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything that we have asked of them and they have done it magnificently. Whatever success we have had in Iraq—every village that is secured, every public works project that is completed, every school that is reopened—is due to the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

We owe our men and women serving in Iraq lot more than this rhetorical pom-pom. We owe them nothing to hold the administration accountable for its conduct of the war. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, the former commander of the 1st Marine Division. General Newbold is one of a growing number of general officers who have courageously voiced their concerns about Iraq. General Newbold told me what he told Time Magazine in April when he said, “We are living with now [in Iraq] is the consequence of successive policy failures.”
not disloyal to ask these questions; oversight is a core responsibility of Congress. The great strength of a democratic system with built-in checks and balances is that mistakes are caught and corrected.

Every member of this House, Republicans and Democrats, wants a stable and representative government. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot hope to change course in Iraq until and unless we are willing to acknowledge mistakes and until the administration is held to account and forced to change.

Even implementing a successful endgame in Iraq will be difficult, but the President’s open-ended commitment to remain in the country is untenable and unwise. The American people want Iraq to succeed, and for representative government there to survive and lead to a better future for the Iraqi people, but that success requires a new direction. This empty resolution fails to provide that and, accordingly, I will oppose it.

Mr. SKELETON. Can the Chair advise the time I have left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California, a moment ago, referred to an Amendment by Senator WARNER, of California, that says, "We have talked about the fact that they will not be effective, that they know what they are doing, that they may be the best military we have had in centuries, that we have great leadership. That is why their judgment on the ground as they stand up and train in this Iraqi force, and that handoff from the American and handle those security duties themselves. It shouldn't be a Congress from California, it shouldn't be a Senator from Minnesota, it shouldn't be subject to a committee vote by those of us in Washington, D.C.

Mr. SCHIFF, the gentleman from California, a moment ago, referred to an amendment by Senator WARNER, Armed Services chairman in the Senate. That amendment stayed in the law last year. This is what we should be discussing today about Iraq, as we were told we would.

Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq. That is where we should be today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I think it is important to remember the two major provisions in this resolution, one that there is not going to be an arbitrary cutoff, that that would displease the military interests of the United States to have an arbitrary exit date from Iraq; and, secondly, that we are going to finish the mission, we are going to fulfill this mission, and that we support the mission that is being undertaken by those 130,000 plus troops who are in Iraq right now.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about this question of who should determine when we leave Iraq. Over the last week, we have talked about the bringing to justice of Mr. Zarqawi, and everyone.

Democrats and Republicans, have been talking about the extreme competence of the American military. We have talked about the fact that they were extremely effective, that they know what they are doing, that they may be the best military we have had in decades, that we have great leadership. That is why their judgment on the ground as they stand up and train in this Iraqi force, and that handoff from the American military and handle those security duties themselves. It shouldn't be a Congress from California, it shouldn't be a Senator from Minnesota, it shouldn't be subject to a committee vote by those of us in Washington, D.C. It should be a function of the collaboration and the discussion and the analysis of the combat commanders on the ground listening to their captains and their majors and their colonels who are training up this Iraqi force. When they say they are ready, that is when we make that handoff.

Mr. Speaker, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for 30 seconds.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, instead of finding, capturing or killing the man who viciously attacked our country almost 5 years ago, the administration misled our country and sent 150,000 troops to war with a country without any credible link to 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us mentions Iraq 18 times, but it does not mention Osama bin Laden even once. Not only, not find bin Laden in Afghanistan, we cannot find him in this resolution.

If the other side of the aisle is serious about a resolution on the global war on terror, they would be better served to get their target correct.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent that he control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of order?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our country is at war. Men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces, Republicans and Democrats, are making the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq to defend our freedom. With 2,500 men and women having lost their lives in Iraq alone. They deserve our respect, our gratitude and our admiration, but we do not honor them with this debate today.

Instead of discussing ideas and long overdue course corrections, we are being confronted with slogans. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle couch this country unfallen, that their party will stand firm in Iraq, while we want to cut and run. That kind of gross distortion may resonate on right-wing talk radio, but nothing could be further from the truth. We need to make sure the job is done right in Iraq, and leave the country unfallen.

Our men and women in uniform are striving, sometimes without the necessary troop strength and without adequate equipment to make the effort in Iraq a success. Here the House majority is undermining the democratic process and the very principles that these brave servicemen and women have gone abroad to defend.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I represent the State of California, a moment ago, referred to an amendment by Senator WARNER, Armed Services chairman in the Senate. That amendment stayed in the law last year. This is what we should be discussing today about Iraq, as we were told we would.

Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq. That is where we should be today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I think it is important to remember the two major provisions in this resolution, one that there is not going to be an arbitrary cutoff, that that would displease the military interests of the United States to have an arbitrary exit date from Iraq; and, secondly, that we are going to finish the mission, we are going to fulfill this mission, and that we support the mission that is being undertaken by those 130,000 plus troops who are in Iraq right now.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about this question of who should determine
During the first year of the war, $9 billion, that is $9 billion with a B, moved through Iraqi ministries with little or no accounting for results.

More than 75 percent of oil and gas reconstruction projects, begun with our assistance, remain incomplete. Over 14,000 electricity reconstruction projects are unfinished. Some 40 percent of water and sanitation reconstruction is incomplete.

Mr. Speaker, the international coalition's ability to exit Iraq responsibly, leaving the Iraqi people in charge of a stable country, is directly related to the success of our reconstruction efforts. These efforts have been severely undermined by waste, fraud and abuse. Our troops have been needlessly exposed to far greater risk because of these failures. We cannot stay the course when it is riddled with mismanagement.

If this debate were about substance, rather than slogans, we would also be talking about the unconscionable punishment that many members of the National Guard and the Reserves suffer because of their patriotism. Legislation that I have been advocating for over 3 years to address the gap between these volunteers' salary in their civilian jobs and the often far lower active duty pay in the Guard and the Reserves has met with repeated roadblocks thrown up by the Department of Defense and the Republican leadership of this House, for no legitimate reason.

This pay gap not only affects the soldier but also thousands of families who now have to make ends meet on a significantly reduced income. In addition to their concerns for the safety of a loved one far away, tens of thousands of American families have to worry about meeting mortgage payments or even making homes because this House has not responded to their needs.

If we truly cared about our fighting forces in Iraq, we would not merely wile away the hours in a debating society over a symbolic resolution lauding them in the abstract. We would take concrete action to ensure that they and their families are treated fairly. Rather than taking up legislation that would fix this problem, we are debating a divisive political resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let nobody, not in this Chamber and not in this country, let nobody be fooled by the picture that the Republican leadership tries to paint with a debate over this resolution. There is no need to make a choice between "cut and run" and "stay the course." What is called for is a long overdue course correction in the way the executive branch manages our country's efforts in Iraq and in the way Congress fulfills its critical constitutional role of oversight.

Since I deeply favor a course correction, I will vote against this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, we have been at this for about 6 hours, I guess, and I think everything that has been said on the subject has been said. Not everybody has said it, and so we will continue for another 6 hours on it.

But I have met many people today who seem to have used this as an opportunity to insist that the mission in Iraq has been a failure, and that our presence in Iraq has not been properly run, and that we are not winning the peace. Frankly, I think this is absolutely a wrong assertion and only serves to lower the morale of the men and women fighting in Iraq, while encouraging the terrorists who aim to harm both America and Iraq.

Rather than taking up legislation that would fix this problem, we are debating a short-term, one-sided anti-Iraq resolution. There is no need to make a choice of cutting and running or staying the course. We can and we must win this war.

I ask my colleagues to remember the sacrifices that our men and women in uniform have made, and to recognize the critical importance of doing everything we can to support our men and women fighting in Iraq.

We are fighting the war on terror on our terms, and we are winning.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I was a freshman, Ronald Reagan was President and I was invited to the White House with a group of people to talk to Ronald Reagan about things we thought were important. We talked for a long time about many issues, and when we finished, the President leaned forward in his chair and said: Let me say something to each of you. All of those things are important. They are all in America's best interest. But nothing is more important than a system of national security that will protect our right to live with those issues.

I wish more people had been with me that day because I think of that every morning on my way to work. It appears there are some who have forgotten the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and our coalition partners in Iraq who make every effort to advance the global war on terror, to combat the al Qaeda and the affiliate organizations that work with them.

How misguided. Nothing could be further from the truth. Iraq is a critical front in the global war on terror. Separating Iraq from the global war on terror, in my opinion, is a recipe for disaster.

Do not take my word for it. Listen to the enemy. These are the enemy's words. The leadership of al Qaeda has made Iraq an important part of its goal of spreading and imposing its ideology around the world. According to al Qaeda, defeating the coalition forces in Iraq is the first phase of its stated strategic goal of establishing a Taliban-like rule throughout the Middle East.

In a July 2006 communication from Ayman al Zawahiri, al Qaeda's second-in-command right behind bin Laden, to the now-deceased leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, Zawahiri explicitly states the centrality of the war in Iraq with a global jihad. Bin Laden's right-hand man calls it out as the enemy's strategic goal of spreading and imposing its ideology around the world and the enemy's means to achieve that goal: the Americans from Iraq establish an Islamic authority in Iraq; extend the jihad to the countries neighboring Iraq; and destroy Israel. Those are the goals stated by al Qaeda.

We must not lose sight of the fact that a successful prosecution of the global war on terrorism and defeating al Qaeda and its affiliates require us to pay attention to multiple locations in the world, including Iraq. Though we have made progress, the threat remains global.

Since September 11, al Qaeda has planned, supported, or executed attacks leading to the deaths of innocent
civilians around the world. According to the Defense Intelligence Agency, there are active jihadists, radical terrorist organizations with the goal of taking control of governments and territories in countries across the globe, including Iraq and Afghanistan, of course, but also in South Asia and Africa, in many countries in Africa, and we know of the terrorist presence today in Canada and right here in the U.S.

I have spent a career, Mr. Speaker, in Congress studying the threat posed by terrorism. Long before September 11, I came to learn the dangers of ideologically inspired terrorist organizations. As a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, we have made great strides in combating this enemy, but we must remember that this is a long war, and although the challenge is great, our commitment to security and human freedom ultimately defeat the oppressive ideology that fuels our terrorist enemies.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a measure that has been the subject of much debate in recent weeks. The resolution is one that I have been pushing for since its introduction in the House of Representatives. It is a bipartisan measure that seeks to ensure that our military efforts are directed towards achieving the long-term goals of stability and peace in the Middle East.
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quote: “The American people are far safer today than we were in the 18 months following the initial intervention.”

I think, in fairness to General McCaffrey, if we are going to quote from him we should quote the entirety. I heard also some comments about how we are not doing right by our forces in very recent debate. I would refer again to General McCaffrey’s observation. I have here a list of five pages, bullet points of what this committee and this House and this Congress has done for our men and women in uniform in just the last four National Defense Authorization Acts. There are 51 points, and I won’t read all of them, but let me account for some.

In 2001, we provided $500 a month to assist the most economically challenged members, to take them off food stamps, and we did it. We did it. This Congress.

In 2002, we improved permanent change of station requirements to reduce out-of-cost moving expenses for military families. There is now no out-of-pocket expenses.

In 2003, we gave them assignment incentive pay, and in 2006 increased that maximum from $1,500 to $3,000 a month. We increased hostile fire and imminent danger pay from $150 to $225 a month. Family separation allowance from $100 to $250 a month. We completed, as I said, that 5-year program to eliminate out-of-cost housing expenses.

We have eliminated the requirement to pay subsistence charges for those brave members of the military who are hospitalized. We now pay an allowance to reimburse for the cost of life insurance, and in the bill we passed this year, that cost will be totally paid for the federal government for the first time in our nation’s history. We authorized a new payment of $430 a month to combat wounded service members who are hospitalized, and on and on.

The chairman mentioned that in each of the last 8 years we have increased pay to our military men and women in uniform by more than half a percent over what the civilian sector in this country has received, whether it is TRICARE for every Guard and Reserve member; hospitalization, better coverage. We have cared for these troops.

The chairman noted, and the figures show us, though I have heard about a strained force, and we are concerned about them. We worry about them every day. I know I have in my six trips to Iraq and twice to Afghanistan. But let me read you the recruitment figures for this very time.

The Army, 104.3 percent of goal. The Navy, 100 percent of goal. The Marines, 101.5 percent. The Air Force, 100.5 percent. A DOD total of 102.1 percent. Lastly, retention. These brave members that General McCaffrey talked about. Retention in the Army, 113 percent; Navy, 106 percent; Marines, 145 percent; and Air Force, 109 percent.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to clear up a point.

There are 340,000 sets of advanced body armor produced and fielded. That is more than two sets for every single person serving in uniform in Iraq.

I have made this statement for the last year, but if anybody has a relative who is serving in Iraq without body armor, please call me personally. I have not yet received a single phone call.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) who does so much for the troops.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, we can’t talk about the global war on terror without talking about the 922,000 heroes who have volunteered for our nation, going to a land that must have never been to, to liberate a people most have never met.

Before 9/11, I worried if America needed our young people, would they go. And we all knew that history will remember their courage and name them. But until it does, I call them Freedom Believers.

On my first trip to Iraq, I met a young man on the crew of our C-130. He told me he had a small daughter, yet defending freedom was so important that when he finished his enlistment, he would join his reserve unit. He said there were so many from that unit who volunteered to go to Iraq; he knew he would not be back soon.

Another soldier said to me: Let me make this simple. In a football game, you want to play at home. But this is not football. This is war. And war must always be played away. We played at home on September 11, and we lost.

My proudest moments in Iraq have been the ones spent seeing their smiles when I told them about the support that they have here at home. Many that I met were on their second and third tours. Their feelings are summed up in a recent letter to the editor, a returning soldier said: “If the choices are pull out or I go back, I am going back.”

On the way home from Iraq in Shannon, Ireland, as a Marine unit walked through that terminal, everyone stood and clapped for them. On both of my trips to Iraq, I was asked repeatedly by our troops: When are we going to tell America what they are doing in Iraq, explain the threat to America and the world, and share the success that they achieved? The saddest moments were when they quietly asked me: What are Americans thinking and saying?
These are people who show no fear on the battlefield, but it was like they were afraid to ask that question and hear my reply. They are probably referring to stories such as the one from the New York Times, October 28, 2005. They quoted Corporal Jeffrey Starr, who lost his life defending democracy. Here is their quote: ‘I kind of predicted this. A third time just seemed like I’m pushing my luck.’

And here’s the real quote: “Obviously if you are reading this, then I have died in Iraq. I know I predicted this, that’s why I am writing this in November. A third time just seemed like I’m pushing my chances. I don’t regret going. Everybody dies, but few get to do it for something as important as freedom. It may seem confusing why we are here in Iraq. It’s not to me. I’m here helping these people so they can live the way we live, not to worry about tyrants or vicious dictators, to do what they want to do with their lives. To me, that is why we have died for our freedom, now this is my mark.”

Our military is the most lethal fighting force in the world, not solely because of their training, not solely because of their technology, but because they are a body of people with the most unequivocal support of the American people. That is the most effective tool in their arsenal and one they cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, they watch our news. They read CNN. They are watching us right now.

This is your time. What do you want to say to them? Do you want to tell them, you’re doing a terrible thing, but we support you.

Well, I want to say: you’re doing an honorable and noble thing. We support you and we love you.

There is only one option for Iraq, that’s victory. Thank you to our brave American heroes. Thank you to their families. God bless America, and God bless the men and women who keep us free.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker: I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in fighting the war on terror. I believe America must stay engaged in the world, but what we have is a quite a quarrel. We have a quarrel in Iraq. And what we have on the floor today is a resolution that essentially says stay the course.

You know, sometimes the American people are smarter than the politicians. This resolution would have us believe that everything is hunky-dory in Iraq and everything would be wonderful if we only stayed the course. The American people don’t believe that; and, Mr. Speaker, neither do I any more.

We need a new strategy in Iraq, not an open-ended rubber stamp and more of the same. At what point do we reassess our strategy and come to the conclusion that it is not working? But what do we get here from our Republicans friends, a resolution that is a farce, a political document that by the majority leader’s own admission was designed to embarrass Democrats and put Democrats in a box.

All of the problems we see in Iraq today, the daily deadly attacks by insurgents, the rise of ethnic militias, the shortage of gas and electricity, the weakness of the economy, can be tied to the complete lack of planning by the administration. They didn’t have a clue as to what they would get when they came into Iraq.

Our intelligence was faulty, but what really makes me mad was this war was mishandled from the get-go. First, we didn’t send in enough troops. Secondly, we didn’t secure the borders. We fired the Baath leaders and created all kinds of antagonisms and unemployed people. We fired the security forces so our people would have to do security, and we fired first, without a plan. Then we disagreed with the administration.

A former commander of U.S. Central Command, General Zinni, said: “10 years’ worth of planning were thrown away; troop levels were dismissed out of hand; these were not tactical mistakes; these were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.”

But what do we have here from our Republican friends? A resolution that is not bipartisan. We could have had a resolution that could have supported. We treasure our troops. I want us to succeed in Iraq, but what do we have: partisan, political drivel. Democrats had no input. Democrats were not allowed a substitute. Democrats were not consulted so our men and women serving in the military are being reduced to pawns in the Republican’s election game.

Shame on this resolution. I wish we could have a resolution that I could vote for. But we do not have one on the floor today.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), a member who is a leader not only in supporting the troops but in humanitarian efforts in Iraq.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America is first and foremost an ideal. It is an ideal that has fought for, achieved, and is equal, endowed by that Creator with inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Truly, that is what our troops fight for in Iraq.

For their efforts, we now see a country that, although it has been in bondage since it was called Babylon, has a freestanding constitution and hope for freedom. And there is hope that freedom may take root in the Middle East and turn the whole of humanity in a better direction.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that there are other ideals in the world besides America’s noble ones, and they have great consequences. I am concerned that this Nation does not understand that we are now at war with an evil ideology. It is an ideology that has the most profound human implications and consequences.

On September 11, terrorists murdered our own soil 3,000 American citizens. But this ideological war did not begin on 9/11. It began many years ago when certain Muslim extremists embraced a divergent Islamist dogma that dictates that all infidels must die.

Not so long ago, al Zarqawi himself said of America’s leaders: “They are aware that if the Islamic giant wakes up, it will not be satisfied with less than the gates of Rome, Washington, Paris and London.”

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny that we are fighting a war against an ideology that is bent on the destruction of the Western world. They are committed to killing us and would like nothing better than to decapitate this country by detonating a nuclear yield weapon 100 yards from here. That low Islamist extremists to declare victory in Iraq will only hasten such a day.

These are moments when we must hear the voice of history and remember the words of Winston Churchill when he began: “If you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly, there may come a moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse moment: when you may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is still better to perish than to live as slaves.”

Mr. Speaker, if freedom is to survive, to allow Islamist terrorists to declare victory in Iraq is not an option. We must win. The world has changed since Mr. Churchill warned us all. We are 60 years now into a nuclear age. We must not let terrorists have even the slightest hope of victory ever.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution that we are debating, I would like to focus on point four of the resolution that declares that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.

I think it is helpful for us to look back at some milestones over the last year or so to help us understand how far we have actually come.

We went there to take Saddam Hussein out of power. He is now in jail and on trial for his life. We got that done.

In January of 2005 we held the first election for a transitional government. That got done.

Their job was to write a Constitution. At each and every one of these
steps there was great anxiety that the Iraqi people couldn’t get it done. They got their Constitution written in August of 2005.

The next step was a referendum on that Constitution. They got that done.

Then came the election. Under that Constitution in December of 2005. Again, ahead of that election there was grave concern that the Iraqis couldn’t do it. But they went to the polls and elected that government.

When I was there in April, the concern was that in time that they couldn’t pick a prime minister, the next big step to the road to democracy in Iraq. That got done.

Two weeks ago when I was there, the final point was they couldn’t find a minister of defense or a minister of interior to lead those very important ministries, but they have gotten that done.

By any evaluation, we have a long stretch of historic milestones that are proof that the Iraqi people are up to the task.

A CODEL I participated in, our job was to go over there and get a sense of whether the Iraqi Army was standing up to the task. We met with a General Bashir at his base at Tajik and found a very professional individual. He was very candid in his remarks on where the Iraqi Army was up to that point in time. As I watched the staffers, his staff in the room, I tried to assess them and determine whether the Iraqi Army was up to the task. We met with a General al-Tuzer, a very professional individual. He was very candid in his remarks on where the Iraqi Army was up to that point in time. As I watched the staffers, his staff in the room, I tried to assess them and determine whether they could lead, fight and defend their country.

We are making this happen, and we are completing this mission in Iraq. I support this resolution and I ask that each of my colleagues all support it because a free, sovereign, united Iraq will make the Middle East a safer place to be, and by extension it will make America a safer place to be.

So I rise in support of this resolution and ask my colleagues to vote for it. I, too, like Mrs. Drake ask God’s blessings on our country and in particular on our fine young men and women who are fighting this fight.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, Colin Powell thought Vice President CHENEY was so obsessed with attacking Iraq that he suffered from war fever. The problem is that fever can make you delusional and you can see things that aren’t there, no matter how much you want them to be true.

The Vice President said that we would be greeted as liberators. False. Secretary Rumsfeld said that the war would last not more than 6 weeks. False. Secretary Wolfowitz said that Iraq would pay for its own reconstruction from oil revenues. Again, false. We were told that the administration had a coherent plan for postwar Iraq. False. The truth is that this administration’s incompetence has set back the effort against global terrorism. Don’t take my word for it. Simply come to this floor and read the statements of these generals, patriots all. The generals all claimed that there was a link between Iraq and al Qaeda. Again, false. But they are not talking about a link that does exist and should cause us all profound concern. That is the relationship between terrorism and Iran. The truth is that this new government in Iraq is full of Iranian allies. They have signed a military cooperation agreement. And the Iraqi Foreign Minister just recently said, Iran has a right to develop nuclear technology and the international community should drop its demands that Iran should prove that it is not trying to build a nuclear weapon.

And we are supposed to believe that our national security has been strengthened and that we are making progress on the war on terrorism?

The truth is that the war in Iraq has not just simply been a distraction from the global war on terror, it has actually increased and influenced the number one state sponsor of terrorism, according to our own Department of State, an original charter member of the axis of evil club, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), a very fine member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to first rise tonight to thank the men and women of our military for their efforts in Iraq, in Afghanistan and other places around the world in the war on terror. Their sacrifice, their families’ sacrifice, has value and will never, never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, there are many members of the minority that have forgotten an important lesson of history, and that is that you cannot appease tyrants and evil. We learned that in the 1930s, the voice of Winston Churchill that said we must confront Hitler and the Nazis as they began to build up the German military machine. Well, we waited and we waited until they invaded their neighbors. And it was the blood and lives of hundreds of thousands of Europeans and Americans that defeated that evil.

In the 1960s and the 1970s, we failed to confront the growing Soviet threat. We waited and we waited until Ronald Reagan inspired this Nation to have the will to stand up to the Soviets and engage them in an arms buildup that cost Americans billions of dollars, but bankrupted the Soviets, and we defeated that evil.

In the 1990s the terrorists attacked us over and over again. We failed to respond, as President Clinton dismantled our intelligence capabilities. Appar- eate, our intelligence does not work. History shows us that over and over again.

President Bush learned this lesson, and he and this Congress did not wait until Saddam had nuclear weapons. We acted on intelligence, not just our intelligence, but intelligence from agencies around the world. We thought it was accurate. Unfortunately, it was wrong. But it took us going into Iraq to realize that the Bush administration had not have the biological, chemical and nuclear capabilities we thought he might be building. But we removed a tyrant. We freed a people and we focused the war on terror in Iraq. And today we are helping to build a democracy in Arab world which can be a model to other nations to create liberty, justice and, most importantly, hope for a better tomorrow for millions of Arabs.

We must stay the course, as this resolution tells us. And United Nations were egregiously misled going into this war by a failed strategy, and that sacrifice for freedom is always worth.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution because it represents an unrealistic and disingenuous portrayal of the situation in Iraq. The rhetoric on the other side of the aisle is filled with erroneous assertions of impending victory reminiscent of President Bush’s so-called “mission accomplished” claim.

Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, it is clear that the Iraq war has become an exercise in futility that can no longer be justified with pipe dreams and good intentions. Americans were egregiously misled going into this war without a plan to win the peace. They have been misled about America’s progress in Iraq, and today they deserve the truth. The truth is that President Bush took his eye off the ball in the war on terror, diverted necessary resources from Afghanistan to Iraq, and today Osama bin Laden remains free.

The truth is that victory is not around the corner in Iraq, that the insurgency and sectarian violence continue unabated, and that the death of Zarqawi, while very significant, will not bring security to Iraq.

The truth is that on the day Zarqawi was killed there were five bombings in Baghdad, and the violence continues irrespective of his death.

The truth is that while 265,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained and armed, nearly one-third of the force does not show up for work.

The truth is that our policies have failed to stabilize Iraq, and we must not stay the course. We must change the course.

President Bush, this resolution blurs the line between reality and fiction by painting a rosy picture of Iraq and ignoring the ongoing insurgency on the ground.

To paraphrase Secretary Rumsfeld, in a war we must deal with the reality we have and not the reality we want. Please join me in opposing this charade.
Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 861. I am proud of the progress being made in the global war on terror; every day that passes, there is no quick path to victory; it is absolutely necessary for us to maintain our resolve. Many people forget that terrorists have long waged war against the United States, well before the 9/11 attacks. Americans were bombed in the United States, well before the 9/11 attacks. Americans were bombed in the United States, well before the 9/11 attacks.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a very fine member of the committee.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding time. Your commitment today is unmatched.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Mr. Speaker, said we are all entitled to our own opinions, but he went on to say we are not entitled to our own facts.

Facts have been badly set aside today. Overight? 92 hearings, 42 full committee, 52 subcommittee and others. Anyone that did not have oversight or was not fully informed simply had other priorities. And that is an option in the People's House. But the information was there, publicly exposed. And other information was readily available.

Generals? Six generals have spoken out. In America we are free. We can speak out. But the facts are that in the war for terrorists it is not someone we rely on, it is what we do rely on. That is the United States military. We have 11 4-stars, 53 3-stars, in the Air Force 11 4-stars, 38 3-stars and numerous others who take exception to the quotes that have been mistated here tonight.

This is a war against terrorists. Terror, and the tactics of terrorism and killing. Abu Musab al Zargawi was killed last week. Yet, as President Bush said, we must continue to prosecute this global war on terror until our mission is accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of our troops for their service, selfless attitude and sacrifice. They are making great strides. They are freeing people from oppression so they may enjoy the same freedoms that all Americans cherish. Today our military has liberated the people of Afghanistan from the brutal Taliban regime, and has denied al Qaeda its safe haven of operations. They have crushed Saddam Hussein’s brutal military and captured thousands of terrorists and terrorist operations. Children in Iraq are returning to school and Iraqi businesses are prospering. Iraq has had successful elections and has formed their government under a new prime minister. There is undeniable progress and hope in Iraq every day.

Mr. Speaker, I close with a story about a constituent, Sergeant Dale Beatty of Statesville, North Carolina. Sergeant Beatty was severely injured while fighting the global war on terror and lost both legs. Yet Sergeant Beatty is not angry. In fact, his resolve is even stronger today. He knows that he made a great sacrifice for a noble cause. Sergeant Beatty came to visit me while he was at Walter Reed and told me he would gladly go back to the Middle East to fight alongside his comrades if he could. That is a true American hero. Sergeant Beatty’s morale and the morale of our troops I have spoken with demonstrate we are doing the right thing.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER), who has just welcomed home his old unit, the 116th Armored Cav.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we pause long enough during this important debate tonight to remember back to another time in a place not too far from this place.

During the heated debate and many times rancorous discussions on their efforts to establish a government that would elevate the individual above the crown, above the prince, above the king, and above the head of state, the Americans said above all else the pain of victory and the certainty of failure. Caution was urged, voted on, and rejected. The hope and the promise, the
Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have been amused at some of the rhetoric tonight, but one of the questions that has been asked is what is our strategy?

We have a strategy. The strategy is to keep America safe.

We are winning the war on terrorism. We have gotten Saddam Hussein. We have gotten Zarqawi. But the problem is, were there any other Zarqawis out there that would threaten the very fabric of the life that we live in America?

We have a choice. We can fight that war on terrorism in other places around the world, or we can fight it here in America. The right choice is to fight those terrorists where they are, where they are beginning to thrive, and keep them contained where they are.

If we get out too quickly, what are we going to tell all these young soldiers that paid the ultimate price for the freedom and democracy that we are sewing the seeds for in Iraq today? What are we going to tell the young men and women that are going to have volunteered, I repeat, volunteered, to come and serve a noble purpose?

I got a letter from a young marine named Kevin Hester. And Kevin enlisted, Mr. Speaker. He knew exactly what he was getting into when he enlisted in the Marines. And Kevin wrote me a letter the other day, and he said, The Iraqi people trust us, and they trust us and they are trying to help us help them by telling us who the bad guys are in their country.

We have been fighting the cause for America and keeping America safe for over 230 years coming this July 4. This is a war on terrorism. This is a different war than we have fought before. This is like the war on drugs. This is like the war on crime. The war on terrorism is a war that we will be fighting for many years to come, but it is a war that we cannot afford to lose. We cannot disgrace those young men and women who are representing and defending our country so greatly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I encourage people to support this resolution in order to say to the young men and women around the world that are defending freedom and democracy, we love you, we appreciate you. God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Ryun), a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of our service members who have worked hard during the global war on terrorism. They are keeping us safe by defeating a very destructive enemy.
Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with the American people the truth about the war in Iraq. For truly it had nothing to do with 9/11 or the threat of terrorists attacking our citizens to be attacked here at home. I prefer to keep the terrorists outside our borders.

Right now al Qaeda and the insurgents in Iraq are busy attacking our servicemembers and our allies, and they would like nothing better than to bring these attacks to America. Even the terrorists themselves admit Iraq is the front line of the global war on terror. Why should we not continue this fight and keep it from coming to our own backyard?

Fortunately, we are fighting this battle in Iraq and our servicemembers are making real progress in the global war on terror. Not only are we capturing, detaining, and eliminating al Qaeda’s most brutal leaders, but we are training law-abiding Iraqi citizens to defend their own freedom. In fact, over 250,000 Iraqi citizens have stepped forward and responded to the call of duty to defend their country.

I think there are several obvious reasons why so many Iraqi soldiers and citizens are willing to join the Iraqi security forces. First, they know the enemy they are fighting against because they have endured hardship under this enemy for most of their lives. For years they and their families have been brutalized by ruthless dictators. Many of them have been separated from their families and had not seen them for many years.

Second, they have seen the pain that al Qaeda has inflicted on America and other democracies around the world. They know that what al Qaeda did in 9/11 is just a hint of what could happen. Because of this, Iraqi security forces are seizing this opportunity to root out evil.

Third, they can taste freedom and they want to hold on to it. After being liberated from tyranny and introduced to democracy they cherish the freedom and are fighting to defend it just as our servicemembers have fought for our freedom.

Fourth, they are inspired by the work servicemembers are doing in Iraq. As a result, they are joining the Iraqi security forces in the fight for freedom. Not only are their servicemembers fighting against terrorism, but they are also working alongside our members and the Iraqi security forces to train them how to effectively defeat the enemy.

I want to encourage all of our colleagues today to support our outstanding men and women in uniform. May they be blessed by their families. Our prayers are with them. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 861.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. AKIN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think that this debate is helpful. I think that whenever you get into a complicated project, even if you are solving a physics problem, many times it is helpful to just stop, stop right where you are and say to yourself, just using common sense, what is the real track?

I think we should stand back from the war for just a moment tonight and ask that simple question: Are we on the right track? And we can think about this country that we love so dearly, the flag that we have just celebrated, and all that makes America special.

But what happens if you were to try to destroy the goodness that we love in America into a formula, which is, which really states what Americans have been for all time?

If you were like an onion to peel off the outer things of hot dogs and baseball, what would that do? What makes America what we love? I would suggest that the answer to that question is found in your birthday document, the Declaration, that says, we hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

And it goes on to say the job of government is to protect those rights. And that is what we have fought wars all through history, to support that basic freedom that the 9/11 terrorists want to terrorize so that people cannot be free, to compel you to do what you do not want to do.

We say, liberty is a gift of God. And so it should be no surprise, just as we found ourselves in the War of Independence and the war against Hitler and the other wars of our history, that we are arrayed against people who have no respect for the formula that has made America so great.

And just as in the past, there is a cost. You know, my own son just came back from Fallujah. They say that the cost of freedom is not free. And the parents all across our country, just as my wife and I did, would look at the local paper in the morning. We would see oh three marines killed in Fallujah. I wonder if my son is one of them.

No, freedom is not free. But we were proud that our son, just as other families are proud of their children, can carry on that same tradition that the patriots did. That is what makes us feel so good when we see the flag flying, the heart and soul of America, that there is indeed a God that gives basic rights to people and government shall protect those rights. And the terrorists will not stand, because that formula does not apply just to Americans; it applies to people all over the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).
that the Bush administration that we were dealing with would say anything and do anything. They were full of lies.

Let’s look at the evidence.

Since the beginning, the Republican leadership in Congress has outright refused to investigate Vice President Cheney involving the billions of dollars awarded to Iraq for reconstruction contracts to Halliburton. $9 billion in reconstruction funds have been unaccounted for. I repeat, $9 billion in reconstruction funds have been unaccounted for.

The amount of taxpayers’ money spent by Halliburton and the defense contractors audit agents have deemed either excessive or insufficient documentation is $1.7 billion. Halliburton has received more than $17 billion in no-bid cost-plus contracts for Iraq reconstruction. Folks, I am talking about billions with a B. That is billions and billions of dollars. It amazes me now that these figures contrast with the situation that the media has given to the Katrina mismanagement, while the billions and billions of dollars in unaccounted funds to Halliburton are still largely ignored by the media.

You know, we need checks and balances. The House, the Senate and the administration are all Republicans. There are no checks and balances. No checks, no balances. No checks, zero balance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The Chair will remind Members that although remarks in debate may include criticisms of the President’s or the Vice President’s official actions or policies, it is a breach of order to question the personal character of the President or the Vice President, whether by actual accusation or by mere insinuation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and to everyone who supports Mr. MURTHA’s resolution.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

I heard one of our colleagues on the other side say that we have two choices tonight: we could stay the course, or we can cut and run. Well, those are not the only choices we have. They were not the choices that we used in the 38 deployments in the 1990s when I supported our Democrat President when we sent troops to Somalia, Haiti, East Timor, Macedonia, Kosovo, Bosnia. You name it we were there.

The decision of when we left those countries was made by our military leaders. It was made by the generals and the commanders, not arm-chair politicians back here who try to do what they do not do from the Congress during the Vietnam War.

Believe me, I want our troops back home. But there is a process that we can use that I think is very logical. You know, when I have been to the theater, the generals talk about the way that they assess the capability and the readiness of the Iraqi brigades.

They categorize them into four levels. That is how to assess the readiness of the Iraqi brigades. They have perfected it. What we should be doing is what is already happening. We do not tie the removal of our troops to an artificial date. We tie it into the assessment that our generals make of the capability and the readiness of the Iraqi brigades.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I went back to my district. I was at the Boeing plant where we rolled out the newest model of the CH-47F, the cutting-edge platform for our Army for the next 50 years. It is a great aircraft.

The speaker there, the keynote speaker for this rollout was an Army colonel. In fact, he was the airwing commander of the 101st Airborne Division, and he oversees 107 aircraft in theater right now. He is home for two weeks of R&R. He oversees 3,200 of our troops that are on the cutting edge. He wants to be home with his family. He has been in the service 24 years. This was his second deployment. He is from Edgewater, Maryland; he is not my constituent.

And I said to Colonial Warren Phipps, Colonel, we are debating today in Congress whether or not we should set a specific date for withdrawal. Are you there? Is that the right thing for us to do? He said, With all due respect, sir, that is the worst thing that our Congress could do for my troops under my command.

That is the worst thing we can do, because it would telegraph and signal the enemy when they can plan their attacks, and when they can do harm to my colleagues.

Well, I will be honest with you, Mr. Speaker. I do not support artificial dates under President Clinton, and I do not support artificial dates under President Bush.

I want the ultimate decision of when the troops come home not to be done by us, but by the field generals in the command situation, command leadership in Iraq, who understand that the safety and security of the troops is their number one priority as well as ours.

What this young colonel said was, Congressman, we are making great success. Today the Iraqis are handling more and more of their own security. That should be the determining criteria on when our troops come home.

As this colonel sees with his own eyes that the Iraqis are engaged and are handling more and more of their own defense. He said, Today, Congressmen, they are going out on their own missions. He said, when I have meetings and we are doing planning sessions. If I hear the Iraqis, planning, it is just as though it were American generals planning for our operations.

He said, Now is not the time to cut and run. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and not cut and run.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight; I have been watching this on TV and listening all day long. I am really kind of saddened by the fact that it seems to be an issue between making excuses for why we are in Iraq, and the other side is cut and run.

I remember being in the Congress before we voted on this resolution. I remember being summoned into a hearing with all of the intelligence agencies there. I remember a colleague asking these intelligence agencies, is Iraq an immediate threat to the United States, yes or no? Every single one of these intelligence agencies represented, every one said no.

And here we are 3 years later with all of the loss of life. Some say, just stay the course. Stay the course for what? There is not even a plan. Mr. WELDON was right, we had a plan in Kosovo, we had a plan in Bosnia, we had plans. Where is the plan?

We have a plan by Mr. MURTHA. There is no cut and run date in it. There are no specific on it. But it is a plan. Why are we not debating a plan?

It is embarrassing that we are here this far into the war, people watching us and having Congress without the ability to exercise democracy, without the ability to have a vote on the only resolution that is ready for a vote, which is Mr. MURTHA. I associate myself with the remarks he made about what he saw and what we experienced going into Iraq.

I wish the majority in this House would have allowed a debate on Mr. MURTHA’s resolution.

I rise to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MURTHA and to everyone who supports our men and women in uniform. We all support the troops and the sacrifices they and their families have made. But, that’s not what this debate is about.

I’ve been listening all day to this debate and find Members are still making excuses for why we got into Iraq in the first place.

You are not hearing what the intelligence community really told us.

Before the vote on authorization of the war all the intelligence agencies were gathered together for a Congressional briefing. One of my colleagues asked the question: “Is Iraq an immediate threat to the United States, tell us Yes or No.”

It was surprising to me that each intelligence community representative said—‘‘No, Iraq is not a threat to our national security.”
And even more shocking to see was that so few of my colleagues were listening.

So, why have we been sucked into a war that was not necessary to protect our national security?

And here we are 3 years later. Over 20,000 U.S. military personnel have been killed or wounded in Iraq.

The loss of American lives is tragic and unnecessary.

Especially because Iraq never was a threat to the United States, nor is it now.

So, today, why aren’t we discussing an end to wasteful spending, to unnecessary loss of lives and building a stronger America?

We can’t because, as you have heard so often today, the majority has stopped listening.

They have made up their minds. They are just as wrong today as they were 3 years ago.

Look—we need a plan. Congressman Murtha is the only one with a plan. Congressman Murtha’s bill, H.J. Res 73, is doable and its implementation would be respected by the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President is listening to this debate. And more importantly I hope he implements the Murtha plan.

The world would be better off for it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. CALVERT.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, just last week we witnessed American, coalition and Iraqi forces taking the fight to the enemy by eliminating the terrorist leader in Iraq. During the very same week the Iraqi people looked as their first democratically elected Prime Minister finalized his cabinet by selecting a new Minister of Defense, a new Minister of Interior, a new member of the state for national security.

The two events are clear evidence that Iraqi forces are making progress on two major fronts in the ongoing war. On one front the coalition and Iraqi forces remain in the hunt for insurgents and other groups that threaten a free and democratic Iraq. On the other front the Iraqi government continues to show encouraging signs into developing a much needed stabilizing body the country is longing for.

During my three trips to Iraq I have observed our military engaging the enemy, protecting the innocent civilians, training the Iraqi forces to make and control and support the new elected government. Despite the positive developments on the ground, we continue to hear naysayers around the world questioning the importance of the outcome in Iraq.

On the other hand, al Qaeda leadership and its terrorist network fully understand the consequences of war, calling Iraq the Qaeda in the greatest battle of the modern era.

I have a copy of a document captured from the safe House where al Zarqawi met his end. In it al Qaeda leaders lament the fact that their strategy for undermining America’s resolve in Iraq is failing. The Qaeda leaders have already been billed nearly a half trillion dollars.

I ignore the issues raised by some of our most respected generals, and it ignores the lack of accountability and oversight that has led to some of the most egregious and embarrassing examples of waste, fraud and abuse on record. We need to be working nonstop to bring our troops home as soon as possible, not trying to score political points while they are away.

We need to be working to keep them safe, as safe as possible, until they are home. For starters, we should send a strong, loud message to the insurgents who will not occupy Iraq and will not controlIraq’s oil, a message that we want to leave, as bad as they want us to leave.

On my last visit to Iraq, everyone I spoke with said that they want the Iraqis to assume more security responsibility faster. Our military has done its job, often in two, three or four deployments, an unconscionable demand on our troops, an unconscionable demand on their families, and an unconscionable demand on their communities.

Make no mistake, it has taken a toll on our military because, as you have heard so often today, our war is not a strategy for success, and we are not doing our job by being a rubber stamp for this administration.

Mr. Speaker, this isn’t honest debate. While the majority plays politics, our men and women serving in Iraq are in terrible danger.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), a veteran of the Second World War.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DINGELL. “To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but it is morally treasonable to the American public.” Teddy Roosevelt.

I remember how proud I was to serve my country in World War II, and I remember how proud I was of the different meaningful debates which we had here, where there was opportunity to amend, to discuss, to have a 5-minute rule, to have a motion to recommit, so that a national policy bringing us together could be forged in a proper legislative fashion.

We are told, either expressly or implicitly, by the administration, and by people on that side of the aisle, that there is something unpatriotic about questioning the behavior of this administration or the policies or the way they are being conducted. Let me not answer that yet. But let me give you...
I am outraged at the fact that this exercise appears to be politically motivated. Charges verging on disloyalty are directed at loyal Americans who criticize the administration failures or suggest better tactics or strategies. Listen to Republican leadership instructions to their members: “Democracy is the other side of the American people.” Listen to that. That is what we are supposed to do.

We are not supposed to be a congregation of yes men and lickspittles. We are supposed to be the voice of the people and the policies of this Nation in an honorable and open fashion. That is not happening today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a fair and proper procedure nor is it a debate.

H. Res. 861 comes before us under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed. This body is told by the rule, no amendments are allowed. Take it or leave it, we are told.

I say shame. What is there to fear from an open debate and what is there to cause us to lose the right to amend this legislation?

The answer can we approve in H. Res. 861 and much on which we can arrive at agreement and consensus.

There are things in this resolution which are controversial, and these require, more than ever, honest and frank discussion.

I find the language of paragraph 3 to be a particular problem. We should not foreclose our options on redeployment.

It may well become that there is such a need and such an interest in the United States, and arbitrary pronouncements such as this will actually be a disservice.

Like many other Members of this body, I supported the President’s father when he came to Congress seeking authorization to liberate Kuwait.

There the process was honest, open, and truthful. The intelligence was clear, the mission was finite, and the world was united. Here the process is closed, the debate filled with hyperbole and half-truths, the world is alienated, and our mission is murky and indefinite.

Here the reasons given for invasion of Iraq were that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons.

Like many others, I did not believe the evidence supported the administration.

I believed we had careful use of intelligence: honest mistake, careless with use of the facts, or willful deceit.

History tells us one or all of these unfaltering conclusions are supported by the unfortunate facts of the administration’s behavior.

Now: Like all of us, I support our troops. I consistently vote for more money, more equipment, and more resources to support them in every way I can to win and to bring them home safe and well.

I have not called for withdrawal of our troops. I have suggested no tactics or strategy, but the decision has the administration, which seems to have for its purpose and tactics more of the same, stay the course.

Our failures and mistakes are many, leaving weapons and munitions everywhere uncollected and available to criminals, insurgents, jihadists, and anti-American groups. We disbanded the army police and security services, necessary to keeping order and assisting in hubandring victory and peace.
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Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—The On-Going Investigation into the Abuse of Prisoners within the Central Command Area of Responsibility
May 21, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Conduct and Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom
June 14, 2004:
Mark-up of H. Res. 646—Resolution of Inquiry requesting that the SECDEF transmit to the House any picture, photograph, video, etc. produced in conjunction with any completed DOD investigation conducted by MG Taguba relating to allegations of torture or violations of the Geneva Convention of 1949 at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq or any completed DOD investigation relating to abuse of a prisoner of war or detainee by civilian contractors working for DOD.
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Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Training of Iraqi Security Forces
June 22, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Progress in Iraq
July 1, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Army and Marine Corps Troop Rotation for Operation Iraqi Freedom 3 Operation Enduring Reserve
July 15, 2004:
Mark-up of H. Res. 689—Requesting POTUS and directing other federal official to transmit to HOR docs relating to treatment of prisoners or detainees in Iraq, Afghanistan, and GTMO.
Aug. 10, 2004:
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Aug. 11, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Implications of the Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission on the Department of Defense
Sept. 8, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—The Performance of U.S. Military Servicemembers in Iraq and Afghanistan
Sept. 9, 2004:

May 19, 2005: Current Operations and the Political Transition in Iraq
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June 21, 2005: Marine Corps Underbody Armor Kits

June 23, 2005: Progress of The Iraqi Security Forces

June 29, 2005: Detainee Operations at GTMO

Sept. 29, 2005: Operations in Iraq
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March 14, 2006: Mark-up for H. Res. 685

Requiring the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any activity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq.

April 4, 2006: Improving Interagency Coordination for GWOT and Beyond

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time. We have a lot less time than on the other side.

Mr. HUNTER. We have reserved the balance of our time. I think we have got a transition here, Mr. Speaker, with the next committee coming up.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California for the purpose of putting a statement in the RECORD.

(Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, When we made the decision to invade Iraq I said this:

"The President is asking us to pass this resolution now, but he has not yet made the case for war. I cannot support the President's request that we authorize military force against Iraq, and the difficult decision for three important reasons: The United States is not acting in self-defense or from an imminent threat from Iraq, the United States should not be pursuing unilateral action without international support, and the President has not stated an exit strategy.

I believe there are times when countries must resort to war, and indeed international law recognizes the rights of nations to defend themselves. I strongly support our campaign against terrorism. But are we voting this week on a case of self-defense? It would certainly be self-defense if Iraq supported the al Qaeda attack on September 11, but the evidence of such support is lacking.

I have listened to the administration and met with top officials. I have yet to see any credible evidence that Iraq is connected with al Qaeda. The experts readily admit that there is no real connection.

I can believe that Iraq is a threat to the region and to some American interests overseas, but I do not believe the threat is imminent or must be handled with a unilateral military strike.

This resolution is an unwise step for America that will in the end weaken America.

How unsatisfactory are the words "I told you so". We invaded Iraq even though it was not involved with al Qaeda and, when we diverted our gaze from the War on Terror, we let Osama Bin Laden get away and now his organization has metastasized so that his capture would no longer be the disruptive blow to al Qaeda that it could have been then. Our soldiers have served bravely but their courage has not been matched by adequate leadership by the brass starting with the Commander in Chief. The problems that face us now in Iraq are not primarily military ones but we are expecting our military to accomplish them anyway.

This entire venture was a mistake, but the question is what do we do now? I think the answer is that it's time for the Iraq's to take responsibility for their own country. Our American soldiers signed up to defend America. Let the Iraq's do the same for their country.

We have spent American lives and treasure in Iraq. It is now the obligation of the Commander in Chief to present a strategy for a successful completion of American activities there so that our troops can be removed from Iraq as soon as possible.

Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity. It is time for leadership from the Commander in Chief that is more than "stay the course" and more of the same. The war in Iraq is not the war on terror and never has been. I voted to authorize the use of force in Afghanistan because it was necessary that we disrupt that terrorist hotbed that never has been. I voted for the course of insanity. It is time for leadership from the Commander in Chief that is more than "stay the course" and more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated the original war resolution, the administration told us that Iraq was stockpiling weapons of mass destruction that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and that Iraq was within a year of having a nuclear capability.

Fast-forward to the deliberations of the 9/11 Commission. They concluded that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and no nuclear capability.

Mr. Speaker, these votes weren't 8-4 or 7-5, they were all 12-0 that the very basis for the war did not exist.

When I go back home, Mr. Speaker, and my constituents ask me to summarize where we are in the war on terror, I tell them this: As we approach the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in the history of our country, we have committed hundreds of billions of dollars in Iraq. More important, over 20,000 young Americans have either been killed or seriously wounded going after Saddam Hussein, who did not attack us, while Osama bin Laden, who did attack us, is still alive, free, planning another attack on our country.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the very definition of failure in the war on terror.

We went after the wrong guy.

But after the invasion, did we have a responsibility to help the Iraqi people build a new government and a new way of life? The answer to that question is yes. And we have fulfilled that obligation. We have helped them through not one, not two, but three elections. It is now time for the Iraqi people to stand up and defend themselves.

There is a general rule of military engagement that says that you do not signal to your enemy what you are going to do in advance. But there are exceptions to this rule, and there are two exceptions to this rule.

Number one is that the insurgents in Iraq are using as a recruiting tool the argument that we have no intention of leaving their country, and that we're going to steal their oil—and it is working. It is fueling the insurgency.

As for our friends in Iraq, those who want this new government and new way of life, they seem perfectly content to let our soldiers take all of the enemy fire. The problem with security in Iraq is not the system of training; it's the fact that the Iraqis are not stepping forward to defend their own government.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, my basic disagreement with the President is this: He says that we should stay in Iraq until the Iraqis declare that they are ready to defend their own country; and I propose that we announce a time-frame for withdrawal, start withdrawing our troops, and make our commitment very clear to the Iraqis: If they want this new government and this new way of life, they have to come forward, volunteer, stand up, and defend it.

Iraq indefinitely and an outright refusal to set a date for withdrawal. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the resolution.

Eighty-two percent of the Iraqi people want us out of their country, and 47 percent say it is justified to attack American troops. It is simply unacceptable to keep our troops in Iraq indefinitely under these circumstances, and I continue to call for the withdrawal of American forces from Iraq, and challenge the Iraqi people to stand up and defend their own country.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated the original Iraq war resolution, the administration told us that Iraq was stockpiling weapons of mass destruction that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and that Iraq was within a year of having a nuclear capability.

Fast-forward to the deliberations of the 9/11 Commission. They concluded that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and no nuclear capability.

Mr. Speaker, these votes weren't 8-4 or 7-5, they were all 12-0 that the very basis for the war did not exist.

When I go back home, Mr. Speaker, and my constituents ask me to summarize where we are in the war on terror, I tell them this: As we approach the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in the history of our country, we have committed hundreds of billions of dollars in Iraq. More important, over 20,000 young Americans have either been killed or seriously wounded going after Saddam Hussein, who did not attack us, while Osama bin Laden, who did attack us, is still alive, free, planning another attack on our country.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the very definition of failure in the war on terror.

We went after the wrong guy.

But after the invasion, did we have a responsibility to help the Iraqi people build a new government and a new way of life? The answer to that question is yes. And we have fulfilled that obligation. We have helped them through not one, not two, but three elections. It is now time for the Iraqi people to stand up and defend themselves.

There is a general rule of military engagement that says that you do not signal to your enemy what you are going to do in advance. But there are exceptions to this rule, and there are two exceptions to this rule.

Number one is that the insurgents in Iraq are using as a recruiting tool the argument that we have no intention of leaving their country, and that we're going to steal their oil—and it is working. It is fueling the insurgency.

As for our friends in Iraq, those who want this new government and new way of life, they seem perfectly content to let our soldiers take all of the enemy fire. The problem with security in Iraq is not the system of training; it's the fact that the Iraqis are not stepping forward to defend their own government.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, my basic disagreement with the President is this: He says that we should stay in Iraq until the Iraqis declare that they are ready to defend their own country; and I propose that we announce a time-frame for withdrawal, start withdrawing our troops, and make our commitment very clear to the Iraqis: If they want this new government and this new way of life, they have to come forward, volunteer, stand up, and defend it.
Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring our troops home.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am manager of the bill for the Judiciary Committee for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself some time, if I may consume. I want to initially present an update as to where we have been and where we are in Iraq. Many months ago an Iraqi citizen said to me, you all must remove Saddam. We can’t do it, he said, because we know what he is capable of doing to us in retaliation. I said to him if we do remove him, will you embrace us or will you kick us? He said, I don’t know.

I responded, that is my concern. I don’t know either. I believe his anti-American sentiments, that three represented a majority view in Iraq, but my concern proved prophetic. Our exercise in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, has not been without mistakes. Our entry strategy was superb. Our after strategy was tentative at best, inept at worst.

A better response to the looting that ensued in the early days should have been in place. The disestablishment of the Army, without an alternative plan, in my opinion, was premature. Some would blame the United States for the delayed political development, but after all, our forefathers were deliberate in forming our country’s operational apparatus, so I think the political complaint is probably unfounded.

Was Saddam an evil, brutal murderer, a flagrant violator of human rights? You bet. Was he involved in international terrorism? You bet. Was he directly or indirectly involved in the 9/11 attack? I don’t know. I can neither confirm nor reject that theory. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that intelligence was flawed. Mistakes were made. But the cause for freedom is a noble one, and progress has, indeed, been realized.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, about the lack of objectivity in reporting the war on terrorism. Some liberal talk show host reports imply that no good has been accomplished. Conversely, some conservative talk show hosts portray Baghdad as moonlight and roses. Clearly these two slanted versions are inaccurate and unfair.

Let me say a word about the PATRIOT Act, Mr. Speaker, and this will be discussed in more detail subsequently.

But the PATRIOT Act was reported in the full House by the Judiciary Committee and it addressed the nexus of the sale of illicit narcotics and terrorist financing. These two shadowy worlds of narcotics trafficking and terrorism is an element of terrorism that I think is lost on many Americans. They are joined at the hip, and I am particularly pleased that the PATRIOT Act did respond to that end.

Seventeen months ago, Mr. Speaker, I publicly supported troop withdrawal was conspicuously absent when the war on terrorism was discussed. Oh, we spoke of appropriating more funds, we spoke of dispatching additional troops, but virtually no one ever even mentioned troop withdrawal in their discussions.

Now, I am not suggesting troop withdrawal tomorrow, but I want our armed servicemen and -women home sooner rather than later. Oh, we cannot cut and run. Cut and run? We have had a presence in Iraq in excess of 3 years. 2,500 armed services Americans have given the ultimate sacrifice to the cause of freedom, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of permanent and temporary injuries have been inflicted upon members of our armed services in addition to the spending of billions of dollars.

I do not know what constitutes cutting and running, but I do know that when we have logged a wartime duration of 3 years, when 2,500 Americans have given their lives for freedom, and Lord only knows how many Americans have been injured, this does not constitute cutting and running.

The time has come, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to pass the baton to the Iraqi Government. Now, this decision will ultimately be made militarily, and properly so, by the commanders on the ground; but I do not want this matter of withdrawal to be lost in the shuffle. If freedom and peace prevail in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, history will be generous in its praise to President Bush and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) who chairs the judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this global war on terror resolution. The war on terror is being fought on two fronts, both abroad and here at home. We applaud the diplomatic and military achievements overseas, but we also need to remain vigilant here in our own country.

Until the terrorists are defeated, Americans will continue to be their targets as long as we stand for freedom and democracy.

One of our weapons in the war on terror is the USA PATRIOT Act. That bill, which originated in the Judiciary Committee, gives law enforcement officials and intelligence officials the ability to cooperate during investigations.

More than 250 people in the United States have been charged with crimes that would not have been possible without the USA PATRIOT Act.

In response to the events of September 11, 2001, we also passed legislation that created the Director of National Intelligence so that all of our intelligence capabilities would be coordinated by one official.

We passed the REAL ID Act which contains several antiterrorism provisions, including one that makes certain foreign nationals deportable because of their ties to terrorism.

We must continue to pass legislation that makes it more difficult for terrorists to enter the United States. That means enacting meaningful border security legislation like that the House passed last December.

Those who would do us harm, Mr. Speaker, respect no borders. Potential terrorists and thousands of others continue to enter our country illegally every day.

In America, we are blessed to have the freedom that others only dream about, but freedom is never free. It must be nurtured and protected, sometimes at great cost in lives; but we will not surrender to terrorists. That only empowers them. We will fight them today so we can enjoy a better tomorrow.

Any other course only resigns us to an uncertain future.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me pay tribute to the brave men and women of the 21st Congressional District of Texas who are fighting this war overseas. The most difficult action I have ever taken as an elected official is to call the families of the 14 servicemen from my district who made the ultimate sacrifice. Their families’ patriotism and love of country is almost indescribable. Their faith is great because they know our cause is great.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad this resolution has been brought to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who fought in the Korean War and was awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the majority has seen fit to bring to this floor a political statement where if you vote against it, you are voting against our troops; and if you vote for it, of course you are supporting the President’s policy. But being a politician, I can understand that.

We cannot say enough about the courage and the dedication of our young people, the volunteers and the
Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. I witnessed the impact of Zarqawi up close and personal. I have seen the damage Zarqawi inflicted. I visited the areas where Zarqawi lived and terrorized people, and I met the brave soldiers who relentlessly tracked him down and killed him. It was Sunday evening, May 28, 2006, and I was in Amman, Jordan, with a small delegation of six Congressmen. As I walked through the metal detector to enter the hotel’s lobby, I thought of Zarqawi. It was here, in Amman, Jordan, that Zarqawi, a native of Jordan, killed 60 people by bombing three hotels on November 9, 2005.

The next day was Memorial Day, Monday, May 29, and I was in Iraq visiting with our troops. Once again, my thoughts turned to Zarqawi. I toured the Special Operations Command Center with General Stan McChrystal, one of our nation’s top strategists, and together we tracked down Zarqawi. All over the walls of the command center were posters of Zarqawi. General McChrystal and his team were confident that they would get Zarqawi, and they briefed us on their efforts.

That same day I flew in a Blackhawk helicopter around the area of Ba’Qubah where Zarqawi was ultimately located. I also toured Baghdad, where Zarqawi intimidated the Iraqi government by bombing their headquarters and where al Jazeera TV once broadcast a videotape showing Zarqawi personally beheading an American citizen.

A week later, on Wednesday, June 7, I was at the White House with a few other Members of Congress to brief President Bush about what we saw in Iraq. At exactly 3:57 p.m., National Security Advisor Stephen Hadley slipped a note to President Bush, Vice President Cheney and Secretary of State Condí Rice. President Bush read the note, smiled and winked at Condi Rice. Zarqawi was dead.

General McChrystal later personally went to the 72nd Special Forces team and determined for himself that Zarqawi had officially been killed. President Bush already called General McChrystal to thank him and his troops, and today Congress thanks them as well.

Mr. Speaker, Amman, Jordan, is a long way from my hometown of Orlando, Florida. Tonight, thousands of people in Orlando will walk into hotel lobbies without having to go through a metal detector, unlike the hotels in Amman. Why? Because our soldiers are taking the fight to the terrorists, like Zarqawi in the Middle East, so the rest of us can live freely in the United States.

However, one feels about the war in Iraq, realize that our troops deserve our support 100 percent. God knows they have earned it. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on House Resolution 861. Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?
responsibility for the security of Iraq. Ultimately, the Iraqi people, the troops, the police officers there have to be responsible for the security of Iraq. There is only so much that our troops can do. This must continue to be a primary focus so that our brave men and women can return home as soon as possible.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), a combat veteran of the Korean War.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ladies and gentlemen, General Anthony Zinni and other retired generals have been outspoken in their opposition to the planning and execution of our occupation of Iraq. But our administration rejected their sound recommendations which predicted exactly what would happen if we didn’t plan for the occupation. These generals explained that our forces were not provided enough resources to do the job; that we alienated allies that could have helped in rebuilding Iraq; and that the Defense Department ignored planning for the postwar occupation, unaware of the growing insurgency there.

I have heard from too many military families, those children of theirs who have been wounded or killed in duty. Their grief is so much harder to bear knowing that often we did not adequately equip their sons and daughters in battle.

Back home I have met many times with Lila Lipscomb, a proud mother from Flint, Michigan, who lost her son Michael in Iraq. Initially, Mrs. Lipscomb supported the war, on the assumption that the government knew best. A week after finding out her son had died, she received a letter from her son in which he forcefully argued that we should not be in Iraq because there was no connection between Iraq and Osama bin Laden.

Cindy Sheehan lost her son Casey in Iraq and became a voice for mothers of soldiers who oppose the war. Cindy’s loss motivated her to unite with other grieving mothers in opposition to the war. And her willingness to speak truth to power has drawn attention to the misconduct of the war and the terrible price that service men and women and their families have paid.

Let me tell you this: We need to encourage our friends and allies around the globe to help with Iraqi reconstruction and peacekeeping. We just don’t have sufficient resources to manage this work on our own. We haven’t learned how to fight the first Gulf War. If we can bring the international community into Iraq to help establish a democracy, protect its citizens, and rebuild its infrastructure, it will free American forces and resources to address the real problem we face: terrorism.

Let’s heed the advice of our colleagues, Mr. MURTHA, and redeploy our troops to find Osama bin Laden and fight terrorists. If we can shatter the myth that occupying Iraq is the same thing as fighting terrorism, then these 10 hours of debate tonight will have been worth something after all.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who sits as a member of the Judiciary, 3 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I appreciate the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker, and also this Chamber. If we take ourselves back to September 11, 2001, we had a lot of small problems then that we thought were big problems, and all of a sudden we had a great big problem. We were attacked by an enemy that most of us hadn’t paid much attention to, if indeed we had ever heard of that enemy. We believed that that day wouldn’t be over before on top of the attacks we knew about there would be other attacks on top of that. We believed in the following months and years we would see more and more attacks in this country because of an organized effort that would be continuing with suicide bomber attacks that would continue to cost the lives of Americans.

We were right. The President stepped up in New York at ground zero and took a leadership role. He said if you’re not with us, you’re against us. If you harbor terrorists, you are a terrorist. And he carried that out. And I yield that to the gentleman from Michigan. And we have helped in rebuilding Iraq; and that the Defense Department ignored planning for the postwar occupation, unaware of the growing insurgency there.

The American people voted on that soil for the first time in the history of the world, and American troops were there to see to it that they were able to do that. They have chosen their own leaders and directed their own national destiny, 25 million people.

And the advisers that put that together, both civilian and military, were the same advisers that advised President Bush on Iraq. The similarities are almost identical: Difficult country, 25 million people, you can’t go there and successfully invade and occupy a nation like that; that has never happened in the history of the world. The terrain is too difficult, the fighters are too tenacious, and it is a fool’s errand to go into Afghanistan and think you can succeed in there militarily. But in fact that is what happened.

They said it would be another Vietnam, but it wasn’t another Vietnam. The Afghan people voted on that soil for the first time in the history of the world, and American troops were there to see to it that they were able to do that. They have chosen their own leaders and directed their own national destiny, 25 million people.

And the advisers that put that together, both civilian and military, were the same advisers that advised President Bush on Iraq. The similarities are almost identical: Difficult country, 25 million people, you can’t go there and succeed. The same advisers. And because some people can find one or two generals that had a different idea, they seem to believe that the President hasn’t used the best wisdom possible.

In the shortest time in the history of the world, an armored column went across the desert and invaded and occupied the largest city ever in the history of the world; we invaded and occupied, successfully, that is Baghdad, by 25 million people. Even though we had some people who have spoken on this floor tonight that were inclined to sur-render before the operation ever began. And now we have an operation going over there that has freed 25 million more people. And Afghanistan and Iraq are the lodestars for the Arab people in the Arab world.

When the Berlin Wall came down on November 9 of 1989, many in this place did not predict that freedom would echo across Eastern Europe for hundreds of millions of people, but it did. And freedom can echo across the Arab world for tens and hundreds of millions of people the same way that it echoed across Europe. That is the Bush doctrine. That is the vision: To free people. Because free people never go to war against other free people. We don’t, at least.

And to the extent that the world is a freer place, it is a safer place, especially a safer place for Americans. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and I stand with our military.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TANNER) who served 4 years as active duty in the U.S. Navy and retired as a full bird colonel after 26 years with the National Guard.

Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, our country was founded and bases itself on civilian control of the military. And when I wore the uniform of our country, I, like all other military people in uniform, followed orders. I obeyed my country and I tried to do whatever the mission was that was set before us. That is what you do in the military of the United States under civilian control.

But I am not in uniform anymore. I am a civilian now, and part of that civilian authority. And it is our patriotic duty as part of that civilian authority to ask questions, to constantly reexamine the strategy, to constantly reexamine the policy of this country, to do whatever we can to accomplish our mission; and, secondly, and more importantly, protect the men and women who are actually doing the fighting for us now.

That is why this debate, I would have hoped, would have been more broad; that we would have had an opportunity, because this debate in this country has to take place in this building on this floor here and in the Senate Chamber. It is the patriotic obligation and duty of civilian authority to do that. And I am proud to be here tonight.

Now, I have supported resolutions like this in the past, but I want to ask
Mr. COBLE a question, sir. There was a news report this morning that the new Iraqi government is negotiating with some of the elements there in Iraq that are insurgents who have been murdering Americans, and this was what one of the Iraqi government officials said this morning, according to those news reports, and I quote: “There is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that these attacks on Americans are legitimate acts of resistance in defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned, definitely, I believe.”

Now, unless that can be cleared up, I am not prepared to vote for a resolution which says in part that the United States and its coalition partners will continue to support Iraq. If this government in Iraq is going to grant amnesty to people who kill Americans because they feel it is their patriotic duty and they are defending their homeland, then we have got to reassess where we are with these people.

Do you know whether or not this has been cleared up?

Mr. COBLE. Mr. TANNER, I do not know. I am told that it was announced that it was a mistake. But I cannot verify that, and this is a case of first impression with me, what you have just shared with me.

Mr. TANNER. Well, I don’t want to catch you off guard, but we need to clear this up before we vote on this resolution. I do not think the American people will support a government that grants amnesty to people who kill American soldiers.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who, by the way, is the founder and chairman of the bipartisan, bicameral Anti-Terrorist Funding Task Force.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly about one aspect of our fight against terrorism that is often overlooked, and that is our efforts to detect and eradicate terrorist funding networks around the world. The fight against terror finance goes hand in hand with the war on terror.

We fought back against terror financiers with people like Dennis Lormel, a veteran FBI agent who was tasked with tracking down the financial lifelines that enabled the 9/11 hijackers to operate.

We fought back against people like David Aufhauser, who was then general counsel at the Treasury Department who was put in charge of a small interagency terror finance group which met regularly at the White House after 9/11.

And the gentleman back here in this House, Chairman Oxley and the ranking member, Mr. FRANK, convened a Financial Services Committee hearing on terror finance just 3 weeks after the attacks. Shortly thereafter, this body passed the PATRIOT Act, which provided critical new terror finance tools. We have held numerous hearings since to improve the government’s antiterror finance efforts and to identify which foreign countries need to do more to stop terror financing within their borders.

And we have created the bipartisan Congressional Anti-Terrorist Financing Task Force to bring a stronger focus on bolstering our fight against terror financiers.

In just a few years, we have made significant progress in combating terror-funding networks. We still have a long way to go, but we are on the right track.

Last December, the 9/11 Commission came out with a report card grading the government’s response to 9/11. The government’s efforts against terror finance got the highest grade of them all, an A minus.

Just last week, an al Qaeda planning document was found in al Qarawi’s hideout which laments our successes in restricting the al Qaeda financial outlets. This House has played an important role in this effort, and it has been approached in a bipartisan way even when dealing with terror finance in Iraq. Continued progress on this complex issue requires a sustained commitment from our Congress.

Last year, members from both sides of the aisle joined me in a letter pressing Syria for more action in stopping the flow of fighters and finances into Iraq.

Members from both sides of the aisle joined me in asking the government of Italy to crack down on open fundraising efforts for Iraqi terrorists in their country.

As we move forward, our challenges continue to grow more daunting as terrorists perpetually adapt. We must add methods to stop them. They are constantly finding new ways to raise and distribute money.

So we must work even harder to keep up with terrorists’ ever-changing financing techniques. We must continue pressing foreign governments:

Continued progress on this complex issue requires a sustained commitment from Congress. By stopping the flow of terror money, we can diminish the ability of terrorists to attack our citizens and our country. Fighting terror finance must remain a critical component of the War on Terror.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time for some of the veterans on the Democratic side of the aisle to have the opportunity to speak out against this sham resolution, and I yield back to him the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose this resolution and to call for a significant reduction of U.S. forces this year and an end to the occupation in 2007. I voted against the invasion in 2002 because I believed the war would be a strategic blunder of historic proportions. And it has been.

We owe the men and women we sent to Iraq and their loved ones more than a few hours of grandstanding on this floor and an empty resolution of support.

We must work toward a national consensus to end this war, a war born in deception and managed under a delusion. Today’s news that the American death toll has surpassed 2,500 is the grim reminder of the danger and sacrifice our Armed Forces face daily in Iraq. We need to rebuild our occupation of Iraq so America can rebuild our economy at home and regain respect abroad.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who sits on the House Ways and Means Committee.

(ACCOUNT OF SPEAKER REPLYING TO HAYWORTH’S REQUEST TO BE RECOGNIZED AND AUTHORIZATION TO REVISE AND EXTEND TIME)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, again we return to the people’s House to discuss the people’s business and the central question that cuts to the very core of our existence: free men and women engaged in an armed struggle to advance freedom elsewhere in the world; our all-volunteer military, standing in the breach against Islamofascism and terror in Afghanistan and in innumerable other places around the globe. But the central front for our discussion this evening is Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, in support of the troops, in support of this mission, as I often recall the words of Mark Twain that history does not repeat it, but it rhymes. We have seen the debate that has gone on in the people’s House today, so many willing to compare this to Vietnam. So many coming to this floor using the term “quagmire,” and yet any dispassionate, objective evaluation of what has transpired would be remiss if we did not include not one, not two, but three elections where we have seen a significant reduction of U.S. forces this year and an end to the occupation in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, in support of the troops, in support of this mission, as I often recall the words of Mark Twain that history does not repeat it, but it rhymes. We have seen the debate that has gone on in the people’s House today, so many willing to compare this to Vietnam. So many coming to this floor using the term “quagmire,” and yet any dispassionate, objective evaluation of what has transpired would be remiss if we did not include not one, not two, but three elections where we have seen a significant reduction of U.S. forces this year and an end to the occupation in 2007.

We see a nation being born, fighting terror, and we see American troops, volunteers, stepping forward.

Others have made the point, Mr. Speaker, that there is no more solemn and sacred obligation than casting a vote for war.
vote to put our military into harm’s way. I have been at Walter Reed with one of my constituents prior to surgery. I had that young man say to me: Congressman, I am a cav scout. That’s my job; that’s my profession. Help me do a job I plan to get back with my unit.

The men and women of our military are professionals doing a tough job. I don’t doubt the sincerity and intent of those who oppose this resolution, but I do respectfully take issue with their judgment.

If it is us, who? If not now, when? We have no choice. Failure is not an option, and to those for whatever reason eager to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory, at Zarqawi is dead. A democracy is being born. Freedom is on the march. This remains an imperfect world with mistakes and challenges that likewise remain, but let us stand steadfast, true to the course, true to the cause, true to freedom. Vote “yes” on this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the resolution.

There is much in the resolution to like. It expresses a commitment to a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq. And it urges that we “protect freedom.”

But this resolution fails to fully address a key question that most Americans are asking: “When are the troops coming home?”

Now let me be clear—I have long opposed setting a “date certain” for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam Veteran, I believe that every unconventional conflict has a “tipping point” where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that the new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it’s time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring.

It is time for Iraq to come together and show the American people that it is ready to defend itself, govern itself and sustain itself.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I observe in this great chamber two large portraits. One is of George Washington, our revolutionary leader. The other is of France’s General Lafayette, who helped us with our revolution from 1777 to 1781. It is instructive to note that General Lafayette did not stay here forever, nor did we want him to go. Good friends know when to come; good friends know when to go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for the troops and their important mission. But it is also time to send a clear message that our commitment is conditional on their successes, and that our days in their country are not indefinite.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the Resolution. There is much in this resolution to like.

After all, it honors those Americans who have fought in the Global War on Terror, and especially those who have been wounded or died.
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But this resolution fails to fully address a key question that most Americans are asking: “When are the troops coming home?”

Now let me be clear—I have long opposed setting a “date certain” for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam Veteran, I believe that every unconventional conflict has a “tipping point” where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that the new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it’s time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring.

It is time for Iraq to come together and show the American people that it is ready to defend itself, govern itself and sustain itself.
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However, speaking as a Vietnam Veteran, I believe that every unconventional conflict has a “tipping point” where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that the new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it’s time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring.

It is time for Iraq to come together and show the American people that it is ready to defend itself, govern itself and sustain itself.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I observe in this great chamber two large portraits. One is of George Washington, our revolutionary leader. The other is of France’s General Lafayette, who helped us with our revolution from 1777 to 1781. It is instructive to note that General Lafayette did not stay here forever, nor did we want him to go. Good friends know when to come; good friends know when to go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for the troops and their important mission. But it is also time to send a clear message to our friends in Iraq, that our commitment is conditional on their successes, and that our days in their country are not indefinite.
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After all, it honors those Americans who have fought in the Global War on Terror, and especially those who have been wounded or died.

It expresses a commitment to a “sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq.” And it urges that we “protect freedom.”

But this resolution fails to fully address a key question that most Americans are asking: “When are the troops coming home?”

Now let me be clear—I have long opposed setting a “date certain” for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam Veteran, I believe that every unconventional conflict has a “tipping point” where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that the new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it’s time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring.
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In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for the troops and their important mission. But it is also time to send a clear message to our friends in Iraq, that our commitment is conditional on their successes, and that our days in their country are not indefinite.
I recall being awakened one morning to learn that we had suffered the loss of our marines in Beirut. I recall the attack on the USS Cole. And then, of course, I recall with all of us the terrible tragedy of 9/11.

Say what you will about the President's policies and say what you will about the imperfections involved, the fact of the matter is since 9/11 this President, this administration, has embarked on a strategy that says we will not wait to be attacked. We will not wait to respond exactly where they attacked us. We will change the rules of the game, and we will decide where and when we will attack.

I understand that this is a global war on terror. Those who suggest that the war in Iraq is not essential to our defense in the war on terror should only listen to the words of Mr. Zarqawi and the correspondence that he had only listen to the words of Mr. Zarqawi. Those who suggest that the war in Iraq is not essential to our war on terror. Those who suggest that they need even more.

Today it seems we have a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan and increasing attacks in Iraq on our troops and Iraqi citizens.

We have seen success in capturing Saddam and eliminating al Zarqawi. I have never doubted the ability of our young men and women in our Armed Forces. We saw what they were capable of doing in the first days of the war when they stormed Iraq and Baghdad within days, overwhelming the Iraqi forces.

The accomplishments we have seen in Iraq can be attributed directly to these troops’ discipline and persistence in fighting the insurgency. Mistakes have been made, and the most experienced members of our Armed Forces have pointed that out. One of the individuals who spoke out was retired Marine General, Former Chief of U.S. Central Command Anthony Zinni, who said, “We grew up in a culture where accountability, learning to accept responsibility, admitting mistakes and learning from them was critical to us. When we don’t see that happening, it worries us. Poor military judgments has been used throughout this mission.”

As this war has gone on, the lack of planning and poor judgment by this administration has become more apparent.

I have here the May 1, 2003 press release from the White House in which President Bush, on board the U.S. Abraham Lincoln, declared all major combat operations have ended. We now know that this was one miscalculation among many. Since that time, seven young men from our 29th Congressional district in Texas have lost their lives in Iraq. Across this Nation, 2,300 service personnel, men and women have lost their lives since the President made these remarks.

Reading over these remarks, it is clear that the administration had no clear plan for securing Iraq after the invasion and no clue about what was to follow the next few months.

Given the size and the strength and the effectiveness of the insurgency, the administration’s intelligence should have given some indication that there would be problems down the road and done a better job of preparing both our public and, more importantly, our troops on what was to come the following month and the following years. It is clear that we did not have enough troops on the ground immediately after the invasion, and that shortage continues.

Congress doesn’t direct troops on the ground. We are not the Commander in Chief. But we are charged with sending our sons and daughters into battle, and therefore it is our responsibility and our duty to debate about what is occurring in Iraq.

I strongly disagree with the way the administration planned and carried out this war. I will continue, though, to vote for the defense appropriations and the supplemental dollars because we have to give our troops protections that they need, and we learn every day that they need even more.

Many brave men and women have given their lives in Baghdad and all across Iraq. We honor those families for their sacrifice, their ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, this war is not the one we anticipated for we were led to believe we were getting into, but I believe we must leave a secure Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol for democracy to prosper.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the question came up previously from a colleague about did Iraq intend to give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers, and I want to clarify that. The National Security Adviser said just earlier regarding alleged comments from the Prime Minister that supposedly amnesty would be given to some who have killed Americans. He said, “This is not the case. I am sorry to tell the Prime Minister of Iraq has been misquoted and misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed Americans.” So that should clarify that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are those who said it is a quagmire in Iraq. It is a mistake for us to be there. Some made these statements from personal heartache. Some, on the other hand, were made from partisan political motivation, and some from disdain for President Bush and a desire to see his efforts fail, even though it risks world stability and national security.

But our soldiers are there. They know they have done great things and will continue to accomplish more. They have seen the admiring faces of Iraqi children that were never present in Vietnam. They have heard gratitude from many there in Iraq that was never heard in Vietnam.

Our valiant soldiers not only fight, protect and defend, they also see the frantic efforts of terrorists who are terrified that democracy and the people will begin to rule over them and their oppressive dictatorial ways. They keep many terrorists occupied there rather than here in America. Mr. Speaker, as legislators, we get to ask a question that I didn’t get to ask as a judge. It was inappropriate because of the separation of powers. And that is, who will be hurt or helped by the actions and, in my case as a judge, by the ruling?

Well, here in this debate as legislators we get to ask that question. Who will be hurt by pulling out? Those yearning for freedom who have it within their grasp will be hurt. And ultimately America will be hurt because of terrorist activities that would resume and multiply unabated in Iraq, and bin Laden would have been proven right, that we didn’t have the stomach to go all the way to victory. Who would be helped by our pulling out? Well, there are some families that would not endure the heartache from losing or having a wounded soldier in...
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their family. But the price in lost lives might be far more expensive in the future. Who would really be helped would be ruthless, heartless, finger detaching, hand removing, throat slashing, decapitating, women raping and abusing, child masuing, corpse abusing, mercilessly, zealous, murderers who think they are going to get virgins in the next life, but may find they are the virgins with what happens to them.

Let me just close by saying, some have things to say about our colleague, Mr. MURTHA, and others wanting to pull out of Iraq quickly. But I understand the faithful visitation that he does routinely. So I say thank God for his big heart. I say thank God for his compassion. Thank God for his visits to the wounded. Thank God for his ministering to grieving families. But thank God he was not here and prevailed after the bloodbaths at Normandy and in the Pacific, or we would be here speaking Japanese or German.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask the Speaker, was the gentleman at any of those locations? Was the gentleman at either Normandy or any of those locations?

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield?

You want to know which locations? Mr. MURTHA. Yes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Normandy was a horrible location.

Mr. MURTHA. I said were you there?

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, no, I wasn’t.

Mr. MURTHA. Were you in Vietnam?

Mr. GOHMERT. No, sir, I wasn’t.

Mr. MURTHA. Were you in Iraq?

Mr. GOHMERT. I have been over there. I haven’t been fighting.

Mr. MURTHA. Boots on the ground?

Mr. GOHMERT. And I do admire the gentleman’s compassion, and I do appreciate all that he has done for our wounded. I have done a great service, and that would be you, Mr. MURTHA. Thank you for your work.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the process that we are dealing with this evening is nothing less than an outrage. The idea that on an issue of this great importance those of us in the minority are not being allowed to offer a resolution on something so important to the democratic process and tells us why we have to end one party government in America.

The Republican resolution talks about democracy in Iraq. I am all for that. But I would also like to see some democracy on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Three and a half years ago, when we were asked to give the President the authority to go to war in Iraq, I voted against that resolution, and I think history will indicate that that was the right vote.

Three and a half years ago President Bush told us that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq was likely to attack us, and that it was necessary to wage a preemptive war against them. President Bush was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were told that there was a link between Iraq and al Qaeda. That was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were shown all of those aluminum tubes which allegedly told us about a nuclear weapons program in Iraq. That was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were told that Iraq was importing depleted uranium from Niger. That was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism is a major problem for our country and the world. Unfortunately, in many respects, the war in Iraq has created more terrorists than it has stopped, and has deflected our attention away from the fight against Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, let us bring our troops home as soon as possible. Let us mount a focused campaign against terrorism with improved intelligence capabilities and with an understanding that we need to work with the entire world.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is a part of the global war on terrorism, and a strong democratic Iraq means a safer America.

Rather than debate the past, I choose to look at where we are today and where we will be tomorrow. In the days and weeks and months ahead, the global war on terrorism will come to a turning point. Today the question is, do we continue to fight and defeat the terrorists who will stop at nothing to destroy Iraq’s democracy?

Ultimately, the success of democracy in Iraq will be decided by the Iraqis themselves, for it is they who must take their country back.

Like many of our colleagues, I have traveled to Iraq. I have visited with its leaders, including the new Prime Minister. I have also visited with our troops, including from my home State of New Jersey. I have met with members of the Signal Battalion from Westfield and our Finance Battalion in Flemington before their deployments. Their commitment and willingness to serve inspire us all.

Difficult days still lie ahead. We acknowledge the sacrifices of our Armed Forces and their families here at home. For those Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice, 2,500 as of today, their sacrifice is immeasurable, and America extends our hands and our hearts to their families.

Looking forward, not backwards, I believe we must stand with the Iraqis who are fighting for their country, because a strong democratic Iraq means a safer America. There can be no alternative to winning the global war on terrorism. There can be no alternative to a democratic Iraq, lest it return to tyranny and a breeding ground for international terrorists who would then seek to fight us far closer to our own shores.

Let us choose a democratic Iraq and a safer America. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, how did this happen? We have lost 2,500 American soldiers and women. They have been killed in Iraq. 18,000 U.S. soldiers grievously wounded. We have spent over one-third of a trillion dollars in Iraq on this war, so far. Yet, 80 percent of the Iraqi people want us to leave. 80 percent of the Iraqi people want us to leave. They are shooting at our soldiers, blowing up our soldiers with improvised explosive devices.

How did we get here? Oh, yeah, I remember. President Bush said that Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat to the United States and had weapons of mass destruction. So many of us voted to send our troops to Iraq to eliminate this threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction and this imminent threat to our national security.

I support the Murtha resolution, which says that we should withdraw most of the U.S. troops back to the United States and leave a quick reaction force in friendly countries around the region.

Some say Iraq is part of the war on terror. Nonsense. There are 25 million people in Iraq, 28 million people in Iraq, less than 1,000 foreign fighters. This is a civil war. The Iraqi Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds cannot agree how to divide up Iraq now that we got rid of Saddam. Well, it is 3 years later. All of this American loss of life. President Bush says stay the course, and in fact, it will not be President Bush who gets rid of this war. It will be the next President. Well, you know what? Americans do not want this war without end. Deploy most of our troops back to America within 6 months. Redeploy a significant number in friendly countries around the region. In case other countries want to meddle.

War without end is not the American way. We met our moral obligation to
the people of Iraq. Now it is up to the Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds in Iraq to decide whether they want to live in peace with one another or not.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), who sits on the Financial Services and Transportation Committees.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, for our families and country to truly be secure, we must prevail in the war on terror. Iraq is a central front in that war.

Mistakes have been made, but so have corrections. But the fundamental fact remains that John F. Kennedy’s words have never been more true: “If men and women are in chains anywhere in the world, then freedom is in endangered everywhere.”

Men and women in the chains of tyranny, without hope, provide the breeding grounds for terrorists that endanger America and the entire civilized world. Terrorism can only be defeated by bringing hope to harsh places.

America has always found that the best way to make our families secure is to confront tyranny and expand the frontiers of freedom. That is our mission in Iraq. And with a democratically elected government and Iraqi troops increasingly taking over for our troops, we are on a path to success, and a path to bringing our troops home.

Others offer a different path, a path that says, get out now, no matter what the commanders on the ground think; get out now whether or not milestones are achieved; get out now, whether or not Iraq becomes a sanctuary for terrorists to regroup and attack America again; get out now, no matter what signal it sends to our friends and other countries that would endanger our security.

Cutting and running is one path. But it is the wrong path.

The only path that makes our families secure is victory in the War on Terror. Mr. Speaker, beyond the lessons of history, I look to what the soldiers on the ground are saying.

The soldiers I have spoken to on the ground in Iraq, at places like Camp Victory in Baghdad, many of them men and women from the Minnesota Army National Guard, want to come home as soon as possible. However, they realize better than most that if they come home before they have defeated the terrorist threat, there will be no lasting peace—there will be no victory in the War on Terror. We, like them, want to finish the job in Iraq, we’ll have to finish it someplace else.

Like them, I want to finish the job in Iraq, because if we don’t finish it there, the horror of 9/11 should inform us that the war will be brought to us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember in our thoughts and prayers those who have sacrificed, as well as those who continue to stand in harm’s way around the world fighting the War on Terror. Let us deserve the bravery and selflessness of our men and women in uniform.

MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. H. R. Conn), who sits on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, proved that our enemy is determined to kill Americans. Instead of sitting idle, our Nation went on the offense. We removed the Taliban from power in Afghanistan. We removed the regime in Iraq that had invaded neighbors and financed terrorism. And we have kept terrorists on
Mr. Speaker, progress in Iraq makes America safer. Terrorists are being pursued, not harbored. We have seen movement toward democracy in belligerent countries. Work remains, but freedom is making progress. And freedom, Mr. Speaker, lays the foundation for a more secure future for America.

Mr. Speaker, I have also had the privilege of visiting our troops in Iraq. They are outstanding young men and women, and they overwhelmingly believe in their mission. I urge my colleagues to offer their unqualified support to our troops abroad until their mission is complete.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the current administration has gotten too many things wrong in Iraq and has totally misrepresented the lessons of the post-9/11 world. It is now up to Democrats to get things right in Iraq so we can focus our military effort to fight terrorists around the world who want to harm us.

Today I ask my colleagues: Will we realistically confront terrorists and terrorism with all the elements of our national power, or will we continue to ignore a proven approach in order to follow a shop-worn, idealistic approach that drains our military of its resources and America of its goodwill with the very partners we need to fight terrorists? That is the choice that our country faces in Iraq and in our national security.

Democrats must speak out against this administration’s tendency to look for a policy that centers on oversight of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, we do not practice oversight. This Congress practices “overlook.” We must respond to public frustrations by creating a secure future for America and restless with a foundation for American efforts to fight terrorists and terrorism across the globe. Congress must confront the legacy of the waste, fraud, and abuse that plagues our efforts in Iraq.

As Democrats, we must continue our efforts, in spite of the current opposition, to bring this waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq to light.

Some talk about cutting and running. But I say we must confront the legacy of cutting and running from veterans health care. Just as the next generation of combat veterans return home, the long-term veterans health care budget falls $3.6 billion short from the projected costs. We must reject that legacy of Iraq.

And, finally, I join my colleagues in commending our U.S. military working in conjunction with Iraqi security and Iraqis themselves for locating and eliminating the mastermind, Zarqawi. His terrorist violence is gone. But we have learned in Iraq that fighting a classic guerilla-type war means that a victory like killing Zarqawi cannot be celebrated too long. Much remains to be done in Iraq, and Democrats have to make right where the administration has gone wrong. Our obligations compel us to ask the tough questions that are currently ignored.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the floor to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who sits on the Ways and Means, Budget, and Joint Economic Committees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I just recently read a lecture from the most highly respected scholar on Middle East affairs and Islam in America, Bernard Lewis. He went through Osama bin Laden’s original fatwa. He went through a lot of writings of al Qaeda back in the early to mid-1990s, and what they declared is very chilling. They declared that their war was going to be against the two superpowers at the time: the Soviet Union and America. They believed they defeated the USSR in Afghanistan. I would like to think peace through strength is what beat it here and the fact that communism did not work. But they think they beat it.

Now they have one last enemy to beat before they can reach their caliphate from Spain to Indonesia: America.

Mr. Speaker, the war on terror did not begin on 9/11. It began on 2/26, February 26, 1993, when they first hit us at the World Trade Center. Then in 1996, the Khobar Towers. Then in 1998 at our two embassies in Africa. Then in 2000, the USS Cole. Then in 2001, 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. They want to have a world like what we saw on display in Afghanistan, the Taliban, throughout the entire Middle East. If democracy and freedom can persist, if it can take root, if it can succeed, as it is succeeding in many parts of the Arab world, the terrorists lose.

And the most important thing in all of this is that all of us should have in the front of our minds is will our children grow up in America with the fear of terrorism that we have today because of our mistakes? Or will we make right where the administration has gone wrong? Will we make right the legacy of Iraq?

This is a global war, a war we have to win, a war that only America through its leadership can win for the rest of the world. The sooner we wake up to that, the better off we are and the more peaceful life we can leave to our children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution because its words honor our troops, but its deeds do not. It is not at all controversial that we honor and respect the heroism of those who serve us.

But they deserve so much more than the hollow words of this resolution. They deserve a plan that for the first time would achieve an intelligence alliance, it would make strikes like the one against Zarqawi on a regular basis against the leaders of the resistance. But this resolution has no plan. They deserve a real plan to fortify and improve the Iraqi security forces so as they step forward, our troops can come home. But this resolution offers no such plan. They deserve a clear path to political stability and broadening political participation so the government of Iraq is viewed as an Iraqi Government and not a tool of any outside forces. This resolution has no such plan.

We face some of the most important questions we are in today because the administration has given us slogans, not solutions. This resolution is very much in that sorry tradition. This debate is a sham, Mr. Speaker. It is a pep rally. It is not a discussion of the alternatives before the American people.

So although I join the words of the resolution in praising our troops, let’s move beyond the words to the deeds.
The way to honor those who fight for this country is to match their sacrifice with our own wisdom. This resolution falls far short of that objective and we should oppose it.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), a 25-year veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps, a Vietnam veteran who sits on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution today. I have enjoyed the debate immensely. The rhetoric has been sometimes heated, the facts sometimes obscured. But I think it is healthy for the American people to see this debate. I am sorry that the gentleman from New York is not here. I wanted to have a discussion about what buck sergeants know and what they do not know in today’s Army. But I suppose we will have to let that one slide by.

But I will tell you that my son, serving in Iraq today, and his colleagues and his soldiers in the 101st and the other soldiers and marines that I have talked to, they know why they are in Iraq. They do not ask why they are there. They know what their mission is. And they understand that not everyone here does, that Iraq is the front line in the war against Islamist extremists in the words of the 9/11 Commission.

But the time is now, this evening to talk about a trip that I took to Iraq a week ago at the request of the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee to assess the progress of the Iraqi armed forces. I am pleased to report that I was very heartened by what I found. I think all of us now understand that the Iraqi Army is progressing with amazing speed. We know the numbers. Over 260,000 Iraqi security forces, over 100 Iraqi Army battalions, almost 30 Iraqi police stations, either leading the fight or serving with their coalition partners.

But it is not the numbers that count; it is the quality of the troops. It is what they are able to do. In a previous trip to Iraq in November of 2005, I had the opportunity to meet with and assess the progress of the Iraqi counter-terrorism forces. These are special forces trained by our Special Operations Command, and they are impressive.

The Iraqi special forces have proved their mettle in combat and in training. Last month, last month a young captain became the first Iraqi to graduate from the United States Army Ranger School, an exceptional feat achieved by only 51 percent of any foreign military personnel who try.

Over Memorial Day weekend, my confidence was further boosted when I visited with Major General Bashar Ayoub, commander of the Iraqi 9th Mechanized Division, and Major General Jamal Khalid, Commander of the Iraqi Second Division. Both commanders expressed their frustration with the bureaucracy in the interim ministry of defense but both generals demonstrated a quite confidence and professionalism exhibited by seasoned battle-hardened commanders.

These two commanders demonstrated the will and the ability of the Iraqi security forces to battle the terrorists and the insurgents who plague their country.

In our discussions, Mr. Speaker, they were blunt. They were proud of their accomplishments. They were confident in their ability to move forward, but they recognize that they continue to rely on U.S. logistical and medical assistance, that they cannot move forward by themselves. Not now.

We have made a commitment, Mr. Speaker, not only to our American forces, but to these Iraqi forces. We have got to stay with them and help them achieve their freedom and their independence.

We have made a commitment—not only to the American men and women of our Armed Forces—but to those who wear the uniform of the Iraqi Security Forces. They have shed their blood alongside our soldiers and Marines in pursuit of a stable and peaceful Iraq.

Now is not the time to abandon them, now is the time to stay. It is with those who defend freedom in a land that has known only tyranny.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the rule this morning, our Republican colleagues suggested something pretty revolutionary, that is, that we do something we do not normally do often around here, and that is read the resolution. They said they encouraged us to review it, and vote based on whether we agree or disagree with the content of the resolution.

So I reviewed the resolution. And as our colleagues suggested, I intend to vote against it based on the fact that there are several things in the resolution that I strongly disagree with.

First, on page 2 of the resolution, it states as follows: ‘‘Whereas by early 2003, Saddam Hussein and his criminal Ba’athist regime in Iraq constituted a threat to global peace and security.’’

I think the only way one could conclude this would be to conclude that there were, in fact, weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I did not vote for the war resolution because I never believed the President when he asserted that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in the first place. I did not believe it then. It was subsequently proven not to be the case. And I most certainly cannot support a resolution that asserts it now.

Second, the resolution asserts that: ‘‘The terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorist’s aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East.’’ There is probably some truth to that.

However, what is probably a lot more true is that the war in Iraq has increased, not decreased, terrorism and the resolve of the terrorists. It has created conditions in Iraq that allow terrorism to thrive.

The Resolution asserts that ‘‘Iraqi forces are, over time, taking over from United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight to secure Iraq.’’ If that were true, we would have started bringing our troops home by now. At some point we have got to make Iraq assume responsibility for itself and its own people. I just don’t believe they or we have come to grips with that.

There obviously are a number of things in the Resolution with which I agree. But we were given no opportunity to amend the Resolution to strip out the things that are untrue and/or offensive or, for that matter, to add to the things with which we agree. My Republican colleagues have, once again, chosen to politicize a matter that should be above partisan politics. I cannot support the Resolution in this form and will, therefore, vote ‘no.’

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair the amount of time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 31 minutes, and gentleman from Pennsylvania has 37½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a veteran of the U.S. Army, who sits on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution for many reasons. But one is that I know we are achieving real progress in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know this not from government reports or media sources, but from two fine Pennsylvanians. I want to quote from an e-mail I received this morning from a constituent, an Army officer in northwest Iraq commanding the military transition team.

And he writes, ‘‘There are many positive things going on here that the American public never hear about. My little 10-man team contributed over 150 boxes of school supplies to the schools in my area. Other units purchased grain to give out to small villages. I am very proud of the accomplishments of U.S. and Iraqi forces and it truly is a shame that all of the news tends to be negative towards the activities of the soldiers, both American and Iraqi who are working very hard every day to make this country safe.’’

I am very pleased and honored this summer to have an intern, Mike Wright, who is a soldier in the 82nd Airborne. When he arrived in Afghanistan in July 2002, the people had nothing but schools, no paved roads. But in 7 months his unit helped build the first school and health clinic. When his unit came back to Afghanistan in late 2004, it was a different place. New facilities, factories, electricity, and miles of paved roads.

When arriving in the village, he tells me his unit would be greeted by small
children, smiling youngsters throwing colorful plastic flowers at them. These examples are among many that illustrate real progress, laying a foundation for future peace, shaping the world where the terrorist message will fall on deaf ears.

Mike told me this also, “The Afghani war veterans, the old-timers have asked him, why did you abandon us when the Soviets left?”

Today their biggest fear is that we will have before the mission tried to and allow the Taliban or other tyrants to take over. We must know that the Afghanis remember 1991 and fear the same thing. We must complete this mission.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, their side of the aisle, your side of the aisle, has a major problem. Yesterday, Prime Minister Nouri al Maliki suggested that our troops provide amnesty to those people who killed or who wounded our soldiers. We are going to see who are the patriots here in the future.

In a speech that Jack MURTHA gave on April 20 this year, he started off by talking about President Teddy Roo-sevelt. He said, “There must be no crit-icism of the President or that we have to stand by the President right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and seri-ble, but is morally treasonable to the American public.”

You are going to have to explain that. You made a very big mistake. I voted for the war, for the efforts of the President, the Chief, the Commander in Chief in December of 2002. And here we are a few years later, looking back at what that decision was based upon.

Talk about impunity, we have had people come on the floor in the last 2 years to impugn this gentleman’s char-acter. The CIA impugned the very facts that the administration has tried to provide. Every day a former CIA agent says that this administration failed to listen to the advice and counsel of those folks who have boots on the ground. That is a shame.

And the other side, the other side has simply provided a rubber stamp, a rub-ber stamp to all of the policies. You have mindlessly rubber-stamped the mismanagement that has cost our sons, and you may laugh, these are our sons and daughters, not just our sons and daughters their lives.

And now, here we are today—considering a partisan, political resolution that ultimately means nothing; a resolution that won’t assist our troops on the ground, a resolution that does not help us move forward in bringing our men and women home.

This is just another shameful example that the leadership of this body is not fit to serve. This Congress has failed to fulfill most basic of duties. Shame should permeate every hallway and every hearing chamber.

If we were serious—truly serious—about helping our men and women in the military, we would not waste our time on this resolu-

Instead we would delve into the deception, the intelligence failures, the scapegoating of the C.I.A., and the mismanagement that has placed us where we are today. The generals, the men and women of our Armed Forces have done their job. We have voted time and time again in budgets and supplements sup-porting this, and the war has become the real culprit come to this floor and demean, undermine, those who ask questions or may criti-cize. Teddy Roosevelt turned over from the clownish gyrations of the Congressmen or women from Ohio.

And we’ve take up H.J. Res. 73—Congressman JOHN MURTHA’s well-reasoned, es-sential call to redeploy our troops from Iraq. We are faced with a choice—more of the same from the Bush administration, or JACK’s way. I believe that rapid turnover of Iraq to the Iraqi people is essential and that our troops need to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date. That is why I am proud to co-sponsor my friend’s resolution.

Today is just another sham in the House of Representa-tives, but that is what we’ve come to expect.

Our troops deserve better.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentle-woman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who sits on the House En-ergy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, our colleagues across the aisle are asking the American people to di-vorce our mission in Iraq from the global war on terrorism. I think it is impossible. I think it is irresponsible, and it is bad policy.

If only terrorism were as clear cut a problem as they want us to believe, and this, indeed, the case? Is your government thinking about offering amnesty to those that attacked only U.S. military?

Mr. BLACKBURN. This is not the case. I’m sorry to say that the prime minister of Iraq has been misquoted and misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed the Americans.

As matter of fact, if you were there in his meeting with President Bush a couple of days ago, he looked the president in the eye and he said, thank you very, very much for liberating our country. Please thank the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood that they have invested in this country. It is well worth investing, of liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful.

And we will—the blood of the Iraqi soldier and blood of Iraqi civilian soldier is as sacred to us as the American soldier. We are fighting the same war, we are fighting together, and this is a joined responsibility. And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi sol-diers, Iraqis.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me ask the gentle-man, my good friend, how many more speakers he has?

Mr. COBLE. I say to my good friend from Pennsylvania, I have two more speakers, Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MURTHA. I will be the last speaker.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes the distinguished gentleman from Connectic-u-t (Mr. SHAYS), who is the chair-man of the National Security Sub-committee of the Government Reform Committee, and who has been to Iraq 12 times.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I have been listening to this debate all day. The argument I am hearing most from the opponents of this resolu-tion is we shouldn’t have gone into Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein in spite of the fact that many of them voted to go into Iraq.

I am hearing from opponents that there was and is no connection between Islamist terrorists and the war in Iraq.
in spite of the fact that the prince of al Qaeda, al Zarqawi, did his gross handiwork in Iraq. Fortunately, he is dead.

I am hearing from opponents of this resolution that we have made many mistakes in Iraq, as if that is justification for arguing that we need to leave. We have made a number of mistakes. We permitted the looting of government buildings. We didn't secure the munitions depot. We disbanded their army, their border patrol and police, and then asked the 150,000 coalition forces to protect the 26 million Iraqis living in a country the size of California.

These were mistakes, but mistakes do not justify leaving prematurely. They help explain why things could be better, and why, because we learn from our mistakes, we are doing better.

Since the transfer of power to Iraq in June of 2004, we have seen considerable progress, three free elections that put out our citizens in the United States to shame, the training of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Iraqi security forces, the establishment of a government chosen by a national assembly comprised of 30 percent women.

I agree we will lose the war in Iraq. I am deeply concerned we will lose the war in Iraq here at home. Our efforts to remove Saddam Hussein from power and help bring democracy to the most troubled part of the world is truly a dear and noble effort that must succeed.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I was just out to a hospital a week or so ago, and a young woman whose husband was in the bed right next to her, and she said, I didn't join the Army to fight for Iraq. He joined to fight for the United States.

We don't send people to fight for other countries. We send them to fight for the United States' national security. That is the first lesson we learn, and then we send them with overwhelming force and then we have an exit strategy.

What we are looking for is all the same thing. All of us want the same thing. We want a resolution. We want a positive resolution to what is going on in Iraq. We want a plan. We want a plan that we can live with. It is not enough to say stay the course. We need a plan that we can live with. It is not a day more than we need to ensure victory.

When I am asked about a time line for removing our troops, my answer is not a day more than we need to ensure victory. We could leave tomorrow. We could set an arbitrary deadline, 6 months, a year, and tell the terrorists how long they need to stick it out before we leave. But what would the ramifications of that be?

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people, and we are not. Iraqis do not want us out of there. They want us out of there.

I am hearing from opponents of this resolution that we have lost in the United States. I do not think this is solely a discussion on Iraq because what happens in Iraq will have far-reaching ramifications across the Middle East and around the world.

When I am asked about a time line for removing our troops, my answer is not a day more than we need to ensure victory. We could leave tomorrow. We could set an arbitrary deadline, 6 months, a year, and tell the terrorists how long they need to stick it out before we leave. But what would the ramifications of that be?

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people, and we are not. Iraqis do not want us out of there. They want us out of there.

I am hearing from opponents of this resolution that we have lost in the United States. I do not think this is solely a discussion on Iraq because what happens in Iraq will have far-reaching ramifications across the Middle East and around the world.
leaders, we learned that more than 30 percent of all day-to-day missions are planned and carried out by the Iraqis themselves. This is significant because it frees our soldiers to focus on capturing and eliminating key figureheads, as evidenced by the recent death of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

There was so much attention on al-Zarqawi that the appointment of three security ministers to complete the new Iraqi cabinet was all but missed. The fulfillment of the new government and these three posts in particular is a critical development in securing their nation from internal and external terrorist factions.

Mr. Speaker, the key to victory in Iraq is the Iraqi people. As their government forms, as it gains influence, as their military is able to defend the people and the infrastructure, we can continue to pull back. And we should. But we want to ensure that that legacy is that the Iraqi people want the legacy of our troops to be? If you think we made a mistake in the past, why would we repeat it?

If we walk away prematurely, how can we deal with Iran? How can we deal with North Korea?

As I said in the beginning, what do we in Iraq will have ramifications across the world for many years. I don’t think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the terrorist influence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked first-hand to our soldiers serving in Iraq. It’s been a year since I was last in Iraq. Since that time, I have attended many briefings and I reported back, seeing our troops and talking with leaders was the most telling status report of all.

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people—and we are not. The Iraqis and their new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence. There has been and continues to be a very small but determined portion of the population in Iraq who profited under Saddam’s regime do not want a free and stable Iraq. Al Qaeda does not want a free and stable Iraq. Freedom is not conducive to their long term goals. Accountability is not conducive to their long term goals. Democracy is not conducive to their long term goals. Saddam is not conducive to the long-term goals of the Iraqis who profited under Saddam’s regime do not want a free and stable Iraq. Al Qaeda does not want a free and stable Iraq. Freedom is not conducive to their long term goals. Accountability is not conducive to their long term goals. Democracy is not conducive to their long-term goals. Saddam is not conducive to their long-term goals. Saddam is not conducive to their long-term goals.

Their goal is to break our resolve with these barbaric acts of terror. They are profiting on poverty, despair, violence and fear. The bottom line is that they cannot afford for free-dom to succeed.

Conversely, we cannot afford freedom to fail. How detrimental would it be if we were to lose the white flag to al Qaeda and the Sunni terrorists? Do you think they will allow the people of Iraq to live in freedom and peace? Do you think they will allow the democratic process to continue?

A while back, some of my colleagues on the other side of the isle raised a good point—we walked away from Afghanistan following the Soviet withdrawal. What emerged from that void were the Taliban and a safe haven for al Qaeda and a powerful figure for terrorists. It is evident that letting Iraq to be? If you think we made a mistake in the past, why would we repeat it?

If we walk away prematurely, how can we deal with Iran? How can we deal with North Korea?

I think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the terrorist influence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked first-hand to our soldiers serving in Iraq. It’s been a year since I was last in Iraq. Since that time, I have attended many briefings and I reported back, seeing our troops and talking with leaders was the most telling status report of all.

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people—and we are not. The Iraqis and their new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence. There has been and continues to be a very small but determined portion of the population in Iraq who profited under Saddam’s regime do not want a free and stable Iraq. Al Qaeda does not want a free and stable Iraq. Freedom is not conducive to their long term goals. Accountability is not conducive to their long term goals. Democracy is not conducive to their long term goals. Saddam is not conducive to their long-term goals.

Their goal is to break our resolve with these barbaric acts of terror. They are profiting on poverty, despair, violence and fear. The bottom line is that they cannot afford for free-dom to succeed.

Paradoxically, we cannot afford freedom to fail. How detrimental would it be if we were to lose the white flag to al Qaeda and the Sunni terrorists? Do you think they will allow the people of Iraq to live in freedom and peace? Do you think they will allow the democratic process to continue?

A while back, some of my colleagues on the other side of the isle raised a good point—we walked away from Afghanistan following the Soviet withdrawal. What emerged from that void were the Taliban and a safe haven for al Qaeda and a powerful figure for terrorists. It is evident that letting Iraq to be? If you think we made a mistake in the past, why would we repeat it?

If we walk away prematurely, how can we deal with Iran? How can we deal with North Korea?

I think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the terrorist influence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked first-hand to our soldiers serving in Iraq. It’s been a year since I was last in Iraq. Since that time, I have attended many briefings and I reported back, seeing our troops and talking with leaders was the most telling status report of all.

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people—and we are not. The Iraqis and their new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence. There has been and continues to be a very small but determined portion of the population in Iraq who profited under Saddam’s regime do not want a free and stable Iraq. Al Qaeda does not want a free and stable Iraq. Freedom is not conducive to their long term goals. Accountability is not conducive to their long term goals. Democracy is not conducive to their long term goals. Saddam is not conducive to their long-term goals.

Their goal is to break our resolve with these barbaric acts of terror. They are profiting on poverty, despair, violence and fear. The bottom line is that they cannot afford for free-dom to succeed.

Conversely, we cannot afford freedom to fail. How detrimental would it be if we were to lose the white flag to al Qaeda and the Sunni terrorists? Do you think they will allow the people of Iraq to live in freedom and peace? Do you think they will allow the democratic process to continue?

A while back, some of my colleagues on the other side of the isle raised a good point—we walked away from Afghanistan following the Soviet withdrawal. What emerged from that void were the Taliban and a safe haven for al Qaeda and a powerful figure for terrorists. It is evident that letting Iraq to be? If you think we made a mistake in the past, why would we repeat it?

If we walk away prematurely, how can we deal with Iran? How can we deal with North Korea?

I think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the terrorist influence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked first-hand to our soldiers serving in Iraq. It’s been a year since I was last in Iraq. Since that time, I have attended many briefings and I reported back, seeing our troops and talking with leaders was the most telling status report of all.

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people—and we are not. The Iraqis and their new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence. There has been and continues to be a very small but determined portion of the population in Iraq who profited under Saddam’s regime do not want a free and stable Iraq. Al Qaeda does not want a free and stable Iraq. Freedom is not conducive to their long term goals. Accountability is not conducive to their long term goals. Democracy is not conducive to their long term goals. Saddam is not conducive to their long-term goals.

Their goal is to break our resolve with these barbaric acts of terror. They are profiting on poverty, despair, violence and fear. The bottom line is that they cannot afford for free-dom to succeed.
must finish our mission to leave a secure Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol that democracy can prosper in the Muslim world.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of America. I rise in support of our active troops and those who have given their lives and their loves so that we will prevail in this Global War on Terrorism. These troops are part of an all-volunteer force that is the envy of the world.

I rise to reassure the American and Iraqi people that we reject any timetable for the withdrawal or redeployment of U.S. forces in Iraq. Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have attacked our families, neighbors and friends numerous times over the last three decades. What has been the response? For the most part, there has not been an adequate response. And Mr. Speaker, that is hard to admit. Some would tell you we didn’t respond due to lack of political will, others would say America just didn’t have the stomach. From the killing of 241 U.S. service members in Beirut in 1983 to the attack on the USS Cole in 2000, America responded in a cautious manner.

This is no longer the case. Due to the events of September 11, 2001 our country was forced to reevaluate our defensive and offensive strategies. Led by our Commander in Chief and with the support of the Congress, our goal was to take it from fight to fight to every cave the enemy hides in—sending an unmistakable message. We will fight the enemy overseas and prevent him from reaching our shores.

Having been to Iraq during the recent Memorial Day holiday, I am pleased to report the message is getting across. Our enemies are starting to realize that America and its allies are not leaving and are not intimidated. I say to the Iraqi people—we will not abandon you. We are committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq.

During my 4 trips to Iraq in the last 3 years I have been heartened by the continued resolve of our forces. After receiving briefings from the Generals, I always make sure to spend an equal amount of time with the senior enlisted men and junior officers who are leading at the tip of the spear. The casualty count among this group is rising—and that is hard to grapple with—but it is for a purpose.

A man who was responsible for so many of these casualties—Zarqawi—is now dead. He was killed by a 500 pound bomb dropped from an F-16. This weapon and this method of employment were thoroughly developed and tested at Eglin Air Force Base in Okaloosa County, Florida. The dedicated air force active duty, civil servants who help to build and distribute the F-16, the Test and Evaluation Command and the Air Force Research Laboratory can be equally proud.

I would like to remind my colleagues and the American people of the courage it must take to vote in a country that has never known democracy while under the threat of terrorism. It is simply for making one’s voice heard. This courage is commendable and is a cause worth fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, America and her citizens are strong. A people who have lived and fought the way in showing the Iraqi people how to establish a free and democratic nation and we and they will never forget the sacrifice of those who made their democracy possible.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give strong support to H. Res. 861. For more than three years, the man Osama bin Laden called “the prince of al-Qaeda” orchestrated terrorist attacks that killed thousands of Iraqis, American troops and coalition forces. Now, thanks to hard work and dedication of the U.S. military and our coalition partners, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi’s reign of terror is over.

Since the U.S. and our coalition partners liberated Iraq, bin Laden has sought to defeat the efforts of the people of Iraq to transform their nation into a peace-loving democracy so he can create an Islamic state. Where al-Qaeda calls the shots, the air strike that killed Zarqawi has dealt bin Laden’s organization a crucial blow by eliminating the man he trusted to wage his jihad in Iraq. It is a major victory in the War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the House VA Economic Opportunities Subcommittee, I feel strongly about coming to the floor today to honor our brave servicemen and women who are defending our homeland in the Global War on Terror. They have fought valiantly since the beginning of the war on 9/11. They liberated the people of Afghanistan from the Taliban, an abusive regime that once harbored Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda leadership. The terrorists no longer have a safe haven and are on the run. Their hopes of creating a new home base.

Since the end of the initial operation in Iraq, many of my Democratic colleagues have called for a full withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. As the fighting in Iraq has intensified, so did their calls for us to pull out. If we had heeded those calls and not allowed our military to complete their mission, Zarqawi would still be alive and be making further strides toward turning Iraq into al-Qaeda’s new home base.

Whether or not you supported the initial operation in Iraq, the fact of the matter is we have to see this through. Our troops deserve our support and all the resources they need to get the job done. And I am committed to giving them that support.

Since the liberation of Afghanistan and Iraq, we have captured or killed thousands of suspected terrorists. Our servicemen and women have rooted terrorists out of hiding all over the globe. They deserve our utmost support and praise for keeping us safe and making the world a better place as they continue to fight the global war on terror.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our country’s effort in the global war on terror. This war takes many forms and is waged on many different fronts. It involves the military and our coalition partners, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi’s attempts to foment a civil war between the Sunni and Shia peoples of Iraq. Our cooperative efforts to eliminate Jordanian terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi should stand as a landmark along the road to independent security in Iraq. It should also serve as an opportunity for this Congress to publicly expand its oversight activities to help the United States of America and to those who wish us harm no more determined of a nation when our values and safety are threatened.

In order to win this war, we must support our troops who are deployed around the globe. We must continue to provide them adequate security and our allies every day. These young men and women carry the patch of our flag on their arms and the spirit of our nation in their hearts.

We also must continue to rebuild our intelligence agencies so they do not fall into the lackluster conditions they did before and work with others in the world community to stop threats before they reach our shores. There is still a great deal more work to do, but we will pursue until the job is finished.

Today, we are engaged in what I hope will be the first of many public debates on our national strategy to combat the growth and destabilizing impact of global terrorist networks. In Iraq and Afghanistan, as was clearly described by the 9/11 commission, we must stand for a better future by working with the international community to give the citizens of these countries a fighting chance to develop secure democratic institutions. These countries must never again be allowed to descend into the lawlessness that gives sanctuary to international criminals and terrorists.

Last week, coalition and Iraqi forces scored a major victory over foreign terrorists working with the insurgents against Iraq’s freely elected government. This was a victory over Jordanian terrorist leader Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi who should stand as a landmark. Mr. Speaker, today I want to commend the brave men and women who continue to fight to keep our nation safe.
in the country. Last month, Iraqi security forces played an active role in 90 percent of security operations and acted independent of coalition support in nearly 40 percent of those missions.

These successes have given us the opportunity to begin the eventual withdrawal of our forces and those of the 28 coalition allies who continue to support the development of a free and stable Iraq. However, in doing so, we have a responsibility to do so based on conditions on the ground, and should not be bound by an arbitrary timeline for withdrawal that could only strengthen our enemies resolve. Doing so would do a grave injustice to the brave men and women of our armed services, who have already sacrificed so much in the cause of freedom.

Ms. DUCETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 861. Calling this a true debate on Iraq is a joke, and the Republican majority knows it. The Majority Leader has admitted the true motive—to use this issue in the fall elections against the Democrats. Shame on him and shame on the Republican Party.

Instead of remaining focused on combating terrorism, we got detoured into Iraq. Our courageous Allied soldiers have provided security and rebuilding assistance, and continue to support them as I stand here today. We have given the Iraqis a chance. That is all they can ask of us and that is all we can ask of ourselves. As such, it is time to shift troops to the periphery of the conflict and redirect some resources currently being used in Iraq back to America.

Despite what the Republican majority suggests through this Resolution, saying it is now time to begin redeploying troops and that President Bush needs to develop a plan to do so is not arbitrary. It is, in fact, a reasonable calculation that the cost of Iraq is no longer worth any benefit we may achieve by continuing our armed presence there. The majority of the American people have made it clear they feel it is simply not worth more blood and treasure to achieve perfection in Iraq. They are right. It is time we in Congress listened.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution to affirm the United States of America will ultimately achieve victory in the Global War on Terrorism. On September 11, 2001, 3,000 of our fellow Americans were brutally killed by Islamic terrorists under the leadership of Osama bin Laden. President Bush responded by declaring war against terrorism and its strongholds throughout the world. He said we would fight the enemy on their ground to prevent terrorists from once again attacking our citizens on U.S. soil.

The Bush Doctrine stated: "Any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime." U.S. and Coalition forces have verified his words with irrefutable action. The state-sponsored "safe harbor" Al Qaeda enjoyed in Afghanistan ended when U.S. and Northern Alliance forces routed the Taliban in a decisive military victory.

Afghanistan now has a newly elected parliament, a market economy, equality for women, and millions of children attending school. Al Qaeda and its afghanical clones face the burning embers of the attack on the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center collapsing, the burning embers of the attack on the Pentagon, or the scorched field in Pennsylvania that will forever stand as a testament to heroism and self-sacrifice. Our successes in the Global War on Terror have prevented additional horrifying images from filling our TV screens saving untold innocent American lives.

We may never know what catastrophes have been averted by the dedication and vigilance of U.S. servicemen and women. Nearly 2,500 Americans have given their lives in exchange for the peace that we have enjoyed here at home these past four and one-half years. The very fact that we have not endured another terrorist attack on U.S. soil proves their lives were not given in vain. We have not seen additional attacks such as those in London and Madrid, or experienced the fear Israelis face on a daily basis. We owe our safety and security to the soldiers who are giving their all to protect our families, communities, and friends.

Al Qaeda remains a persistent danger to the United States. This terrorist network operates in over 60 countries around the world. It brainwashes men and women into becoming suicide bombers; destroys religious sites; bombs and howards innocent people; and seeks the destruction and overthrow of America, our values, our people, our freedoms and our way of life.

We cannot allow Al Qaeda the opportunity to establish a permanent base in Iraq from which to attack the United States. The collapse of Iraq's new democratic government would be a huge victory for Al Qaeda, drawing additional recruits for bin Laden's brand of terrorism from the ranks of young Muslims. It is well-known that bin Laden seeks nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction to inflict severe casualties on the United States and allied countries.

Al Qaeda conducted poison gas experiments on dogs in Afghanistan, and the government of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States has each foiled plans by Al Qaeda to use chemical weapons. U.S. intelligence sources have documented repeated attempts by Al Qaeda to purchase nuclear material, including weapons grade uranium. Nations such as Iran and North Korea are a potential risk for transferring nuclear capabilities to terrorist insurgents. We must not fall into a sense of complacency. The continued threat from Al Qaeda to...
our citizens at home and abroad is real. Thankfully, U.S. and Coalition forces have captured or killed more than three-fourths of Al Qaeda’s known pre-9/11 leaders. These include senior field commanders, masterminds of the September 11th attacks, communications coordinators, and key operational leaders. Just last week, the leader of Al Qaeda in Iraq was killed by U.S. forces.

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi had repeatedly attacked religious shrines and Iraqi political leaders to destabilize Iraq, provoke a civil war, and create a haven for terrorism. The February bombing of the Askariya shrine in Samarra—one of Iraq’s holiest religious sites—ignited a firestorm of reprisals that led to the deaths of over 130 Iraqis. Killing the man who incited this violence was a resounding victory toward building a safe, secure, stable Iraq.

More than 4,000 suspected Al Qaeda members have been arrested worldwide since 9/11, and Al Qaeda cells have been identified and dismantled in Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa. Over $140 million in terrorist financial assets have been confiscated or seized from over 1,400 bank accounts worldwide.

Mistakes have been made in the War on Terror, but the Bush Doctrine of dissuasion and deterrence is working. Pakistan broke its state-sponsored ties to Al Qaeda and the Taliban. And we have disavowed terrorism. Until recently, Iran had frozen its uranium enrichment program, but is now threatening our country amid the perceived weakness that we will pull our forces out of Iraq before that nation is able to govern and protect itself from terror. This situation underscores the fact that we must finish the job we began to ensure the continued safety and security of the American people. We must not give in to terrorism by pulling out of Iraq too early.

Fortunately, the talents and capabilities of our U.S. servicemen and women are protecting our nation well. Air Force Chief of Staff, General T. Michael Moseley, told reporters in February that Air Force satellites can locate activities and individuals on a global scale, and targets can be held at risk or struck down with the lethality of a weapon that detonates within several feet of the target. Al-Zarqawi learned this lesson the hard way.

General Moseley continued: “It must be a bit disturbing [to terrorists] to know that if you act against the United States or its Coalition partners, the U.S. Air Force will find you and strike you. And there’s nothing you can do about it. We may never know what has not happened because of this capability.”

General Ronald Keyes, head of the Air Force’s counterterror command, recently said: “If you’re a terrorist and you’ve got static on your phone, that’s me . . . That shadow passing over you, that’s me. That computer that will not boot, that’s me. That noise you thought was happening is real. And we will continue to be one until our children and grandchildren and those of freedom-loving nations everywhere emerge from this plight of terrorism.”

We can and we must improve our intelligence and military capabilities to ultimately eradicate terrorism worldwide. This war has not been waged perfectly, but it has inarguably succeeded in preventing additional terrorist attacks on U.S. soil, protecting American lives and liberty, and forcing terrorists to spend their time running rather than plotting additional ways to murder innocent citizens and spread darkness and destruction.

Voting “yes” for this resolution today will send the clear message to Al Qaeda that the United States is truly united in defeating terrorism and promoting a strong and stable Iraq. I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking our U.S. soldiers, sailors and airmen for their incredible sacrifices, and in supporting this resolution to protect our citizens from terrorism at home and abroad.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. U.S. policy toward Iraq should be focused on bringing home U.S. troops as soon as possible while minimizing chaos in Iraq and maximizing Middle Eastern stability. I believe that 2006 must be a year of significant transition toward full Iraqi sovereignty both politically and militarily and with the responsible redepolyment of U.S. forces. Americans deserve a serious discussion in Congress about the future of U.S. involvement in Iraq, this vote is the first in an effort to legitimize Bush Administration mistakes, and fails to deal with key issues such as the effect of our ‘stay-the-course-at-any-cost’ policy on other threats to our national security and military recruitment and the lack of oversight and accountability over the billions of dollars wasted or stolen in the war and reconstruction effort.

I am a strong supporter of our troops, and I have voted consistently to give them the funding and equipment they need to carry out their missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our courageous men and women in uniform have met their challenges with skill, bravery, and selfless dedication. We mourn the loss of the 2,500 who have died in Iraq and offer our support and prayers to the 8,500 who have been injured so gravely they cannot return to duty.

While this resolution expresses our gratitude toward our troops, it fails to acknowledge the missteps, misrepresentations, and misjudgments that have fatally flawed our involvement in Iraq from the very beginning, making the mission of our troops more perilous. The President rushed to war based on false and faulty intelligence against the protests of the majority of our allies. Warnings from U.S. commanders about troop levels and equipment went unheeded, and shortsighted decisions were made which seriously damaged our efforts to establish peace and security in Iraq.

The Administration’s horrendous miscalculations have damaged our ability to aggressively confront other emerging threats around the world and have endangered the stability of the Middle East. To make matters worse, the Administration has called for accountability for some of its worst mistakes, including the squandering of billions of dollars in reconstruction funds, torture at Abu Ghraib and the provision of inadequate equipment for our troops. The sham resolution before us today is intended to avoid an honest discussion of these issues.

The American people deserve better than today’s partisan grandstanding and the contempt of the Republican leadership for their genuine concern about U.S. policy toward Iraq. For this reason, I will oppose the resolution.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the current state of affairs in this war, and express my profound and heartfelt concern in the midst of a global fight against terrorism, and cannot allow partisan politics to undermine our efforts to root out this disease.

I rise today in strong support of the brave, young men and women in our military for their sacrifices, dedication and hard work on behalf of all Americans and people fighting for freedom worldwide. Our courageous soldiers have removed a tyrannical dictator from power and are helping eliminate the ability of thousands of terrorists to harm innocent civilians.

The war in Iraq has been difficult, but progress is being made. Last week, al-Zarqawi, the terrorist leader in Iraq, was killed. Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds are working through their differences. Women are now allowed to get an education.

Coalition units are taking the lead on missions to root out insurgents. And we have already brought 30,000 troops home and turned bases over to the Iraqis; but we cannot leave Iraq and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anytime, anywhere. We must make sure and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anytime, anywhere. We must make sure and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anytime, anywhere. We must make sure and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anytime, anywhere. We must make sure and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anytime, anywhere. We must make sure and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anytime, anywhere. We must make sure and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. I remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.
Iraq is the central front in the Global War on Terror. Al-Qaeda views Iraq as the main battleground to spread their ideology of hate and violence against the Iraqi people and the civilized world. The simple fact is we are fighting terrorists in Iraq so we don’t have to fight them here on our homeland.

I have visited Iraq and have seen firsthand the atrocities brought on by the Iraqi people and their infrastructure by Saddam Hussein’s regime. I stood in the spider hole that Saddam Hussein was cowering in before his capture and was able to meet many of the brave men and women who are serving there. Now, the “Butcher of Baghdad” is behind bars and is on trial for brutal crimes against his own people, and democracy is slowly coming to fruition in a Nation and a region of the world that has never known it.

It has been an exciting week in Iraq, with the completion of Iraq’s National Unity Government and the death of Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi, a terrorist and ally of Osama bin Laden. This week was capped off by President Bush’s surprise trip to Baghdad Tuesday to reach out to America’s commitment to securing a peaceful Iraq.

Only with our continued presence and coalition support will Iraq be able to make the transition to a peaceful and prosperous democracy. It is imperative that we remain patient and vigilant in our mission in Iraq and in the Global War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless our brave men and women serving to protect our homeland.

Mr. MOYESTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 861, which, above all, honors our brave men and women prosecuting the Global War on Terror and declares that the United States will prevail. I am pleased we are debating this resolution today, because it is imperative that Congress confirm to the world that Americans stand united in full support of the American people to prevail. It is unfortunate that today’s debate was limited to this is such a serious issue facing our Nation.

In addition to combating terrorism throughout these two countries, it is essential that two key components are met to achieve success in Iraq—security and stability. The Iraqis must continue to move toward a stable and self-sustaining government, and their forces must take over the security in Iraq and Afghanistan. Afghanistan provides a test case for this in the new democracy.

While Americans continue to train the Iraqi Army and Special Police, the Iraqis can move toward control of their own security. Lanced Foreign Minister of the American footprint in Iraq and bringing our troops home is the goal, and it will be met because of the success our troops have already had in stabilizing Iraq provinces (14 out of 18) and by training Iraqi forces. Having been to Iraq and having met with both the military brass and our enlisted men and women in the war zone, I am optimistic that we can continue moving toward a successful conclusion of this mission. However, I have real concerns that setting an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal of U.S. troops would be a detriment to our national security and the security of our troops. It is essential that we not publicize our plan for withdrawal which would make our servicemen and women vulnerable to attacks. In doing so, we would defeat our purpose by making their safety the priority.

These examples are among many that illustrate real progress—laying a foundation for future peace, shaping a world where the terrorist message will fall on deaf ears.

My intern from the 82nd also told me this: Afghan war veterans... the old-timers,” asked, “Why did you abandon us when the Soviets pulled out?” Today their biggest fear is that we will leave before the mission is done, and allow the Taliban or other tyrants to take over. Iraqi civilians remember 1991 and fear the same thing.

We must continue the mission.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and in strong support of our troops. They are far away, waging the war on terror so that we can be safe here at home. In particular, I want to congratulate not only those who directly were involved in the demise of Al-Zarqawi, but all of those troops whose mission each and every day is heroic and brave and appreciated by us all.

Every building they secure, every Iraqi troop they train, every vehicle they service, potato they peel, or small mission they accomplish is a blow against terrorism and a boost for our freedom.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for this war. But within months of our troops entered Afghanistan, the Taliban had disarmed and were winning. After all these years of fighting, we have now forced the Taliban to the brink and are looking to the future. We are an impatient people, always in a hurry, often seeking the quick success. But our troops do not work in the 24-hour news cycle or a two-year campaign cycle or any timetable other than to execute each mission as it builds toward the larger objective.

That patience is paying off. Already we have seen in the information seized at Al-Zarqawi’s hideout that the terrorists feared that time was working against them. I shudder to think if those on the other side of the aisle had their way where Al-Zarqawi would be today.
In closing, let me just say that when I visited Iraq with my colleagues to thank our troops for all they are doing, it was they who thanked us for caring enough to visit them over there. We owe them such a debt of gratitude, and yet their spirit of service and commitment to their mission led them to thank us.

Mr. Speaker, no American troop should ever have to thank a member of Congress. They should know that we are with them, that we support them, and that our support and thanks are there for them and with them always.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the state of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a free and prosperous Iraq is one which is no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a wealth of support for radical Islam, no longer a source of destabilization in the Middle East. The simple truth is that an Iraqi people with hope for the future is an Iraqi people with whom we can work for peace.

And, nobody knows this better than the terrorists themselves.

They know they win only if they can maintain a strong, divisive, bloody insurgency in Iraq. They know they only win if they can keep the Iraqi people feeling despondent for their future.

Let me be clear: The litmus test for whether or troops should stay or withdraw or on what timetable is not about nation-building. The U.S. should not be in the business of nation-building, now or ever. There is nothing in the Constitution which grants this Congress the authority to engage in nation-building, nor does the American public wish that we do.

Instead, the nation which we must always remain steadfast engaged in protecting and building up is this nation—America.

The future of the Iraqi people is in their hands, for better or for worse.

But, the truth of the matter is that life for the Iraqi people—despite the ongoing war on their soil, has been more hopeful than it was before wasting away in the shackles of Saddam Hussein’s tyranny. And, it is only getting better.

For those Iraqis who survived Saddam’s policies of genocide, political imprisonment, and near-constant state of war, they went on to rebuild their homes and their country.

The Iraqis have had incredibly broad and successful elections. They have developed a constitution and established a government. Just last week, the Iraqis appointed key ministers for defense, national security, and interior. Now that the Iraqi people are free to direct their own economy, their own policies, and their own destiny, there is hope for a brighter future.

Just last year, in 2005, the Iraqi economy grow by 3 percent. This year economists predict that the economy will grow by 10 percent with a GDP that will have almost doubled since the fall of Saddam Hussein. As freely elected economic officials begin to work for the benefit of all Iraqis, the future of the Iraqi economy is bright.

The Iraqi people are rebuilding their capability to care for their own medical needs. Last year, 98 percent of children under the age of three were vaccinated against measles, mumps, and rubella. Basic care has been provided for 1.5 million new mothers and their children, and a new generation of Iraqis will grow up strong and healthy.

Over 110 medical facilities have been renovated and 600 centers have been equipped with basic clinical and lab equipment. By providing training for 2,500 health care workers, Iraqis will build a structure for living longer, healthier lives far into the future.

Iraq once boasted one of the most educated female populations in the Middle East. Under Saddam Hussein’s iron fist, they fell to near perfect illiteracy. Working together, we have helped the Iraqis provide for 2,800 rehabilitated schools and 8.7 million math and science textbooks. And, young girls can look forward to careers as engineers and scientists, instead of looking forward to legalized honor killings.

The preamble of the Iraqi constitution reads: “We the people of Iraq . . . are determined to respect the rule of law, reject the policy of ag- gression, pay attention to women and their rights, the elderly and their cares, the children and their affairs, spread the culture of diversity and defuse terrorism.”

This is a statement rarely seen in the history of Middle Eastern nations. Iraqi legislators are determined to create a free society on par with our own. The future of Iraq is one in which men and women are free to practice their religions and speak their mind without fear of imprisonment or death.

Every Iraqi feels for the parents and loved ones of the brave men and women who are serving in Iraq. Every one of us wants to see those young heroes quickly and safely return home.

I would like to read from a message I received from one of these brave young men who is serving in Iraq. He said: “There is a tough war going on here, but we can either fight the enemy here or back at home. If we were to withdraw, there would be a bloodbath of epic proportions that would only encourage the enemies of peace.”

Now is the time that the Iraqi people may build a bright future of freedom, opportunity, and peace upon their rich cultural heritage.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our Nation’s continuing dedication to the War on Terror and this resolution we are debating today. When we think of the War on Terror, we immediately think of the frontlines in Iraq and Afghanistan where our soldiers are bravely fighting for the hope and freedom of the Iraqi people. Debates today should not be limited to debating the fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. This resolution is about freedom and our dedication to eliminating terror globally. This resolution puts in writing that we, the Congress of the United States of America, will honor all Americans who have supported the war on terror as well as our international partners in the struggle to defend freedom.

The War on Terror is not only being fought overseas. This war is being fought, and fought successfully, on our own soil by our own law enforcement agencies and the law enforcement agencies of our allies. We have great partners working with us around the globe to win this fight for freedom and, fortunately, one of these great allies is also one of our closest and closest friends.

On June 2nd and 3rd a series of counter-terrorism raids by Canadian law enforcement teams successfully thwarted possible attacks planned by seventeen Al Qaeda inspired terrorists, terrorists who have been found to have ties not only in Canada, but in many other countries as well.

These terrorists took actions to obtain three tons of ammonium nitrate and were allegedly planning to use it against the Government of Canada and the Canadian people. This is more than three times the amount of ammonium nitrate used in the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995.

This successful raid on behalf of the Canadian law enforcement bodies, including the Integrated National Security Enforcement Team which coordinated the efforts of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Ontario Provincial Police, and other local police forces, illustrates both our strength of law enforcement as well as the growing weaknesses of the Islamist militant network.

Their achievement has made our hemisphere safer and brings optimism that other nations around the world will have similar triumphs over terror. We all salute Canada for its unwavering commitment in the global war on terror.

Their success only emphasizes that we must continue the fight against terror on all fronts: foreign and domestic. We must continue to promote peace, security, and the promotion and protection of liberty, while being vigilant against those extremists who want to do harm to freedom-loving countries. We must continue to support our armed forces, first responders, and our fellow citizens in this war and we must continue to work with our close friends, such as Canada, to promote the principles of a free and democratic society.

I urge strong support for this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter for the RECORD.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURTHA: I am a Florida Democrat who feels deeply in your debt for the campaign you are pursuing to get our troops out of Iraq ASAP. When a new Democratic Congress convenes early next year I hope its first order of business will be to present you with a well-deserved Congressional Gold Medal.

I share your heartfelt concern over the situation in Iraq. It is a national disaster that is taking our nation’s youth, and the future of the Middle East. It is a national disaster that is taking our nation’s youth, and billions of our national treasure. In this regard I stand squarely behind you and your views of the war. In support of those views I have prepared a piece called Iraq: We Need a Democratic Congress convenes early next year I hope its first order of business will be to present you with a well-deserved Congressional Gold Medal.
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I am confident that God will grant you the strength to carry on your fight. But all Americans should rise to your support. They need to cast aside complacency and lassitude. They need to clench their fists and stand up to an administration bent on destroying the underpinnings of our democracy. In short, we must sound off.

With admiration and respect, Sanford H. Winston, LTC, USA Ret.

IRAQ: WE NEED A STRATEGY, NOT EMPTY SLOGANS

God bless Representative John Murtha, the Pennsylvania Democrat. He is the only Member of Congress with the guts to tell the American people about what is going on in Iraq. He does not spin this story. He calls for the removal of our forces from Iraq ASAP on the basis that only the Iraqis themselves can heal the divisions that have torn their progress toward a viable government. He describes bluntly the irreconcilable mess that is Iraq with its three obsturate and competing factions—Kurds, Shites and Sunnis. He emphasizes the failure of the U.S.-led efforts to provide essential services to the Iraqi people such as electricity and oil production that are being hindered prior to our deceptive invasion. He makes it clear that the Iraqi people really don’t want us there.

Congress asserts that most of our more than 2,500 dead and 17,000 wounded—many of them amputations, spinal cord and head injuries—have been caused by improvised explosive devices. IID’s continue to extract a great toll on our people even after three years of war and ceaseless effort to neutralize them. Still, we have had more than enough time to devise a practical, achievable strategy for extracting our troops. There is none. Joining Mr. Murtha in the class of great American patriots are the seven retired Army and Marine generals who view the Administration’s conduct of the war as deplorable and had the guts to call for the removal of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld.

President Bush has stated our objective in Iraq is establishing “a democracy which can defend itself, sustain itself—a country which is an asset to the world and a country which serves as a powerful example for others who desire to be free.” Religion, culture and customs combine to pose impenetrable barriers to our goals. This objective is actually in a state of civil war now even though the Administration won’t acknowledge that fact. American-trained Iraqi soldiers are not yet to prove that they are capable, loyal and trustworthy. The Parliament, to this point, has refused to agree on Ministers of Defense, Interior and National Security. Without solid political backing behind appointees to these three ministries the prospects for success are remote.

The President promotes support of his war by spreading public fear. He refers to our Iraqi campaign as a part of a “global war on terror.” Is there really an ongoing global war? Or is it the Iraq war in the process of preparing to take on the United States? This thought by the President acts to promote public anxiety, but not enough for him to call for a military draft and mustering our forces we need to prevail in a global war. If he tried to do that the Congress would revolt and his approval numbers in the polls would sag. Administration scare tactics are reinforced by the Vice President who warns that the Muslims are working to establish a conglomerate of caliphates in the offing intended to attack us? If so, our country is not prepared to confront this awesome threat. Hopefully we are summoning aggressive diplomatic activity and the active support of the United Nations, the countries of Mr. Rumsfeld’s old allies of peace-loving allies in readying our defenses.

Let’s make one thing clear. Iraq is our national disaster. It is diluting the resources we need to fight a tragic conflict in Iraq. The only people with a real stake in the war are apparently our men and women in uniform and their families. They represent about one percent of a population of 250 million. There are few signs of spontaneous patriotism other than Support Our Troops bumper stickers. While the long war continues, the Army is being torn to shreds courtesy of Mr. Rumsfeld. It is forced to pay incentives of up to $40,000 to recruit soldiers and still can’t meet its personnel quotas. It promotes unqualified officers to fill its ranks. The Marine Corps is no better off. The National Guard has been worked beyond reason with most of its troops having been on duty in Iraq longer than we were actually open. The lack of debate is even more evident when dealing with the media. The media does not report the positive things we do. Hogwash! The American press has done more to build and preserve our democracy than any other national institution including our armed forces. Blaming the media is the last resort of knomenothings.

There is a way out of the quagmire. To disengage in Iraq we need a new Congress sworn to do the people’s business. We need a Congress with guts. It is up to the American people to see that we get one come this November. The new Congress can vote to cut off the funds that support the war in Iraq as soon as it convenes, or it can send leaders representing both parties to stand before the Iraq Parliament and announce that Iraq has 90 days to assume responsibility for its own fate.

To paraphrase General of the Army Omar Bradley’s warning on Vietnam, the war in Iraq is a war of resistance, not resistance to war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place.

When the time comes, vote Americans, vote! Only you can end this war.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are having this debate today. Frankly, I think it is shameful it has taken us three years to have an “open” debate on the war while our soldiers are dying, their family members are praying for their safe return, and the American public is questioning what, exactly, is our policy over there. I think that debate were actually open. The lack of debate is even more shameful when you consider the fact we have been fighting in Iraq longer than we fought in World War I, the European Theater of World War II, and Korea. The American people deserve better, and you can bet your life the American soldier definitely deserves better than that. The American soldier deserves more than ten hours of debate on a policy that affects their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I want everyone in America to know that the Leadership of the House of Representatives wants to stifle debate and control what you hear from your government. Every single American citizen should ask themselves this, “What are they trying to hide? What are they afraid of? If a policy decision is so sound, you would think they would let it be debated in the Congress.” I think the lack of confidence the Majority has in the ability of their policies to face challenges and amendments should be eye opening to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed the Majority Leader of the House abandoned his earlier talk of a “civil” debate on policy and instead decided to turn something as serious as a war into a rhetoric filled partisan political tool with
the goal to make Democrats look “sheepish.” In my opinion, war and the deaths of American soldiers is too serious to be used as a political tool. Don’t our soldiers deserve more respect from Congress than this? Additionally, anyone who would accuse a Member of Congress of not supporting our troops to shame them into voting for him or her should ask themselves whether anything is sacred to them anymore. They should ask themselves whether or not there is any depth to which they won’t sink in order to score political points?

Mr. Speaker, I was not a Member of Congress when this resolution passed giving the President the authority to send our fighting men and women to war. However, since I’ve been a Member of Congress I have continued my lifelong support for our troops. I have voted for every spending request, and I have been to Iraq to visit our soldiers four times. Every Member of Congress should have gone to Iraq by now, and if you haven’t, go. Whether or not you support this war you need to show your support for our soldiers, and they deserve to talk to us face to face and let us know what is really happening out there.

Mr. Speaker, how we got to Iraq should not be the point at this time. Historians, politicians, and the American public will debate that for years on end, and you can bet they will draw conclusions and hold people responsible in the history books and the public opinion of the future. However, right now we should focus on how we stabilize the country, allowing for a new, free, democratic Iraq to reemerge, and how we get our troops home safe as soon as possible while ensuring our future is more stable and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I support our troops. The Congress and the American public support our troops. And I think we should reaffirm our support for the troops by giving them every tool they need, like additional armor and padding in their helmets to protect them from IEDs, rather than forking over taxpayers’ dollars hand over fist to Halliburton and other defense contractors with little to no accountability. That, I think, would be a stronger sign of support for our troops, or the war, than any politically motivated resolution brought to the House floor. Majority has admitted their inter-conference memo of talking points of how “We must conduct this debate as a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats” according to Majority Leader Boehner’s memo. I don’t know about you, but I believe our country and our troops deserve better than these political tactics.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is time for both political parties to figure out that our base is America, and the American people, not the ideology of the political fringe.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the number of U.S. military deaths in Iraq reaching 2,500, it’s disappointing that the best the GOP leadership can do is demand more of the same. That’s exactly what this resolution does by calling for a vague open-ended military commitment in Iraq. This resolution re-affirms a policy that simply isn’t working.

Instead of acknowledging the difficulties our troops face by offering clear alternatives to the President’s “business as usual” approach, this resolution tries to cloud the debate by focusing on the past and not tomorrow. Indeed, Iraq isn’t even mentioned until the eighth paragraph.

The real issue at hand is whether this particular U.S. military-led effort that we’ve been following under Secretary Rumsfeld will achieve lasting peace and democracy in Iraq. I can understand why the GOP would want to divert attention from this critical question—it is precisely because of the Administration’s policy that Iraq has become a terrorist haven where none existed before.

Since I boarded on an aircraft carrier and declared “mission accomplished”, the estimated number of insurgents in Iraq has quadrupled from 5,000 to 20,000. As a result, the average number of daily attacks by insurgents has climbed from 53 to 75, from May 2004 to May 2006.

This war is an expensive quagmire that’s weakening the federal government’s ability to meet our domestic needs. We have spent over $300 billion so far on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which is costing us about $8 billion a month on average, according to the Department of Defense. It’s no wonder that this Congress was recently asked to vote on a budget that cuts education, freezes funding for health care research, and shortchanges medical care for our nation’s veterans.

The massive deployment of National Guard and Reserve units overseas has undermined our capacity to confront terrorist attacks or natural disasters here at home. We know that state officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their states in the after-math of Hurricane Katrina.

Despite these grim realities, politicians on the other side of the aisle are stubbornly re-iterating the same talking points—namely, the solution allows only a phony debate on the employment of American forces. Instead, this resolution only allows a phony debate on the “war on terror” which will not allow amendments that would offer alternatives to the Bush administration’s policy in Iraq.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the lessons of history demonstrate that threats, left unchecked, become more dangerous over time. In the long-term isolationism is not an effective solution for peace-keeping nations.

Osama bin Laden, and the al Qaeda terrorist network he founded, were at war with the United States throughout the 1990s.

1993: The first attack on the World Trade Center
1996: Bin Laden claims: Muslims should kill Americans anywhere—including civilians.
May 1998: Bin Laden foreshadows the future. He warns the battle will “move to American soil.”
June 1998, a grand jury investigation issued an indictment against bin Laden.
On the 8th anniversary of the UN sanctions against Iraq, two simultaneous explosions occurred at the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The bomb in Kenya kills 213 people, including 12 American, injuring more than 4,500. In Tanzania, 11 are dead—65 injured.

August 20, 1998 President Clinton orders cruise missile attacks at suspected terrorist training camps in Afghanistan and a pharmaceutical plant in the Sudan.

Soon after a new indictment was issued against bin Laden.

However, Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda were left virtually unchecked despite these and other terrorist attacks throughout the 1990s and up until 9/11.

Tanzania. The bomb in Kenya kills 213 people, including 12 American, injuring more than 4,500. In Tanzania, 11 are dead—65 injured.

Today’s discussion is about a simple choice; do we fight terrorism tomorrow or do we stop it with our actions today?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 861 and believe many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said that the war in Iraq is nothing to do with the Global War on Terrorism. I could not disagree more with their assessment. Iraq is the central front in the overall Global War on Terrorism. An immediate withdrawal would merely embolden our terrorist enemies and lead to open season on America and our allies. We cannot allow this to happen. We must prevail in Iraq. The stakes are too high to fail.

Coalition forces are having a great deal of success in Iraq. The recent killing of terrorist leader Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi and seven of his aides is a serious blow to al-Qaeda’s operation. The man Osama bin Laden called “the prince of al Qaeda in Iraq” arguably had more innocent blood on his hands in the last few years than any other terrorist. Zarqawi led one of the most deadly insurgent groups in Iraq in a bloody campaign of bombings, shootings, beheadings, and kidnappings aimed at killing Iraqi Shi’as to incite sectarian violence and derail democracy in Iraq.

Furthermore, after receiving confirmation of Zarqawi’s death, Coalition and Iraqi Security Forces conducted 17 simultaneous raids in the Baghdad area, yielding a treasure trove of information and intelligence that is being analyzed for future use.

The National Security Adviser Moufawak al-Rubaiie said today that these documents and computer records would give the Iraqi government the upper hand in its fight against al-Qaeda in Iraq.

“We believe that this is the beginning of the end of al-Qaeda in Iraq,” al-Rubaiie said, adding that the documents showed al-Qaeda is in “pretty bad shape,” politically and in terms of training, weapons and media.
"Now we have the upper hand," he said. "We feel that we know their locations, the names of their leaders, their whereabouts, their movements, through the documents we found during the last few days."

He also said that he believed the security situation in the country would improve enough to allow the U.S. to begin leaving Iraq by the end of this year, and a majority to depart by the end of next year. "And maybe the last soldier will leave Iraq by mid-2008," he said.

Throughout American history, we have been tested in times of war. But virtually every time, we started the war and prevailed.

We did not experience quick victory in the American Revolution. In fact, it took our Founding Fathers years to win our hard-fought independence. We were defeated at the Battles of Long Island, Harlem Heights, White Plains and others, and we will never forget the dark days at Valley Forge, yet we did not give up our desire for freedom.

And let's not forget in World War II, where we suffered rapid and repeated defeats at Guam, Wake Island, the Philippines and Kasarina Pass.

We must also remember that the terrorists were at war with us long before we were at war with them. In April 1983, 63 people, including the CIA's Middle East director, were killed in a suicide truck-bomb attack on the U.S. Embassy in Beirut. Later on that year, simultaneous suicide truck-bomb attacks on the American and French compounds in Beirut killed 242 Americans and 58 French. In 1988, all 259 people on board Pan Am Flight 103 were killed when a bomb believed to have been placed on the aircraft by Libyan terrorists exploded. These are just a few examples. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are others.

Noted Islamic scholar Bernard Lewis has written that the sources of Islamic extremism toward the West stem from the belief that the American way of life is a direct threat to Islamic values. But it is basic Western democracy that especially threatens Islamic extremist movements, for it is their own community and more and more Muslims are coming to value the freedom that political democracy allows. Lewis has also written that attitudes toward the West have evolved through contacts with first the Eastern Empire in Constantinople, then Spain, Portugal, and France, and through years of direct conflict in the Crusades and the colonial wars of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we can see, the War on Terrorism did not begin on September 11, 2001.

The Global War on Terrorism will not be won next week, next year, or even in the next 10 years. Like the Cold War, this struggle is a generational conflict, potentially spanning decades. The Cold War stretched from Asia to Africa to the very heart of Europe, just as our struggle today reaches from the Philippines to the mountains of Afghanistan to, as we recently saw, our neighbor Canada. Terrorism knows no bounds and will strike wherever freedom reigns, from London to Madrid, to a quiet field in Pennsylvania.

Victory cannot be found on a single battlefield or a single treaty signing. Our enemy does wear a uniform and is not gone. Mr. Speaker, this is an international fight. They have one goal: kill as many Americans as possible and establish tyrannical regimes that rule according to a violent and intolerant distortion of Islam.

The War on Terror will be a long war. Yet we have mobilized to win other long wars, and we can and will win this one.

Last year, I traveled to Iraq and everybody I met was enthusiastic about doing their job and helping the Iraqi people. We found our troops have high morale and a commitment to their mission. The troops told us that we are winning the war.

Because of our intervention, a murderous dictator and a totalitarian regime have been overthrown, free elections have been held, a new Iraqi constitution has been drafted and ratified, and a new national unity government has been completed.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is only one theater in the overall Global War on Terror and success in Iraq is vital to victory. Much has been accomplished but much is left to be done. The question for all of us here is do we have the will to stay the course and leave with honor? I believe we do. We must finish the job. The stakes are too high to fail.

Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to have this debate. I first of all want to congratulate our brave soldiers deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other regions of the world. Throughout our history, our freedom and our way of life have been preserved by the grave sacrifices made by the men and women of our military. We cannot thank them enough.

I want to specifically thank the many Reserve and National Guard units from my home state of Iowa serving overseas. Throughout the War on Terror, Iowa has had one of the highest overseas deployment rates of any state.

Recently, I had the opportunity to welcome back a battalion of Marine reservists from Waterloo, Iowa, in my district. I was very impressed by the brave soldiers of Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 14th Marines who risked their lives conducting vital security operations throughout the Al Anbar province of Iraq in the dangerous areas of Ramadi, Al Asad and Fallujah. They left their families and loved ones behind to serve a cause greater than themselves—the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the war on terrorism in Iraq is a vital part of the Global War on Terror. Removing Saddam Hussein from power was a difficult but necessary step to eliminate the threat that his regime had posed for so long to the United States and the international community.

We should take this opportunity to reflect on our many accomplishments in Iraq over the past three years.

Saddam Hussein's reign of terror is over, his sons have been killed, and just last week we learned the good news that the leader of the Iraqi insurgency, the brutal terrorist Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi, has been eliminated.

The Iraqi people have taken historic strides towards establishing a free and stable democracy. They have participated in free elections for the first time, drafted a new constitution, and newly elected Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki just announced the formation of his cabinet. In addition, the Iraqi security forces continue to increase in number and have taken a larger role in the defense their country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it is necessary to stay the course and follow the path to a lasting peace in Iraq. We will continue to provide for our troops and ensure that they have the best training, equipment, and technology available. And we must not waver in our commitment to win the Global War on Terror and protect our homeland from brutal terrorists who wish to attack our homeland and our very way of life.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our continued mission in Iraq as part of the Global War on Terror.

I am proud to say that throughout the Global War on Terror, thousands of Idahoans have fought valiantly side-by-side with their fellow countrymen and newly freed citizens of Iraq and Afghanistan. During a visit to Iraq in May 2005, I had the opportunity to visit with the brave men and women of the 116th Cavalry Brigade. I was amazed at their level of professionalism and their enthusiasm for the mission. They took great pride in their contributions and were fully committed to finishing the job. I have been similarly impressed by our nation's military as a whole.

When I consider what action should be taken in Iraq I look to the advice of the experts, those who are on the ground fighting the war. The message I continually hear from military experts and generals is: Finish the job, complete the mission.

I know there have been many calls in the United States lately to withdraw our troops from Iraq or set some kind of artificial deadline for withdrawal. Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with this defeatist attitude. A premature withdrawal from Iraq would be disastrous for America.

In an interview with Osama bin Laden just prior to the 1998 terrorist attacks on the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, bin Laden referred to the United States as a "paper tiger" because of our withdrawal from Somalia after the tragic loss of 18 U.S. soldiers. Al-Qaeda learned from this, and similar events, that the United States would retreat rather than fight. During the War on Terror, Al-Qaeda has counted on Americans to similarly become demoralized and once again withdraw from the fight. It is the cornerstone of their strategy.

If we lose heart and withdraw from Iraq before the mission is complete, Iraq will become a permanent breeding ground of hate and terror.

Instead of the stable mid-east democracy it is becoming. Our enemies will become further emboldened by their perceived victory. A premature withdrawal from Iraq would only strengthen their resolve to use cowardly and barbarous terrorist attacks to achieve their ends. An artificial timeline for a withdrawal would only have similar results. The enemy need only sit back, wait, and then step forward to declare victory once U.S. forces have left. As a consequence, Americans and democratic societies throughout the world will be in greater danger than ever before.

We simply cannot afford to back down, return home, and hope this threat will dissipate on its own. The terrorists must be confronted and must be defeated. We cannot pass this mission on to another generation. This is our job and the time is now. By stepping up and completing this mission we will find the gift of greater peace and stability to future generations.

I can understand why so many want to cut and run, it would be the easy thing to do. I do not support this. During a visit to Iraq in May 2005, I had the opportunity to say that the mission in Iraq is a difficult one and it has been costly. The price for freedom is all too often painfully high. I, for one, do not ever want to receive another notice that a fellow Idahoan, or any American,
has fallen or been wounded in this war. However, quitting now would only prolong bloodshed in the long run, not end it.

Once again Mr. Speaker, I support America’s efforts to complete the mission in Iraq, and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to commit to its completion. At such a perilous time in our nation’s history let us stand united.

Mr. LATORETTE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the leadership allowing this important discussion on the war in Iraq and the ongoing global war on terror.

We can all regret the faulty intelligence that overestimated the presence of WMDs. We can focus on the need to press the new Iraqi government to meet speedy and attainable goals for the responsibility for their own security. But, we should never underestimate what’s at stake in Iraq for their people or ours.

Nor should we ever permit the use of propaganda or terrorist barbarism to signal to the brave men and women serving this Nation in uniform that the resolve of our country is wavering.

There are many thoughts that I could lay upon the record of this body about the war on terrorism, but sometimes it’s better to shut up and listen to the voices of those who know much more than you or I. One of the casualties of war in my district was a great Marine—Lance Cpl. Andy Nowacki. Andy, 24, was a member of the Grand River Police Department and was killed by an IED in Iraq on February 26, 2005. His family, though filled with grief, determined that Andy’s spirit would live on in many ways. One way will come through the establishment of a scholarship fund at Lakeland Community College.

On March 31st of this year, friends, comrades and family gathered to honor Andy’s memory and raise funds for the scholarship. One of the people to speak that evening was Lt. Col. Mark A. Smith, the former battalion commander of Andy’s unit—the 2nd Battalion, 24th Marines. Lt. Col. Smith’s remarks, which I ask through unanimous consent to appear in the Record immediately following my own, centered on the question of “Why.” He stated in part, “Think the part that’s most lost in public discourse in the ongoing global war on terror is really the “Why.” We all know how Andy died . . . I’d like to spend a few minutes talking about why Andy died.”

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. Mark A. Smith, with the eloquence of a soldier, said it better than I could ever hope to, and I commend his words to the House:

I got a call last Saturday when I was on duty from Sheila Nowacki, Andy’s mom. And she told me a part of the ceremony was going to be a video, and she had a small sit for me. She asked if I’d speak for a few minutes after the video, and to be positive.

Now, as the commanding officer of 2/24th, I don’t get the option of saying no to the families of my KIAs for whom I was responsible, but in Sheila’s and Dennis’s case, I was honored that they even asked me, so I immedi-ately rogered up to the mission. So, here we go.

The only way I know to be positive in talking about Andy is to talk about—from my perspective and from Andy’s perspective in this room who shared time with him in combat—why Andy died. Because I think that the thing that’s most lost in public discourse about the ongoing global war on terror is really the “Why.” We all know how Andy died. Unfortunately, he was struck by an improvised explosive device while on an ASR in our zone. I’d like to spend just a few minutes talking about why Andy died.

Andy died because he was out engaging the enemy. The single most misunderstood aspect of this war is the enemy. As a professional war-fighter focuses on one thing and one thing only—the enemy. He doesn’t focus on time-lines, he doesn’t focus on how fast he can stand up Iraqi battalions. He focuses on the enemy, and there’s a particular reason why we need to focus on this enemy. Because this enemy is real, this enemy is vile, this enemy is evil. And this enemy has a 100-year plan to destroy the United States of America—a one hundred year plan. We think in terms of the next football season and they’re thinking in terms of 100 years from now and how they’re going to destroy this Nation.

Can this enemy win this war against us? Unfortunately, I’m here to tell you absolutely he can. He can focus on two things which he focuses on every day. The first thing this enemy focuses on is breaking the will of the American people. He does that through videos, he does that through propaganda, and he does that through information.

The second way he can win this war is to convince the will of the American people is foremost in his head. He understands that this is a will that can and does, at every opportunity, battle, destroy this enemy. And then the second thing is what is this enemy does to the enemy. Contrary to some popular opinion, it is does not create jihadists by us being there. Quite frankly, we deprive them of the will of the American people is foremost in his head. He understands that that is a will that can and does, at every opportunity, battle, destroy this enemy. And then the second thing is what is this enemy does to the enemy. Contrary to some popular opinion, it is does not create jihadists by us being there. Quite frankly, we deprive them of the will of the American people.

It’s for these reasons, and because of this enemy, that Andy was in Iraq. And while so many still fail to get it, the enemy doesn’t. The enemy understands Iraq is the focus of effort, because he understands that as long as Marines and warriors like Andy are in Iraq that the will of the American people is foremost in his head. He understands that that is a will that can and does, at every opportunity, battle, destroy this enemy. And then the second thing is what is this enemy does to the enemy. Contrary to some popular opinion, it is does not create jihadists by us being there. Quite frankly, we deprive them of the will of the American people.

One day we were going out to conduct a raid to arrest the Sgt. Major and the operations officer of the Iraqi Army battalion that we were training. Upon moving into our cordoned positions, in the raid force—hitting the objective and seizing the Sgt. Major of the Iraqi Army battalion—his very children, the children of the Sgt. Major that we had in flex cuffs and blindfolded, were running around their front yard acting as if they were holding weapons and warriors. One of the Marines went up to them, and he took the interpreter with him, and he said, “Ask these kids what they’re doing.” And the interpreter asked them, and the kids said, in English, “Mists, we play U.S. Marines, Mistsf. We U.S. Marines.”

I don’t think those kids are going to grow up to be jihadists. I think those kids are going to grow up to be the honorable people that they saw the U.S. Marines in their zone to be. Further proof of that was mentioned by your esteemed colleague when she showed you that picture of Andy and those two Iraqi kids. They say a picture tells a thousand stories . . . that’s not a staged picture. That is honest re- spect for an American Marine, who in this case was Andy Nowacki. And there are thousands of them out there affecting those Iraqi kids every day.

The second story I want to tell you about is the election—the very first Iraqi election that occurred in our zone. In order to truly understand why you have to back up to December of 2004. The election was scheduled for 31 January of 2005. Exactly two weeks before the election was to be held, the Iraqi government said there was no way an election would be held in our zone because in that point in time there were two triangles in Iraq that were famous in our zone. One was the Sunni Triangle and one was the Triangle of Death. The Triangle of Death was our zone and it was so named because for four months at that time, on a daily basis, we had gone forward, we had seized terrain, we had lived the misery of the Iraqi people. We had become their neighbors and, in so doing, we had sung steel and harsh language with this enemy on a daily basis, and they did not like that. They did not like the fact that these Marines were forward—living and earning the respect of the Iraqi people. But we were able to convince the government that as a result of the efforts of Marines like Andy, the Iraqi people would come out and vote. We couldn’t guarantee them that it wouldn’t be violent, but we guaranteed them they would come out and vote.

So I ask you to picture, in two weeks, having to put together eight polling places. That meant that we had to tactically go out 48 hours prior and we had to seize the locations. We had to set up all the force protection that would allow the Marines to protect the Iraqi people from what was knew would be constant and pressure attacks on election day. And then most importantly, we had to transport 500 workers from the city of Baghdad to down to our Battle- tion FOB, house them for two days, and then move them safely to those eight polling sites. You can rest assured that was one big, juicy target that the terrorist wanted to hit. We were able to accomplish all that, but the most telling time in all of that is where we housed these 500 election workers was in our battalion chow hall. My battalion major . . . had to go to our chow hall because they were located right next to our fallen Marines. At that time, there were 12 of them. He had their pictures, and we had an American and a Marine Corps flag. Now for those of you who’ve never been to Iraq, who’ve never spent time with the Iraqi people, when you get two of them together, the noise level, the amount of smoking and the amount of drinking that goes on is pretty mind-numbing. When you put 500 of them in a facility, it borders on chaos. Now we accepted that that was going to have to be the cost—that our workers were probably going to get pretty torn up. And it did, except for one spot.

Any time any of those Iraqi election workers got anywhere near the Sgt. Major’s memorial, absolute, utter respectful, solemn silence. They respected the Marines and what they were doing for them, and that was a sight that I will take with me to my grave, and that makes me challenge those who say we’re creating jihadists. I argue we are doing just the opposite. On that very election day, the mortars flew, the mortars flew intently. All eight of our sites started getting mortared and rocketed and we were supposed to open. I was sitting in my COC thinking, “Well, there’s the end of my career. I just convinced the whole world that we could
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have an election and they’re blowing us up before they’ve even started.” But an amazing thing happened. In spite of all the mortars, in spite of all those rockets, in spite of the Marines providing security, telling the Iraqi people to seek cover, they refused, and in broken English, could not delineate the Marines, “You will protect us. You have brought us democracy. And we will vote.”

To conclude, one story from south of our zone where one young man pushed his 70-year-old father four miles under enemy fire in a shopping cart. When asked by the Marines, “What was the American public doing when he was doing?” He said: “My father has but one wish before he dies, to show you the respect the support of Americans like you, we cannot have warriors, gentle warriors like Andy, the 19-year-old father four miles under enemy fire in democracy. And we will vote.

One hundred years. That’s the enemy’s plan. He is prepared. Are we? As long as we have warriors, gentle warriors like Andy, the unbelievable support of parents like Dennis and Sheila who do things like this despite hav- ing sacrificed what they have sacrificed, and the support of Americans like you, we cannot lose. Sheila asked me to be positive. I don’t know how I can be anything but. If it weren’t for warriors like Andy and the other ones you see in this room here tonight, we would not be able to gather tonight to laugh, to cry and to celebrate.

She asked me to be positive, I don’t know how to be anything else. I know now something I didn’t know a few years ago: Being positive does not make the world the way you wish it would be, it’s accepting the world the way it is and going out and doing what you can do to change it. I used to tell my young daughters when they’d see something on TV or read a fairy tale, I used to tell them there’s no such thing as dragons. I don’t tell them that anymore. There are dragons. There are fire- breathing, evil dragons that inhabit this world. But I tell them don’t be afraid, because for every dragon that is out there, there are 10 knights in shining armor that will go forth and suffer great hardship to protect you. And I’ve seen them, and I’ve worked with them and they’re called United States Marines. So be positive. I will be positive, Sheila, and I will be thankful and humbly that you asked me to speak today. I will forever thank God Almighty for Andy and all the warriors like Andy, and your amazing family, and this blessed land.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Iraq, a failure built on the lies of this Administration. I am opposed to H. Res. 861, because contrary to what it states in this resolution, I be- lieve that it is in the best interest of the United States to bring our troops home now.

I voted against our involvement in Iraq, and I have opposed funding the conflict. For years, I have been calling for the return of our sol- diers. This war has been a mistake, and our continued participation will not change this basic fact.

I have the utmost respect for our former Secretary of State Colin Powell. He was a truly outstanding Secretary of State: However, I will never forget how this great American was sent to the United Nations to sell a fab- rication and to convince the world that this was a just endeavor and what we all now know was deliberately falsified evidence. This was just one part of a continuous effort to de- ceive the American public into believing that a conflict, that even many in our military had misgivings about, was the right thing for our nation to do.

The image of our President standing on the aircraft carrier and proclaiming “mission ac- complished” is one that I continue to associate with this failed effort. Since that fabricated public relations moment, both our nation and the nation of Iraq have suffered great personal loss.

The American public no longer supports our involvement in Iraq, and we as our represent- atives, must respect their wishes and bring our troops home.

I am saddened and heartbroken when I think about how many brave young men and women have died in this conflict that was never in our nation’s interest. Many of these courageous young soldiers who have lost’ their lives came from the Bronx, from my own community, and so it is partly on their behalf that I believe I am now speaking. Too many American soldiers have died, too many inno- cent Iraqi civilians have suffered and lost their lives, and too many reporters have been killed—all as a result of this failed policy.

As I thought about what I wanted to say on the floor today, I went back to the remarks that I spoke on this floor on October 9, 2002, when this House was voting on the authoriza- tion for the use of military force against Iraq. At that time I certainly couldn’t anticipate what the result will be an increase in Al Qaeda’s membership and a renewed hatred toward Americans.” I think that this has come true and that our image as a nation has certainly been tarnished as a result of this conflict. I re- gret that—because I know that we live in a na- tion that does not want to be seen as an enemy by those who live in Arab nations.

What has also come true is that Al Qaeda continues to flourish and to find new recruits as a direct result of our nation’s actions in Iraq. Although Al Qaeda had at most a neg- ligible presence in Iraq before this conflict, it is now a well established force there. For every terrorist that our nation works so hard to cap- ture, another one is motivated to join out of hate for our nation’s involvement in Iraq.

This conflict has resulted in worldwide im- ages that I doubt our nation can ever over- come. The pictures associated with the Abu Ghraib prison scandal are firmly etched on the minds of our next generation of youth around the world. Although soldiers of low rank were prosecuted for these atrocities, our leaders at the top must look responsible.

Now an investigation is being conducted into our activities at Haditha, where it seems as though innocent civilians died. These ac- tions are all a direct result of a failed policy and have come at great cost to our image in the world. No longer do nations look at us as the ultimate protector of human rights. As everyone here knows, I am a part of the city that was a target on September 11th. When this Congress was debating the resolu- tion on the use of force against Iraq, I did not believe at the time that in attacking Iraq our country was taking the right course, and I didn’t know what words to use that would change the step towards war that our nation seemed so determined to take. I was filled with emotion and I ended my speech that night by saying, “I cannot agree with the course that our great nation is embarking on, one that brings the threat of war closer and the goal of peace further away.”

So now once again we in Congress are de- bating this war. However, now I think we must look at all that happened in Iraq, the suffering and the fail- ures, as an unfortunate part of our nation’s history. As I once again struggle to find the words that can bring this conflict to an end— I am again filled with emotion. Let us bring our brave American soldiers home now and let us once again embrace the goal of peace.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, a war we did not start or choose. But to use that war as either justification for a war in Iraq, or a reason for staying, is wrong. A lesson I’ve learned in life is you finish what you start. This Administration took us off- track from the war on terror and chose the war in Iraq. The torch of the war on terror should, and shall be, passed to future generations, but the war in Iraq was started by this Administra- tion and should be finished by this Administra- tion.

This Administration decided to launch the Iraq war based on, at best, shaky intelligence. Until that time, this country had historically set a high threshold in its decisions to go to war. Wars have been done so badly, costs are sometimes uncertain, and the cost in human lives is frequently high.

We who question this Administration’s deci- sions have faced the charge that to be candid about this war would upset military morale or be divisive. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is now the time for this President to be honest and forthright with the American people about its ill-conceived war. In candor, the Administration should say to the American people that no matter what course we choose now, the future in Iraq will be bloody and costly.

That is why democracies enter war as a last resort, with solid evidence and a united nation. I have listened to our generals about their view of the future. General Casey has person- ally said to me that he needs until the summer of 2007 to fully train Iraqi forces. I am willing to allow General Casey the time to complete this task, but we should begin an immediate redeployment of troops.

General Casey’s projection might place Iraq on a course to embrace a self-governing de- mocracy. However, the single most important action the newly elected Iraqi government can do is to allow General Casey the time to complete this task, but we should begin an immediate redeployment of troops.

General Casey’s projection might place Iraq on a course to embrace a self-governing de- mocracy. However, the single most important action the newly elected Iraqi government can do is to allow General Casey the time to complete this task, but we should begin an immediate redeployment of troops.

As everyone here knows, I am a part of the city that was a target on September 11th. When this Congress was debating the resolu- tion on the use of force against Iraq, I did not believe at the time that in attacking Iraq our country was taking the right course, and I didn’t know what words to use that would change the step towards war that our nation seemed so determined to take. I was filled with emotion and I ended my speech that night by saying, “I cannot agree with the course that our great nation is embarking on, one that brings the threat of war closer and the goal of peace further away.”

So now once again we in Congress are de- bating this war. However, now I think we must look at all that happened in Iraq, the suffering and the fail- ures, as an unfortunate part of our nation’s history. As I once again struggle to find the words that can bring this conflict to an end— I am again filled with emotion. Let us bring our brave American soldiers home now and let us once again embrace the goal of peace.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, a war we did not start or choose. But to use that war as either justification for a war in Iraq, or a reason for staying, is wrong. A lesson I’ve learned in life is you finish what you start. This Administration took us off- track from the war on terror and chose the war in Iraq. The torch of the war on terror should, and shall be, passed to future generations, but the war in Iraq was started by this Administra-
this Chamber voted to go to war in Iraq. How many would do so today, knowing they are committing us to a war longer than World War II?

Let us commit to a final push for an end to the bloodstream and violence in Iraq. Let us return to our original mission to fight the global war on terror that this Administration sidelined in Iraq.

I support our troops in Iraq. I support them all the way home—soon.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, while the war in Iraq has been poorly managed, the United States has a moral obligation to the 2,500 American military men and women who have given their lives in the fight for freedom to allow the newly established government to develop, stabilize, and to provide for that nation's people.

Perhaps the current Administration does not want to openly discuss Iraq policy because they feel it is a black and white issue, either we stay the course or we withdraw our troops.

I disagree; I believe that the war in Iraq is anything but black and white. Immediate troop withdrawal would result in an Iraq so destabilized that our homeland security would be more threatened than before the war even began. Staying the course would be equally senseless, as the course we are currently on has done nothing to stabilize Iraq, nor has it quelled the violence.

We recently passed the third anniversary of the date when President Bush declared "mission accomplished" regarding Iraq. What we have really accomplished in Iraq is yet to be seen, what is clear is that we need to change our course. We must set a new path towards a unified Iraq with a realistic exit strategy for our troops. We must disarm militias. We must help the new government provide electric power and economic and social services. We must convey to the Iraqis how important it is to the United States that they come together politically and make necessary amendments to their Constitution to achieve functional unity, we must make them see that whether or not a peaceful, democratic Iraq can succeed is ultimately in their hands. If we allow the Iraqis to think that the United States has no intention of leaving Iraq, there is no incentive for them to make the compromises necessary to unite their country under one stable government.

The outcome in Iraq will have a major impact both in the region and on our security here at home for decades to come. We cannot move forward in Iraq without a full debate about the war here at home, without an end to the level of secrecy that the administration and the Department of Defense have built up regarding the war, without an end to the corruption in contracting and profiteering, and without a real plan from the President that sets specific goals, achieves them, and then provides our troops a way out, an exit strategy.

I intend to support the resolution on the House floor today because I agree that we cannot simply hold out and leave Iraq; to do so would make that region less stable, less peaceful, and more of a threat to U.S. security. We must prevail in the War on Terror; but let me be clear, I do not support staying the course in Iraq.

I will continue to push the Administration and the military to develop a clear plan for Iraq, based on the creation of a national unity government, that will require the new government to live up to its commitments, transfer responsibility for Iraq to Iraqis, and that will bring our troops home as soon as possible.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave men and women of our Armed Forces for their service and dedication to winning the War on Terror.

On September 11, 2001 a group of 19 hijackers commandeered 4 commercial aircraft and crashed them into the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., with the intent on destroying our way of life. Over 5,000 innocent men, women, and children lost their lives in this unprecedented attack. Sadly, the events that transpired on September 11th were the result of years of training and preparation by an enemy that does not value human life, liberty, equality, or religious freedom.

Our great Nation lost 473 American lives both civilian and military to the hands of terrorist from 1983 to 2001 for a total of 3,525 victims. With each passing decade our enemies have become more sophisticated and desperate to accomplish their aims of a global jihad. Individuals such as, Osama bin Laden, the founder of al Qaeda, have declared war on the United States and created worldwide networks of hate to accomplish their aims.

On several occasions, bin Laden has explained, that it should be every jihadists mission to get women, men, and children against the United States and its allies. The last 26 years have taught us that we must remain vigilant and take every opportunity possible to find and destroy these ruthless killers wherever they reside. In order to accomplish this mission, the brave men and women of America's Armed Forces have answered the call with honor and an intense dedication to the mission of preserving our way of life.

One of our most important responsibilities as members of Congress is to make sure our troops have every resource they need while advancing democracy overseas. By visiting these heroes where they serve, we're able to get a much better understanding of what we can do to make their jobs as safe as possible. With this in mind, I decided to lead a Congressional delegation to the Middle East that traveled to Kuwait, Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Germany.

The leaders of these nations understood the importance of ensuring that we remain vigilant in fighting the Global War on Terror and expressed confidence in the abilities of the coalition forces. In Iraq, Kuwait, and Germany I had the special privilege of visiting with members of our Armed Forces and I found their moral to be high and their dedication to the cause unyielding. Soldiers like Sgt. Mark Gregory, 1st Lt. Marathana Loddy, Lt. Mike Schilling and Staff Sgt. Leonard Campbe1.Vall from my home state of Nevada expressed their determination to see the mission through and understood that it will take time to achieve.

Since toppling Saddam Hussein's ruthless government, the people of Iraq have created a 275 member parliament, confirmed the selection of the top seven posts for a national unity government, and laid a foundation for democracy. Now more than ever we must stay the course and support our Iraqi friends as they continue to strengthen the infrastructure of their government.

Last week on June 7, 2006 Coalition forces killed Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and his top lieutenant and spiritual advisor Sheikh Abi Abdul-Rahman. Zarqawi was the operational commander of the terrorist movement in Iraq and was personally responsible for the deaths of many American forces and thousands of innocent Iraqis. The killing of Zarqawi is a testament to the notion that we must stay the course and remain committed to the mission and the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and heartfelt gratitude that I salute the men and women of our Armed Forces and thank them for their service and dedication to our great nation.

Mr. OLAY. Mr. Speaker, a member of the out of Iraq Caucus I rise in opposition to this resolution. We would not even be debating this bill if the American people were disillusioned by this war and did not want to bring our troops home.

I was among those who opposed the tragic decision to launch this war. I warned that the invasion and occupation of Iraq would plunge us into a bloody quagmire of violence that would only intensify the instability in the Middle East and leave this nation less secure and less able to protect our interests. The sad truth is that all the grimmest predictions have now come true and today—

The Taliban are mounting a major come back in Afghanistan; Iran is on the verge of producing a nuclear weapon; Somalia is dominated by an al Qaeda-inspired militia; And, here at home, our Nation is at risk.

The fundamental recommendations of the 911 Commission are still waiting. Those who still support the Iraq war often claim it has made this Nation a safer place. That it has kept away the terrorists and stopped another 911 tragedy. Unfortunately, such wishful thinking is only a way to justify the horrendous human suffering that we have caused by our misguided mission, an effort to justify a war that was never properly planned and executed and that has wounded thousands and cost the lives of two thousand five hundred American soldiers.

The toll of this war is still climbing and throughout the world terrorism is on the rise. The administration talks a lot about National security but those in Congress knows the war in Iraq has not made America a safer nation. We are appropriating millions and millions of dollars, at a time of skyrocketing Federal deficits, to fortify security in the U.S. Capitol Complex and at all other Federal facilities across this Nation. If Members of Congress believed this Nation is safer than it was before we captured Saddam Hussein, then why would we allow a single lost airplane to trigger the evacuation of the U.S. Capitol? Why does a single suspicious noise cause the lock down of the house office buildings? And just yesterday, why did the leadership of Congress upgrade our supplies of escape hoods?

No one in the leadership of Congress is behaving like we have diminished the terrorist threat. We know the war has made U.S. more vulnerable to terrorism. Our National security is still in danger. Democracy is not flourishing in the Middle East. It is time to bring our troops home and to devote our resources to our own national security.

I commend my courageous colleague, Mr. MURTHA who has displayed tremendous patriotism on the battlefield, and in this chamber.
I support his call to implement a strategic re-deployment from Iraq and implore the Members of this body to have the good sense to listen to the people of this Nation and to support the call to re-deploy our U.S. troops in Iraq.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my concerns over the Bush administration's mismanagement of the war in Iraq.

First and foremost, I am disappointed that the President still refuses to put forward a strategy for a successful transition in Iraq and a timetable for the withdrawal of American troops.

Almost 2,500 of America's military personnel have lost their lives in this conflict, and thousands more of our troops have been injured and disabled. Among the most recent casualties was a young man from my district and hometown of Rialto, California. U.S. Army Spec. Luis Daniel Santos was just 20 years old and due to come home to his loving family—his parents Irma and Carlos and siblings Carlos Jr., Amy and Eric—next week. Luis was engaged to his sweetheart from Fontana High School and was working part-time to buy a barbecue his mother was preparing for him. Tragically, he was killed one week ago in a roadside bombing while maneuvering his Humvee in combat.

I offer my condolences to the Santos family and join in mourning the death of this patriotic young man.

Military families especially, and Americans generally, understand the sacrifice that service entails and the dangers involved. And we are united in supporting our troops and honoring their sacrifice.

However, the American public has lost confidence in President Bush's leadership. The President has chosen to risk the lives of our Armed Forces without providing a coherent exit strategy, a realistic timetable, or the equipment required to complete the mission.

The American people want—and our military forces deserve—a clear plan for completing the Iraq transition and bringing our troops home.

As if the loss of life weren't overwhelming enough, the war in Iraq has cost American taxpayers more than 300 billion dollars. Americans have other needs and priorities, and 300 billion dollars could help solve some of the challenges we have here at home. That same money could have paid for 5 million additional teachers in our schools, or 14 million four-year college scholarships, or 2.5 million new affordable housing units across the country. Think about how much money that is and how much of a difference it could have made for working families like those I represent in San Bernardino County, California.

So I reiterate my call for the Bush administration to plan for an orderly withdrawal of American forces in Iraq. We must begin to transfer security responsibilities to the Iraqi people and allow the international community to step in and help.

Our brave servicemen and women in the Armed Forces have sacrificed enough. They have completed their mission and accomplished what was needed. Their families have waited for them long enough. Now it is time to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, American forces are at great risk as they remain in Iraq without a clear objective. Their mission was to be a liberating force, not an occupation force. We cannot allow our troops to become targets of resentment and terrorism while the administration tries to figure out a plan.

American forces in Iraq have gone above and beyond the call of duty. Their heroism and compassion in the most trying of circumstances is their most important battle against the dangers posed by terrorism. Despite inadequate equipment, despite shifting priorities, despite sweltering heat, our military has delivered time and again. The recent success in removing the threat posed by terrorist al-`Zarqawi is a testament to their tenacity and grit in the face of the enemy.

But the President did not take their commitment for granted and cannot expect them to serve indefinitely. Military forces in Iraq already are serving longer and longer deployments and a high percentage of returning troops are falling prey to mental health disorders and financial difficulties. We need a real solution, Mr. Speaker.

I stand with my Democratic colleagues in calling on the President to provide a real solution for peace and security in Iraq and ask my colleagues in Congress to recommit themselves for peace and security in Iraq and ask my colleagues to recommit themselves to supporting our troops and honoring their sacrifice.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 861. Today's debate is about more than just the war in Iraq and Afghanistan; it is about freedom and democracy worldwide and the fight against terror and injustice. Our great nation is doing what we have always done—fighting for the values we hold dear and helping to spread those values to other nations. We also have a stake in seeing that the right forces are fighting the terrorists in the streets of America or in Iraq and Afghanistan where al-Qaida has claimed as its battle ground to kill Americans?

The Global War on Terror hits home for me because I have the distinct privilege of representing the brave men and women stationed at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. These courageous Americans have been leading the way in the Global War on Terror since September 11, 2001. In Afghanistan, these soldiers liberated the country from the oppressive Taliban regime. They helped stabilize the country and their efforts as well as those of other units laid the foundation for the democratic elections of Afghanistan's president, parliament, and provincial councils.

In Iraq, the 101st was deployed before the war began in 2003 and were instrumental in the success of dismantling the regime of the criminal dictator Saddam Hussein. They were also responsible for the location and death of Saddam's two sons. They liberated and rebuilt the town of Mosel, including the reconstruction of the holy mosque. The 101st is now on its second deployment to Iraq and is involved in the securing of the city of Ramadi where some of the most violent fighting in Iraq still exists. I have personally met with many of the soldiers that have been involved in this fight and they have my utmost admiration and respect. After meeting with the soldiers of Fort Campbell, I am convinced that they understand what they are fighting for in Iraq and are committed to the very end in order to preserve the democracy we have helped create and to ensure the safety of the Iraqi people.

One of my duties as an officer is to decide which of our wounded soldiers can return to duty and which soldiers get to come home. He says this task is tougher than it should be because his soldiers require Army Regulations and argue endlessly in an effort to stay. Colonel Kunk's story doesn't end there, he was caught in the effects of a roadside bomb that damaged the nerves and muscles in his legs causing his legs to swell and throb from pain by the end of every day. But Colonel Kunk wouldn't think of saying he's a father and a grandfather and he wants to do right by them. So Colonel Kunk stays and he fights because he knows it's the right thing to do.

Specialist Clark and Lieutenant Colonel Kunk's commitment is without compromise and their dedication to duty should be commended. Their stories are unique, but their actions are not.

There are many soldiers that refuse to leave when they have incurred wounds that would allow them to come home. These service members understand what they are fighting for and they stay to see the mission through to the end.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should follow the example of our men and women in uniform and stay committed to completing our mission and winning the Global War on Terror. If our soldiers, like Specialist Clark and Lieutenant Colonel Kunk, are committed to stay then we owe it to them to provide our support to stay and get the mission done, to do otherwise would undermine our soldiers' efforts.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this simple-minded resolution. President Bush and Republicans in Congress would have you believe that the War on Terror and the War in Iraq are one and the same. But terrorism is not exclusive to a geographic or political entity. Terrorism is the result of an accidental or intentional trauma inflicted on humanity. Numerous examples exist within our own borders.

My son is terrorized by the threat of destruction posed by the ignorance, of President Bush in his steadfast opposition to addressing the real threat of terrorism at home.

Parents are terrorized by the lack of treatment for children born with diabetes, leukemia, and multiple sclerosis. Yet right-wing evangelical Pharisees dictate prohibitions on stem cell research that could cure these and other diseases saving lives in this country. Middle-class Americans are terrorized by the outsourcing of jobs, elimination of pensions and health benefits, and expansion of
preatory lending. The U.S. Chamber of Com-
merce promotes these terrifying practices, driving working families to fear for their finan-
cial future.

All Americans are terrorized by more than 30,000 handgun deaths each year. This trau-
ma is conditioned and promoted by the National Rifle Association, a bipartisan terrorist or-
ganization.

Our brave servicemen and women in uni-
tform are terrorized by the Iraqi insurgency and civil war. Though 2,500 American soldiers and
countless Iraqi civilians have died, the right wing noise machine encourages additional
deaths by coloring as pro-terrorist those of us who dare to acknowledge the futility of the
President’s War in Iraq.

Terrorism is a very real threat, but it comes in many forms other than those found in Iraq
and, as I’ve outlined here today, we are doing precious little to combat it in America.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolu-
tion and to join me in a call to redirect our at-
tention, our federal dollars, and our lives to
our needs here at home.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, we are on the floor today debating a most serious issue.
However, rather than truly addressing solu-
tions, the resolution before us is filled with platitudes which seek to vindicate the ill ad-
vised policies of the President’s war on Iraq. Rather than allowing a meaningful and con-
structive debate on Iraq, the Republican Lead-
ership decided not to allow any amendments
to their resolution. It is a travesty that the
elected representatives of the American peo-
ple are prevented today from offering policy al-
ternatives that actually affect the shape of U.S. policy in Iraq.

This debate had the potential to mark a
turning point to the current vacuum of con-
gressional oversight over the Bush Administra-
tion as it pursues its misguided and incom-
petently planned war in Iraq. Rather than of-
fering real solutions, the Republican Majority in Congress has decided to rubber stamp the President’s campaign in Iraq.

The American people know what has hap-
pened, and demand more than just a rubber stamp from their representatives in Congress.
Just as in the case of Vietnam, they see a White House which misled our country into war. Using shoddy evidence and insinuations about the connections between Iraq and al Qaeda, the Bush Administration took our country to war to face the “immense threat” of an Iraq with nuclear weapons.

Despite claims by the Republicans and the Bush Administration, there was no significant relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction, a fact which has been eradicated by the UN weapons inspection team, recently stated would have become clear had President Bush not ignored our allies’ requests that we give the inspectors a few more months before invading. After its claims about the weapons of mass destruction were proven to be incorrect, the Administration has continually shifted its rationale for the in-
vasion.

As though it were not bad enough that we went into a war in an incompetent and decep-
tive manner, it is unforgivable that our troops were sent into this war without adequate plan-
ning and equipment. Our troops are out there putting their lives on the line, yet the President
decided to follow the advice of misguided ideologues in overruling the plans developed
by experts before the war. One former com-
mander of U.S. Central command, General
Anthony Zinni, said that “ten years worth of planning were thrown away; troop levels dis-
missed out of hand . . . these were not tac-
tical mistakes, these were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.”

There are more than 20 American soldiers than to send more of them to their death in a
poorly planned war. It’s time to shift our ap-
proach from the ineffectual policies of a Presi-
dent who only listens to advisors with pre-de-
termined hawkish mindsets. As a member of
the Committee on Armed Services, I stand with my col-
leagues in urging Congress to urgently re-
evaluate the failed policies of the President.
Representative JACK MURTHA has drafted a resolu-
tion that encourages the Iraqi people to take charge of their own security and lays the
groundwork for bringing our troops home.

These are the sort of options we should be
debating today if we truly want to demonstrate our support for our troops. Instead, the Repub-
lican Leadership has put forth this political
play. Congress should fulfill their Constitutional responsibility to exercise oversight instead of
continuing to place blind faith in the President as he pursues the war in Iraq.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not support
this shameful attempt to provide an illusion of oversight.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, America and
its allies are engaged in a war against a ter-
rorist movement that spans all corners of the
globe. It is sparked by radical ideologies that
breed hatred, oppression, and violence against all of their declared enemies. Since September 11, 2001, the powerful coalition of
countries, led by the United States, has seen
many successes against al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups. It is imperative that we remain
united and steadfast in the quest to defeat ter-
rorism around the world.

Last year I traveled to the Middle East to visit with troops in Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghan-
istan. I came away with several observations:
First, morale of the troops is HIGH. They
are confident of the progress they have made in the mission to spread freedom and democ-
ration across the Middle East. JUST ONE serviceman or woman I encountered had any doubts about the purpose and importance of his or her presence there. The troops are positive and appreciative of all of the support they re-
cieved from back home.

Their confidence in their mission is well-jus-
tified. Since my visit, the Iraqis have ratified a new constitution and installed a new, strong
prime minister. Nuri Al-Maliki. And now the latest milestone: Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, al
Qaeda’s leader in Iraq, was killed in an air raid last week.

Mr. Speaker, as I sat in a tent in Kuwait eat-
ing dinner with troops from Texas, I was
struck by how young most of them were. Those soldiers with me were 18–20 years old.
Their experiences and their stories humbled me. Never in my life have I felt such emotion
and love for our service men and women than when I sat and looked at these brave young
soldiers. Barely out of high school, yet each day these heroes awaken knowing of the per-
rils that lie ahead. Danger awaits them, but
never in my life have I felt such emotion
and love for our service men and women than
when I sat and looked at these brave young
soldiers.

I sometimes feel that we Americans take our freedoms and our lives for granted. We
forget the images of 9/11. Yet while on my trip
to the Middle East, the London bombings oc-
curred. This was yet another stark reminder that if we don’t fight terrorists abroad, they just
get closer to our home.

Mr. Speaker, the War on Terror is a global
effort; it reaches beyond a small concentration of countries in the Middle East. I’d like to
share the story of Marine Staff Sergeant Na-
than Fletcher. Sergeant Fletcher’s wife, Mindy,
lived in Dallas and also worked for another
war hero, my fellow Texas Congress-
man Anthony Zinni, said that
Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fletcher is serving in a very re-
"
Iraq. Today, we begin to answer their calls. But we cannot stop today. We should debate the war in Iraq everyday on the House floor.

Yet rather than seriously and substantially debating the issues at hand, the Majority has presented self-congratulatory resolutions that intentionally seek to divide the House. Today, no exception.

Earlier today, I meet with a group of 7th and 8th graders from my Central New Jersey district. I asked them what I should say to put the Iraq War in perspective. The students offered a number of observations. One said that too many lives have been lost already. Another said that the reasons for going to war were wrong, maybe even deceptive. A third said that the Iraqi people are worse-off today. They are right. Their longer U.S. troops remain in Iraq the worse the conditions on the ground get for the Iraqi people.

I spoke with Senator Byrd (D–WV) the other day, who was here for the deceptive Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. He says that is one vote he would like to take back. I am not saying that Iraq is another Vietnam, because the two are different. But we should ask ourselves how will posterity regard Congress for giving President Bush everything he asked for without any oversight or accountability.

The shifting rationales for the war in Iraq have led to the lack of a clear understanding of what we are doing or how we achieved our objective. Our mission cannot be accomplished because there is no clear mission. There have been a number of rotating rationales offered for the war. One was Weapons of Mass Destruction, and the threat of a terrorist attack on one of our cities. Then it was Saddam’s human rights abuses. Another was the argument that the United Nation’s disarmament and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated.

I have said for almost a year now that the United States must redeploy our troops from Iraq. I am a cosponsor of Congressman Murtha’s legislation, H.J Res. 73, which would redeploy the current forces in Iraq at the earliest practicable date. That is because the presence of our troops, who are serving valiantly and ably, is improving neither our security nor that of the Iraqis. In fact, our presence itself is unifying Saddam Hussein loyalists, al Qaeda sympathizers, and many civilians against us. Our presence is fueling the insurgency.

Redeploying our forces does not mean walking away from Iraq. Iraq’s security forces and government will need our continued moral, political, intelligence and in some cases, financial support. But the hard work of securing the country and building a new society is one that only the Iraqis can do. Reducing and refining our military and political presence in Iraq is the necessary first step in that process.

If we are to defend America and our allies from the global jihadist threat, our continued presence in Iraq defeats that purpose. It has been and remains a deadly and unnecessary misadventure that has compromised our ability to advance our interests around the world and at home to defeat the larger threat we face. To get back on course in the global war against al Qaeda, we must change course in Iraq, and now.

This war is simply not making us or the Iraqi people safer. The generals understand that. A majority of U.S. citizens understands that. The majority of the American people understand that. Seventh graders from New Jersey understand it, as well. Let’s begin our redeployment immediately so that we can refocus our efforts where they belong: on rallying the world to the cause of defeating Osama bin Laden and those who follow him.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Resolution.

The Resolution before this House today engages in a rhetorical fiction. The Republican Leadership has grafted into this Resolution language which confuses the War in Iraq with the War Against Terror. Iraq did not have anything to do with the September 11th attacks. We did not invade Iraq because of 9–11. We invaded Iraq because the Bush Administration convinced Congress and the American people that Saddam Hussein had acquired nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and might use them.

The terrorists who take place in Iraq is the direct result of the war, not its cause. To suggest otherwise is to ignore the facts.

The fact is, this war was a very bad mistake. The Administration launched an invasion into Iraq in March of 2003 even though the Administration knew from the reports it was getting back from the IAEA and the UN inspectors that there where no nuclear or other WMDs at the sites identified by the CIA, by British Intelligence, and by other sources.

Now we are bogged down in a quagmire with no end in sight.

In February of this year, the President was asked when we could expect all American troops to be out of Iraq, and he replied that this was a decision for a future President and a future Iraqi government to make. In other words, if we continue to pursue the Bush Administration’s policies, we will likely have troops deployed in Iraq until at least January of 2009—that’s nearly three years from now! What has been the cost of this war in terms of blood?

2,500 U.S. troops killed.

More than 18,400 American troops wounded.

An estimated 38,000 Iraqi civilians killed.

What has been the cost of this war in terms of treasure?

Nearly $320 billion so far...

Just think of all the good we could have done in this world or in this country if we had devoted $320 billion for health care, for education, for fighting poverty or creating jobs.

Redeploying has been being in the terms of America’s influence around the world?

It has been severely compromised.

We “cried wolf” over non-existent Iraqi WMDs, over alleged connections between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda.

We failed to deploy enough troops to suppress the insurgency.

We put inadequately trained troops in charge of Abu Ghraib prison.

It’s time to pursue a new direction.

The Iraqis are standing up, but we are standing still, staying the course. It is time to redeploy an increasing percentage of our forces to an over-the-horizon presence, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has suggested in the legislation he introduced last year.

We should not be planning on maintaining any military bases in Iraq or any long-term troop presence in that country.

It is time for us to bring this war to an end, and to bring our troops home.

Vote NO on this resolution because it is as much a fraud as the reasons the Bush Administration gave for invading Iraq in the first place.

I urge defeat of the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 886, further proceedings on the resolution will be postponed.
COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE HONORABLE SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Aaron Sporck, Legislative Director for the Honorable Shelley Moore Capito, Member of Congress:


Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil deposition subpoena, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents and testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with my legal obligations and the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

Aaron Sporck,
Legislative Director.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to with an amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2006, 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 gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF 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 North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY 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. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

THERE MUST BE A NEW DIRECTION IN IRAQ

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been a day of great importance, and tomorrow, we will conclude this debate on Iraq.

When I spoke earlier today, I mentioned that the dilemma that we have is that although there has been a debate, one would wonder, with such an important topic, why the process did not allow the American people to have alternatives to the present resolution on the floor and why we were so constrained that there could not be a definitive plan that speaks to the concern of the American people, the families of soldiers and veterans, and that is, to discuss fully, without partisan rhetoric, the idea of redeployment and the opportunity for our soldiers to return home.

Now, 2 years or so ago, I had, and offered, to this administration a concept that I believe would not have placed us where we are today. I rose today to say that I support the Murtha plan and resolution, which clearly provides an opportunity for redeployment as soon as practicable. It is not the cut-and-run theory. It is a theory that we respect the idea of the military fighting for our freedom and respect the fact that the military’s mission has been completed.

Having just come back from Iraq myself, and been there three times and as well to Afghanistan, I know that the boots on the ground, the leadership on the ground is, by any means, any definition, the most excellent military in the world. We thank them. We thank their families. We thank the enlisted. We thank the Reservists, we thank the National Guard and any others, civilian, who are serving on those front lines.

But we are the policy-makers, and we owe them not just a debt of gratitude. So, tomorrow, in protest for no plan, I will be voting “no” on the resolution. I do so without any shame or any conceding to accusations of not being patriotic. My patriotism is exhibited by my dissertation and the dissent of the American people asking us to do something, to create a plan that tracks the sovereignty of Iraq, gives them the opportunity to rebuild their own country, to work toward their own freedom, to protect themselves through the Iraqi National Army and the Iraqi National Police.

Let me just simply say to the American people that what we are discussing today are these soldiers who have been willing to put their lives on the front line. These are husbands and wives and aunts and uncles and cousins. These are mothers and fathers. These are our neighbors. These are our brothers and sisters. These are Americans, individuals who have put themselves on the front line. We, as policymakers, should not cut and run on them.

I would just say to my colleagues that if we are to be patriotic, then we should do it by words and not by deeds.

So I would argue that what we have done to the soldier is to talk and not act. We have demonstrated the United States Army, therefore, disallowing or at least causing them to be diminished and taking and causing us to put them in a position where it will take years for them to rebuild themselves.

We have undermined the military by not equipping the troops. When asked by a soldier in the field why U.S. troops did not have the right armor for their vehicles, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, as you know, you have to go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you want. What a callous, senseless thing to say, to throw our Army into harm’s way, and careless about whether they are protected or have the armor to protect themselves, allowing families and parents to get their hard-earned pennies to send flak jackets to their children and then not taking care of our troops when they come home.

The Bush administration has not developed policies to take care of the thousands, 19,000 casualties who are injured, 2,500 of course who died, the 2,500 today.

Health care has proven inadequate, and wounded veterans have been threatened by debt collectors because of inefficiencies in the Pentagon’s administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this is not long enough for the catastrophic and necessity of the debate or the changes that are needed in order to change the direction of Iraq.

I, too, applaud the ending of Zarqawi’s leadership of terrorism in the world, but that is not the end of the story, and we know that insurgents in Iraq is only 10 percent of the violence. The violence is between Shiite and Sunni and those young people who believe they can kill Americans with impunity and with immunity.

So I would simply say that I hope tomorrow there will be a metamorphical change. I hope someone will shine the light on this body. I hope we will rise with courage to say that there must be a new direction. I hope we will discard this senseless resolution that simply wants to make partisan or make a party political, or makes supports the troops and who does not.

We cannot stay the course. Richard Nixon knew that we could not stay the
course in Vietnam, and he changed the course of direction.

It is not anti-patriotic to be able to stand up against the wind of the majority, to be able to say that the dissenting Americans need to be heard, and I say that it will be betterment of this Nation and the betterment of this world. Then we can begin to fight the global war on terror. Then we can be more successful. Then we can form the coalition that we need to weed out the terrorists and to truly create a better world.

I hope tomorrow we will shed the light on this place and change direction in the Iraq War.

GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 we commemorated D Day, the day that American military forces stormed the coast of France 62 years ago to turn the tide in one of the most brutal conflicts the world has ever known. The United States sustained 6,603 casualties that day, yet the final victory over the forces of fascism remained nearly a year away.

Rows of silent graves at the American Military Cemetery in Normandy bear witness to the high price of freedom. They solemnly remind us that there is no substitute for perseverance and sacrifice if we are to prevail over the threats which challenge this Nation and the world today.

The global war on terror is a different war from the wars of the past. This is not a war of uniformed armies on clearly defined battlefields. It is a war that invaders tranquil space and time without warning, carried out by those who hide among and behind civilian populations, seeking to exploit the vulnerable for ruthless purposes.

While we have endured the sacrifice of global wars during the past, we have never waged a war in an age of globalization, in an age when technology eviscerates the concept of distance, magnifies our losses, trivializes our accomplishments, and places our adversaries in a far better position to leverage the freedoms of our society against us.

In seeking to prevent another 9/11, the President and the United States Congress would have been utterly irresponsible to ignore the threat posed by Saddam Hussein in Iraq. It is important to note that in 1998 President Clinton ordered U.S. Armed Forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq because Iraq’s nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs posed a credible and serious threat.

But I am not here to argue the case for war. The United States and our coalition partners made judgments to enter Iraq based upon the best available evidence, and now the commitment is ours to complete. We are all in this together, and the successful progression of our commitment in Iraq, from which I remain convinced that an abrupt withdrawal of U.S. troops would do more harm than good, is vital to achieving national security for America, stability for people of the Middle East, and establishing the prospects for civil reforms and long-term peace throughout the entire world.

While our mission continues to be dangerous and costly, it continues to make strong progress as well. The recent establishment of democratic institutions in Iraq is without cultural or historical precedent. This fact, combined with rapid progress in the deployment of Iraqi security forces, gives us realistic hope of diminishing conflict and a stable foundation for the prospects of long-term peace.

As we proceed with our obligation, may each one of us endeavor to discharge our responsibilities in a manner that is worthy of the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces.

And may each of us recall that this obligation is ultimately connected to the mantle of leadership that has fallen to the United States, not only for our own welfare, but for the welfare of the entire world.

IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 2002, this Congress voted to give the President of the United States broad powers to engage in a unilaterally first strike war against Iraq without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States.

Our oath of office does not permit us to delegate our responsibilities in placing our fighting men and women in the field of battle, and I commend each and very one of them for the sacrifices they are making for freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Our Constitution places the power to declare war squarely and solely in the Congress. This issue rises far above partisan politics.

President Lincoln put our congressional responsibility this way, when he said: “We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will make strong, or pale, or tinctured with fear or glory, the whole drama of our lives, will be remembered, not in unkindly terms, but with gratitude, fervent and deep.”

I opposed that initial resolution, and I would later oppose because after all of the information I have seen, and after all I have heard, neither I nor a majority of the residents of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, are convinced that the war is our only, our best or was our most immediate option.

I am not convinced, and I am still not convinced, that the resolution would properly guide us to act cooperatively and legally through the United Nations with the agreement and the involvement of the international community. In fact, it led us to pursue risky, unilateral action in defiance of international law and the United Nations Charter.

As the American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation, it is the duty of Congress to ask some hard questions.

What are we accomplishing by keeping our troops in immediate danger in Iraq? In my judgment, the answer is not much.

In my judgment, commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflict is an important part of what our democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand continuous military presence in Iraq.

I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and we need to prepare for an honorable way out. It is my profound hope that as we press forward, we will press forward towards the mark of a high calling; that we will take the high road; that we will take the road that leads to peace and not to war, the road to peace based on mutual security and international cooperation.

Let us walk the road to peace knowing that it is also the road to the rights we have defined in the United Nations Charter for all humankind. Let us walk the road to peace not because it is the easiest road or the smoothest road or the shortest road, but knowing that it is the right road for the American people.

Sometimes in the pursuit of noble and inescapable goals it takes more courage and more vision not to fight or to fight in a different way. We can fight by arming, training, and equipping the Iraqi military and civilian police forces to provide security and protection for the Iraqi people in their country. We can fight by providing clean water, food, and medicine to the Iraqis.

This is one of those times when we must take the road that leads to peace and not down the path to continuous destruction. Let us have the courage and the vision to find a permanent peace and security, to remove the presence of terrorism and not just drive it underground. Surely, if America has a destiny, it is a responsibility to lead the world to such peace.

This is a time of testing for all of us. Let us not fail this great test. Let us pursue peace, and not war.
TURKEY’S EU MEMBERSHIP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, next week the European Union will begin conducting membership negotiations with Turkey. As this process begins, it is important that the EU not allow Turkey to take any shortcuts. I am confident the European Union will insist Turkey follow all the proper steps and make all the substantial changes necessary in many areas before the nation could ever be accepted.

To date, I do not believe Turkey has made substantial and meaningful progress in many of the areas that are of concern to members of the European Union. Despite making commitments for its membership negotiations, Turkey’s lack of progress in adhering to essential democratic principles is of great concern. It continues to be in breach of the pace and standards set forth in its agreements with the EU. In fact, the EU has prepared a report criticizing Turkey’s reform process.

During next week’s meetings, the European Union will demand that Turkey withdraw from the Turkish government as to why the nation is not meeting benchmarks it agreed to in order to receive EU consideration. The EU must also begin to seriously explore Turkey’s continued disregard for improving fundamental freedoms within its boundaries, freedoms that are commonplace throughout the European Union.

There is no question Turkey is going to be forced and should be forced to make dramatic improvements in these areas before it can ever be considered for EU membership. The EU must also consider Turkey’s relations with its neighbors. I remain a vocal critic of Turkey’s treatment of both Armenia and Cyprus, and believe that these issues should also be addressed during next week’s discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about Turkey’s lack of progress in the diplomatic recognition of Armenia, the removal of its blockade against Armenia, and ending its official policy of denial of the Armenian genocide by coming to terms with it, an irrecoverable historical fact affirmed by an increasing number of EU member states and European institutions.

Turkey’s refusal to acknowledge the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenians has no limits. Just last month, Turkey pulled out of a NATO exercise because the Canadian Prime Minister used the term “genocide” in reference to the massacre. Prior to that, the Turkish Ambassador to France was temporarily removed from the country as an act of protest against a French law making it illegal to deny the Armenian genocide.

This type of behavior goes on and on. Five journalists who criticized a court’s decision to cancel a conference on the genocide were arrested. A leading Turkish novelist, Orhan Pamuk, was also arrested and charged with insulting Turkey’s identity for referring to the Armenian genocide. Clearly, Turkey’s protection of the fundamental freedoms of a democracy is simply inadequate.

Now, while Turkey continues to illegally occupy the northern third of Cyprus. In 2001, the European Court of Human Rights rebuked the Turkish government when the court overwhelmingly found Turkey guilty of all but a few violations in a scathing 146-page decision. The court concluded Turkey has not done enough to investigate the whereabouts of Greek-Cypriot missing persons who disappeared during life-threatening situations after the occupation.

The findings of the European Court of Human Rights should be taken very seriously by the EU, and the Turkish government should be forced to respond to these devastating charges before even being considered for membership. Turkey must also agree to once again come to the table and negotiate in good faith with Cyprus. Turkey simply cannot be admitted to the European Union if Cyprus remains divided and still has them, that Saddam Hussein was training terrorists with the Turkish military to use in Iraq.

It is imperative Turkey’s progress is measured on the basis of its complete accomplishment of all necessary criteria set forth by the European Union.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was September 26, 2002. I was sitting in the cabinet room of the White House with Condoleezza Rice, Andy Card, and President Bush, and the President explained to us that day, and I took notes and still have them, that Saddam Hussein had most of the mass destruction; that Saddam Hussein was training terrorists on weapons of mass destruction; and that if military force was used, in President Bush’s words, it would be swift. September 26, 2002.

It is now June 15, 2006, some 2,500 soldiers have died and more than 18,000 injured, many like Kevin Pannel, from Glenwood, Arkansas, who have been injured in ways that will forever change his life and so many others.

One thing I know for sure. Mr. Speaker, is that our intelligence failed us. There is not a more difficult decision that Members of Congress are asked to make than whether or not to send our men and women in uniform into harm’s way. And when we are faced with making that decision, we must know our intelligence is right.

This has been a war that has touched most families, and mine is no different. My brother-in-law, Christmas in the Middle East supporting a mission to refuel Air Force aircraft over Afghanistan. My first cousin was in Iraq serving our country when his wife gave birth to their first child.

He had a stone that. We all know someone who has been there. I escorted a young woman and her two children to the White House this morning for a tour of the White House. They are in Washington, D.C., with her mom and dad on vacation. Her husband was in Iraq when she gave birth to their second child, and he is in Iraq today on his third mission in 4½ years.

I want you to know that our men and women in uniform and their service to our country is much greater, much greater than that of any other Congress or any President could ever be, and tonight I honor them.

There has been a lot of talk about this resolution that we will be voting on tomorrow. I have read it three times. I understand our troops, and I do. It says that we are against terrorists, and I am. It says that we are against a date certain for withdrawal from Iraq, and I agree with that, and so I plan to vote for this resolution tomorrow. But here is where I disagree with this President.

This President is spending $279 million of your tax money in Iraq every 24 hours. And yet if you ask him to be accountable for it, if you ask him how he is spending that $279 million of your tax money in Iraq every day, he will tell you that you are unpatriotic. I disagree with that. I believe in accountability. I believe that this President, this administration and this Republican Congress, must be accountable for the $279 million of your tax money that they are spending in Iraq every 24 hours.

I also believe that this President lacks a plan. This resolution is full of saying things like, we support our troops, and I certainly do. It is full of things like saying, we are against terrorists, and I would hope we all are. But there is nothing in the resolution about how we are going to win, how we are going to win, and it is time for this President to give us a plan on how we can win in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Iraq. We had some 3,000 Arkansas National Guard troops there August 11, 2004, and I went to let them know we support them and to make sure some of this money was being spent on them and the equipment they need to get the job done. I visited with young soldiers from my hometown, soldiers I had taught in Sunday school, soldiers I had duck hunted with.

And so I said to them, what do we need to be doing differently? They said we need to be hiring Iraqis to rebuild
The IRANIAN GOVERNMENT has rejected the U.S. proposal for direct talks between the two countries, but the United Nations Security Council has issued a statement urging both sides to engage in dialogue. The council has warned that Iran must comply with its obligations under international law or face further sanctions. This follows a series of meetings between representatives from Iran and the European Union (EU) aimed at finding a peaceful resolution to the nuclear dispute.

The collapse of the talks has raised concerns over the future of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), which was signed in 2015 and aimed to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. The agreement has been hailed as a significant achievement in外交 and international relations, and its success is seen as crucial in ensuring that Iran adheres to its commitments.

The EU has expressed its deep regret at the failure of the talks, but has reiterated its commitment to the JCPOA. The EU has also urged Iran to resume negotiations with the aim of finding a long-term solution to the nuclear issue.

In the meantime, the United States and its allies continue to monitor Iran's activities closely. The U.S. has accused Iran of violating the terms of the JCPOA, while Iran has denied these claims.

The situation remains tense as both sides seek to find a way forward. It is hoped that the upcoming round of negotiations, scheduled for next month, will provide an opportunity to bridge the gaps and make progress towards a peaceful resolution.
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Iraq Resolution

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are going to take the full 5 minutes. I have been in this House almost all day and I have heard these arguments that we don’t have a plan to end the war in Iraq and succeed, and that is just simply not true. It is not true at all.

The fact is the plan was wrong in the sense that there was the anticipation that it would happen more easily. But the plan is very clear. It is not simple. It requires that the Iraqis have their own police, their own border patrol, and their own army in order to secure themselves and since we did not allow for their police to be restood, we had to start from scratch and train them.

And it is simply not possible to train a police and border patrol, an army, in 1 year. There are 28 million Iraqis in a country the size of California. But every day we train more and more of them, so that now they control about 42 percent of the land that includes 42 percent of the population.

So as we continue with our plan, as we continue to train more and more Iraqis, we are able to move our troops out and move their troops in. We are able to move their police in and our troops out and we are able to move their border patrol in and our troops out.

Now, it is clear that they do not have the logistics, so we will still have to be there later, but not in the numbers that we have now. That is all part of the plan; to train their troops, train their border patrol, train their army, and allow them to take our place.

What we object to is leaving prematurely. And if you ask an Iraqi what their biggest fear is, and having been there 12 times I have spoken to them, it is basically the same thing, it is that you will leave us; that you will leave us before we can take hold of democracy and before we can defend ourselves. That is their biggest fear. Some of them even say, like you did in Vietnam. And some of them will make reference to what they hear on CNN or what they hear about elected officials who say we need to get out, we need to have some kind of artificial timetable.
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Thank goodness George Washington didn’t have Congress telling him he had to have a timetable to beat the Brits. Thank goodness when all the generals criticized Abraham Lincoln, we didn’t say, well, the generals are against Abraham Lincoln, he doesn’t have a plan, we better just fold our tent. Thank goodness that didn’t happen.

The bottom line for me is very clear. We may have been wrong about weapons of mass destruction, and for that the President loses credibility, and people like me do, and people on the other side of the aisle who voted for going into Iraq. And now pretend like they didn’t, we all lose our credibility there. But we don’t lose our credibility with this: Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. He used these weapons on his own people and neighbors. He didn’t abide by the agreement that stopped us from going into Baghdad. He has now been removed. Thank God.

The Iraqi people have a democracy that is flourishing and is extraordinarily impressive. Three elections, every single one of those elections that the Iraqis have had are to form a government that created a Constitution, adopt a Constitution, and then elect a government under that Constitution.

All the Iraqis are asking from this Congress is you came in, you removed the insurgency was inevitable in Iraq. Even Vice President Cheney declared the insurgency was “in their final throes.”

America has heard this type of reasoning before from President Johnson during the Vietnam War. In 1967, the South Vietnamese freely elected their government. President Johnson then declared the Vietnamese election had established a democracy supported by the Vietnamese people. Even our Vietnam military leaders declared the war would be over soon as there was “light at the end of the tunnel.”

After this Vietnamese election, and the light at the end of the tunnel, 3,800 more Americans would die in Southeast Asia.

Since May 1, 2003, when the President declared “mission accomplished” in Iraq, over 2,500 troops have died in Iraq and embodies President Bush’s latest attempt to justify the U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Last December the President and his congressional allies claimed the Iraqi parliamentary elections were a “crucial victory” in establishing a democracy in Iraq. Thus, through this election, “victory” was inevitable in Iraq. Even Vice President Cheney declared the insurgency was “in their final throes.”

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House this morning to tell you that the truth is the Iraqi people have a democracy that is flourishing and is extraordinarily impressive. Three elections, every single one of those elections that the Iraqis have had are to form a government that created a Constitution, adopt a Constitution, and then elect a government under that Constitution. Thus, through this election, “victory” was inevitable in Iraq. Even Vice President Cheney declared the insurgency was “in their final throes.”

This is not a war like our grandsires fought. This is not a war like our grandpas fought. This is not an insurgency. There is no country to hoist a white flag of surrender. There is no recognized political entity that America can
sign a peace agreement with. There is only an insurgency of fanatics who have no desire to reach peace with the United States.

Our brave men and women in the military are trying to build a democracy in a country that views U.S. troops as occupiers. Almost one-half of the Iraqi people believe it is justifiable to kill our U.S. troops. The U.S. military has been used to prop up a government being threatened by a guerrilla insurgency.

With this Iraqi insurgency, I cannot envision an event, a goal or a date when victory in Iraq can indisputably be achieved.

What has President Bush said about achieving victory in Iraq? The President said the United States will stay the course and the next President will have to withdraw our troops from Iraq. It will be 2 1/2 years, or 30 months, before this President leaves office. Does this mean America will spend another $300 billion and lose the war in Iraq? Does it mean America will suffer 18,000 more young people to war wounds and another 2,500 killed?

In October 2002, I warned that this administration would open a Pandora’s box that would lead the United States unilaterally to go to war in Iraq. Mr. President, you opened Pandora’s box with all its death and destruction of American and Iraqi lives. You cannot simply wash your hands of this war and leave it to the next President to withdraw our troops from Iraq.

It is time for America to demand accountability from the President and the Iraqi Government. It is time for an Iraqi accountability plan to bring this war to an end.

Because of America’s sacrifice, the people of Iraq have been able to participate in a democracy by electing the leaders who will shape their young government and institute laws to protect them. This is a giant step towards accountability.

The formation of a new government in Iraq is more than just filling out a cabinet. It is an opportunity for the people of Iraq to accept responsibility for governing their country. This responsibility extends beyond voting or forming a new government or killing Abu Musab al Zarqawi. Now, is the time for Iraqis to be accountable for themselves and their developing country.

I believe that in order for the principles of democracy to take hold in Iraq, the target of the insurgency, our U.S. troops, must be removed as soon as possible!

The President must develop a strategy to bring our troops home. I believe America should demand from the Bush administration an Iraqi Accountability Plan that will set clear and measurable goals. The United States has provided the Iraqis with an opportunity for freedom, democracy and self-governance. But it is the responsibility of the Iraqi people to seize the opportunity and set forth these principles in a constitution.

In this war, the truth lies in today’s The Washington Post headline which states “Iraq Amnesty Plan May Cover Attacks on U.S. Military.” The war in Iraq has boiled down to amnesty for insurgents who attack and kill U.S. soldiers but no amnesty for the insurgents who kill Iraqi citizens. This amnesty proposal appears to have the tacit agreement of the Bush administration for Iraqi government officials stated, “There’s some sort of understanding on both sides and the UNF-I [The U.S.-led Multi-National Force-Iraq] that there is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks [on U.S. military personnel] are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely, I believe.”

If you vote “yes” on this Resolution, you are supporting the Iraqi Government’s belief that it is “ok” to give Iraq’s amnesty for attacking and killing U.S. troops!

I cannot, and I will not support Resolution 861 which supports a government that pardons and justifies killing of 2,500 American personnel as Iraqi patriots!

I will not support a resolution that leaves our commitment in Iraq “open-ended”; or which allows this President to hand over the Iraq war to the next President, 30 months from now; or which forces a resolution that does not have a strategy to end the war in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution!

H. RES. 861. IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution on the Iraqi war.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss what to do now, we must first acknowledge the fact that we cannot discuss an exit strategy for leaving Iraq without first stating what the entry strategy was, and then stating what we are trying to accomplish now.

We were originally told we invaded Iraq because they had weapons of mass destruction. That turned out not to be true.

We were then told that we invaded Iraq because the Iraqi leaders were connected with the 9/11 attacks. That turned out not to be true. The rationale that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States was exposed as untrue even before the invasion.

A letter from the Director of the CIA to the Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee dated October 7, 2002, specifically stated that the CIA believed that Iran did not pose a terrorist threat to the United States and would not be expected to pose such a threat unless we attacked.

Mr. Speaker, after it became clear that there were no weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11, and that Iran posed no terrorist threat to the United States, we have been subjected to the excuse of the week for being in Iraq.

We were told that we needed to capture Saddam Hussein for our safety. He has been in jail for over a year, and yet we are still in Iraq.

Then the rationale changed that we needed to capture al Zarqawi. We did that, and we are still in Iraq with no apparent plan to leave.

The rationale for this week is we are still in Iraq in order to establish a democracy. We have to recognize that the nature of a democracy is that it cannot be imposed on anyone. Furthermore, if the purpose is to establish a democracy in Iraq, it is ironic that the citizens right here(2,5),(997,995) in Washington, D.C. cannot elect a representative to vote on this very resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that we made a mistake and the only sensible rationale for still being there is because we made a mess and we have a moral responsibility to clean up that mess. And so we have to acknowledge that we are in quagmire, and it will become clear that there are no good results that can occur.

Cut and run, bad result. Stay the course to prove we have resolve, bad result. Don’t worry, be happy, bad result. Continue to pretend that success is around the corner, said Bush. I use “quagmire” lightly because this administration’s poor planning has strained our troops with many units in their second and third tours. Attacks on the United States are increasing. Despite of our occupation, the number of insurgents has dramatically increased, and our presence in Iraq has been counterproductive, just as the CIA predicted. As of today, 2,500 servicemen have been killed and many more wounded.

Our military equipment is wearing out much faster than normal. Emergency reserve stocks have been stripped. We have endured the embarrassment of torture at Abu Ghraib prison and questionable detention policies at Guantanamo Bay, and we have not begun to effectively deal with the issue of corruption in private contracts.

Despite spending billions of dollars on electricity and reconstruction, over half of Iraqi households lack clean water, and 85 percent lack reliable electricity.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be reminded when we first invaded Iraq the administration instructed the Budget Committee not to even budget for the war because it would cost so little. But now we have appropriated almost $400 billion, not including future medical costs for injured troops, and that has to be compared with the $7.4 billion that it would cost us to defeat Iraq in the Persian Gulf war.

Meanwhile, we have problems at home. There are shortages in the Department of Veterans Affairs, cuts in first responder grants, only 5 percent of our containers in our ports are being screened, and the administration has failed to adequately implement the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, we are not more secure. We are less secure as a result of the war.

Many experts have concluded that the military has done as much as it can, and so our exit strategy must include the use of diplomacy and politics
using the lessons we have learned from our mistakes.

But today, instead of honestly assessing what we are going to do in Iraq, we are considering this resolution which repeats all of the disheartened reasons for the invasion and proclaims its success, not a civil war is just around the corner, and that we should follow the strategy of don’t worry, be happy.

In contrast, any real debate would have us start with an honest assessment of our situation. But without articulating why we invaded in the first place and what we want to accomplish now that we are there, we cannot have an exit strategy. There can be no coherent discussion of an exit strategy while we are being directed by this resolution to accept the smiling face, don’t worry be happy description of our situation in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DUNCAN 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 (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. HINCH 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

IRAQ RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the time here tonight. There has been so much discussion today about the resolution on which we will vote tomorrow that we wanted to address that. And I have a friend with whom I went to Iraq in April, Congressman Shia (sic) from Connecticut, who will also be assisting in this hour.

I would just like to clarify for those who are interested what this resolution involves. Because the time is short remaining, I won’t read all of the whereass, but I will go straight to what is normally referred to as wherefores.

Resolved that the House of Representatives honors all of those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders protecting the homeland, as servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, or in other roles.

Honors the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and our partners in the coalition and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside them, especially those who have fallen or been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and others who risk their lives to help defend freedom.

Number 3, declares that it is not in the national security interests of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

Number 4, declares that the United States is committed to the completion the mission to create a sovereign, free secure and United Iraq.

Five, congratulates Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating in increasing millions, in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq’s new Constitution.

Number 6, calls upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other coalition partners to support the efforts of the Iraqi and Afghans people to live in freedom.

And 7, declares that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

And I think that last point, Mr. Speaker, is the one on which there is so much dissension from the other side and there are a few Members on our side that are concerned, but it declares, we actually believe, and a positive vote tomorrow will indicate, we believe we are going to prevail in the global war on terror. And the truth of the matter is we don’t have a choice. It is either prevail on the global war on terror, or be prepared to give up so many freedoms that I do not want to see this Nation give up. Far too many people have given their lives to get us what we have.

Now, one note I would like to address that has been brought up time and time again, well, the President lied to us about WMDs. There are no weapons of mass destruction. Well, we know there were at one time. But to hear it said over and over, and hear again today, during the day today, over and over, well, the President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. The President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. His administration lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. And I think the jury is still out. We are finding documents that apparently refer to things that were taken to Syria. There may be things that turn up that we haven’t yet found.

But let’s say, for argument purposes, that there are no weapons of mass destruction. You know, being a Christian
is part of who I am. We have been taught to forgive. I think it is high time, if the President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction, then let’s forgive President Clinton for all those lies. Let’s forgive his administration, people like Madeleine Albright who lied, and let’s move on. Let’s put that behind us and just get on down the road.

And I would like to say, I do appreciate the visitation that Congressman Murphy makes to those who have been injured and harmed and to the grieving families. He is very devoted in his visitation. And it obviously, as I have talked to him, it obviously affects him, as it would any of us that see people suffer.

There in East Texas, in my district, we had a Private First Class Steven Wright who is 19 years old. Was killed, he was from Kilgore, Texas. And, you know, some of us, this was before I got elected to Congress, but having spent 4 years in the Army, I have been to funerals enough, back in the days when people didn’t come to service members’ funerals. And they present the flag to the deceased family and say, on behalf of a grateful Nation and the people would look around, go where is the grateful Nation. There is nobody here. Just a few friends. Where is the grateful Nation?

And so out of concern that there might be a few who may show up to that young man’s funeral, this hero, Steven Wright from Kilgore, many of us showed up from around east Texas that have been in the service before. And I am telling you, that little rural church there on Highway 31. And I ended up at the back, and I checked the mileage. There were cars creeping along three solid miles to have their opportunity at the cemetery to pay tribute to that young man and his family. And I saw them on Memorial Day, his family and his friends. They know what the price is. They are not ready for us to cut and run. They know that to do that would diminish the value of what Private Wyatt fought and died for.

We had a Marine that I visited 2 or 3 weeks ago from Bridgeport, Tony Flynn. He took a mortar round in the chest. And I think through the prayers and the grace of God, he is doing well. And his mom was there with him. He is very, very, very grateful to the grace of God, he is doing well. And we are getting there. And I checked the mileage. And I ended up at the back, and I checked the mileage. There were cars creeping along three solid miles to have their opportunity at the cemetery to pay tribute to that young man and his family. And I saw them, Memorial Day, his family and his friends. They know what the price is. They are not ready for us to cut and run. They know that to do that would diminish the value of what Private Wyatt fought and died for.

Being to Iraq 12 times has been very interesting for me because what I have been able to do, I go every 3 or 4 months and I am able to kind of graph out how well we are doing or how well we are not doing. And just to say that we are doing the right thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in hearing from my good friend, Mr. Shays from Connecticut, on this subject at this time. I yield to Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And just to say that I appreciate the opportunity to appear with him and to have some dialogue.

When we dug this hole with no army, no police and border patrol, and asked our military, we saw the problems that we have seen. But then what did we do to turn this corner and head in the right direction? We started to train their police, their border patrol and their army. That is what we did. And we saw it in 2005, extraordinary elections. I was there for the first election. It was one of the most thrilling things that I have ever seen in my entire life. We went to Iraq, and we saw Iraqi women bringing their husbands and family members to vote. They were so excited that after they voted they celebrated. And I was so excited watching these brave people as they went to their polling stations. And what I saw was something pretty extraordinary. What I saw were Iraqis thrilled with the opportunity to vote. And I asked if I could put my finger in that ink jar. And they looked at me and said, with some as- surance, no, you aren’t an Iraqi. And I thought, she could have said I wasn’t a Kurd. But she said I wasn’t an Iraqi. She didn’t think of Sunni, Shia and Kurd. In fact, when I go to Iraq and I will ask someone, are you a Kurd or a Shia or a Sunni, they will say I am a Shias, but I am married to a Sunni, or I will ask someone the same question. They will say, I am a Kurd. But sir, Kurds are Sunnis.

For me, it is an amazing thing to go to that country and to see the absolute commitment that the Iraqis have that they can have a better future. And I think as I am seeing this, back here at home we are saying we need to leave. Again, we had a Marine that I visited 2 or 3 weeks ago from Bridgeport, Tony Flynn. He took a mortar round in the chest. And I think through the prayers and the grace of God, he is doing well. And his mom was there with him. He is very, very, very grateful to the grace of God, he is doing well. And we are getting there. And I checked the mileage. And I ended up at the back, and I checked the mileage. There were cars creeping along three solid miles to have their opportunity at the cemetery to pay tribute to that young man and his family. And I saw them, Memorial Day, his family and his friends. They know what the price is. They are not ready for us to cut and run. They know that to do that would diminish the value of what Private Wyatt fought and died for.

When we dug this hole with no army, no police and border patrol, and asked our military, we saw the problems that we have seen. But then what did we do to turn this corner and head in the right direction? We started to train their police, their border patrol and their army. That is what we did. And we saw it in 2005, extraordinary elections. I was there for the first election. It was one of the most thrilling things that I have ever seen in my entire life. We went to Iraq, and we saw Iraqi women bringing their husbands and family members to vote. They were so excited that after they voted they celebrated. And I was so excited watching these brave people as they went to their polling stations. And what I saw was something pretty extraordinary. What I saw were Iraqis thrilled with the opportunity to vote. And I asked if I could put my finger in that ink jar. And they looked at me and said, with some as- surance, no, you aren’t an Iraqi. And I thought, she could have said I wasn’t a Kurd. But she said I wasn’t an Iraqi. She didn’t think of Sunni, Shia and Kurd. In fact, when I go to Iraq and I will ask someone, are you a Kurd or a Shia or a Sunni, they will say I am a Shias, but I am married to a Sunni, or I will ask someone the same question. They will say, I am a Kurd. But sir, Kurds are Sunnis.

For me, it is an amazing thing to go to that country and to see the absolute commitment that the Iraqis have that they can have a better future. And I think as I am seeing this, back here at home we are saying we need to leave. Again,
when I ask the Iraqis what is their biggest fear, their biggest fear is this, that you will leave us, that you will leave us before we can take hold of democracy and own it.

And I know my colleague made reference to the concept of lying. There is no question in my mind that anyone lied about weapons of mass destruction, not a scintilla of doubt about that issue. And I could confirm it in a whole host of ways. One is, we didn’t let our troops go into Iraq until every one of them had protective chemical gear.

If we didn’t think they had chemicals, if we didn’t think they would use it, we sure as heck would not have spent our time doing that. What we should have made sure of was that they had body armor. So they did not have body armor. They had exactly what we thought they needed: protective gear against chemicals.

When I went to the Brits, the French, the Turks, the Jordanians, and the Iraqis, they all said to me: He has weapons of mass destruction. Only the French said he wouldn’t use it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time for the majority has expired.

Is there anyone from the minority that claims the additional time?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the remainder of the time being there is no one here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed until midnight.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. I am almost done for this part, and I would encourage the gentleman to stand up so we could have a little bit of a dialogue about this.

But when I read what he read in the resolution, declares that it is not in the national security interest of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, I think it is a very clear statement. If people think it is in the national interest to have an arbitrary date, they can vote “no” against this resolution and hold their head up high. If like you, Mr. Gohmert, and I feel that it would be an absolute huge mistake, and, in fact, I am not aware of any war that has been won by setting an arbitrary date beyond which we were not willing to fight. Once the enemy knows that there is a date and that is all they have to get by, then it is just a matter of their surviving until that date.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman will allow me to comment, I think the gentleman makes a very good point. I love to just think of the Revolutionary War and, being somewhat a student of history and a lover of history, thinking of when my professors would tell me that one-third of the American people supported the war against Great Britain, one-third opposed it, and one-third didn’t care or didn’t even know there was a war. But we were pretty divided.

In fact, the war during that time we had families absolutely divided. And Benjamin Franklin’s son was the governor of a State, did not want to give up that authority given to him by the crown, and opposed the war. Even among their own family, there was division.

But what I think about that Revolutionary War that just blows me away is George Washington had one failure after another after another. In fact, they said if the wind had been blowing the other way, he would have been captured in Manhattan. Thank goodness there was not the press that said we have made all these terrible mistakes, we need to leave. And it gets me to this point. We have made mistakes, but they do not justify leaving. What is justified is to stop making those mistakes and doing it the right way.

And if the gentleman would just indulge me a little longer, I am well aware that Abraham Lincoln was constantly criticized because his generals were not winning. In fact, his generals started criticizing him. In fact, a general ran against him in his reelection because they thought he was not fighting hard enough. Thank goodness we did not set an arbitrary date on either George Washington or Abraham Lincoln. Thank goodness we did not say because you have made mistakes, we have got to just stop.

Mr. GOHMERT. Of course, being a history major at Texas A&M, I am also a great fan of history and do believe the adage those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it. And then, of course, the follow-up to that is those who do learn from history will find new ways to mess up.

But going back to the Revolutionary War, the gentleman from Connecticut gives a great example. As history indicates, and McCullough did a great job of documenting this in his book 1776, before the victory December 24, 1776, where Washington crossed the Delaware, there was not much to really crow about. And as the gentleman well knows, that retreat from over to Manhattan with the superior British forces there could have been a disaster and would have been if the wind had been blowing the other way. But I think it was providential that they crossed and covered their retreat. But I believe it was on December 27, not only did the Congress not set an arbitrary date by which he had to win, they were so committed to victory, they passed a resolution that basically gave Washington the power. We never had authority to spend money he needed to get the job done, to get the troops reassembled so that they could fight until they won the war. That is how committed they were. And in the cover letter, the resolution of that day, was testimonial to Washington’s being the man for the time, it went along the lines of basically we submit a copy of the resolution and knowing that neither man nor his liberty will be in jeopardy with your having all this power, and then when it is no longer necessary, you will return it back, as well he did. But what a contrast to the discussion today to say, you know what, let us set an arbitrary date over here and then just pull our hands after that. We would not have had a successful conclusion to the American Revolution.

I would like to address something here. This is taken off-line from USA Today. And it says “Text of a Document Discovered in Zarqawi’s Safe House.” And then it has updated June 15, 2006, 2:31 am, the Associated Press. And it says “Text of a document discovered in terror leader Abu Musab al Zarqawi’s hideout. The document was provided in English translation by the US security adviser Mouwafak al Rubaie. And this is supposedly from these guys, that it was discovered in a safe house. And it documents exactly the things that so many on the other side and a few on our side have been saying is not the case. Our own findings have documented what Mr. SCOTT will be glad to know are good results that have been occurring.

And it goes on to say, and these are the terrorists writing this. ‘As an overall picture, time has been an element in affecting negatively the forces of the occupying countries due to the losses they sustain economically and
human lives, which are increasing with time. However, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be of service to the American forces and harmful to the resistance.” The terrorists call themselves resisters.

The following reasons:

Number one, “By allowing the American forces to form the forces of the National Guard, to reinforce them and enable them to undertake military operations against the resistance. The resistance is the terrorists, which is just what the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) was saying earlier. We have been there. They are training them. Some opponents are saying we have not been able to train people, that they cannot protect themselves. Well, the terrorists are saying in this document that our forces have been able to form them and train them and reinforce them and enable them to undertake military operations.

Mr. SHAYS. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GOHMERT. I certainly will yield.

Mr. SHAYS. What is important in your dialogue is the terrorists. And there was this argument: Well, the terrorists are not in Iraq. I am not going to argue whether they were there before we went in, but no one can argue that they are not there now. In fact, the prince of the terrorists, al Zarqawi, was killed. He was killed operating and doing business in Iraq.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming the time, it is such a great point. He was killed. I will tell you, I do not know if the gentleman has been hearing some of the ridiculous reports. One thing we have found in Iraq is they cannot keep secrets too well. The President went to Iraq without but a handful of people knowing. But if they try to keep a secret very long, somebody leaks from all over the place. And so there were some reports, and I could make my head, that said, We think they had Zarqawi on ice in a freezer somewhere and they just brought him out. And some have said he was beaten to death, that a bomb did not do that. Do you want to know how absurd that is? Can you imagine this administration having Zarqawi in a freezer somewhere for weeks and somebody not leaking that? I am sorry. That could not happen. That would have been leaked by somebody that they got Zarqawi on ice.

Mr. SHAYS. I do not know, if that is the kind dialogue that has been happened in Texas. Most of my folks have recognized that we got him and it was due to good intelligence. But if I could, you are talking about this administration. Let me just talk briefly about what a former administration said, in other words, what Bill Clinton said, according to John A. Torres from the Florida Today on June 13 in a meeting he had on the 12th. He wrote, “Former President Bill Clinton told Florida Democrats on Monday that Iraq’s fledging government would falter if the United States were to withdraw its troops. He also said more terrorists could emerge from that region without an American military presence.”

So he is arguing that without a presence it would be worse. Then he said, and this is a quote: ‘The representative government in Iraq is a hopeful sign.’ Clinton said at a fund-raising reception for the Florida Democratic Party at the Orlando Marriott downtown. ‘But we need to stay there long enough for the politics to get worked out,’ he said. ‘If we withdrew tomorrow, that government couldn’t survive.’

“Clinton said he didn’t agree with the original decision to invade Iraq before finishing military operations in Afghanistan. However he said the focus now needs to be on stabilizing Iraq and he warned that occupying Iraq for too long would backfire.” Too long it would backfire, but he is very clear: We cannot leave until we stabilize Iraq.

Mr. GOHMERT. Those are important words from our former President Clinton, who has numerous times that they did have weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, that Saddam did, and I am glad to hear that he is recognizing that an arbitrary withdrawal would be devastating.

There are numerous other things here in this document. If I could just touch on a couple very briefly as our time comes to a conclusion. He goes through about how the picture is bleak, and he goes on to say, “Based on the above points,” and there were seven of them, “it became necessary that these matters should be treated one by one.” And he has a strategy. The strategy is to use the media for spreading an effective and creative image of the resistance, or otherwise the terrorists. Another point was to create division and strife between America and other countries and among the elements disagreeing with it. And then after seven more points, he says, in general, and I quote the current bleak situation, I think he has to say: “This crisis is to entangle the American forces into another war...”

Mr. SHAYS. This is al-Qaeda that is saying that correct?

Mr. GOHMERT. This would be al-Qaeda that is saying that. Correct.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to: Mrs. Miller of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 12, 13 and 14 on account of a family emergency.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to: Mrs. Miller of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 12, 13 and 14 on account of a family emergency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4939. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Friday, June 16, 2006, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows: 8088. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final
rule — Importation of Small Lots of Seed Without Phyto sanitary Certificates [Docket No. 02-119-2] (RIN: 0579-AE76) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8090. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standards for Privately Owned Quarantine Facilities for Ruminants [Docket No. 00-022-2] received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8091. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Importation of Baby Corn and Baby Carrots From Zambia [Docket No. 05-059-2] received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8092. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Tuberculosis in Captive Cervids; Extend the Reporting of Cervid Tuberculosis Test [Docket No. 04-094-2] received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8093. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Removal of Container Regulations [Docket No. FV06-922-1 IFR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8094. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Grapes Grown in California: Reversion of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines [Docket No. APHIS-2006-819-1 IFR] received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8095. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Removal of Container Regulations [Docket No. FV06-923-1 IFR] received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8096. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Grapes Grown in the San Joaquin Valley; Exempting Raisins Grown in Florida; Modifying Procedures and Establishing Regulations to Limit Shipments of Small Sizes of Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. APHIS-2006-820-1 IFR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8097. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Oranges, Grapefruits, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Exempting Raisins Grown in Florida; Modifying Procedures and Establishing Regulations to Limit Shipments of Small Sizes of Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. APHIS-2006-820-1 IFR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8098. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8099. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8100. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8101. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8102. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8103. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8104. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8105. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8106. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Exempt Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.


8108. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(w)(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. H. 5628. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 802 South Carrier Parkway in Grand Prairie, Texas, as the “Alexander McRae Dechan Post Office Building,” to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

H. H. 5627. A bill to prohibit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from providing insurance or financing to countries that subsidize their steel industries and for projects producing goods subject to anti-dumping duties, to require the United States to oppose the proposal by the International Monetary Fund assistance to countries which subsidize their steel industries, and to ban assistance by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to countries that subsidize their steel industries; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. H. 5628. A bill to provide for an initial period of admission of 36 months for aliens employed as dairy workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H. H. 5593. A bill to provide for the same treatment of all individuals notified of possible qualification for low-income subsidies for purposes of enrollment and the waiver of late enrollment penalties under the Medicare part D program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H. Res. 871. A resolution recognizing Sam Hornish, Jr. for winning the 90th running of the Indianapolis 500; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. H. 111: Mr. Cuellar.
H. H. 414: Mr. Allen and Mr. Schatz of Hawaii.
H. H. 615: Mrs. Napolitano.
H. H. 952: Mr. Udall of New Mexico.
H. H. 997: Mr. Sullivan.
H. H. 1020: Mr. Gene Green of Texas and Mr. LaTourette.
H. H. 1249: Mr. Boswell and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi.
H. H. 1384: Mr. Barton of Texas and Mr. LaTourette.
H. H. 1384: Mr. Bonilla, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Deal of Georgia, Mr. Hefley, Mr. Franks of Arizona, and Mr. Carter.
H. H. 1392: Mr. Brown of Maryland.
H. H. 1458: Mr. Wynn, Mr. Walsh, and Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
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H. Res. 845: Ms. Lee, Mr. Stark, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Serrano, and Mr. Kucinich.
H. Res. 852: Mr. Green of Wisconsin and Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
H. Res. 858: Mr. Pallone, Mr. Scott of Virginia, and Mrs. Lowry.
H. Res. 863: Mr. LoBiondo.
H. Res. 867: Mr. Wu and Mr. Schiff.
H. Res. 870: Mr. Brown of South Carolina, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Davis of Kentucky, Ms. Harman, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. Lynch, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Owens, and Mr. Bishop of New York.
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today’s prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rev. H. Kenneth Dutille of Swans Island Atlantic Baptist Church in Swans Island, ME. The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God of grace and glory, we turn to Thee today for motivation, guidance, and inspiration. Before we turn to today’s challenges and opportunities, we would thank You for these few moments of prayer and meditations of heart.

Grant us greatness of spirit, to see Your all-encompassing view of the many traditions and customs from which we come. The task before us is daunting; we need always to look upon the Almighty for understanding, wisdom, knowledge, and strength. May we be granted this day and in the days that lie ahead clear insight into the many problems and troubles that our great Nation faces.

Bless, O God, our Senators. They serve our Nation with poise and pride. Empower each to fulfill today’s manifold responsibilities with courage and grace.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever, Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thank you very much, Reverend Dutille.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this morning, at 10 a.m., the Senate will vote on the supplemental appropriations conference report. Following the vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the Defense authorization bill. The two managers have made substantial progress, but we will need to work through a number of amendments today in order to complete the bill in a timely fashion.

Those Senators who have amendments should be working with Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN to get in the queue. The Santorum amendment on Iran is the pending business and we will need to schedule a vote on that today. The majority leader has announced that Members should stay close to the floor so that we can make significant progress during today’s session.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted that our opening prayer this morning was so eloquently delivered by the Reverend Ken Dutille of Swans Island Atlantic Baptist Church in my home State of Maine. It is a great pleasure to welcome him to the Senate today. In fact, as he offered the invocation in this Chamber 11 years ago, on October 18, 1995, it is a pleasure to welcome him back to the Senate today.

Pastor Dutille’s words give direction and purpose to our work. His actions also inspire us; they are a vivid reminder of the commitment and compassion that exists among people of faith throughout our Nation.

His ministry is truly unique. His church is joined with churches on three other islands to form the Maine Sea Coast Mission. This nondenominational organization was founded more than a century ago to provide spiritual guidance and educational opportunities to the remote seafaring communities of downeast Maine. In its early years, the mission’s boat, which was called Hope, would deliver a minister to isolated island communities where there were no churches and books where there were no libraries.

Today, the Sunbeam V not only continues that vital work, but it also serves as a mobile health clinic bringing medical services—including screenings, inoculations, and telemedicine—to four islands that otherwise would not have access to medical services.

Pastor Dutille is the founder of another outstanding mission project, the Bread of Life Food Pantry on Swans Island. The food pantry is often all that stands between the pangs of hunger and a healthy meal for some people in this disadvantaged area of my State. Although the demands upon the food pantry are always considerable, they increased exponentially this last July when the only grocery store on Swans Island was destroyed by fire. The pastor and the rest of the mission community immediately rose to the challenge with a major fundraising campaign. The power of God was evident in their strength of purpose as they responded to this crisis.

The pastor is a fisher of people and a person of many accomplishments. He is a graduate of the Baptist Bible College in Springfield, MO, as well as of the University of Maine. He holds a master’s degree from the California Graduate School of Theology. He has served in churches throughout Maine and has...
preached throughout New England. He is a published author, too, and a successful small business owner. He has also had experience that all of us can relate to. In a previous community, he served as a town selectman, so he has a keen understanding of the challenges of public service, as his opening prayer demonstrated today.

It is a great pleasure to have such a dedicated spiritual and civic leader with us today and giving the opening prayer. I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues in extending him a warm welcome and in giving thanks for his inspiring prayer.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I just got word that the 2,500th soldier was killed in Iraq. It is a milestone, obviously, that we all mourn deeply in this country. And that is what I rise to talk about, as a few of those who have died in the line of duty were from my State.

Mr. President, May was an especially difficult month for our home State of Nevada. We mourn the loss of four soldiers and marines who were killed in action in Iraq and Afghanistan. One soldier was killed during training. And just last week, another soldier from Winnemucca, NV, was killed. While there are not many of these deaths, there is also strength and pride that never ceases to amaze me.

I had the opportunity to attend two of the recent funerals: the funeral of SGT Carlos Saenz at Arlington National Cemetery and the funeral of SGT John Griffith at the Southern Nevada Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Boulder City. Each funeral I have attended is in extending him a warm welcome and in giving thanks for his inspiring prayer.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

SGT John Griffith lived in Las Vegas most of his life. He told his wife Christa that he was fighting this war so their son would not have to. I will never forget the image of his two young daughters, just as the funeral had ended and they were taking the casket away. I did not say anything. I was just sitting there with the hearse. I heard his two young daughters crying, and I heard one of them say: Don’t let them take daddy.

That is the real pain of war coming home to a family, and we should all remember the sacrifices that not only the men and women in uniform who have died have made but also the sacrifices and the pain their families go through.

I also had the opportunity to speak with Victoria Legaspi, the mother of SSG Emmanuel Legaspi. Manny was born in the Philippines and signed up to serve this country. His wife Nanette, serving this country. His wife Nanette, understood her husband's sacrifice.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senate is going to be considering in just a few minutes the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. I do want to be clear that like most of my colleagues, I will be voting for this bill because it does provide the funding for our troops that is critically needed to carry out their mission and because it supports recovery efforts along the coast. I do wish to express three concerns I have with the conference report.

First, this bill continues the charade that this war should be funded off budget. Instead of including the money our troops need in the regular budget as requested by the President and sent to us, we keep getting sent emergency supplemental requests. It is clear to me, having been here for 13½ years, that emergency spending bills used to be for emergencies, things we could not foresee such as natural disasters. The need for funding for the war in Iraq is not a surprise. It is not like responding to an earthquake or tornado. By funding war off budget, we continue to hide the true cost of the war.

It is imperative that the Senate and the House get a budget from the President that gives us the true cost of what we need to be funding.

In addition, the administration should not have the sole authority to decide what is worthy of emergency funding and what is not. We have emergencies in our backyard as well as overseas. We should not hand over to the President the final authority on what deserves emergency funding.

The second concern I have is that this bill leaves out very critical funding for areas we considered and adopted in the Senate. They were removed once the bill went to conference. Funding for VA health care, for emergency transportation assistance in the gulf coast—much of the progress we made in the Senate was thrown out. Why? To meet an arbitrary limit set by the President. That is going to hurt many of our communities in the coming months.

Part of what we did in the Senate in April was to overwhelmingly pass the Murray-Akaka amendment that ensured our veterans would get the help they need. That amendment had broad support on the Senate floor. It was removed in conference in the middle of the night. That is a huge setback for the men and women who are coming home from the war today and entering a VA system that is overwhelmed and underfunded. In March, the VA told us they are seeing 38 percent more Iraqi war veterans than they budgeted for. Veterans now have to wait a year to get the specialty care they deserve. Some are waiting more than 18 months before they get the benefits they have earned. I fear we are at the top of that, we have waiting lists that are thousands of names long at major VA hospitals. I am frustrated that the
Our veterans deserve better. The veterans health care system is aging and needs additional funding to provide proper care and treatment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to vote on the amendment to accompany H.R. 4939, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, hav- ing met, have agreed that the House re- cede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I intend to vote for this emergency supplemental appropriations conference agreement because of the critical fund- ing it will provide to our troops. Our men and women in uniform, and their families, deserve our support, not just in words but with deeds. This bill also provides important support to our fel- low Americans in the gulf coast region, who continue to rebuild their communi- ties after the devastation of the 2005 hurricane season.

But I am disappointed that impor- tant provisions included in the Senate bill were stripped out in conference. With nearly 150,000 U.S. troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is shameful that this conference report stripped out $430 million for veterans health care. And I am concerned that this bill short changes the U.S. Coast Guard and important port security measures.

Through the regular appropriations process, I will continue to fight for our veterans, and to ensure the security of our coast and our ports.

In this bill, we have provided over $15 billion to fix or replace equipment that has been damaged during combat oper- ations and to buy additional force pro- tection equipment desperately needed by our brave men and women on the battlefield.

To help protect our troops from deadly improvised explosive devices, IEDs, this bill creates the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund and provides the fund with nearly $2 billion to develop and deploy new and advanced tactical equipment, systems, and training to defeat these deadly weapons.

To ensure that we do all we can to care for soldiers when they are injured, this bill includes an additional $1 bil- lion for the Defense Health Program. This money ensures that we can con- tinue to provide world-class services including rapid aero-medical evacu- ation to our most severely wounded soldiers.

The veterans health care system is stretched to the limit at a time when more and more veterans are turning to VA. That is why I cosponsored an amendment by Senator AKAKA to in- crease veterans funding by $430 million to meet the health care needs of sol- diers returning from Iraq and Afghan- istan and other war veterans. I am very disappointed that this funding was re- moved. I urge the conference to continue to fight for our veterans to ensure they have the funding needed to receive the care they deserve.

The rank-and-file employees of the Federal Government are the unsung heroes of this country. Unfortunately, they are often required to work in sub- standard or often hazardous conditions. It was recently reported that employ- ees within this very building are forced to enter tunnels full of asbestos and on the verge of collapse. That is why I co- sponsored an amendment by Senator ALLARD that provides over $27 million for critical emergency structural re- pairs to the Capitol Complex utilities tunnels. I will continue to fight for our Federal workforce to ensure they have safe working environments and proper safety equipment.

We know that nearly 40 percent of the soldiers deployed today in Iraq and Afghanistan are citizen soldiers who come from the National Guard and Reserves. More than half of these will suf- fer a loss of income when they are mobilized because their military pay is less than the pay from their civilian job. Many patriotic employers and State governments eliminate this pay gap by continuing to pay them the dif- ference between their civilian and mili- tary pay. The reservist pay security amendment, which I worked on with Senator DURBIN, was designed to en- sure that the U.S. Government also takes care of our reservists.

To counter this, I supported an amendment proposed by Senators GREGG and BYRD to add $1.9 billion for border security initiatives to include buying additional vehicles, airplanes, helicopters, and ships. This amendment also provided $800 million for the U.S. Coast Guard, the border protector of our waters. Of this amount, $12 million was for the Mission Effectiveness Pro- gram at the U.S. Coast Guard Yard at Curtis Bay, MD. This project is de- signed to extend the service life and im- prove the mission performance of the Coast Guard’s aging fleet of medium endurance cutters. I regret that in con- ference the House and Senate agreed to
the President’s border security proposal which solely focuses on beefing up the National Guard and border agents along the Nation’s southwest border.

I am also disappointed that $648 million in military assistance security initiatives was stripped from the final conference agreement. The Port of Baltimore, in my hometown, recently celebrated its 300th anniversary. It is my responsibility to see to it that the Baltimore community celebrates the port properly. We must continue to provide adequate funding for our ports in the manner we are for our borders.

We have all seen the devastating effects of natural disasters and terrorism and are working hard to prevent future occurrences from affecting our Nation and the world. We have recently learned of another potential threat: a worldwide flu epidemic that could cost millions of lives if we are unprepared. In response to this threat, this bill provides $2.3 billion to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic. Making this money available now will help expand the domestic production capacity of influenza vaccine and will help develop the right vaccines, antivirals, and other medical supplies necessary to protect and preserve lives in the event of an outbreak.

Mr. President, this bill is a Federal investment in supporting our troops and the families while providing the right relief for those impacted by the devastating hurricanes.

We support our troops by getting them the best equipment and the best protection we can provide. We support them by ensuring they are cared for with the best possible medical system when they are injured or ill.

With this bill, we are also helping our neighbors rebuild their homes, their communities, and their lives, and I am proud to give it my support.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the conference report we have before us contains $94.5 billion in funding for the war on terror, hurricane recovery in the gulf coast, pandemic flu preparation, and border security.

We have to fund our troops. Therefore, we need support passage of this conference report. But I do so with reservations, mainly because resources for the training and equipping of the Iraqi army have been funded well below the level requested by the President. As all of my colleagues know, training and equipping the Iraqi army is imperative to the ultimate success of our mission there. The security of the Iraqi people, ensured by a properly trained and equipped Iraqi army, is our exit strategy.

Unfortunately, the must-pass nature of this bill has led to the inclusion of hundreds of millions of dollars in unrequested, nonemergency spending and typical run-of-the-mill earmarks. Examples of unrequested and nonemergency additions to this emergency spending bill include three Marine Corps V-22 tilt rotor aircraft, two KC-130J tanker aircraft, four C-130J cargo aircraft, 130 million for Army C-17 cargo aircraft, seven Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, UAV. It also includes $975 million for SINCgars tactical radios, $875 million in Army tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle upgrades, $130 million for Army STRYKER vehicles above combat losses, and $567 million for Army trucks. None of these were requested by the administration, and they are not critically needed to aid in the war on terror.

Let’s take a closer look at just one of these add-ons. The conference report includes $230 million to buy three Marine Corps V-22s. The President did not request any money for the V-22 Osprey, which is still in the development and testing stage. In fact, the V-22 has not even been deployed to an operational squadron yet. If continued development and testing goes well, the Marine Corps will send the V-22 to an operational squadron in the summer or fall of 2007. Northrop Grumman is suing its insurance company and a shipbuilder, Factory Mutual, for those costs associated with Hurricane Katrina. This provision may increase Navy shipbuilding costs by $140 million over what the administration had requested. The military funding for this aircraft is expected to primarily benefit Northrop Grumman’s shipyard in Pascagoula, MS. This language substitutes Government funding for what insurers would pay to shipbuilders. Northrop Grumman is suing its insurer, Factory Mutual, for those costs associated with Hurricane Katrina. However, in the near term, the appropriators have decided the best course is to arrange a giveaway to an insurance company, which is a sure way to cut costs.

Furthermore, the explanatory statement accompanying this conference report contains language stating that the conference agrees with House and Senate language delaying the Department of Transportation, DOT, rulemaking which proposes to give domestic air carriers with foreign investors more control over business matters. Yet this legislative language does not include any related provisions, and rightly so, in my view. This greater control would by gravely concerning matters that do not relate to safety or security and only when the investors’ home countries provide our airlines with investment and market access. I assure my colleagues this statement was not included by accident, and its intent seems to be to signal to DOT that Congress does not approve of its proposed rulemaking.

I am also disappointed that some other notable projects funded as “emergencies” in this measure: $16 million for hurricane repair in the State of Pennsylvania; $40 million for sugar and sugarcane disaster assistance in Florida, which was not requested; $248 million for sugar and sugarcane disaster assistance in Louisiana, which was not requested by the President; $400,000 for disaster assistance to sugar cooperatives in Texas, which was not requested by the President; $400,000 to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Demonstration barrier, which was not requested by the President; $9 million in drought emergency assistance to communities in Nevada and New Mexico; $225,000 to the Missouri Soybean Association for the purchase of a $40 million for sugar and sugarcane disaster assistance in Louisiana, which was not requested by the President; $100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Washington in Silver Spring, MD for renovation of Boys and Girls Clubs of America; $7 million for the Port of Baltimore; $7.5 million for the Greater Washington Clubhouse No. 4, Clubhouse No. 10, Clubhouse No. 11, and Clubhouse No. 14 in the District of Columbia; $100,000 to Wesleyan College in Macon, GA, for faculty renovation, buildout, and construction of a new facility; $5.5 million for repair of a building for use as an incubation center in the Kansas City metropolitan statistical area; $100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Washington; and $5.5 million for a library upgrade of a library.

I think we can fund this war—and indeed win this war—while also budgeting for this war. We know the war is going to cost more than the over $400 billion we will have appropriated to date upon enactment of this conference report, and we know that the war is not going to end as quickly as most of us would prefer. But we need to continue funding our military and all the other job is done. Withdrawing our military presence prematurely is not an option in my view, the view of many of my colleagues, nor the view of the President or his advisers. We are in it to win.

Instead of fixing the problem, and fixing it will not be easy, we have only succeeded in making it bigger, more unstable, more complicated, and much more expensive. And adding hundreds of billions of dollars to a problem is not the best way to fix it. The $2.3 billion is a placeholder amount that was more conveniently designated as emergency expenditures—so that they don’t have to be budgeted for along with other national priorities—is only making the fiscal problem that much greater.

Again, Mr. President, it is unfortunate that, at a time of war and with such a huge deficit and burgeoning debt, we continue to fund unnecessary projects and load up emergency supplemental appropriations bills with nonemergency items. We must continue our search for the resources necessary for our young men and women swerving in Iraq to successfully complete their mission, so that they
I am very pleased, however, that our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee included critical funding to provide relief to elementary and secondary schools in the Gulf region and to schools across the country that generated additional costs incurred during this school year so that they can continue to provide good education for all the children they serve.

The schools, colleges, and universities are a cornerstone of the Gulf communities, and their recovery is essential to the successful rebuilding of the region. I am disappointed that the conferees rejected a Senate provision that would have leveraged hundreds of millions of dollars of low-cost loans for these colleges and universities. I am sure that my colleagues in the Senate increased the grant aid in the bill to help these colleges and universities rebuild. These funds are a step in the right direction to enable these institutions to remain a vital part of the Gulf coast.

It is clear that border security, hurricane relief, and pandemic flu preparations all affect our national security. The need for these funds cannot easily be assessed in advance and made part of the regular budget. But no one can disagree that each has a profound impact on our Nation and has to be addressed.

I commend Senator HARKIN for his leadership on the needed funding to prepare for a pandemic flu. Those of us on the authorizing committee look forward to continuing to work with Senator BURR to see that these funds are used effectively to increase the Nation’s readiness for this major disease threat.

I am disappointed that the conference report rejected our Senate amendment to compensate first responders injured by experimental flu vaccines. If pandemic flu reaches our shores, Americans will have to rely heavily on nurses, paramedics, emergency technicians, and other first responders. The question is whether these first responders will risk taking an experimental vaccine so that they can stay on the job and protect us all.

The least these brave first responders deserve is fair compensation if they are harmed by the vaccine. We know from past experience that without such a compensation program, first responders will be reluctant to take experimental vaccines. The Senate did the right thing, to fund a compensation program, but Republican leaders inexplicably allowed the House conference to reject the funds. The message we are sending to our first responders—"You’re on your own" and a pandemic will be even more disastrous if it hits.

It is a sorry substitute for a real budget.

The deeming resolution completely ignores the Senate-passed budget. It sets a spending cap $16 billion below the level approved by a bipartisan majority of Senators in a budget resolution. It wipes out an amendment passed by the Senate to add $7 billion for urgent health and education needs. It cuts funding for vital medical research by the National Institutes of Health. It underfunds the No Child Left Behind education initiative by $55.7 billion over the next 5 years. It sets the wrong priorities for America.

This deeming resolution indicates a willingness on the part of Republicans in Congress to blindly follow the Bush administration’s reckless strategy of cutting essential domestic programs. American families depend upon while providing more and more tax breaks for the wealthiest taxpayers in the country. It is outrageous. It is one more failure for a leadership that consistently takes the country in the wrong direction.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to acknowledge a tangible result of our Federal Government’s investment in preparing for a pandemic. This week, the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, in partnership with the Wildlife Conservation Society and the Global Avian influenza Network for the Surveillance of wild birds, or the GAINS program, GAINS systematically tests and monitors wild and dead birds to identify the viral strains they carry, to share the virus samples in order to continually update vaccine production options, and to disseminate lab results on a map-based publicly accessible database. Major flyways around the world will be monitored including those running north-south through the Americas.

I wish to recognize Chairman COCHRAN from Mississippi and Senator BYRD from West Virginia, along with my colleagues, Senator HARKIN from Iowa, Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania, and Senator BROWNBACK from Kansas, for their commitment to avian flu preparedness and for putting in place an effective system for the surveillance of wild birds. GAINS is instrumental in our ability to prepare communities in the wake of wild birds moving with the virus for a potential outbreak.

At the same time we work to develop a vaccine and procure antivirals, we can also track the movement of the virus in wild birds. GAINS can track wild birds in the same way the National Hurricane Center tracks hurricanes. By analyzing, storing, and reporting using a real-time computerized data mapping system and interface, we can see the viral strains wild birds were carrying, as the virus along migratory routes, and how the virus is genetically evolving. This will make it possible for us to develop
vaccines more quickly using the most recent strain available and will help us warn vulnerable populations in wild bird flightpaths should the avian flu strain turn deadly.

I am happy to report that the GAINS program Dr. Wolf and Senator Byrd of West Virginia, for and Senator BYRD of West Virginia, for
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astation caused by Katrina in Lou-
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heavily populated areas of South Flor-

ida where insured damages from Wilma

were estimated at $7.4 billion. Hurri-
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Chairman BOND and Ranking Member

MURRAY included a provision in the bill

that will help address the backlog of

emergency highway repairs. I thank

them for their efforts, as this provision

is vital to Florida’s Panhandle which

was pounded by Hurricane Ivan in

2004 and then by Dennis in 2005. It in-

cludes language lifting the mandatory cap of
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Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am

pleased that the Senate is approving
today the conference report on this

supplemental appropriations bill.
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House also approved the
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The conference agreement provides a total of $94,519 billion. Of this amount, over $70 billion is provided to carry out
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ghistan.
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This conference agreement is the re-

sult of hard work and true compromise

between the House and Senate, and I

am pleased the Senate is prepared to

approve it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask for the yeas and

nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The clerk will call the roll.
The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka  Akaka  Alexander  Allard  Allen  Bayh  Bennett  Biden  Bingaman  Bond  Boxer  Brownback  Bunning  Burns  Burr  Byrd  Cantwell  Carper  Chafee  Chambliss  Clinton  Coburn  Cochrane  Coleman  Collins  Conrad  Cornyn  Craig  Crapo  Dayton  DeMint  DeWine  Dodd  NAYS—1

Specter

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, today I voted in favor of the fiscal year 2006 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery conference report. I want to register my serious reservations about using an emergency supplemental bill to fund ongoing U.S. operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and despite the fact that the bill fails to change the direction of the dangerous policy in Iraq that this administration is pursuing. That policy is taking a tremendous toll on our Nation’s resources and our national security, and I will continue to look for every opportunity to force the Senate to debate and vote on changing that policy. I supported the conference report because it included necessary funding for our troops, along with vital assistance to those communities devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and to those suffering in war-torn countries and those countries in need of immediate funding for their newly formed democracies. I am particularly pleased to see that $63 million is being provided for establishing peace in Darfur and $63 million for supporting the nascent Libyan Government that was recently elected.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to. Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I thank all Senators for their patience and support during our deliberations on this conference report. I think the result reflects the sentiment that we have reached an agreement that is fair. It reflects respect for the administration’s budget request and remaining within that budget request. I appreciate the cooperation of all members of our Appropriations Committee and the full Senate as well. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Department of Defense authorization bill is the pending business before the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2766, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Pending: Senate amendment No. 4234, to authorize, with an offset, assistance for pro-democracy programs and activities inside and outside Iran, to make clear that the United States supports the ability of the people of Iran to exercise self-determination over their own form of government, and to make enhancements to the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act of 1996.

Nurse Corps of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) serving in a reserve component of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force;

(2) honorably discharged from the Armed Forces; or

(3) a retired member of the Armed Forces.

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. PILOT PROGRAM ON TROOPS TO NURSE TEACHERS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and potential benefits of a program to—

(A) assist nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in achieving necessary qualifications to become nurse educators and in securing employment as nurse educators at accredited schools of nursing; and

(B) provide scholarships to nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) to attend school for continuing service in the Selected Reserve or other forms of public service; and

(c) become nurse educators at accredited schools of nursing;

(b) not exceed $2 million for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

(2) DURATION.—Except as provided in subsection (h), the program shall be conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2012.

A nurse corps officer may not enter into an agreement to participate in the pilot program after December 31, 2012.

(3) PARTICIPANTS.—The pilot program shall be conducted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The pilot program required by subsection (a) shall be known as the “Troops to Nurse Teachers Pilot Program” (in this section referred to as the “Program”).

(c) NURSE CORPS OFFICERS.—A nurse corps officer described in paragraph (1) shall not be designated as an officer in a Nurse Corps of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) serving in a reserve component of the Armed Forces;

(2) honorably discharged from the Armed Forces; or

(3) a retired member of the Armed Forces.

(d) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAM.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An eligible nurse corps officer seeking to participate in the Program shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor under paragraph (1).

(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select participants in the Program from among qualified nurse corps officers submitting applications therefor under paragraph (1).

(3) PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A nurse corps officer selected under subsection (d) to participate in the Program shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense relating to participation in the Program.

(d) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAM.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An eligible nurse corps officer seeking to participate in the Program shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor under paragraph (1).

(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select participants in the Program from among qualified nurse corps officers submitting applications therefor under paragraph (1).

(3) PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A nurse corps officer selected under subsection (d) to participate in the Program shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense relating to participation in the Program.

(2) SELECTION.—The agreement of a nurse corps officer under this paragraph shall be approved by the President at the election of the Secretary for purposes of the Program and as appropriate with respect to that status of such nurse corps officer.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The agreement of a nurse corps officer under this paragraph shall—

(1) require such nurse corps officer within such time as the Secretary may require, to accept an offer of full-time employment as a
nurse educator from an accredited school of nursing for a period of not less than one year; or
(b) require such nurse corps officer—
(i) to serve in the Selected Reserve or some other force of public service under terms and conditions established by the Secretary; and
(ii) upon completion of such program and service at an agency, or at a facility or at a public service position as a nurse educator from an accredited school of nursing for a period of not less than three years.
(f) Assistance.—
(1) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may provide a participant in the Program who enters into an agreement described in subsection (e)(2)(A) assistance as follows:
(A) Career placement assistance in securing full-time employment as a nurse educator at an accredited school of nursing.
(B) A stipend in an amount not to exceed $5,000 for transition to employment referred to in subparagraph (A), and for educational training for such employment, for a period not to exceed two years after entry by such participant into an agreement under subsection (e).
(2) SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may provide a participant in the Program who enters into an agreement described in subsection (e)(2)(B) scholarship assistance to pursue a degree described in subsection (e)(2)(B)(i) in an amount not to exceed $30,000 annually for a period not to exceed four years.
(g) TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE.—A stipend or scholarship provided under subsection (f) shall not be taken into account in determining the eligibility of a participant in the Program for Federal student financial assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).
(h) ADMINISTRATION AFTER INITIAL PERIOD.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The termination of the Program by December 31, 2012, under subsection (a)(2) shall not terminate the entitlement to assistance under the Program of any nurse corps officer entering into an agreement described in the Program prior to December 31, 2012.
(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall undertake any administration of the Program that is required after December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program after that date.
(i) REPORT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after enactment of the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, submit to Congress a report on the Program.
(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall—
(A) describe the activities undertaken under the Program; and
(B) include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in—
(i) facilitating the development of nurse educators;
(ii) encouraging service in the Selected Reserve and other forms of public service; and
(iii) helping alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.
(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
(1) NURSE EDUCATOR.—The term "nurse educator" means a registered nurse who—
(A) is a member of the nursing faculty at an accredited school of nursing;
(B) holds a graduate degree in nursing from an accredited school of nursing or a doctoral degree in a related field from an accredited institution of higher education;
(C) holds a valid, unrestricted license to practice nursing from a State; and
(D) has successfully completed additional course work in education and demonstrates competency in an advanced practice area of nursing.
(k) FUNDING.—From amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense, $5,000,000 may be available for the Program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, he is not on the floor, but Senator WARNER and I have been discussing this amendment. I would like to at least leave open the option that he will join me in cosponsoring it. It is a bipartisan amendment which I would like to describe at this point, if I can, and ask the Senator from Oklahoma if I may have a few minutes to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. Before the Senator from Oklahoma proceeds, I would like to comment. The Senator has worked this amendment. There is a problem that is that the Senator is seeking to correct, and I believe the amendment does correct it. I join him as a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much. I am honored that the Senator from Oklahoma would join me as a cosponsor.

In speaking to this amendment, this morning’s Washington Post had a front-page story that started it all. It is a story about the status of emergency rooms in hospitals across America. The organization that represents the emergency rooms and their physicians across America has issued a troubling report which suggests that many of those emergency rooms are not really adequately staffed or prepared to deal with emergencies. Too often, the men and women who are brought there in terrible medical situations can’t find the help they need. As a result, they are left waiting at hospitals or they wait sometimes up to 2 days before they are admitted to a bed in the regular hospital. It is a serious problem.

You might ask: What does that have to do with the Department of Defense authorization bill? Part of the problem facing the emergency rooms is also facing hospitals and clinics across America, and the problem is this: We don’t have enough health care professionals; in particular, we don’t have enough nurses in America. We know this is a fact.

Just last week, an administrator of a major hospital in Chicago came to see me. She is a wonderful woman. She is a Catholic nun who runs a hospital in one of the toughest parts of Chicago—Inglewood—and she has kept that hospital open. I don’t know how she has done it. It has been nothing short of a miracle. The biggest single problem that she faces year in and year out is not coming up with money but finding nurses.

I said to her: What do you pay a nurse?

And she said: About $50,000 a year. But, she said, if I can’t hire that nurse for $50,000 a year, I have to buy what we call contract nurses. There are companies which, when hospitals don’t have enough nurses, will send a nurse in to work for a day, a week, or a month. But the contract nurses cost three times as much, $150,000 annualized salary.

She said to me: Senator, I don’t know if I can keep this hospital open if I can’t fill the positions.

This isn’t just a problem at that hospital. It is a problem across my State and across our Nation. I am from downstate Illinois, a part of our State dominated by smaller towns, rural areas, struggling to keep hospitals open. We know better than most that when one of our neighbors goes into labor, they may not have the time to make it to the big city where there is a big hospital. She is counting on that rural hospital being open. When she gets there, she is counting on finding a nurse and a doctor to help her.

In many places in rural Illinois and across our country, the same challenge that faces the administrator of that hospital in the Inglewood section of Chicago is facing them: inadequate supplies of professionals, health care professionals.

The ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have increased the need for qualified nurses in military medical facilities. Unfortunately, the military faces the same difficulty in recruiting and in the retention of nurses as the civilian medical facilities just described. Neither the Army nor the Air Force has met their nurse recruitment goals since the 1990s. In 2004, the Navy nurse core recruitment fell 32 percent below its target, while the Air Force missed its nurse recruitment target by 30 percent.

Have you seen this special on HBO called “Baghdad ER”? I have watched a little bit of it. As you watch it, you realize the heroic efforts that are being made by the men and women in the military who are providing emergency medical care to our soldiers who are shot in Iraq. It is incredible. It is heartbreaking to think about what they go through every day.

Now, put it in the context where the major sources of military nurses are telling us they can’t recruit enough nurses fast enough. Last year, the Army experienced a 30-percent shortage of certified registered nurse anesthetists, as one example.
I have talked about civilian hospitals. According to the American College of Health Care Executives, 72 percent of hospitals have been experiencing a nursing shortage since 2004, and it is growing. This chart that I will show you is a projection of the projected shortfalls and shortages in registered nurses. The dark blue indicates the supply of nurses, which continues to decline, and, of course, the lighter blue, the shortage, which continues to increase. We can see, our number of nurses is growing, and it is no surprise. We have an aging population that needs help: specialized medical care that requires specialized nurses. Time and again we find ourselves relying and counting on those nurses to be there, and we see from this chart as we project forward for the next 15 years that the problem is going to get much worse.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services looked at all licensed nurses in our nation. They found that in the year 2000, our country was 110,000 nurses short of the number needed to adequately provide quality health care—110,000 across our Nation. Five years later, that shortage had increased to 219,000 nurses needed and didn’t have in America. By the year 2020, we will be more than 1 million nurses short of what is necessary for quality health care.

Now the National Institutes of Health funded two medical research to find new cures and treatments for diseases, and God bless them for all the work they do. The best and brightest minds can get together in laboratories and find new pharmaceuticals and new medical devices that give us a new lease on life. But we know that when the moment comes, when we need this help, we need a nurse. And if we find ourselves in a few short years with a million fewer nurses than we actually need, we need to increase the supply of and availability of health care in America. It is not just a problem for the military, as I mentioned earlier, it is a nationwide problem.

To avoid the vast shortages the Department of Health and Human Services is projecting, we have to make a significant increase in the number of nurses graduating and entering the workforce each year. Just to replace the nurses who are retiring, we need to increase enrollment by 50 percent at nursing schools by 2020. This chart is an indication of where we are, starting in the year 2000. This shows the baseline supply of nurses across America, which you can see is declining. This next line, the green line, shows the demand which is going up dramatically for nurses in our society, and this purple line shows what happens if 90 percent—the supply if 90 percent moregrads take place. So even increasing graduate nurses by 90 percent over the next 15 years will still leave us short of our national goal.

Clearly, this is an emergency which has to be addressed. The baseline demand for nurses is rising; the supply is falling. If we increase the number of nurses graduating from nursing school by 90 percent by 2020, we are still not going to have enough.

I might add parenthetically, there is another issue which has to do with this issue. I have been involved in this as long as I have been in public service. Small hospitals, small towns come to you desperate because they have lost their doctor. They need a doctor, and I do my best to find a doctor. But if in 9 cases out of 10 there is no doctor you find comes from a foreign land. Many doctors have come to the United States from India, from Asia, from Africa, and we welcome them. We greet their families warmly as they have come to our country, and they are meeting our needs. And I thank them for making the decision to come and be a part of the solution to America’s health care problem. But I have come to learn that there are two sides to this equation. The other side of the equation is that our nurses and nurses and health care professionals are leaving a land, too.

Last year, and over the last several years, we have taken 20,000 health care professionals out of Africa; doctors and nurses; and they are essential in the frontline of defense when it comes to medical care. We have attracted them to the United States, to England, to Germany, and to France, and it is no surprise that they want to stay here. Many of them are here already. Many of them are already working for us in America. The United States alone, which you can see is declining in the medical professionals in some of the poorest nations on Earth, you are opening the possibility that the dread diseases in that part of the world will come across the border and hit us. That is part of this shrinking globe on which we live.

The problem, when you look at the United States, is that there are not enough teachers at schools of nursing. Department of Health and Human Services is projecting, we have to make a significant increase in the number of nurses across the nation. Sixty-six percent, or two out of three nursing schools across the United States, tell us that they have enough teachers. Last year, 1,900 qualified student applicants were rejected from Illinois nursing schools because they didn’t have enough teachers at the nursing schools. They have come to our country, and they are working for us, and they were denied admission to 35,000 qualified applicants simply because they didn’t have enough teachers at the nursing schools.

In my home State of Illinois, schools of nursing are denying qualified students admittance because they don’t have enough teachers. Last year, 1,900 qualified student applicants were rejected from Illinois nursing schools because they didn’t have enough teachers. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing surveyed school of nursing applicants because they didn’t have enough teachers and financial resources.

Illinois State University, another top university in our State, increased its enrollment by 50 percent in nursing over the past 5 years by working with health care systems and seeking grants, but last year, ISU was still forced to reject 100 qualified nursing applicants because they didn’t have enough faculty and fiscal resources.

Think about that: 35,000 more nurses that we could train and have serving us domestic and international. It is not just our problem, it is a global problem. This is not an issue of our military, this is an issue of the United States, tell us that they need additional faculty. We find that in some schools there are no vacancies and no additional faculty needed. That is 18 percent. And in 15 percent, almost 16 percent, there are no vacancies, but they could use additional faculty. They could expand. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing surveyed nursing schools in Illinois, and they have been forced to reject 100 qualified nursing applicants because they didn’t have enough teachers and financial resources.

So those who argue that the answer to our need in the United States will be increasing graduate nurses and doctors and professionals from around the world have to understand that this equation is not a zero sum. We end up bringing in these health care professionals at the expense of other countries and other people who face many more medical challenges than in the United States.

Some would say: Well, that is their problem. They ought to pay their doctors more or train more. But it is our problem, too. If an avian flu epidemic, if there were public health officials and doctors and nurses present, and if they don’t do it within 21 days, that epidemic can circle the world.

Diseases which used to die on immigrant ships coming across the ocean live quite well, unfortunately, on the airliners that crisscross this globe every single day. So if you take away the medical professionals in some of the poorest nations on Earth, you are opening the possibility that the dread diseases in that part of the world will come across the border and hit us. That is part of this shrinking globe on which we live.

The problem, when you look at the United States, is that there are not enough teachers at schools of nursing.
but could use more faculty. These statistics paint a bleak picture for the availability of nursing faculties now and into the future.

Take a look at this final chart I will show you which is showing that there is, again, a graying of the population that serves us. The median age of doctorally prepared nursing faculty members is 52. The average age of retirement for faculty at nursing institutions is 62. It is expected that 200 to 300 doctorally prepared faculty will be eligible for retirement each year from 2005 to 2012, reducing faculty, even though more than a million are needed. The military recruits nurses.

I want to thank all the men and women who are in nursing in the military and all in our medical professions. But they recruit from the same place that doctors and hospitals also recruit: civilian nursing schools.

Unfortunately, the lack of faculty, there is going to be a shortage of nurses everywhere. In 1994, the Department of Defense established a program which is a terrific idea. It is called Troops to Teachers. It serves the dual purpose of helping relieve the shortage of nurses, and educator teachers in high-poverty schools and assists military personnel in making transitions from the military to a second career in teaching. It is a terrific idea. As of January 2006, this—this program, 6,000 former soldiers have been hired as teachers through the Troops to Teachers Program, and an additional 6,700 are now qualified teachers looking for placements. We need teachers, and the men and women trained and educated in the military who want to serve bring a special quality to this mission.

The amendment which I have before the Senate will set up a pilot program—we call it Troops to Nurse Teachers Program to our nursing in the Reserves, retiring nurses, or those leaving the military, to pursue a career teaching the future nurse workforce. More than 300 nurses left the Army last year. Historically, about 300 nurses leave the Air Force each year. Between 30 and 40 percent of the nurses in the Navy leave after they fulfill their initial obligation.

The Troops to Nurse Teachers Pilot Program will provide transitional assistance to servicemembers who already hold a master’s or Ph.D. in nursing or related field and are qualified to teach. Eligible servicemembers can receive career placement assistance, transitional stipends, and educational training from accredited schools of nursing to expedite their transition. Troops to Nurse Teachers will also establish a pilot scholarship program that will provide financial assistance to officers of the armed services who have been involved in nursing during their military service or have obtained the education necessary to become nursing educators. Tuition stipends and financing for educational expenses would be provided. Recipients of scholarships must commit to teaching at an accredited school of nursing for at least 3 years in exchange for the educational support they receive. The Secretary of Defense may also require them to serve in select reserve areas or perform other public service in exchange for this program.

The supporters of this amendment include the American Nurses Association, the National Association of Directors of Nursing, the American Organization of Nurse Executives, the American Health Care Association, and the National League for Nursing.

I want to conclude. We must increase the number of teachers preparing tomorrow’s nursing workforce. With the aging of the baby boom generation, long-term needs of growing numbers of wounded veterans and military and civilian health care systems will need qualified nurses more than ever in the years to come. Let’s take quality men and women serving in the armed services, who gave so much to this country, and tell them they have the option of transitioning to the armed services there is an option where they can continue to serve America as professors and teachers in our nursing schools. This will increase the capacity of these nursing schools, provide more qualified nurses, of which is what we need, and lessen the demand for nurses to come from overseas where they are also desperately needed. I think this is a winning opportunity all across the board, and I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, let me acknowledge to my friend from Illinois he is attempting to, and I believe will successfully, resolve a problem. I happen to be more sensitive to this than he is. Two of my kids are doctors, and they assure me that this nurse shortage is nationwide. It is all out there.

One of the concerns I had when this came up was I would not want this to detract from any of the other programs. Right now I have been one to say our military budget, our Defense authorization bill, is really not quite adequate as it is. It is my understanding the Senator has been very cooperative to make sure this doesn’t happen.

I have added my name as a cosponsor, and it is my understanding Senator WARNER is going to be here shortly and wants to add his name. So the amendment would give the discretion to the DOD, working with the Department of Education, to structure a program that would achieve the dual goals of creating more nurse educators and more Reserve officers. I think we have the support of the committee on both sides, and I commend the Senator for bringing up this solution.
Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment. The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006, while maintaining in Iraq only the minimal force necessary for direct participation in targeted counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.)

(a) REDEPLOYMENT.—The United States shall redeploy United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006, while maintaining in Iraq only the minimal force necessary for direct participation in targeted counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.

(b) REPORT ON REDEPLOYMENT.—(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to Congress a report that sets forth the strategy for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.

(2) STRATEGY ELEMENTS.—The strategy required in the report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A flexible schedule for redeploying United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.

(B) The number, size, and character of United States military units needed in Iraq after December 31, 2006, for purposes of countering global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

(C) A strategy for addressing the regional implications for diplomacy, politics, and development of redeploying United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.

(D) A strategy for ensuring the safety and security of United States forces in Iraq during and after the December 31, 2006, redeployment, and a contingency plan for addressing dramatic changes in security conditions that may require a limited number of United States forces to remain in Iraq after that date.

(E) A strategy for redeploying United States forces to effectively engage and defeat global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to withdraw that amendment. I intend to call for another amendment which has to do with the special inspector general for Iraq. Will the Chair tell me what the number of that amendment is? I have to clarify the number of this amendment. In light of that, I yield the floor so Senator Schumer can speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I read, as many did, in the newspapers this morning that the Prime Minister of Iraq has proposed giving amnesty to those incarcerated by the Iraqi Government who have killed or maimed Americans.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
and saw that he was a good man. We are urging that President Bush call up the Prime Minister of Iraq immediately and get him to retract this pernicious, nasty statement which basically abdicates the great sacrifices that have been made by American soldiers for the sake of the Iraqi people.

It is just mind-boggling to believe that the Iraqi Prime Minister would decide that it would be OK to give amnesty to those who hurt Americans. What kind of ally is this? Will he turn on us in 2 months or 6 months? He seems to be the new hope of the new government, and within 24 hours after President Bush leaves Iraqi soil, he defames the sacrifices of American soldiers and their families.

President Bush, you should call your friend the Prime Minister and get him to retract this evil statement immediately. How can we ask America’s young men and women to risk their lives in Iraq if those who seek to shoot at them are then absolved of any blame?

This is a statement which should really go down in infamy, and I hope and plead with the President to urge the Iraqi Prime Minister to withdraw the statement and figure out what consequences should follow if the Prime Minister refuses.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4192, WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For clarification, the amendment No. 4192 offered by the Senator from Wisconsin was withdrawn.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4256

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) for himself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 4256.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction)

SEC. 1054. STRENGTHENING THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of discharging the duties of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction under subsection (f) of section 3001 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (5 U.S.C. 407 note) and determining the date of termination of the Office of the Special Inspector General under subsection (d) of such section, any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their patience. I had identified the wrong amendment. I got that clarified.

What I wish to tell my colleagues is that this amendment strengthens the Special Inspector General for Iraq and ensures that U.S. taxpayer dollars will be spent wisely, efficiently, and within the law.

The Special Inspector General for Iraq, known as “SIGIR,” was established in 2003. I worked hard with a few of my colleagues in creating this office to monitor, audit, and report on the expenditure of billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars that this body appropriated to the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

My amendment is relatively simple. It recognizes the fact that we need to continue to ensure oversight and monitoring of U.S. taxpayer dollars that continue to support reconstruction efforts in Iraq, which includes over $1.6 billion in the latest supplemental for Iraq reconstruction and in the fiscal year 2006 foreign operations bill. It increases the mandate of the Special Inspector General for Iraq, while also extending the period for which that office will be in existence.

This amendment will strengthen the capabilities of the Special IG to monitor, audit, and inspect funds made available for Iraq in both the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund—IRRF—and in other important accounts.

I offer this amendment today because it is my firm belief that we should not be pouring tens of billions of dollars into Iraq reconstruction without ensuring there is appropriate oversight and auditing. American taxpayers deserve to know where their money is going in this costly war and that it is being used effectively and efficiently and ending up in the right place.

The SIGIR’s work to date has been extremely valuable to the U.S. Government and to Congress. The SIGIR has now completed over 55 audit reports, issued over 165 recommendations for program improvement, and has seized $13 million in assets. Overall, the SIGIR estimates that its operations have resulted in saving the U.S. Government over $24 million, in addition to the considerable wasteful or fraudulent spending that office has uncovered.

Throughout 2005, the Iraq IG provided aggressive oversight to prevent waste, fraud and abuse in the at-times lethal operating environment in Iraq. Its emphasis on real-time auditing—where guidance is provided immediately to management authorities upon the discovery of a need for change—provides for independent assessments while effecting rapid improvements.

In its January report to Congress, the SIGIR concluded that massive unforesen security costs, administrative overhead, and waste have crippled reconstruction strategies and have prevented the completion of up to half of the work originally called for in critical sectors such as water, power, and electricity. The Iraq IG’s work has resulted in the arrest of five individuals who were defrauding the U.S. Government, and it has shed light on millions of dollars of waste. This is a kind of investigation and reporting that helps shape the direction of reconstruction funding and ensures that the SIGIR has the capability and the life-span to finish up work associated with monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on how U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent in Iraq for reconstruction purposes.

Let me talk briefly about what my amendment actually does. Because current legislation requires that the SIGIR continue its work until 80 percent of the IRRF had been expended, and unless we do something to change it, the SIGIR will cease to exist before U.S. taxpayer dollars going to Iraq reconstruction efforts have been expended. This means that despite the fact that we continue to support Iraq reconstruction efforts, we are removing our ability to oversee billions of taxpayer dollars.

To help avoid this potentially costly and unnecessary challenge, this amendment considers any money going to Iraq reconstruction efforts—regardless of whether or not it is in the IRRF—be subject to the SIGIR’s oversight mandate. It will also help determine when we can ask the SIGIR to stand down.

This amendment is common sense. The SIGIR’s great work has more than paid for itself, and it has developed a capacity that is unparalleled by either DoD or State’s inspector general offices. The SIGIR is doing great work, and I, along with my distinguished colleagues and others, believe that this small change in the law will allow us to tell our constituents that we are making every effort to ensure that their hard-earned taxpayer dollars are being used in the most effective and efficient way possible. Let’s support the SIGIR, and let’s give it the time and mandate to monitor Iraq reconstruction funds.
I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, while that is the Senator from Wisconsin. It was at his instigation and his initiative that we extended this Special Inspector General’s Office last year, and it was that initiative which has paid off so handsomely for us. This initiative is critically important or disastrous. Unfortunately, it is not have the same watchdog looking over the most recent appropriations we adopted.

I again believe the Special Inspector General actually testified before the Chair’s subcommittee earlier this year, so the Presiding Officer has had the ability to hear firsthand from the Special Inspector General about his operations.

By the way, I commend our Presiding Officer for those hearings. They were very helpful.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are prepared to go ahead with a voice vote at this time, if it is agreeable. I add my endorsement of the basic thrust of the amendment. As soon as I can work that out, I will urge my colleagues to support the Feingold amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague.

We are trying to work this out. There is a problem. The problem is not to the generic virtues of Senator FEINGOLD’s amendment—which, incidentally, I very much support—Mr. LEVIN, Mr. President, while that is being worked on—I hope we can resolve that because this is a very important amendment. We want that Special Inspector General, who is really doing the only significant oversight on the expenditure of these billions of dollars in Iraq, to perform the same oversight functions on the appropriations, for instance, which we just adopted.

I again commend the Senator from Wisconsin. It was a little bit in limbo. I very much support the Senator’s amendment. I hope it can be cleared. If so, apparently the Senator is willing to take a voice vote.

Mr. FEINGOLD. That is correct. Mr. President if I could proceed with my remarks in support of the amendment while they discuss it.

I support the Feingold amendment to ensure that the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction has jurisdiction over funds appropriated for the reconstruction of Iraq.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned, Congress established the Special Inspector General position in a fiscal year 2004 emergency supplemental appropriations bill to ensure oversight and audit of relief and reconstruction efforts in Iraq. The Special Inspector General reports jointly to the Secretaries of Defense and State and has responsibility for oversight of operations and programs funded by the Iraq Reconstruction Fund. The Senate from Wisconsin last year offered an amendment to extend the position. It was very welcome. It was a very useful and important contribution. I commend him for it. It is unfortunate that the most recent emergency supplemental which we just passed today would appropriate funds for Iraq reconstruction without including those funds in the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. It is important that this amendment be agreed to so as to ensure that this Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction has jurisdiction over all funds appropriated for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Under current law, this funding approach would have the effect of excluding reconstruction projects using these new funds from the jurisdiction of the Special Inspector General.

The State Department says that its Inspector General would be responsible for auditing the use of these funds. However, the State Department IG, unlike the Special Inspector General, does not have a significant presence in Iraq and does not have experience in auditing contracts and ferreting out fraud in the unique environment of Iraq.

For the last 3 years, the Special Inspector General has been the only source of consistent, independent, on-the-ground monitoring activities in Iraq. As a result, the Special Inspector General has reported case after case of criminal fraud and egregious waste that would otherwise have gone unremedied. Report after report has documented substandard hospitals, Karbala Library, Babylon Policy Academy, Karbala, Baghdad International Airport and elsewhere—in which we paid contractors millions of dollars for work without making site visits, issuing performance reports, preparing post-award assessments, or taking other steps to ensure that the work we paid for was actually performed. In case after case, the Special Inspector General determined that either the contractor’s performance was deficient or the work was not performed at all.

One particularly egregious case reviewed by the Special Inspector involved a $75 million contract with Kellogg Brown and Root, KBR, to develop a Pipeline at Al Fatah, Iraq. The Special Inspector General reported that the project failed because subsurface geologic conditions made it impossible to carry out the project design. These conditions were identified by a contractor work commenced, but neither the Army Corps of Engineers nor KBR acted on the consultant’s recommendation to perform additional research that would have prevented the failure.

A subject matter expert for the Coalition Provision Authority recognized that KBR had limited experience in this type of project and advised that the project would probably fail because design restrictions provided no flexibility to accommodate site conditions. However, KBR refused to conduct design reviews requested by the subject matter expert.

The Army Corps of Engineers awarded KBR a firm fixed-price contract with no performance requirements. As a result, KBR was assured that it would get paid the full contract amount, regardless whether it successfully completed the project.

A KBR subcontractor identified problems with the site conditions at the outset of the project and suggested alternative drilling sites, but was turned down by KBR. KBR prohibited the subcontractor from talking directly to the Army Corps of Engineers and told the Army Corps that detailed cost reports were not required, because they were not required by the contract.

As a result, we spent the entire $75 million allocated to the project, but achieved only 28 percent of the planned pipeline throughput. According to the Inspector General, the lack of pipeline capacity resulted in the loss of more than $1.5 billion in potential oil revenues to the Iraqi government.

The Special Inspector General is the only U.S. audit and investigative authority with a significant on-the-ground presence in Iraq. He is the only inspector general who has an experienced staff with hands-on knowledge of how things work in Iraq. He is the only inspector general who has shown the capacity and desire to turn over rocks in Iraq to identify and address problems of fraud and criminal conduct.

We are serious about protecting the taxpayer and preventing contractor abuses in Iraq, we will adopt this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the Feingold amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank both the ranking member and chairman for their comments and support.
My understanding is the chairman wants to take this by voice vote. Therefore, I ask the yeas and nays be vitiatted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4256) was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WARNER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the leadership and the managers have reached a recommended unanimous consent request which I now propose.

I ask unanimous consent at 12 noon today the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to Santorum amendment No. 4256, to be followed by a vote in relation to a first-degree amendment to be offered by Senator BIDEN related to the same subject. I further ask unanimous consent that the time until 12 be equally divided between myself, representing Senator SANTORUM and others, and Senator LEVIN, with no second degrees in order to either amendment prior to the votes; provided there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it my understanding that following the disposition of these two amendments that then a Democratic amendment would be the next in order?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am not able to answer that question. I believe that would be correct. I would be perfectly willing to have it that way because I know we did Senator Durbin’s this morning.

Mr. DURBIN. With that understanding—and there will be a Senator NELSON of Florida amendment, so you are on notice relative to that—I have no objection.

Mr. WARNER. Fine.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I first want to apologize to the chairman and ranking member that I came to the floor this morning thinking they were in the process of doing this because I certainly would have spoken to them in advance before making this request.

But I hope they will agree to this request.

We have just been informed at the Department of Defense that we have now lost our 2,500th soldier in Iraq. Last October, when we lost our 2,000th, the Senate voted unanimously in respect for all of the soldiers and those serving in uniform and their families. I would like to ask if the chairman would consider amending his request so that between the two rollcalls, when Members are on the floor, that the same people chair the votes and we would observe a moment of silence in respect for our troops and for this notification that we have reached this sad milestone.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I so amend the unanimous consent request that there be a time not to exceed whatever is appropriate for this proper recognition by the Senate of the loss of life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for this suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think we are ready for the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WARNER. Let it be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today for two purposes: one is to speak against the Santorum amendment relating to Iran—the Iran sanctions—and, two, to offer an amendment relating to the negotiations that are now underway by the President of the United States.

Let’s cut right to it, if I may. Are we going to stand aside while the President of the United States of America is trying to stop the development of a nuclear bomb in Iran? The President of the United States has made a judgment—I would argue, finally, but he has made a judgment—that the best way to keep the worst thing from happening is to cooperate with our friends to put pressure on the bad guy.

What do I mean by that? The President of the United States, I assume at the urging of the Secretary of State—although it is not relevant, actually—the President of the United States took a more aggressive course about a month ago in attempting to stop the Iranian development of a nuclear weapon, a weapon that, if developed in conjunction with a missile, could change, in a material way, the dynamics in the Middle East and particularly relating to our interests, notwithstanding the fact that it might not be able to strike the United States—a development that if it occurred would almost assuredly put great pressure on the Sunni Arabs in the region, who have a lot of money to join, possibly Egypt or another country to develop a Sunni bomb. This is not a good thing.

So the President, in conjunction with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, our three largest European allies, along with China, and Russia, has agreed to and has been sitting down and making a specific proposal, which the President of the United States has pledged the United States to, in order to both entice as well as dissuade the Iranians from pursuing their course. There are two pieces to it. One, it says to the Iranians: If you cooperate and verifiably cease and desist, we, the United States, the three European countries, China, and Russia, will move forward with the following incentives to move you closer to the family of nations as a responsible nation. And there are a set of very specific incentives that the President of the United States of America has signed on to—quite an “offer”—if you will, to the Iranian Government.

It also says, as was reported in the New York Times and the Washington Post today, that the Chinese, as well as the Iranians and Russians, have communicated a second piece of information to the Iranians: If you do not cease and desist, these bad things are going to happen to you, and we are all jointly—jointly—going to impose them on you.

I think that was a stroke of significant diplomacy on the part of the President, which basically, as I understand it, the Europeans, Russians, and Chinese said: Will you join us in some of the carrots? And as I understand it, said: Yes, if you join me in the strikes. It is carrots and sticks.

I know of no way to avoid one of two alternatives: one is the resignation to the acceptance of an Iranian weapon, and relying upon deterrence; or, two, the use of military force against Iran to prevent the development of that weapon.

My friend from Pennsylvania, as well as all of us on this floor, have received, I think, the same kind of briefings—there have on just how limited those alternatives are at this point militarily.

So I think the President has chosen a very reasonable course here. But even if you disagree with it, one of the things that—and I have been here during seven Presidents, and I have been very critical of this President’s foreign policy—but the idea, in the midst of a negotiation, at the point at which the world is expecting and waiting and wondering what Iran’s response will be, that the President of the United States of America has set in his record as the President’s hands in this negotiation—I find that amazing, absolutely amazing.
I spoke this morning with the Secretary of State who authorized me to say, unequivocally, the administration opposes this amendment. It limits their flexibility in doing what we all want: preventing the construction of a nuclear weapon in Iran. How much clearer could this situation be figured out by my Grandfather Finnegan from my home State of Pennsylvania used to say: Who died and left you boss? Since when do we negotiate for a President? We are in the midst of a negotiation. The President and I have gone far beyond what we, all siding with us, are about to mess up? Folks, I think this is such a tragic mistake—well-intended but tragic. The underlying amendment, Mr. SANTORUM’s amendment, in my view, and in the view of the Secretary of State, actually advocates a policy that would jeopardize President Bush’s initiative and, I believe, play directly into the hands of Iranian hard-liners. I tried to go beyond the language, and it also has the potential to damage relations with some of the key countries whose cooperation we need to pressure Iran to abandon its nuclear ambitions. If this approach were adopted, we would be in the untenable position of having to impose sanctions on Iran if they fail to accept the offer put forward by Russia, China, and the United States. It does not, with all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania, have the flexibility we need to pressure Iran, but this is a different amendment and it is a fundamentally different time.

I remember going down to see the President when he was making his first trip to Europe. He asked whether I would come down and speak with him and his staff and I did. It was very gracious of him to ask my opinion, which was very nice of him. He said he was going to speak personally—I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I have an amendment. If, in fact, they fail— as they have an overwhelming prospect that could happen—then come back to the Senate and the Congress to put on these restrictions. Mr. President, may I ask how much time the Senator from Delaware has remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 50 seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. I say to my friend from Pennsylvania—I have not had a chance to say to Senator Santorum personally—I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I have an amendment.

Mr. President, have I sent my amendment to the desk? Is the amendment at the desk? The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is at the desk but not called up.

AMENDMENT NO. 4257

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4257:

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1231. UNITED STATES’ POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR PROGRAMS OF IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The pursuit by the Iranian regime of a capability to produce nuclear weapons represents a threat to the United States, the Middle East region, and international peace and security.

(2) On May 31, 2006, Secretary of State Rice announced that the United States would join negotiations with Iran, along with the United Kingdom, Germany, and France, to suspend its enrichment and reprocessing activities.

(3) On June 1, 2006, President George W. Bush stated that “Secretary Rice, at my instructions, said to the world that we want to solve the problem of the Iranian nuclear issue diplomatically. And we made it very clear publicly that we’re willing to come to the table, so long as the Iranians verifiably suspend their program. In other words, we said to the Iranians (that the United States of America would, come to the table and work with our partners to solve the problem).”

(4) On June 1, 2006, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the People’s Republic of China, and the Russian Federation agreed upon a package of incentives and disincentives, which was subsequently presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union, Javier Solana.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) endorses the policy of the United States announced May 31, 2006, to achieve a successful diplomatic outcome, in coordination with leading members of the international community, with respect to the underlying amendment, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4257.

(2) calls on Iran to suspend fully and verifiably its enrichment and reprocessing activities, cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enter into negotiations, including with the United States, pursuant to the package presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union; and

(3) urges the President and the Secretary of State to keep Congress fully and currently informed about the progress of this vital diplomatic initiative.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, what my amendment does is speak to and support the President’s present negotiations. It gives full support to the President of the United States, because if there was ever a time the President should have the world know the Nation stands behind him, it is now. It is now in the negotiation and we must have time to read the amendment, but I promise you, it is a rendition of the administration’s position on negotiations and compliments him for it and says we support him. Although Senator HAGEL is in a hearing on his way, there will probably not be much time for him to speak. But he is a cosponsor, along with Senators LEVIN and DODD. I am sure there are others, and I ask unanimous consent that they be able to be added later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I also want to point out that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, if I am not mistaken, yesterday raised significant concerns with the Santorum amendment as well. As I look at the RECORD, they all are pertinent and accurate.

I will conclude by saying, this is no time to be meddling in the midst of a negotiation on one of the most important issues facing the United States, when the President has newly initiated a specific proposal. I urge my friend from Pennsylvania to withhold his amendment until we see what turns out there. If he thinks it is necessary after the negotiations succeed or fail, then come back.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for allowing me to probably run over a minute or so.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4238

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield such time as our wishes. I ask unanimous consent that each man have at least 3 minutes to address this at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. With respect to the Biden amendment, I was handed a copy of it five minutes ago. But now that I read it, it is a sense of the Senate. I don’t see any reason not to support the Biden amendment. I have no problem with the language. It basically says that we hope for a resolution to the diplomatic efforts under way, a positive resolution with respect to Iran not pursuing nuclear weapons. That is no problem for me. But it doesn’t do anything else than say we wish you well.

The amendment I have offered is an amendment that is in substance the bill that passed the House of Representatives in April with over 300 votes. At the time it passed, prior to the negotiations that were commenced at the end of May by the administration, Senator Lugar, Senator from Delaware, suggested when it passed in April, the administration opposed it. I suspect, although I will let the Senator from Delaware speak for himself, I know he is not a cosponsor of my bill that is in the Foreign Relations Committee, and, to my knowledge, Senator Lugar has not supported this legislation. The State Department has not supported my legislation. It is not surprising to me that they don’t support this amendment. They don’t generally support amendments to do what sanctions and forcing them to do things they don’t want to do.

We are a coequal branch of Government, and it is vitally important for us at a critical time—and I agree with the Senator from Delaware on this, this is a critical time. I disagree with him on several things. One of the things on which I disagree with him, I think these negotiations are more important than North Korea. I think the threat of Iran’s hardliners, that fascism is more significant than the threat posed by North Korea.

I believe this is a vitally important negotiation. I think it is vitally important during the course of these negotiations to speak to them and to speak in support not only in words but in deeds of what the President is trying to accomplish. The deeds here are very clear. It is twofold. The Senator from Delaware suggested there are not very many good options on the table.

The two options on the table, other than military force, are in this amendment. Those two options are to support pro-democracy efforts within Iran, to try to see if we can get a peaceful transformation of the government. The second is to try to dissuade the Iranians from moving forward and más 24 de línea
Let me remind colleagues that we already are at war in two nations. We have 130,000 American troops engaged now in a war in Iraq. The Middle East is in turmoil. We have 20,000 troops in Afghanistan. NATO is in Afghanistan. Many of our allies say with us in Iraq.

We should be careful in how we are dealing with this issue. It is a serious issue. It is dangerous. But it is complicated. Iran is not a monolithic government that we can ascribe motives to, agreements to. One fact of course of action is exactly where the President is going. And that is, engaging Iran, engaging with our allies, strengthening our alliances. If we are not careful, we will find America isolated in the world at a very dangerous time. That is what the Santorum amendment is about.

This is not helping our President. Our President is opposed to it. He is taking a different direction.

Let’s be careful. This is not just some amendment. This is the force of the U.S. Senate that could be put into a law in fact limiting the President’s options. Is that what we want to do and is that how we describe supporting the President, limiting the President’s options? That is what the Santorum amendment is about.

Before our colleagues vote, they better understand what is going to be required. Again, I thank my distinguished colleagues from Virginia for the time. I hope our colleagues, before they vote, will understand the consequences of a dangerous amendment like this. I shall oppose it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in fairness, I think he should wrap this debate up. How many minutes does he desire?

Mr. SANTORUM. I understand I have 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator has 4 minutes, and the managers have 3 minutes left.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let us establish the hour of 12:15 for the vote, with 5 minutes at the conclusion for the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and 5 minutes under the control of the Senator from Virginia and 5 minutes under the control of Senator LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my distinguished colleagues here that in this unique time in our history, I have studied this matter very carefully. I spoke out on it yesterday expressing my concerns. I do believe the actions proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania are not irresponsible. They are a clear matter of conscience and what he thinks is in our best interest.

My concern, which I think is the Senator’s concern, is that the timing is unwise. I support the Senator from Nebraska in that observation, as do I the Senator from Delaware, because we have a negotiation of great sensitivity underway at the direction of the President, who, under the Constitution of the United States, has the primary responsibility in the matter of conducting foreign affairs. His chief designee, the Secretary of State, has spoken through Senator BIDEN.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me, to which I will refer momentarily, from the Department of State.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is our understanding that the Iran Freedom Support Act (S. 333) will soon be offered as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2007 (S. 2766). The Administration has serious concerns about S. 333, and therefore opposes its inclusion in S. 2766.

As Secretary Rice recently announced, Iran is being warned: either it can continue to pursue nuclear weapons and face isolation and progressively stronger sanctions, or verifiably abandon uranium enrichment and reprocessing activities and receive civil nuclear energy and economic cooperation from the international community. We are in agreement with our European partners on these elements of the benefits if Iran makes the right choice, and the costs if it does not. More broadly, we have found support from Russia and China for this approach.

The amendment runs counter to our efforts and those of the international community to present Iran with a clear choice regarding their nuclear ambitions. This amendment, if enacted, would shift unified international attention away from Iran’s nuclear activities and create a rift between the U.S. and our closest international partners. Moreover, it would limit our diplomatic flexibility.

The amendment also runs counter to our efforts of significant differences between this amendment and an amendment I cosponsored. It changes the threshold which makes it more difficult for the President to impose sanctions. So there are a number of significant differences between this amendment and an amendment I cosponsored.

The other difference is that, of course, there has been significant change which occurred since that time. Senator WARNER has outlined that point. That change is now the decision of the administration—which I support—to engage or participate in direct talks with Iran under specified circumstances. I think that is a policy which should be given a chance to work, and if the policy doesn’t succeed and Iran does not work out a negotiation and agreement with all the countries with which there are discussions going on, at that point, it seems to me there is a greater chance we will get other Acts of Congress in many ways. It is Russia, to support sanctions if, in fact, the negotiations and discussions with Iran do not succeed.

So those discussions the President has decided to engage upon are actually a prelude to a much stronger chance to succeed with sanctions down the road because countries that might support us on sanctions, and whose
support would be extremely helpful, would then realize we had gone through the negotiation and discussion route with Iran. I believe that policy is wise. It will strengthen our position in getting sanctions, should that be necessary, with the best chance of having the solution here, which will avoid greater and greater conflict down the road. While it is with some reluctance that I cannot support a sanction amendment relating to Iran, nonetheless this is broader than the one that previously I cosponsored, and mainly because of the ongoing negotiations which will strengthen our position if they do not lead to a good resolution, I cannot support the Santorum amendment. I will support the Biden amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will address the comments made by my colleagues. I appreciate their thoughtful comments.

First, this is not just a sanctions amendment. This is a sanctions amendment which imposes additional sanctions, but it also has a large pro-democracy component to support pro-democracy efforts and public diplomacy within Iran.

Second, with respect to the sanctions, I agree with some of the criticisms leveled by Senator LEVIN that it adds things which were not in the previous versions. One thing it adds is a nuclear components provision, which says if you are going to be a company that is doing business with Iran in the development of their nuclear weapons capability, you cannot do business with us in America. If that is objectionable to folks, I find it somewhat remarkable that we would want companies doing business in Iran doing business here. But that is a new sanction; he is correct.

What he is not correct about is that we are not difficult to waive these sanctions. In fact, we have made it easier to waive sanctions. We have given the President more time to waive sanctions. In fact, the big difference between the House bill and ours is we have an additional 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, the PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will try to be quick. I listened with some interest to the Senator from Pennsylvania and his presentation. I also looked at the amendment he has produced. In that amendment, we are going to administer sanctions against companies doing business with Iran.

Now, the surprise here is that three times before, when I had an amendment, the Senator from Pennsylvania voted against it, would not include it, didn’t want to discriminate against firms that do business with Iran and that provide revenues that kill our kids in Iraq. And now we have a flimsy amendment. If the President does not act, by not stepping forward, we like what the President is doing and support it, therefore, will not apply to the company that owns it—in this case it happens to be a Halliburton—that has a sham corporation operating in Dubai based originally in the Cayman Islands. That should not be allowed, that the grasp of the U.S. Government cannot reach these perpetrators of the kind of indelicacy that places our soldiers at risk because they are doing business with an avowed enemy of the United States that is providing funds that are lethal to our troops over there.

I hope everybody will take a good close look at this amendment and vote ‘no.’

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this goes under the old rubric of no good deed goes unpunished. We have attempted in this amendment to meet the Senate from New Jersey halfway. The Senate’s amendment has consistently been voted on. I have opposed it and so has most of the Senate, which suggests that those who are currently doing business and have invested should be penalized for their investment. What we say is that on any future investment, you will be penalized. We make the Lautenberg language prospective.

In attempting to meet the Senator from New Jersey halfway, we find out...
that this is not sufficient and, therefore, we should oppose this amendment. I would think half a loaf is better than no loaf. This, by the way, was not in the Iran Freedom and Support Act. This is one of the provisions Senator Levin mentioned that way added, frankly, out of respect for the concerns the Senator from New Jersey raised and has raised on the floor repeatedly.

This is an attempt to make a good-faith attempt—and I do mean that—a good-faith attempt to meet the Senator from New Jersey halfway and to take his policy and put it in place in a prospective manner. If that is not sufficient for the Senator from New Jersey, that is fine. He is welcome to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, is the Senator aware that the exemption in his amendment would make it almost impossible to hold a U.S. company liable for doing business with Iran through a foreign subsidiary?

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding is that we crafted this language pursuant to the language the Senator from New Jersey used in the past and put a threshold we thought was—I think it was a $20 million threshold we put in place which we thought was a reasonable threshold of investment to reach the level of sanctions.

If the Senator from New Jersey would like to toughen that language or change the threshold, I would be happy to sit down and talk with him about it. I am open to discussion.

My only point, and I think the point we have had in this discussion in the past, is do I believe it is proper to penalize companies that have investments there, in many cases long-standing investments. What we want to do is discourage future investment. That is what we attempt to do in this amendment. If the Senator does not believe it has been effectively written, I will be happy to sit down with him, in all sincerity, and work to make it effective that future investments are discouraged.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have another question, if I may, and that is, would the Senator be willing to move the vote back, if we can do it, so we can discuss the language?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, we are under a unanimous consent agreement. The time, I believe, has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. There is 6 seconds remaining.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield back the 6 seconds so we can get to the vote? I regret we have to move forward.

Mr. SANTORUM. The Senator has heard his answer.

Mr. WARNER. There are Senators who have to go to the Pentagon for a memorial service. The yeses and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, there are a number of differences between S. 333 and the Santorum amendment. These differences include a number of new provisions in the amendment that are not in the S. 333. Some of them are:

- Remove the requirement that a parent or a subsidiary of a person against whom sanctions have been issued must have actual knowledge of the activities before sanctions can be issued against them.
- Remove the requirement that an affiliate of the Company against which sanctions have been issued must have actual knowledge of the activities before sanctions can be issued against them.
- Remove Libya from the scope and title of the Iran Libya Sanctions Act.
- Would impose an additional condition on the exercise of the President’s waiver authority by imposing an additional element in the report that must be submitted to Congress prior to the waiver going into effect. Current law requires, among other elements, an assessment of the significance of the assistance provided to the development of Iran’s petroleum production. The new requirement would also require an assessment of the significance of the assistance to the development of Iran’s weapons of mass destruction or other military capabilities.

Reduces operations and maintenance funding for the Army for Iraq and Afghanistan by $100 million.

In other instances, there are modifications to provisions in the amendment that are included in S. 333. For instance, both S. 333 and the Santorum amendment would expand the universe of persons against whom sanctions could be imposed to include a private or government lender, insurer, underwriter, reinsurer, or guarantor of a person sanctioned. S. 333 would require that these persons would have to have actual knowledge of the activities of the person sanctioned; the Santorum amendment does not include the requirement of actual knowledge.

Both S. 333 and the Santorum amendment would expand the definition of a person to include a financial institution, insurer, underwriter, reinsurer, or guarantor. The Santorum amendment would also include any other business organization, including any foreign subsidiaries of the foreign person.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4234. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yes 46, nays 53, as follows:
Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Florida is here. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 425

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, without objection, is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is laid aside.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment as follows:

The amendment (No. 425) was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 4265.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE GRANTING OF AMNESTY TO PERSONS KNOWN TO HAVE KILLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings: (1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS. (1) The Government of Iraq should immediately notify the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States and that the President should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

It is fairly straightforward. I could go on and on with comments. I am awaiting the arrival of Senator MENENDEZ because I want him to make some comments as well.

If you do what a number of us in this body have done in visiting either with the families of those who have borne the brunt of the fighting and have given the ultimate sacrifice or if you have visited with those who return wounded and maimed, then there is no question there should be no obfuscation as to the policy of granting amnesty to those who have killed Americans.

I remember going back to the time that I served as a captain in the Army, which was years and years ago. One of the most dread duties I had was to be the officer who was given the task of notifying the loved ones in the family of a service person who was killed. That, of course, is an exceptionally emotional event. And although it was decades ago, those experiences are seared in my memory because of the
trauma and the emotion when you meet with the grieving family of a loved one.

By the same token, there are over 18,000 of our service people who have been wounded. And many of them, because the body armor is working and saving the vital organs, their lives are being saved, but they have been maimed. The extremities are often the part of the body that is the casualty since the body armor is saving the vital organs. As a result, what we see is a lot of soldiers and sailors and Marines who come back, and they are just as optimistic as they can be in their outlook and yet think of the life that they will live with the maiming that has occurred. Their life was spared, but their life is going to be clearly different for the future.

Anyone who would dare suggest that in the formulation of a new government of Iraq, which we, the United States Government, clearly support, anyone who would dare to contemplate that that government have a policy that, as they try to build reconciliation, they are going to grant amnesty to those who have killed Americans, as we say in the South, they have to have another thing coming, because we are not going to tolerate it.

I offer a simple resolution on behalf of the Senate. I hope it is not going to be controversial. I hope it will be accepted.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

There appears to be.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I had my fourth trip to Iraq recently and met with a number of leaders over there. I have been impressed with them and how garbage of them. I know Senator NELSON has also. He and I are the chair and ranking member respectively of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. We have worked together on many important issues.

I wanted to say a couple things. First, the amendment he has is of value and will be something that can be accepted. I believe it should be. You worry a little bit that maybe language difficulties come into play in how miscommunications can occur. Even among those of us who speak English together, we can have misunderstandings.

I was just handed a CNN interview today. It just came across the wire. It was by a reporter, Daryn Kagan, with the new national security adviser to Prime Minister Maliki in Iraq, He was asked about this very subject because the reporter obviously felt some of the same concerns the Senator from Florida raised. He said this to him.

The report said:

Doctor, I know there’s a big effort by your government in your country to try to prevent civil war. And as a part of that, the Washington Post reports today that your Prime Minister is considering offering amnesty to Sunnis or to others who perhaps attacked only U.S. troops. This, not surprisingly, is causing consternation here in the U.S., even talking about it and being raised on the floor of the U.S. Senate today. Is this, indeed, the case? Is your government thinking about offering amnesty to those that attacked only U.S. military?

This is Dr. Rubaiie’s reply:

This is not the case. I’m sorry to say that the prime minister of Iraq has been misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed Americans.

As a matter of fact, if you go there in his meeting with the Bush couple a couple of days ago, he looked the president in the eye and he said, thank you very, very much for liberating our country. Please thank the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and blood they have invested in this country. It’s well worth investing, of liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful.

And we will—the blood of the Iraqi soldier and the blood of Iraqi civilian soldier is as sacred as the American soldier. We are fighting the same war, we are fighting together, and this is a joined responsibility. And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldier or civilian.

What the prime minister is going to give amnesty to are those who have not committed the crimes, rather they’re against Iraqis or coalition. Those who have carried arms and they might have probably done some minor mistakes in staging some arms or allowing some terrorists to stay overnight or shelter, give shelter to some of these insurgents. That’s it. Basically, it’s a goodwill gesture to the Sunni community, to those who have committed some mistakes in the past.

I don’t know exactly how it all came about or how the comments were made. Mr. Maliki is new to being Prime Minister. There are language difficulties. I hope this reflects the firm view of the government in your country to try to prevent civil war. There is some sort of preliminary understanding between us and the U.S.-led multinational force in Iraq that there is “a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitively,” I believe.

Well, who in the U.S.-led multinational force has an understanding

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment Senator NELSON and I have offered on this issue of amnesty for those who have killed American soldiers.

I know the latest statements that have come out. I hope that is ultimately where the intention is. But it became very clear to me. I hope my colleagues have had the opportunity to read today’s Washington Post article. It says: “Iraq Amnesty Plan May Cover Only U.S. Troops.” On U.S. Military, if you read the statements there, I have to be honest, they were very unequivocal but unequivocal in a way that we could not accept as the U.S. Senate.

I continued to read this article, my anger grew. In the article it refers to the Prime Minister of Iraq acknowledging that reconciliation could include an amnesty for those “who weren’t involved in the shedding of Iraqi blood.” That is where the quote ends.

There is not a single mention of American blood. Is that a misinterpretation? Is that an oversight on the day on which we recognize the loss of 2,500 American soldiers and the thousands and thousands who have shed their blood and come back injured? Is that an oversight?

How about American blood and American lives, Mr. Prime Minister? Are you willing to have reconciliation on the pool of American blood that has been spilled to give your country and your people a chance for freedom? Is there so little value to the 2,500 American lives that have been lost and the over 18,000 wounded on behalf of your country that you wouldn’t even think about including American lives when you were talking about Iraqi lives? No way. No way.

Then I look at the article and look at the quote attributed to Adnan Kadhimi, a top adviser to Maliki. What does he say? He says:

The government has in mind somehow to do reconciliation, and one way to do it is to offer an amnesty... .

We can see if somehow those who are so-called resistance can be accepted if they have not been involved in any kind of criminal behavior, such as killing innocent people or damaging infrastructure, and even infrastructure, if it is minor, will be part of it.

So we have this elaborate plan that talks about even infrastructure, but doesn’t talk about American lives. And more recently, when asked why for those who attacked U.S. troops, he goes on to say—the adviser to the Prime Minister—that “that’s an area where we can see a green light.”

There is some sort of preliminary understanding between us and the U.S.-led multinational force in Iraq that there is “a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitively,” I believe.

Well, who in the U.S.-led multinational force has an understanding
with the Iraqis that it is OK to offer amnesty for those who have killed Americans? I would like to know the answer to that question.

I do believe very strongly that Senator NELSON’s and my amendment should be considered by the entire Senate. We cannot allow to chance that those statements attributed on the record—one directly by the Prime Minister and one directly by his top advisor—can be equivoated on. We have to send a very strong message that we will not return to those same tactics and careers that have taken the lives of American soldiers and for those who have spilled American blood in defense of their country.

Just a little while ago, we had a moment of silence for the 2,500 American soldiers who have died in Iraq. Let’s do much more than have a moment of silence in the face of these statements. Let’s make sure the taking of American lives can never be rewarded with amnesty and that we have an opportunity to make a clear, unequivocal statement that it is unacceptable, and I believe that it should take this opportunity. It is not only with a moment of silence that we show our respect, it is with our deeds that we show our respect.

Let the Senate act unanimously and speak with one voice to make it very clear that this should not even be a thought on behalf of the Iraqi Government. They have honored the lives of those people, our fellow Americans, who gave the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of their country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, I placed a call to a Nevada mother, Jennifer Laybourn. These calls are not easy; they are hard. Like many other Nevada mothers, she lost a boy, 19 years old, her son David, in Iraq. He was performing his duties as a soldier when he was killed by an improvised explosive device. Again, he was 19 years old.

Nevada has lost 39 soldiers in Iraq. Nevada is a small, sparsely populated State. Thirty-nine is a lot of funerals, a lot of sorrow for those of us from Nevada. There is no way we can ever repay those 39 Nevada heroes and their parents, siblings, family, and friends for the sacrifice they have honored. Mr. President, always make sure their service is honored, which is why today I compliment and applaud Senators NELSON from Florida and MENENDEZ from New Jersey, and to express my complete shock and outrage that the Iraqi Prime Minister has even considered granting amnesty to the insurgents who have killed our troops.

Up to this day, today, we have lost 2,500 soldiers in Iraq. The mere idea that this proposal would go forward is an insult to the brave Nevadans who have died in the name of Iraqi freedom, and this doesn’t take into consideration those Nevadans who have been grievously wounded in battle. It is my hope the President will denounce this proposal immediately—not wait for a retraction by the Iraqis but denounce it immediately. We should remember that the majority of Iraqis killed in Iraq were not killed in acts of warfare, which is why they have been historically termed war. They were killed in acts of terror.

All of us who are committed to freedom and democracy should recognize that their murders, 39 Nevadans, deserve justice. While I support reconciliation, and I believe we can reconcile political factions together, I don’t support amnesty for those who commit acts of terror against Americans.

It sends the wrong signal to our troops, the wrong signal to the Iraqis, and it sends the wrong signal to all Americans. It certainly sends a wrong signal to the insurgents who have now been given the message that they can attack our forces without consequence. President Bush continually makes a point of saying that a free Iraq means that the United States will have a friend in the Middle East. This amnesty proposal is no sign of friendship; it is a sign of hostility which dishonors the sacrifice of our troops. Our troops deserve better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to my good friend from Nevada. I hope Senators will be more supportive of our elected allies who are the Government of Iraq. The national security adviser for the Government of Iraq just said a few hours ago:

And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

So this notion of amnesty about a new, duly-elected Iraqi Government is a sideshow, an effort to divert our attention away from the core issue. Over in the House of Representatives today, they are having a much needed debate on the Iraq war. I had hoped that we would have that debate. I thought it is a legitimate debate. I hoped that we would have that debate. I can’t think of a better time.

Right now in Iraq, according to the latest AP story, since we were able to get Zarqawi last week, we have carried out 452 raids; 104 insurgents were killed during those actions; we have discovered 28 significant arms caches; 255 of the raids were joint operations, with 143 of them carried out by Iraqi forces alone; and the raids resulted in casualties of 759 anti-Iraqi elements. That is just in the last week. So we have them on the run in Iraq.

Why would anybody want to suggest that we ought to run when we have them on the run? But I think that is a legitimate debate. I hoped that we would have it. It is 2:10. I have been waiting anxiously all day, assuming that we would have that amendment laid down by those on the other side of the aisle and get on with the debate. Maybe we should have it in any event because it is time to step up and be counted.

Do we want to stay and finish the job and continue to protect America or do we want to send a message to the terrorists, when we have them on the run, that we are about to cut and run and leave them there to their own devices? I don’t know any responsible countries in the world at this point of how they may have initially felt about the decision to go into Iraq, that think it is a good idea to leave now—particularly as we are making dramatic progress with their new constitution; a progress we should never forget. We may be starting to see the death of the most notorious terrorist in the country; these successful raids that have been carried out in the last week; and the effort underway to clean Baghdad out.

Why in the world would we want to say to those elements in Iraq, which want the country to be a haven for terrorism forever, that you can count on...
us to be out of here by the end of the year; that we are giving you adequate notice that we are leaving by the end of the year?

I see my colleague from Texas on the Senate floor. I wondered if he had a question about Iraq.

Mr. CORNYN. Yes. Will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority whip, isn't the real difference between those of us who believe war is bad and must never be fought and those of us who believe that war is bad but must sometimes be fought for the right reasons? What is the alternative to fighting the good fight that our troops are fighting in Iraq now? I just ask whether the Senator has heard any alternatives offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Texas, the only alternative I heard suggested, I have read about in the press—I have not heard it offered on the floor yet—is that we essentially give the terrorists advance notice that we are going to be out of the country by the end of the year.

Look, we all hate, as the Senator from Texas indicated, to read reports of the death of any of our troops. We value human life in this country greatly. We don't want to lose America's brave men and women who have given their lives in this great cause by giving up when we are making dramatic progress. And it is also important to remember that while we value every single life, we have lost fewer of our soldiers liberating Afghanistan and Iraq—58 million people liberated—than we lost on 9/11 in one morning or in Normandy during the invasion in World War II.

So while we value every life and we regret the loss of each soldier, it is extremely difficult to fight a war and lose absolutely no one.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for an additional question, I ask the distinguished majority whip, what does he believe the consequences in Iraq to be—and not just to Iraq, but to America itself in terms of our own security—if we were to precipitously draw down our forces and leave a void there that might then be filled by enemies of our country and, indeed, terrorists akin to those who attacked our country on 9/11?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Texas, I think one thing that is pretty obvious is the terrorists would have a haven from which to operate, once again, such as they had in Afghanistan for a number of years prior to our clearing that out and giving those folks an opportunity to set up a democratic government. They would have a base of operations right in the Middle East from which to attack, once again, as they had in Afghanistan for a number of years prior to our clearing that out and giving those folks an opportunity to set up a democratic government.

That would be the consequence of cutting and running just on the heels of making dramatic forward progress in Iraq.

Mr. CORNYN. If the Senator will yield for one final question, I just want to be sure I understood his earlier comments from the National Security Adviser for the Government of Iraq. There had been some suggestion that the Iraqis were planning on granting amnesty to those who had killed American soldiers. But if I understood the distinguished majority whip, the National Security Adviser said:

And we will never give amnesty to those who killed American soldiers or who killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

If that language is true, that they would never give amnesty to the Senator care to venture a guess as to what the reason for this supposed sense of the Senate is to condemn some amnesty that will never be given?

Mr. MCCONNELL. It sounds to me, I answer my good friend from Texas, as some kind of diversion from the core issue we ought to be debating in the Senate, which is these suggestions that have been made by a number of our colleagues that we ought to have all the troops out by the end of the year. It is time to have that debate in the Senate, not a sense-of-the-Senate resolution about a proposal, as the Senator from Texas points out, that has been shot down today by the National Security Adviser in Iraq who, as the Senator from Texas indicated, said today:

And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or who killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

What party or what party do our colleagues not understand?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID addressed the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe I have the floor. Would someone like to ask a question?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield to my friend from Florida, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. This Senator clearly doesn't support pulling the troops out of Iraq by the end of the year. This Senator offered an amendment which is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States based on this morning's story in this newspaper that indicates contrary to that that were made by the Prime Minister.

Is the Senator suggesting that he does not agree with the sense-of-the-Senate resolution being expressed in this amendment as laid down by this Senator from Florida?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, answering the question, let me just repeat what the National Security Adviser in Iraq has just said:

And we will never give amnesty to those who killed American soldiers or who killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

Is it helpful to be passing resolutions condemning our allies in Iraq for posi-
Iraqi Government
than to say: Be careful, don't tread on this resolution anyway. This is no agreement at all with the words made by officials in Iraq.

That is a pretty clear vote, Mr. President.

That is the reason for this resolution. It is not about an amendment that will be offered and there will be some other debate. It is about whether the people of Iraq, who are running that government, should pardon those people, grant amnesty to those people who have attacked our forces either through snipers, armed combat, or explosive devices. It is a simple vote.

Further, the man went on to say they would consider taking a look at Iraqi forces who were attacked. They wouldn't necessarily be given amnesty like those who attacked Americans.

That is a pretty clear vote, Mr. President. And that is the issue before the Senate, not some make-believe thing that will come at some later time, not some sense-of-the-Senate resolution to distract us from the serious work that the people of this country sent us here to do and not to run, tax and spend.

The American people know what is going on here. They know what is going on. We all want the Iraqi issue to proceed even though it is costing us $2.5 billion a week, 2,500 dead soldiers, 18,000 or 20,000 wounded, a third of them seriously wounded, 20 percent of them coming back from Iraq with post-traumatic stress syndrome with a Veterans' Administration that is underfunded.

First of all, I don't know why, after the Iraqi officials have disclaimed any intent whatsoever to offer amnesty to those who have killed an American soldier, we would gratuitously offer a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to condemn them for something they said they are not going to do, unless we are engaged more in gamesmanship than we are in working and passing serious legislation.

The comment was made earlier that perhaps this is just a diversion. I think the comment was made earlier that perhaps this is just a diversion. I thought we were going to have a serious debate about what we were going to bring to the troops back home and on what kind of timetable we were going to do that, whether it is some arbitrary timetable or, instead, whether it is based on conditions on the ground. I thought that was the kind of debate we were going to have today, not some sort of manufactured debate offering a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to divert public attention from an issue that does not exist about this amnesty that has been suggested which has been expressly disclaimed by the Iraqi leadership.

My suggestion is that we move on to the serious work that the people of this country sent us here to do and not to engage in sideshows, which is clearly what this sense-of-the-Senate proposition is designed to do.

Mr. Nelson of Florida. Will the Senate yield?

We have done everything that we could to help the Iraqi people help themselves, from training their security forces to encouraging them and helping them in the development of a government that is really a miracle to behold, if you think about it. Three years ago, they had a blood-thirsty dictator with his boot heel on the back of the neck of the Iraqi people, responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and a threat to the entire world because of the potential partnerships with terrorists who might export their terror to places such as the United States. Why would we gratuitously take an occasion like this to distract us from the important business that we are about, to criticize in one way, form, or fashion the new Iraqi Government which is just beginning to show that they are able to take the first small steps toward self-determination and self-governance, why we would take this occasion to admonish them for something they have expressly indicated no intention of doing is beyond me.

Mr. Cornyn. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. Cornyn. Mr. President, I don't know what the question was, but let me just respond to the distinguished Senator from Florida. It makes no sense at all for the Senate to use its authority at the new Government of Iraq and to criticize them, whether it is a condemnation or a criticism or an admonishment or whatever you want to call it, for something that they have expressed that they have no intention of doing. I don't dispute from a procedural standpoint the Senator's right at some point, perhaps, to have a vote on the sense-of-the-Senate amendment, but I just question the wisdom of proceeding in this way when we are a nation at war.

We have done everything that we could to help the Iraqi people help themselves, from training their security forces to encouraging them and helping them in the development of a government that is really a miracle to behold, if you think about it. Three years ago, they had a blood-thirsty dictator with his boot heel on the back of the neck of the Iraqi people, responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and a threat to the entire world because of the potential partnerships with terrorists who might export their terror to places such as the United States. Why would we gratuitously take an occasion like this to distract us from the important business that we are about, to criticize in one way, form, or fashion the new Iraqi Government which is just beginning to show that they are able to take the first small steps toward self-determination and self-governance, why we would take this occasion to admonish them for something they have expressly indicated no intention of doing is beyond me.

Mr. Cornyn. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. Corney. Mr. President, I would...

Mr. McConnell. Mr. Cornyn.

Mr. McConnell. I know the Senator from Texas and I covered this a few moments ago, but I would ask the Senator from Texas again if it is not the case that the national security adviser to the Iraqi Government just this very day said the following: And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians?

Mr. Cornyn. Mr. President, I would answer the distinguished majority whip by saying, that is exactly the quotation. The same individuals went on to say that the Prime Minister is going to give amnesty to those who have committed the crimes, whether against Iraqis or coalition forces. He went on to say, they might probably have done some minor mistakes in storing some arms or allowing some terrorist to stay overnight or providing some shelter. But he has expressly said: We will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.
Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the Senator from Texas yield for an additional question?

Mr. CORNYN. I would.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Might it not be just as useful an exercise to try to pass a resolution commending the Iraqi Government for the position they have taken today with regard to this discussion of amnesty?

Mr. CORNYN. I would answer the distinguished majority whip and say, I would feel much better about something that was constructive and encouraging in assisting the Iraqi Government in their determination not to give amnesty than I would in offering criticism where it appears to be gratuitous and where it is a distortion from the debate that I think the American people would want us to have; that is, under what conditions do we want to leave Iraq, and are some of the proposals that some of our colleagues on the Senate floor have made about setting timetables, are those in the best interests of the American people or do they endanger America by allowing perhaps those who are America’s enemies, the enemies of all civilization, to plot and plan, and then use that failed state as a platform to export their terrorist activities to other parts of the world?

AMENDMENT NO. 429 TO AMENDMENT NO. 426

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the underlying amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 429 to amendment No. 426.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq and urge the convening of an Iraq summit)

At the end of the amendment add the following:

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) SCHEDULE FOR WITHDRAWAL.—The President shall reach an agreement as soon as possible with the Government of Iraq on a schedule for the withdrawal of United States combat troops from Iraq by December 31, 2006, leaving only forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The President shall consult with Congress regarding such schedule and shall present such withdrawal agreement to Congress immediately upon the completion of the agreement.

(c) MAINTENANCE OF OVER-THE-HORIZON TROOP PRESENCE.—The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security if they have the agreement of the United States.

(d) IRAQ SUMMIT.—The President should convene a summit as soon as possible that includes the leaders of the Government of Iraq, leaders of the governments of each country bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council to negotiate a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that addresses fundamental issues including federalism, oil revenues, the militias, security guarantees, reconstruction, economic assistance, and border security.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the amendment I have sent to the desk is the amendment that I believe the Senate from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, had indicated he was going to be offering today so that we can have an appropriate debate on this very important day about whether it is appropriate to withdraw American troops by the end of 2006. That is the second-degree amendment that I just sent to the desk.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I don’t have a dog in this fight, you might say, and I am not one of those who have been involved in writing the amendment. But I have talked to this debate, and I wonder about history. I wonder about the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I remember reading so clearly that after the War Between the States, the North lined up those from the South and took their guns and let some of them take them home. I remember so well that after World War II, we went through a process of trying to urge the governments involved in the access to obtain a pledge from the former members of the military that they would support the new democracy. That was amnesty.

In Japan, we certainly had a period under General MacArthur which was probably the greatest period of amnesty that has ever been known. We helped that country immediately to form a democracy and we never prosecuted the people who killed Americans.

I wonder seriously about what the Senator from Florida is doing by telling this new fledgling democracy that they cannot go through the process of cleansing, go through the process of trying to get people who were misguided, who were part of coalitions that they now are willing to recant, if they are, to come forward and support this new democracy. What are we doing anyway on the floor of the Senate trying to tell the new democracy what they can and can’t do? I didn’t like that story when I read it in the paper this morning, but I was happy to see the new statement from the security people that clarified what they intend to do.

But the time will come, if that democracy is going to succeed, when they are going to have to fold into their population those who are willing to give up terrorism, those who are willing to put aside the activities of the past which led them to attack Americans as well as any other—there are 34 other nations over there. Are we saying just those who did kill Americans, they can’t get amnesty, but the rest of them can?

What are we doing on the floor of the Senate trying to do? What are we going to do? The Arab League, the enemies of all civilization, the terrorist leaders of the past, to forget the terrorists of the past, and to pledge themselves to a new future of democracy and have people come forward and say: I am willing to support this new democracy. And if they do, and demonstrate that they do after a period of time, shouldn’t they be recognized as being loyal citizens of the new democracy?

This is a debate that disturbs me. It disturbs me to think we are willing to judging the moment of history. A political point—seize the moment and make a point—and not think. It is time we started thinking about how we can assure and take steps to help this country survive as a democracy. If it becomes a democracy in that part of the world, it will be a marvelous success, and I think it will lead to greater consideration by other countries of liberalization of their concepts and giving the people more power.

I believe we ought to try to find some way to encourage that country, to demonstrate to those people who have been opposed to what we are trying to do, that it is worthwhile for them and their children to come forward and support this democracy. And if that is amnesty, I am for it. I would be for it. And if those people who come forward and want to obtain a better life for their families in the future are willing to support that democracy—if they bear arms against our people, what is the difference between the person who bore arms against the Union in the War Between the States? What is the difference between the Germans and the Japanese and all the people we have forgiven?

When I left the war and came home, I had a deep hatred for the Japanese. Today, Mr. President, I have a granddaughter who is Japanese. I have a daughter-in-law who is Japanese. And her parents were involved in World War II. Now, are we to understand that it is not wiped out if time can heal, heal the pain of the past?

I really wish the Senator from Florida would have the courage to withdraw the amendment, just withdraw it and say it was a political effort. This is nothing but politics. I will vote to table it or vote against it in good conscience.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Is it not true, Mr. President, that today we have Iraqis who are fighting the war against the
insurgents who at one time fought against American troops and other coalition troops as they were marching to Baghdad, who have now come over to our side and are doing one heck of a job of fighting alongside the Americans and coalition forces, attacking and killing insurgents on a daily basis.

Mr. STEVENS. That is absolutely true. I would say to the Senator, I was there and participated in the conversation with some of our military people who were trying to find ways to help the Iraqis, to try to find ways to help the regular armed services some of those people who served in the Red Guard under Saddam Hussein. But they are willing to come forward now and see that there is a country they would like to support. And if they asked my opinion about that, I would say I would encourage it. I would encourage it. I think if there is anything that can bring about stability in that country and have them support this new democracy, we should encourage it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. I will, Mr. President.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Alaska would agree that as he goes through the history of countries that have been torn apart by war, including our country in the Civil War and Japan, after the World War II, and the processes of reconciliation, whether South Africa might not be an example. And is it not true that Nelson Mandela’s courage and his ability to create a process of reconciliation and forgiveness was a major factor in what has been a political miracle in Africa, where White and Black people now are able to live together in a democracy? Is not that process of reconciliation one of the most admired processes in the last century? Nelson Mandela, the winner of a Nobel Peace Prize for that process of reconciliation, whether South Africa might not be an example. And is it not true that Nelson Mandela’s courage and his ability to create a process of reconciliation and forgiveness was a major factor in what has been a political miracle in Africa, where White and Black people now are able to live together in a democracy? Is not that process of reconciliation one of the most admired processes in the last century?

Mr. STEVENS. Absolutely. Mr. President, I would say it falls under the concept of the Christian ethic. We are people who believe that you can be converted. You can be a nonbeliever and then become a believer. What is the difference between that and amnesty, between those people who may have been on the wrong side and then will come forward and belong to this new government? And if they pledge and demonstrate to do it, I think it is up to the Iraqis to determine when and how they become full-fledged citizens of the new Iraq.

But this amendment would have us say if they indicate they are going to grant amnesty to them, that is wrong. Amnesty ought to be a reward for a pledge of cooperation and support. In this context, the military context, I think it would bring about harmony and find time after time after time where it was successful. But this amendment is a political amendment, and I am tired of these political things coming on the floor. The minute something comes in the paper, before it can even be corrected by the country, we have an amendment saying, oh, here, let’s force the majority to vote against this amendment. Baloney. I am proud to vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I just came to the Chamber a few moments ago. I understand the pending amendment to be this one, and although I have not reviewed it in its entirety, I see that it reads that the President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader will be recognized; the pending amendment is the McConnell amendment.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand. I will speak to the Kerry amendment. I will read that amendment just stand. I will speak to the Kerry amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator shall reach an agreement as soon as possible with the Government of Iraq on a schedule for the withdrawal of United States combat troops from Iraq by December 31, 2006, unless the President——

Mr. President?

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

Does the majority leader yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRIST. I will shortly. Let me finish my statement because I think it is important to look at the issue that has been put on the floor. I will be very brief. Then we can do the parliamentary inquiries back and forth.

If we withdraw from Iraq before the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people are capable of defending their new democracy, I am absolutely convinced that the terrorists would see this as a vindication, a vindication of their strategy of intimidation, of confrontation, and that they would take that vindication and continue to challenge us elsewhere in the world—in Afghanistan, in other countries in the region, overseas, and, indeed, right here at home. If we were to cut and run, the violence in Iraq would certainly increase.

We know there is violence there, and we know how tough it is on our troops who are there and the American people who watch this violence. But I am absolutely convinced that if we cut and run, if we withdraw from Iraq, terrorists will increase their attacks on the Iraqi people and on that brand new Iraqi Government. Clearly, it has only been 5 days. Clearly, the Government itself is not able, completely alone, to defend itself. Chaos would result.

The unity of Iraq that we celebrated on this floor, the unity of Iraq that has resulted from a democratically elected government, that unity will be torn apart; sectarian violence would ensue and would explode. It would split the country apart into segments that, yes, probably would be controlled, but they would be controlled by terrorists, ethnic militias, tribal militias. I am convinced parts of Iraq would become safe havens for terrorists who have spilled out—and we think of the letters and the words of Zarqawi—who have spilled out what their intentions are in terms of creating here, right here in the United States.

I believe terrorist bases in Iraq would threaten Middle East security. Although it may be a secondary issue, we do know that energy supplies ultimately would be disrupted. We have seen supply go down, demand go up, and a disruption of energy sources all over the country. Indeed, I believe it would result in a skyrocketing of gas prices in this country.

The terrorists affiliated with bin Laden and Zarqawi have stated in crystal clear terms what their objectives are, their aim of overthrowing moderate governments.

Given the presence in Iraq of many of Saddam Hussein’s former weapons scientists—remember Saddam Hussein? Forget about weapons of mass destruction right now, but we actually know that Saddam Hussein and his scientists have developed weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons, and he has used both of those on his own people. Those scientists are still around. If we cut and run, I believe those scientists once again will pursue and will have the freedom to pursue those weapons of mass destruction: sarin gas, anthrax, biological weapons.

President Bush has repeatedly stated that the potential combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction does pose the greatest threats to the United States. I believe cutting and running would allow those weapons of mass destruction and that terrorism intent to come back together, to endanger the people of the region but also the people right here in the United States of America.

In some ways, I am glad this amendment has come to the floor, this modification of the amendment. It is clear that the الشرق المعاصر (Arabic: The West) failed to fully play out, to fully understand the potential implications of...
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The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my understanding is the Senate now turns to the measure by the Senator from Florida, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. WARNER. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCaIN. Reserving the right to object, what is ‘a moment’?

If the Senator compounds a unanimous consent for an amount of time, I would be glad to not object. I wonder what a moment is?

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to have 5 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I move to table the McConnell amendment. So the chairman, the majority leader, and it is one that ought to be protected.

I respect and I understand completely what the distinguished minority leader did. Did it in consultation with me. I think it was the appropriate measure for him to take to protect my interests and the interests of those on our side.

The Senate ought to give a more appropriate kind of seriousness of purpose to debate of this kind of consequence. This will be the first time in some time that we will have debated this issue. I suggest some of my colleagues go back and reread the resolution which gave the President the authority to go into Iraq. There is nothing in that resolution that gives authority for what we are doing today.

So, in effect, this is a war of evolution, a war of transformation, and it deserves the kind of serious debate that it will get next week in the Senate.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Alexander). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. McCaIN. For a moment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts and I did have a brief conversation just before the conclusion of the vote in the middle of the noon hour. I, in an effort to try and keep momentum on the bill, did inquire of the desire to move forward with my amendment. I only conveyed my response to me, which was not at this time—he was in consultation with colleagues—to my distinguished ranking member, advising him we best look at other amendments to keep the momentum going forward. I then departed for the memorial services at the Department of Defense honoring those who lost their lives on 9/11. And, therefore, when I arrived back we were in the middle of the debate that has been described by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCaIN. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and I thank the distinguished chairman for his explanation of what just transpired.

Mr. President, I rise to discuss the pending Nelson amendment. I think it is very important that, first of all, we try not to react on the floor of the Senate to the headlines that appear in the morning paper, they happen to be totally accurate or not.

The second thing I want to point out is that all of us—all of us—are pained

leaving prematurely. Cutting and running before Iraq can really defend itself threatens the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority reader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, two things that do not exist in Iraq and have not are weapons of mass destruction and cutting and running.

This is the McConnell amendment. It is not the Kerry amendment. People have the right to file amendments. They can decide whether they want to offer them or modify them or change them.

I move to table the McConnell amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I reoffer my motion to table. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Rockefeller) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Roll call Vote No. 174 Leg.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baucus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambliss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
when a brave American is killed in this terrible, long, drawn-out conflict which has divided America and cost us so much in American blood and treasure. All of us—no matter where we stand on this conflict—feel the utmost sorrow and regret at the loss of any American soldier or woman. So this debate is certainly not about the enormous sacrifice that has already been made and probably will be made in the course of this conflict.

But I think we have to be realistic about the way out of this conflict, the way out we have seen time after time throughout history of other conflicts, especially those that in many respects are civil wars.

Nelson Mandela probably had the greatest reason to seek revenge and full accounting not only for the years of imprisonment and mistreatment he personally received but also because of the hundreds if not thousands of his countrymen who were brutalized, mistreated, and driven to frustration and incredible—sorrow when we hear of the loss of these precious young men and women.

But we also know that the insurgency does not end until the insurgents stop fighting. And the sooner the new Prime Minister, freely elected—freely elected—Mr. Maliki, is able to bring his country back together, the sooner we will find the insurgents can be withdrawn, and the sooner American casualties will end.

I am confident the amendment by the Senator from Florida amendment is well-meaning, and I understand the intent they should continue. But I think it is important we look back and recognize that not only do times change, as in the case of Vietnam—our Secretary of Defense just in the last week visited Vietnam, as we have renewed our relationships, have healed the wounds of the Vietnam war, and moved forward in partnership with the Vietnamese.

Mr. President, from a personal standpoint, there are a few Vietnamese I would very much like to see, people I may not have the most peaceful intentions toward. But the reality is—the reality is—we must heal the wounds of war if we are going to unite a nation and move forward. And that is the case with Iraq, as it has been with almost every other nation in history.

I finally add, as a footnote, I am not sure we here in the U.S. Senate should be dictating to the leaders of Iraq how they should conduct their affairs as they, the freely elected leaders of that nation, attempt to bring about peace and reconciliation in their nation.

But the larger issue here is, I believe, that our goal must end the conflict as quickly as possible in Iraq. If that means, in return for laying down their arms, that some are allowed an amnesty or allowed to reenter the society of Iraq, in a peaceful manner, in a productive manner, as has happened in South Africa, El Salvador—and is happening in Colombia—and many other insurgencies throughout history, then I think we should welcome it. And as we place our confidence in the new Government of Iraq, perhaps we should give them some latitude.

I would also like to add, by the way, that perhaps we can save the lives and fortunes of our own and those who we support.

Things are very difficult in Iraq. And we are angered when we hear of an IED that blows up and kills and maims innocent Americans. We are sometimes driven to frustration and incredible—sorrow when we hear of the loss of these precious young men and women.

I am sure that the enemies we faced in World War II—who the distinguished chairman of the committee fought against in that great war—that there was a time where we had reconciliation with our enemies on both sides of the Atlantic.

Mr. President, were people who were guilty of specific war crimes brought to trial? Absolutely, and punished, in some cases, to the point of execution. But those who fought against us are clearly not our friends.

I hope that we would understand that this amendment would not be helpful to the process of peace, would not be an endorsement of the freely elected leaders of the country of Iraq, and might even serve, in an unintended fashion, as an impediment to a process of peaceful reconciliation in Iraq rather than helping it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

'THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginiya.'

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my very good and longtime friend, we have known each other since the closing months of the war in Vietnam when I was Secretary and he was serving in our naval service and returned. So I think sometimes of the great fortune of this body to have men such as JOHN MCCAIN, DANIEL INOUYE, and TED STEVENS, and others, who have experience firsthand. I do not claim that same experience that these men had in their naval combat of the war.

Senator McCaIN recounts the history of our Nation very accurately; that is, when the conflicts are over, it has always been the stature and the greatness of this Nation to bind the wounds of war and to move forward with peace.

I say to the Senator from Florida, I have just handed him the corrections that are now in the press, corrected by the national security adviser to the new Prime Minister of Iraq, in which it is apparent that the quote I quoted was misquoting or in translation. Some misfortune. But he sets forth here with absolute clarity, and I think that I would want to state for my colleagues exactly what he said. He said the following—and he said it. I presume, with the full knowledge of the Prime Minister.

He said: We thank—and the quote is—"the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in this country, of liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful."

And further, he affirmed their position of the government that they "will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians."

It seems to me that puts to rest, as my colleague from Arizona said, this issue. And I wonder if the Senator would consider the withdrawal of his amendment to obviate the necessity on our side to take other steps, and let us move forward with the bill.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?
Mr. WARNER. Yes, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Does the Senator from Florida have the floor or—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. The Senator from Florida has been seeking recognition for the past hour and has not been able to speak.

Will the Senator from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee, agree to a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Florida would be allowed to speak on this issue immediately after the comments of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am delighted to accommodate my colleague. I would hope we could discuss this matter in the traditional way of a colloquy, but if you want the exclusive comments of the Senator from Virginia on this issue immediately after the Armed Forces Committee, agree to a unanimous chairman of our Armed Services Committee, I have been speaking for the past hour and has not been able to speak.

Will the Senator from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee, agree to a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Florida would be allowed to speak on this issue immediately after the comments of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am delighted to accommodate my colleague. I would hope we could discuss this matter in the traditional way of a colloquy, but if you want the exclusive comments of the Senator from Virginia on this issue immediately after the Armed Services Committee, agree to a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Florida would be allowed to speak on this issue immediately after the comments of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am delighted to accommodate my colleague. I would hope we could discuss this matter in the traditional way of a colloquy, but if you want the exclusive comments of the Senator from Virginia on this issue immediately after the Armed Services Committee, agree to a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Florida would be allowed to speak on this issue immediately after the comments of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am delighted to accommodate my colleague. I would hope we could discuss this matter in the traditional way of a colloquy, but if you want the exclusive comments of the Senator from Virginia on this issue immediately after the Armed Services Committee, agree to a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Florida would be allowed to speak on this issue immediately after the comments of the Senator from Virginia?
Mr. NELSON of Florida. If the Senator would like, we could have a quorum call and discuss exactly that matter.

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, as a coauthor of the amendment of my distinguished colleague from Florida, I hope he will continue to pursue his amendment. It is incredibly important to send a very clear message on behalf of the United States about what is and is not acceptable as it relates to the future of our young men and women in the armed service of the United States.

We are told on the Senate floor: Don't react to the morning's papers. But, in fact, it is our reaction to it that brings the recognition from the National Security Adviser of the Iraqi Government that moves us in the direction which should have been the position of the Iraqi Government from the outset.

I am amazed how I have heard some of my colleagues in this Chamber stretch and twist and turn to justify a position which even now the Iraqi Government supposedly rejects. We had some history lessons about amnesty. Most of those were as it related to civil wars. But I remember how President Bush started this engagement. He said to the Nation: You are either with the terrorists or you are with us.

As I listened to my colleagues suggest that amnesty is something we should actually be in favor of for those who have committed acts against the Armed Forces of the United States, for those who have killed American soldiers, for those who have wounded American soldiers, it is beyond my imagination that there are Members of the Senate who believe that is the signal we want to send throughout the world. What happened to “you are either with the terrorists or you are with us”? What happened to making it very clear that men and women are not sitting ducks for those who think they could ultimately seek to kill them and then walk away and get amnesty? I don’t understand—if a terrorist survives our arrest or attack, does that mean that if they suddenly see the light we will say: Yes, it is up to the Iraqis to give them amnesty? Is that the message the Senate wants to send?

It is beyond my imagination—we hear about the challenges of democracy in Iraq. Democracy is about the rule of law, and then ultimately we would set aside the rule of law and say you can kill American soldiers and we will have no say. Imagine that as the Nation sends its sons and daughters abroad to shed their blood and to give their lives, that we should have no say? That is what we heard on the Senate floor, that we should have no say, that we should let the Iraqi Government pursue even more violence and terrorism against those who kill American soldiers. That is the message we want to send? I think not.

The essence of the message we want to send is that we do not believe and do not want to act in a way that is contrary to the fact that there may have even been a consideration that there could be amnesty for those who killed American soldiers but not amnesty for those who killed Iraqis. That is the world’s worst message we could send. We have to send a very clear message that we will not allow our sons and daughters to have their lives lost, and that their lives are not expendable and cannot be bartered for amnesty. That is what Senator NELSON was trying to do with this amendment. Why is it so difficult for the Senate to come together in a bipartisan effort to send that very clear message, not only in Iraq but throughout the world, that this is simply not a standard which is acceptable, is beyond belief.

This amendment is very clear, it is very simple, but it is also very powerful. It is a message that you can’t kill our soldiers and walk away with impunity. Truly, you are either with the terrorists or you are with us, but you can’t be a terrorist and then suddenly get caught, see the light, and then ultimately walk away with amnesty. That would be a horrible message for the Senate to send.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCONNELL now be recognized, that the pending amendments be set aside, and that Senator MCCONNELL then offer an amendment which is relevant to the Nelson amendment; provided further that if and when the McConnell and Nelson amendments are scheduled for votes—that would be sometime next week—the McConnell amendment would be voted on first. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the offering of the amendment, Senator CHAMBLISS be recognized in order to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. I have no objection.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might, I would like to delete the last sentence which reads:

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the offering of the amendment, Senator CHAMBLISS be recognized in order to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. McConnell, offer an amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the amendment that was offered by Senator Nelson, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its position of No Amnesty for Terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces.

Sec._ Sense of the Congress Commending the Government of Iraq for affirming its Position of No Amnesty for Terrorists who Attack U.S. Armed Forces.

(a) Findings. Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that the new Government of Iraq is commended for its statement by the National Security Adviser of Iraq on June 15, 2006 that—

(1) thanked “the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in this country . . . of liberating 30 million people in this country . . . And we are ever so grateful.” and

(2) that affirmed their position that they “will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I now ask that the amendments be laid aside. The leadership is in agreement that there will be no more votes tonight. We will now turn to other matters relating to the bill. My understanding, then, is these two amendments are now the pending amendments; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The McConnell amendment is the pending amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS Nos. 4278, 4279, 4280, 4200, 4201, 4198, 4282, 4283, 4284, 4232, AS MODIFIED; 4225, 4235, 4236, 4237, AS MODIFIED; AND 4278, AS BLOC

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and members of the Armed Services Committee, I send a series of amendments to the desk which have been cleared by myself and the ranking member. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider these amendments en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that any statements related to any of these individual amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 4278
(Purpose: To provide for the incorporation of a classified annex)
At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1008. INCORPORATION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.

(a) STATUS OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The Classified Annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to accompany S. 2766 of the 109th Congress and transmitted to the President is hereby incorporated into this Act.

(b) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF ACT.—The amounts specified in the Classified Annex are not in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by other provisions of this Act.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act that are made available for any program, project, or activity referred to in the Classified Annex may only be expended for such program, project, or activity in accordance with such terms, conditions, limitations, restrictions, and requirements as are set out for such program, project, or activity in the Classified Annex.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The President shall provide for appropriate distribution of the Classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

(Purpose: To make the modifications applicable to payments under incentives clauses in chemical demilitarization contracts)
On page 93, strike lines 23 through 25 and insert the following:

(c) PAYMENT CONDITIONAL ON PERFORMANCE.—No payment may be made under an incentives clause under this section unless the Secretary determines that the contractor concerned has satisfactorily performed its duties under such incentives clause.

AMENDMENT No. 4280
(Purpose: To modify the requirements for certain reports applicable to other nations)
At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1223. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTS ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMON DEFENSE.—Section 1003 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c) and (d).


(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

AMENDMENT No. 4281
(Purpose: To make a technical correction to section 871, relating to a clarification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects)
On page 362, line 1, strike “by striking” and insert “by inserting”.

AMENDMENT No. 4282
(Purpose: To improve the authorities relating to major automated information systems programs)
On page 296, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

“(c) INCREASES.—In the event any increment of a major automated information system program separately meets the requirements to maintain itself as a major automated information system program, the provisions of this section shall apply to such increment as well as to the overall major automated information system program of which such increment is a part.

On page 297, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

“(d) COMMISSION.—(1) For purposes of this chapter, the initial submittal to Congress of the documents required by subsection (a) with respect to a major automated information system program shall constitute the original estimate or information originally submitted on such program for purposes of the reports and determinations on program changes in section 2445a of title 10.

“(2) An adjustment or revision of the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program may be treated as the original estimate for a major automated information system program if the adjustment or revision is the result of a critical change in the program covered by section 2445a of title 10.

“(3) In the event of an adjustment or revision to the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program under section 2445a of title 10, the Secretary of Defense shall include in the next budget justification documents submitted under subsection (a) after
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such adjustment or revision a notification to the congressional defense committees of such adjustment or revision, together with the reasons for such adjustment or revision.

On page 18, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

“(g) PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—(1) If the determination of a critical change is made by the Department of Defense official responsible for the program under subsection (d)(2) and a report is not submitted to Congress within the 60-day period provided by subsection (d)(2), appropriated funds may not be obligated for any major contract under the program.

(2) The prohibition on the obligation of funds under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply on the date on which Congress has received a report in compliance with the requirements of subsection (d)(2).

AMENDMENT NO. 428

(Purpose: To require a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of incentives to encourage certain members and former members of the Armed Forces to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO SERVE IN THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit to appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of offering incentives to covered members and former members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of encouraging such members to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(b) COVERED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—For purposes of this section, covered members and former members of the Armed Forces are the following:

(1) Members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

(2) Former members of the Armed Forces within two years of separation from service in the Armed Forces.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—

(1) NATURE OF INCENTIVES.—In considering incentives for purposes of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretaries shall consider such incentives, whether monetary or otherwise and whether or not authorized by current law or regulations, as the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(2) TAXATION OF INCENTIVES.—In assessing any incentive for purposes of the report, the Secretaries shall give particular attention to the utility of such incentive in—

(A) recruiting service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former members of the Armed Forces who have provided border patrol or border security assistance to the Bureau as part of their duties as members of the Armed Forces; and

(B) leveraging military training and experience by accelerating training, or allowing credit to be applied to related areas of training, required for service with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(d) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of various monetary and non-monetary incentives considered for purposes of the report.

(2) An assessment of the desirability and feasibility of the incentive for purposes of the report specified in subsection (a), including an assessment of the particular utility of such incentive in encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (c)(2).

(3) Any other matters that the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, ‘‘appropriate committees of Congress’’ means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 429

(Purpose: Relating to energy efficiency in the weapons platforms of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 275. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to improve the fuel efficiency of weapons platforms, consistent with mission requirements, in order to—

(1) enhance platform performance;

(2) reduce the size of the fuel logistics systems;

(3) reduce the burden high fuel consumption places on agility;

(4) reduce operating costs; and

(5) dampen the financial impact of volatile oil prices.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility of designing a senior Department of Defense official to be responsible for implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(B) A summary of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(i) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in April 2006;

(ii) the Defense Science Board Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Strategy established by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006;


(C) For each recommendation summarized under subparagraph (B)—

(i) the steps that the Department has taken to implement such recommendation;

(ii) any additional steps the Department plans to take to implement such recommendation; and

(iii) for any recommendation that the Department does not plan to implement, the reasons for the decision not to implement such recommendation.

(D) An assessment of the extent to which the logistics guidance and directives of the Department for weapons platforms are appropriately designed to address the policy established by such recommendation.

(E) An assessment of the extent to which such guidance and directives are being carried out in the research, development, acquisition, and logistics programs of the Department.

(F) A description of any additional actions that, in the view of the Secretary, may be needed to implement the policy established by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 430

(Purpose: To modify limitations on assistance under the American Servicemembers’ Protection Act of 2002)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE UNDER THE AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS’ PROTECTION ACT OF 2002.


AMENDMENT NO. 431

(Purpose: To amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes)

At the end of title X of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. COURT SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) JUDICIAL BRANCH SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ENSURING CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH THE JUDICIARY.—Section 506 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(l) The Director of the United States Marshals Service shall consult and coordinate with the Judicial Conference of the United States on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government.’’.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 331 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘The Judicial Conference shall consult and coordinate with the Director of United States Marshals Service on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government.’’.

(b) PROTECTION OF FAMILY MEMBERS.—Section 331(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ‘‘or a family member of that individual’’ after ‘‘that individual’’; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting ‘‘or a family member of that individual’’ after ‘‘the report’’.

(c) EXTENSION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking ‘‘2008’’ each place that term appears appearing inserting ‘‘2009’’.

(d) PROTECTIONS AGAINST MALICIOUS RECORDING OF PICTORIAL LIENS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGES AND FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘SEC. 1521. RETALIATING AGAINST A FEDERAL JUDGE OR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER BY FALSE CLAIM OR SLANDER OF TITLE.

‘‘(a) Whoever falsely or attempts to file, in any public record or in any private record which is generally available to the public, any false lien or encumbrance against the real or personal property of a Federal judge or a Federal law enforcement official, on account of the performance of official duties by the Federal judge or Federal law enforcement official, knowingly or having reason to know that such lien or encumbrance is false
or contains any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

(g) In section 115—

"(1) the term ‘Federal judge’ means a justice or judge of the United States as defined in section 611 of title 28, United States Code, a judge of a United States Court of Federal Claims, a United States bankruptcy judge, a United States magistrate judge, and a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, United States Tax Court, District Court of Guam, District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, or District Court of the Virgin Islands; and

"(2) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given that term in section 115 of this title and includes an attorney who is an officer or employee of the United States in the executive branch of the Government.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1521. Retaliation against a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer by false claim or slander of title.”

(e) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 118. PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES.

"(a) Whoever knowingly makes restricted personal information about a covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official, publicly available, with the intent that such restricted personal information might be used to create and expand witness protection programs in order to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, crimes—

"(1) has the greatest need for witness and victim protection programs;

"(2) has a serious violent crime problem in the jurisdiction that;

"(3) has had, or is likely to have, instances of threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, crimes—

"(A) by regulation or otherwise, a magistrate judge; or

"(B) by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 377 of title 18, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 870(a)(5) of title 5.”

2) TERRITORIAL JUDGES.

— Sec. 24 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1424b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a magistrate judge of the United States in regular active service or who is retired under section 377 of this title shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 870(a)(5) of title 5.”

3) TERRITORIAL JUDGES.

— Section 24 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U.S.C. 1414a) is amended—

"(m) Health Insurance for Surviving Family Members.—Section 8001(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—"
A full-time United States magistrate judge.

Islands, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, as defined under section 451 of title 28, United States Code; (ii) a judge of the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands; (iii) a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims; or (iv) a United States bankruptcy judge or a full-time United States magistrate judge.

AMENDMENT NO. 4235

Purpose: To require that, not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army for operation and maintenance may be authorized by the congressional defense committees separately or as part of another required report.

(2) the Secretary of Defense should prepare a comprehensive schedule for safely destroying the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the shortest time possible, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4235

Purpose: To provide for the applicability of certain requirements to the acquisition of speciality metals.

(a) the Secretary of a military department may make a contractual commitment to purchase specialty metals that cost or are expected to cost, in the aggregate, more than 5 percent of the total price for the specialty metals described in subsections (a) and (c).

SECTION 1804. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DESTRUCTION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Chemical Weapons Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, done at Paris on January 13, 1993 (convention referred to as the “Chemical Weapons Convention”), requires all United States chemical weapons stockpiles to be destroyed by no later than the extended deadline under the Chemical Weapons Convention for destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpiles.

(3) Destroying existing chemical weapons is a homeland security imperative, an arms control priority, and required by United States law.

(4) The elimination and nonproliferation of chemical weapons of mass destruction is of utmost importance to the national security of the United States.

(1) the United States is committed to making every effort to safely dispose of its chemical weapons stockpiles by the Chemical Weapons Convention deadline of April 29, 2012, or as soon thereafter as possible, and will carry out all of its other obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

(2) the Secretary of Defense should prepare a comprehensive schedule for safely destroying the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the shortest time possible, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.

(3) the Secretary of Defense should make every effort to ensure adequate funding to complete the elimination of the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the shortest time possible, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.

(2) by adding at the end the following:

(4) by adding at the end the following:

(2) by adding at the end the following:

(1) the Secretary of Defense may make a contractual commitment to purchase specialty metals that cost or are expected to cost, in the aggregate, more than 5 percent of the total price for the specialty metals described in subsections (a) and (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to items accepted for delivery on or after that date.

(1) the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by section 301(i) for the Army for operation and maintenance may be used for the transport and disposal required under subsection (a).

(c) LIABILITY.—The Secretary may only transport uranium under subsection (a) after receiving from Sequoyah Fuels Corporation a written agreement satisfactory to the Secretary that provides that—

(2) the Secretary of Defense should prepare a comprehensive schedule for safely destroying the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the shortest time possible, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.

(1) the United States assumes no liability, legal or otherwise, of Sequoyah Fuels Corporation with respect to the uranium transported.

(2) the Secretary of Defense should make every effort to ensure adequate funding to complete the elimination of the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the shortest time possible, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.

(1) the United States is committed to making every effort to safely dispose of its chemical weapons stockpiles by the Chemical Weapons Convention deadline of April 29, 2012, or as soon thereafter as possible, and will carry out all of its other obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Chemical Weapons Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, done at Paris on January 13, 1993 (convention referred to as the “Chemical Weapons Convention”), requires all United States chemical weapons stockpiles to be destroyed by no later than the extended deadline under the Chemical Weapons Convention for destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpiles.

(2) On April 10, 2006, the Department of Defense notified Congress that the United States would not meet even the extended deadline under the Chemical Weapons Convention for destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpiles.
SEC. 874. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANDED USE OF MENTOR-PROTEGE AUTHORITY.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of treating small business concerns described in subsection (b) as disadvantaged small business concerns under the Mentor-Protege Program under section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 1824 note).

(b) COVERED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—The small business concerns described in this subsection are small business concerns that—

(1) are participants in the Small Business Innovative Research Program of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638); and

(2) as determined by the Secretary, are developmental or have the potential to become developmental, as described in section 882 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638a).

(c) TREATMENT AS DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the pilot program, the Secretary may treat a small business concern described in subsection (b) as a disadvantaged small business concern under the Mentor-Protege Program.

(2) MENTOR-PROTEGE AGREEMENT.—Any eligible business concerned approved for participation in the Mentor-Protege Program as a mentor firm may enter into a mentor-protege agreement and provide assistance described in section 831(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 with respect to a small business concern treated under paragraph (1) as a disadvantaged small business concern under the Mentor-Protege Program.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the limitation in section 9(f)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)(2)), funds for any reimbursement provided to a mentor firm under section 831(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 with respect to a small business concern described in subsection (b) under the pilot program shall be derived from funds described in subsection (b) as disadvantaged small business concern under the Mentor-Protege Program.

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for reimbursement described in that paragraph may not exceed the amount equal to one percent of the funds available for the Small Business Innovative Research Program.

(e) SUNSET.—

(1) AGREEMENTS.—No mentor-protege agreement may be entered into under the pilot program after September 30, 2010.

(2) OTHER MATTERS.—No reimbursement may be paid, and no credit toward the attaining of a subcontracting goal may be granted under the pilot program after September 30, 2013.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2009, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the pilot program. The report shall—

(1) describe the extent to which mentor-protege agreements have been entered under the pilot program; and

(2) describe and assess the technological benefits arising under such agreements.

(g) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

(A) the Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, and Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate; and

(B) the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 437

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate on the nomination of an individual to serve as Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense on a permanent basis)

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. SENSE OF SENATE ON NOMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO SERVE AS DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION ON A PERMANENT BASIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Congress established the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense in 1983 to ensure the operational effectiveness and suitability of weapon systems in combat.

(2) The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation serves as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on operational test and evaluation and is vital to ensuring the operational effectiveness of weapon systems in combat.

(3) The position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has been held on an acting basis since February 15, 2005.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should submit to the Senate the nomination of an individual to serve as the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as soon as practicable.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to provide compensation for civilian veterans of the Cold War who contracted cancer as a result of their work at our nuclear weapons facilities.

My amendment will ensure that employees who worked at the Nevada Test Site during the years of above- and below-ground nuclear weapons testing and suffering from induced cancers as a result of that work finally receive the compensation they deserve. These Cold War veterans sacrificed their health and well-being for their country. We can wait no longer to acknowledge those sacrifices and to try, in some small way, to compensate for the cancers they have suffered as a result of their service to their country.

U.S. citizens have served their country working in facilities producing and testing nuclear and other atomic energy defense activities that served as a deterrent during the Cold War. Many of these workers were exposed to cancer-causing levels of radiation and placed in harm’s way by the Department of Energy and contractors, and were denied benefits because the Department did not have the knowledge and consent of the workers, without adequate radiation monitoring, and without necessary protections from internal or external occupational radiation exposure.

Six years ago, I worked with President Clinton to pass The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, EEOICPA, to ensure fairness and equity for the men and women who performed duties uniquely related to the nuclear weapons production and testing programs by establishing a program that would provide uniform, and adequate compensation for 22 specified radiation-related cancers.

Research by the Department of Energy, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, NIOSH’s contractors, the President’s Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, and congressional committees indicates that workers were not adequately monitored for internal or external radiation to which the workers were exposed and records were not maintained, are not reliable, are incomplete, or fail to indicate the radioactive isotopes to which workers were exposed. These underlying limitations posed by the factors described above and the resulting harm to the workers, EEOICPA has an expedited process for groups of workers whose radiation dose cannot be estimated with sufficient accuracy or who were exposed to a dose cannot be estimated in a timely manner. These workers are placed into a Special Exposure Cohort, SEC. Workers in an SEC do not have to go through the dose reconstruction process, which can take years and be extremely difficult as these workers are often unable to produce information because it was or is classified.

Congress has already legislatively designated classes of atomic energy veterans, including those working at the Nevada Test Site. We were struck with awe and wonder at the power and strength of these explosions. Little did we know that there was another side to those atomic tests—the exposure of men and women working at the site to cancer-causing substances. Now, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of these Cold War veterans face deadly cancers. Many have already passed away.

The contribution of the State of Nevada to the security of the United States throughout the Cold War and since has been unparalleled. In 1950, President Harry S. Truman designated what would later be called the Nevada Test Site as the Nation’s nuclear proving grounds, and in 1952, the first atmospheric test at the Nevada Test Site was detonated. The United States conducted 100 aboveground and 828 underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site from 1951 to 1992. Out of the 1054 nuclear tests conducted in the United States, 928, or 88 percent, were conducted at the Nevada Test Site.
Unfortunately, Nevada Test Site workers, despite having worked with significant amounts of radioactive materials and having known exposures leading to serious health effects, have been denied compensation under EEOICPA as a result of flawed calculations that are incomplete or in error as well as the use of faulty assumptions and incorrect models.

It has become evident that it is not feasible to estimate with sufficient accuracy the radiation dose received by workers employed at the Department of Energy facility in Nevada known as Nevada Test Site at all in some cases and in others in a timely manner. In fact, the administration has admitted that it cannot construct internal radiation dose for workers employed on the site during the aboveground test and yet is still balking at full compensation for all of these workers. There are many reasons for this, including inadequate monitoring, incomplete radionuclide lists, and DOE’s ignoring nearly a dozen tests conducted at the site that vented. Because of these problems, Nevada Test Site workers have been denied compensation under the act, some of which have waited for decades for their Government to acknowledge the sacrifices they made for their country and compensate them.

Unfortunately, 6 years since the passage of EEOICPA and in some cases decades after their service to their country, very few of those Nevada Test Site Cold War veterans who have cancer have received compensation. In fact, Nevada Test Site workers are receiving compensation at a rate lower than the national average, and many who have waited decades are being told that they have to wait longer. And many have already died while waiting for their compensation.

Last November, I sent a letter to President Bush asking him to initiate this process. He still has not responded. However, his administration is trying to rewrite the law via regulation and cut funding to this program in order to delay compensation further and halt it for some workers altogether.

This is unacceptable.

That is why I am committed to ensuring that Nevada Test Site workers through 1993 are designated as a “special exposure cohort.” This will streamline and speed up the recovery process for those workers.

My amendment would ensure employees and survivors of employees who worked at the Nevada Test Site through 1993 that they receive compensation. I believe this country won the Cold War, sacrificing their personal health in the process, and after decades of waiting and suffering, it is time the Government honored these sacrifices.

This bill would include within the special exposure cohort Nevada Test Site workers employed at the site from 1950 to 1993 who were present during an atmospheric or underground nuclear test or performed drillbacks, reentry, or cleanup work following such tests; present at an episodic event involving radiation release; or employed at Nevada Test Site for at least 250 workdays and in a job activity that involves monitoring or exposure to ionizing radiation or worked in a job activity that is or was comparable to a job that is, was, or should have been monitored for exposure to ionizing radiation.

The Nevada Test Site has served, and continues to serve as the premier research, testing, and development site for our nuclear defense capabilities. The Nevada Test Site and its workers have been, and are, an essential and irreplaceable part of our Nation’s defense capabilities. This bill would honor the service of our atomic energy veterans and provide them with the compensation they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished ranking member for his always cooperative efforts to move this bill along. I think we have made progress on the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Somehow or other, we did make progress.

Mr. WARNER. We did make progress. There will be a briefing in S-407 tomorrow with regard to operations in Iraq. Members of the Senate are invited. I expect we will convene in the morning to order later this evening from the leadership, but we will be back on the bill for some period of time tomorrow.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be put off until Mr. CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, you can imagine the surprise, the consternation of so many who woke up this morning and read on the front page of the Washington Post that the Prime Minister of Iraq suggested he would grant amnesty to those who killed, maimed, hurt Americans. This was just a few days ago.

I rise in support of the resolution offered by my colleagues from Florida and New Jersey to, first, condemn those despicable remarks, and, second, to importune our President, President Bush, to make sure the Prime Minister of Iraq retracts those remarks and registers the strong disapproval of this Senate and of our Nation about what happened.

To give those who shot at, sometimes killed, our maimed Americans a get-out-of-jail-free card is nothing short of despicable and a slap in the face to all Americans. We have been told we are in Iraq for the noblest of purposes—to bring peace and democracy. When the head of state of that country says it is okay if you shot at American troops, it defies belief, it defies credibility.

The bottom line is our President stood with Prime Minister Maliki just two weeks ago and said he looked him in the eye and saw he was a good man. President Bush must have missed something. Clearly, no one can be a good man and state that it would be okay to give amnesty to those who shot at our soldiers.

This is something which calls into question the whole endeavor in Iraq. If this is the man we are relying on to get us out of the morass, to lead a government, and he is able to say that those who shot at our soldiers should be given amnesty while those who shot at Iraqis should not, something is dramatically wrong.

I will never forget when our President said he met President Putin, looked in his eye, and found he was a good man. Yet we have had trouble with President Putin ever since.

Something is desperately the matter. We need to do a few things. We need to pass this resolution immediately and register our condemnation of the remarks.

President Bush, America is asking you to demand a retraction from the Prime Minister of Iraq of these despicable words or America can no longer support sending soldiers to defend Iraq from its previous or current enemies. How can we, our soldiers, and their families go over to Iraq if, when they are shot at by renegade Iraqis, those Iraqis may be given amnesty and a pat on the back? That is despicable. It is so wrong.

I have spent time with families who have lost loved ones in Iraq. I have spent hours seeing our soldiers off to victory, watching as their families, their wives, their husbands, and their children, say goodbye, and watch them board the planes and the transports. For these families, while their beloved men and women are over there, to read that the Prime Minister of Iraq would grant amnesty to someone who tried to kill that soldier who is bravely serving, how would they feel?

President Bush must get on the phone, if he has not already, with the Iraqi Prime Minister and demand a retraction. If not, the American people, and particularly the soldiers and their families, deserve an explanation about what is going on over there. Again, to give a get-out-of-jail-free card to those who shoot at American soldiers while those soldiers are trying to defend freedom, to defend Iraqi peace. How can we, our soldiers, and their families go over to Iraq if, when they are shot at by renegade Iraqis, those Iraqis may be given amnesty and a pat on the back? That is despicable. It is so wrong.

Another question: How can we rely on this man, this new Prime Minister Maliki, as an ally if he says this? My faith in him is shaken to the core. What will happen 2 months from now or 6 months from now?

This is a serious issue. I hope my colleagues will pay attention. It is serious
because of the honor of our soldiers. It is serious because it casts doubt on the future of whatever plan there is in Iraq. It is seriously mostly because it is an inhumane and nasty comment that negativizes all the sacrifices our people have made.

I hope our President will act. He has been silent today. There is no clarification. There is no discussion of a phone call. There is no expression of outrage from the White House. I hope that will change and change soon. If it doesn’t, it has to be because everything we are trying to do over there. This was not a happy day for what is going on in Iraq because of that awful newspaper story this morning and what it reported. I hope, I pray, things will change.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support unanimously the resolution offered by my colleague from Florida and my colleague from New Jersey, that I am proud to support, asking for that change.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I understand the Senate is in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business with 10-minute grants.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, earlier in the week, on Monday to be exact, Senator Robert C. Byrd, our very distinguished colleague, became the longest serving Senator in the history of the U.S. Senate. It is obviously a moment to celebrate and recognize his accomplishments in the service of the Nation. Our celebration is tempered only by the fact that his beloved wife Erma, with whom he spent nearly 69 years of marriage, passed away recently.

I want to join my colleagues who, in the course of this week, have paid tribute to the senior Senator from West Virginia. Senator Byrd this year celebrated his 88th birthday. He has been a U.S. Senator for 50 years, and the longest serving Senator in the history of the Senate. In that time, there was no one who could be considered a more powerful influence on our law and policies, and one who has been so central to so much of the work that the Senate has done. He has been a leader in so many ways, whether it be his leadership on the Appropriations Committee, his role as a policymaker, his work on the Rules Committee, or his role as a powerful player on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is in recognition of the credits accumulated there and other places over a period of many years.

Of the many awards he has received in recognition of his long and distinguished career, Senator Byrd has said that none means more to him than the tribute from the Governor and legislature of his State in naming him “West Virginian of the 20th Century.”

As his colleague here in the Senate for the past 30 years and as one who has the deepest respect and admiration for him and cherishes his counsel and friendship, I submit that he will be remembered not only for his service to the Senate but for his dedication and tenacity he has shown and continues to show every day in the service of our Nation. It is a privilege to be his colleague here in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is in recognition of the credits accumulated there and other places over a period of many years.

Of the many awards he has received in recognition of his long and distinguished career, Senator Byrd has said that none means more to him than the tribute from the Governor and legislature of his State in naming him “West Virginian of the 20th Century.”

As his colleague here in the Senate for the past 30 years and as one who has the deepest respect and admiration for him and cherishes his counsel and friendship, I submit that he will be remembered not only for his service to the Senate but for his dedication and tenacity he has shown and continues to show every day in the service of our Nation. It is a privilege to be his colleague here in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is in recognition of the credits accumulated there and other places over a period of many years.

Of the many awards he has received in recognition of his long and distinguished career, Senator Byrd has said that none means more to him than the tribute from the Governor and legislature of his State in naming him “West Virginian of the 20th Century.”

As his colleague here in the Senate for the past 30 years and as one who has the deepest respect and admiration for him and cherishes his counsel and friendship, I submit that he will be remembered not only for his service to the Senate but for his dedication and tenacity he has shown and continues to show every day in the service of our Nation. It is a privilege to be his colleague here in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today the Chief Justice and associate Justices of the Supreme Court held a memorial observance honoring Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist. It was a really grand event. I am sorry I could not be there the whole time.

At 2 p.m., resolutions in tribute to the Chief Justice were presented for consideration by the Supreme Court bar. There were presentations made by the Solicitor General and by the Attorney General of the United States during a special sitting of the Court, which commenced at 3:15 p.m. this afternoon. Following that, the Supreme Court held a reception for friends of the former Chief Justice.

I think one of the great joys of my life was to be able to say that I was a long-time friend of our former Chief Justice. He and I met here as young lawyers. I left law school when I was seventeen. We were very friendly. As a matter of fact, we double-dated during those days. And as the years went on, as I went to Alaska and came back as U.S. Attorney and had various other functions, we kept in touch. We were divided by a continent, but we remained friends.

Years later, when I came to the Senate, I was with the Department of Justice. I can say it was one of the longest friendships I have had, and I was sad when he passed away. I am here really to ask that the Senate review some of the comments made about my friend and former Chief Justice of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the schedule of the Supreme Court for today, Thursday, June 15, 2006, and also the resolution of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in gratitude and appreciation for the life, work, and service of Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist presented to the Supreme Court today be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

MEMORIAL

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006

Meeting of the Supreme Court Bar—Upper Great Hall, 2:00 p.m.

Call to Order—Paul D. Clement, Solicitor General of the United States.

Introduction of Speakers—Ronald J. Tenpas, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Clerk to Chief Justice Rehnquist (1991 Term), Chairman of the Meeting.

Remarks—Allen R. Snyder, Partner (retired) at Hogan & Hartson LLP, Clerk to Justice Rehnquist (1979 Term).

Remarks—James C. Rehnquist, Son of the Chief Justice.

Remarks—Maureen E. Mahoney, Partner at Latham & Watkins, Clerk to Justice Rehnquist (1979 Term).

Remarks—Courtney Simmons Elwood, Deputy Chief of Staff and Counselor to the Attorney General, Clerk to the Chief Justice (1995 Term).


Motion to Adopt Committee Resolutions—Honorable Steven M. Colloton, Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Clerk to the Chief Justice (1989 Term), Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

Call for Second and Closing Remarks—Ronald J. Tenpas, Chairman of the Meeting, Special Session of the Supreme Court—Courthouse, 3:15 p.m.

Presentation of Resolutions—Paul D. Clement, Solicitor General of the United States.

Request to Accept Resolutions—Paul McNulty, Deputy Attorney General of the United States.


Today, the members of the Bar of the Supreme Court honor the life and legacy of a
gifted lawyer, a selfless public servant, and a treasured teacher, mentor, and friend. Those who knew William Rehnquist will remember him as one who, in the words of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, ‘lived as great a life as the law.’ To his credit, however, Bill Rehnquist cared less about being ‘great’ than about doing and living well. As President George W. Bush noted once, ‘The occasion of his Retirement, “to work beside William Rehnquist was to learn how a wise man looks at the law and how a man looks at life.”’

Rehnquist was born in Wisconsin, on October 1, 1924, the son of a paper salesman and a homemaker who also worked as a transcriptionist. His father, Donald Rehnquist, had worked for a railroad at birth, the future Chief Justice changed his middle name to Hubbe—a family name—in high school. His mother, Rehnquist later explained, had once met a numerologist on a train, and Mrs. Rehnquist was advised that her son would enjoy great success in life if he could dive into the lake more often than she. He won, and contracted pneumonia. Returning to school, Rehnquist graduated from high school in 1942, and after a year at Kenyon College, he joined the United States Army Air Corps. Consistent with his lifelong love for weather—a fascination that would be the stuff of many jokes and memories among his friends and law clerks—he signed up for a premeteorology program.

Rehnquist's assignment in North Africa impressed upon him that “if you lived in the right place, you didn’t have to shovel snow for four months a year.” Accordingly, after discharging from the service as a sergeant, he took whatever clients came in the door. He was sufficiently intrigued by what he learned about the office after dinner. Keeping a schedule that was unusual then, and virtually unheard of today, for the family of a top litigator, the Rehnquists managed to take a month's vacation every year. Rehnquist especially loved camping vacations across the West, visits to a small cabin in the Bradshaw Mountains of Arizona, and driving fast on country roads. Rehnquist ventured so far south that a double yellow line was “just a recommendation.”

The Rehnquists also maintained an active family-oriented social life, including backyard barbecues. Once, when he was in trial, the family dinner was sacred, and he would either bring work home or make the ten-minute drive back to the courthouse. Later, as a justice, Rehnquist reminded him that he had the good fortune to realize long ago, instinctively, what now seems to him so clearly—that time is a wasting asset. He spent abundant time with his wife and young children, “not out of any great sense of duty, but just because I enjoyed it so much.”

As Assistant Attorney General, Rehnquist was “in effect, the President’s lawyer’s lawyer,” as President Richard Nixon would later describe him. He served in the Department during challenging years in the midst of the Vietnam War. He helped to hone the position of the Executive Branch on delicate legal issues and carried the message of the Administration around the country in numerous public appearances. He discharged his responsibilities with such great distinction that President Ford noted that “among the thousands of able lawyers who serve in the Federal Government, he rates at the very top as a constitutional lawyer and as a scholar.”

In 1972 at the age of 48, Rehnquist was made President’s choice to be the 100th Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Rehnquist spent time in the office after dinner. Keeping a schedule that was unusual then, and virtually unheard of today, for the family of a top litigator, the Rehnquists managed to take a month's vacation every year. Rehnquist especially loved camping vacations across the West, visits to a small cabin in the Bradshaw Mountains of Arizona, and driving fast on country roads. Rehnquist ventured so far south that a double yellow line was “just a recommendation.”

The Rehnquists also maintained an active family-oriented social life, including backyard barbecues. Once, when he was in trial, the family dinner was sacred, and he would either bring work home or make the ten-minute drive back to the courthouse. Later, as a justice, Rehnquist reminded him that he had the good fortune to realize long ago, instinctively, what now seems to him so clearly—that time is a wasting asset. He spent abundant time with his wife and young children, “not out of any great sense of duty, but just because I enjoyed it so much.”

After the 1968 election, Rehnquist’s involvement in politics resulted in an opportunity to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Arizona Department of Justice. Upon receiving word of this job offer, Rehnquist visited the Phoenix public library to see what he could learn about the office, and he was sufficiently intrigued by what he read to accept the position. The family moved to Washington, but Rehnquist never lost his deep affection for Arizona or his fond memories of these earlier years. He left Phoenix, as he put it, “very much richer for the experience, but having accumulated very little of the world’s goods.”

As Assistant Attorney General, Rehnquist was “in effect, the President’s lawyer’s lawyer,” as President Richard Nixon would later describe him. He served in the Department during challenging years in the midst of the Vietnam War. He helped to hone the position of the Executive Branch on delicate legal issues and carried the message of the Administration around the country in numerous public appearances. He discharged his responsibilities with such great distinction that President Ford noted that “among the thousands of able lawyers who serve in the Federal Government, he rates at the very top as a constitutional lawyer and as a scholar.”

In 1972 at the age of 48, Rehnquist was made President’s choice to be the 100th Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Rehnquist spent time in the office after dinner. Keeping a schedule that was unusual then, and virtually unheard of today, for the family of a top litigator, the Rehnquists managed to take a month's vacation every year. Rehnquist especially loved camping vacations across the West, visits to a small cabin in the Bradshaw Mountains of Arizona, and driving fast on country roads. Rehnquist ventured so far south that a double yellow line was “just a recommendation.”

The Rehnquists also maintained an active family-oriented social life, including backyard barbecues. Once, when he was in trial, the family dinner was sacred, and he would either bring work home or make the ten-minute drive back to the courthouse. Later, as a justice, Rehnquist reminded him that he had the good fortune to realize long ago, instinctively, what now seems to him so clearly—that time is a wasting asset. He spent abundant time with his wife and young children, “not out of any great sense of duty, but just because I enjoyed it so much.”

In 1976, he summed up his judicial philosophy in an essay entitled, “The Notion of a...
Living Constitution." He rejected the notion that judges “are a small group of fortunately situated people with a roving commission to second-guess Congress, state legislatures, and an administrative establishment concerning what is best for the country.” That elected representatives had not solved a particular social problem, he wrote, did not necessarily mean that the federal judiciary, in its role as the "fourth branch of government," should be "a solution." Rehnquist was critical of a mode of constitutional interpretation that would allow "appointed federal judges" to impose on others a rule that "would be like Caesar's wife, Calpurnia, that they cease to be effective forums in which the pendulum has swung too far and that any excesses.

As Rehnquist took his new seat as the Chief Justice, Rehnquist emerged as a powerful intellectual force. He authored a number of significant opinions for the Court, did not hesitate to press his position in solitary dissent, thus inspiring an early group of law clerks to bestow upon him a Lone Ranger doll as a memento. Chief Justice Burger resigned in 1986, it was precisely Rehnquist's powerful intellect, his stellar record on the Court, and his consistent judicial philosophy that made him President Ronald Reagan's pick to lead the Court. But no less important were Rehnquist's leadership qualities and the respect he garnered from his colleagues, whether conservative or liberal, of time has elapsed and a problem remains unsolved by them, the federal judiciary may press its own view as the court of last resort. In such a case, Rehnquist held that they cease to be effective forums in which the pendulum surely swung back, with the Court

Rehnquist served as Chief Justice for nearly 20 years, a period during which he wrote more opinions than any other Justice in Court history. During his tenure, Rehnquist

Rehnquist was critical of a mode of constitutional interpretation that would allow "appointed federal judges" to impose on others a rule that "would be like Caesar's wife, Calpurnia, that they cease to be effective forums in which the pendulum has swung too far and that any excesses.

As Rehnquist took his new seat as the Chief Justice, Rehnquist emerged as a powerful intellectual force. He authored a number of significant opinions for the Court, did not hesitate to press his position in solitary dissent, thus inspiring an early group of law clerks to bestow upon him a Lone Ranger doll as a memento. Chief Justice Burger resigned in 1986, it was precisely Rehnquist's powerful intellect, his stellar record on the Court, and his consistent judicial philosophy that made him President Ronald Reagan's pick to lead the Court. But no less important were Rehnquist's leadership qualities and the respect he garnered from his colleagues, whether conservative or liberal, that courts are not to be participants in "dirty business," neither are they to be en
dorsed the exclusionary rule adopted during Rehnquist's tenure. Miranda remains a "constitutional decision," but exceptions and limitations adopted by the Court ensure that it gives way to competing concerns such as the right to counsel, Miranda rights, and the ex-

"Neither Mapp nor Miranda was overruled during Rehnquist's tenure on the Court. Indeed, in Dickerson v. United States, the Chief Justice wrote for the Court in 2000 that "[W]ether or not we would agree with Miranda's holding, if we were addressing the issue in the first instance, the principles of stare decisis weigh heavily against overruling it now." Yet the pendulum surely swung back, with the Court

"As it turned out, Rehnquist's last opinion was for a plurality in Van Orden v. Perry, in which a religious symbol installed on public property was not a "established" religion by including a Ten Commandments monument among the nearly 40 monuments and historical markers on the grounds of the state capitol. He wrote: "Our cases, Januslike, point in two directions in applying the Establishment Clause. One face looks toward the strong role of religion and religious traditions throughout our Nation's history. . . . The other face looks toward the principle that governmental intervention in religious matters, or to recognize religious traditions and practices and exclude conflict with governmental interests, is a safeguard for in-

Rehnquist's commitment to judicial enforcement of the Establishment Clause, where the federal-state balance was perhaps most discernible in the Court's cases interpreting the Commerce Clause. As early as 1973, dissenting justices ruled that the federal government must treat the States like sovereign entities, rather than like indi-

As a third area where Rehnquist's legacy is both striking and significant involves the structure and powers of the federal government created by our Constitution and the retained powers of the States. From his earliest to his final days on the Court, Rehnquist was critical of what he called "first principles": Ours is a national government, limited, derives its power from the States and the grant of power, under our Constitution, is an agreement among the States neither abdicate our responsibility to defend a wide and state nor evince a hostility to religion by disabling the government from in some ways recognizing our religious heritage.]

Rehnquist's commitment to the constitutional doctrine that states and the national government act "in pari materia," that is, that the federal government does not "run around popular government,

"As Rehnquist took his new seat as the leader of the Court in 1986, President Reagan presently remarked that he "will be a Chief Justice of historic stature." Rehnquist served for nearly 20 years, and together with his service as an Associate Justice for more than 14 years, this tenure made him one of the Supreme Court's seven longest-serving members. In that time, Rehnquist left an indelible mark on the Su-

"Another area where Rehnquist's work had a powerful effect on the shape and development of the law is religious freedom and the anti-commandeering principle, its strengthening of the States' sovereign immunity, and

Rehnquist’s dedication to judicial restraint and popular government is perhaps most evident in his writings on the subject of ‘substantive due process.’ At his confirmation hearing, Rehnquist was the last remaining member of the Court that had decided Roe v. Wade. He had dissented from the opinion of the Court, commenting that the Court’s reasoning violated the “discredited doctrine of Lochner v. New York, and commenting that the Court’s opinion in Roe ‘partakes more of judicial legislation than of judicial interpretation.’” While Rehnquist was the last remaining member of the Court that had decided Roe v. Wade, he was the first member of the Court to dissuade his restrained approach to substantive due process.

In Washington v. Glucksberg, Chief Justice Rehnquist wrote for the majority and commented that the Court’s reasoning to the “constitutional right to be free from wanton and gratuitous killing” was “genuinely corrosive of the fundamental values of our democratic society.” Running through his opinions and recitations of a case by saying “we hope all your answers will be principled.” When a lawyer responded to Rehnquist by saying “you are correct, Chief Justice,” the Chief said, “I’m glad to know that.” During his last public session on the Bench, Rehnquist observed that seven different opinions had been written in a case, then remarked, “I didn’t know we had so many Justices.”

As the last Chief Justice presided over not only the Bench and the Conference, but over the entire Judicial Branch as well. He brought to this role the same collegiality, wisdom, effectiveness, and clarity of purpose that marked his leadership of the Supreme Court itself. As with so many things he did, he impressed all with his ability to perform so effectively while running the Judiciary. His colleague Justice Byron White remarked in 1996 that “of the three Chief Justices with whom I have served, the man who now sits in the center chair, . . . seems to me to be the least stressed by his responsibilities and to be the most efficient manager of his complicated schedule.”

Rehnquist’s legacy on the Supreme Court involves much more than doctrinal contributions and particularly noteworthy decisions. He encouraged and exemplified collegiality, fairness, and graciousness among the Justices, urging them towards greater consensus wherever possible, and the respect enjoyed by the Court in American society. To some degree, Rehnquist’s achievements as the leader of the Court were the result of all these things—his ability to be the conscience—from Justice Rehnquist, “The Lone Dissenter,” to Chief Justice Rehnquist, the consensus-builder.

In his 1988 confirmation hearings, Rehnquist alluded to the role of a Chief Justice in gaining consensus, and allowed that deviation from personal judicial philosophy may be proper “where there are constraints that there ought to be a court opinion rather than a plurality opinion.” Rehnquist acknowledged, in an interview, that while his legal philosophy had never changed, since becoming the Chief Justice he had “become a lot more convinced of the need for the Court to get a Court opinion in each case. . . . I’m more conscious of the need for that and also conscious of the . . . lack of need for a lot of concurring opinions.”

For those attorneys privileged to argue before the Supreme Court during Rehnquist’s long tenure, his legacy is probably as much about the personal presence of the man as about the ramifications of the decisions he reached. As rector of the Bench as his approach to the Constitution or the Conference, Rehnquist’s view of oral argument was emblematic of his no-nonsense approach. The Court’s opinion was defined as an integrated life as a lawyer, a life that is the end of all human endeavor.” In a 2000 commencement address, he invited the wonderful old Jimmy Stewart movie, You Can’t Go Home Again, with You, this advice to ambitious young lawyers to “[d]evelop a capacity to enjoy pastimes or pretense. Al- though Rehnquist had decided as to the Supreme Court’s refusal to hear the case. When one lawyer rose to present his re- buttal to Rehnquist’s decision, he stated, while breaking a wi, “the Marshal says you have 5 seconds left, and under the principle de minimis non curat lex, the case is disposed.

Rehnquist’s dry sense of humor often was on display during argument sessions. During one argument, a lawyer gained that he described as an “honest and principled answer” to another Justice’s question, and the Chief quickly replied, “we hope all your answers will be principled.” When a lawyer responded to Rehnquist by saying “you are correct, Chief Justice,” the Chief said, “I’m glad to know that.” During his last public session on the Bench, Rehnquist observed that seven different opinions had been written in a case, then remarked, “I didn’t know we had so many Justices.”

As the last Chief Justice presided over not only the Bench and the Conference, but over the entire Judicial Branch as well. He brought to this role the same collegiality, wisdom, effectiveness, and clarity of purpose that marked his leadership of the Supreme Court itself. As with so many things he did, he impressed all with his ability to perform so effectively while running the Judiciary. His colleague Justice Byron White remarked in 1996 that “of the three Chief Justices with whom I have served, the man who now sits in the center chair, . . . seems to me to be the least stressed by his responsibilities and to be the most efficient manager of his complicated schedule.”

Rehnquist brought his penchant for innovation and management of the judicial branch. He adopted changes that dramatically improved the efficiency and operation of the Judicial Conference, including creation of the newly designated Executive Committee, which became the senior executive arm of the Judicial Conference. He fostered inclusiveness by requiring, for the first time, that members of Judicial Conference committees rotate regularly, and he never asserted his authority as Chief Justice to impose compromises or to be the de facto dictator of the Court. He instilled in his staff and toward the public an integrated life as a lawyer, a life that is the end of all human endeavor.” In a 2000 commencement address, he invited the wonderful old Jimmy Stewart movie, You Can’t Go Home Again, with You, this advice to ambitious young lawyers to “[d]evelop a capacity to enjoy pastimes or pretense. Although he was already the last Chief Justice in history to preside over an impeachment trial, confronted a disputed presidential election in 2000, and led the Court in deciding pressing questions involving civil liberties and security in the context of the war on terror and the attacks of September 11, 2001.

For those who knew, worked with, learned from, and cared about William Rehnquist, his personal qualities—the unassuming manner, the care he took to put people at ease, and his constant desire to be a teacher and mentor—are as salient in memories of him as his re-invention of the “first principles” of our federalism, his re-focusing of the Ninth Amendment on reasonableness, or his conviction that the religion clauses of the First Amendment do not require a public square scrubbed clean of religious faith and expression. Rehnquist never forgot what it felt like to arrive at the Court as a slightly westerstruck and appropriately apprehensive law clerk. He never lost his sense of gratitude for the opportunity to serve the law in that great institution. And he never outgrew or got tired of teaching young lawyers how to read carefully, write clearly, think hard, and live well.

William Rehnquist served well his country, his profession, and the Constitution. All the while, he kept and nurtured a healthy focus on his family, his spouse, his clerk, his clerks a commitment to building and living an integrated life as a lawyer, a life that is the end of all human endeavor.” In a 2000 commencement address, he invited the wonderful old Jimmy Stewart movie, You Can’t Go Home Again, with You, this advice to ambitious young lawyers to “[d]evelop a capacity to enjoy pastimes or pretense. Although he was already the last Chief Justice in history to preside over an impeachment trial, confronted a disputed presidential election in 2000, and led the Court in deciding pressing questions involving civil liberties and security in the context of the war on terror and the attacks of September 11, 2001.

For those who knew, worked with, learned from, and cared about William Rehnquist, his personal qualities—the unassuming manner, the care he took to put people at ease, and his constant desire to be a teacher and mentor—are as salient in memories of him as his re-invention of the “first principles” of our federalism, his re-focusing of the Ninth Amendment on reasonableness, or his conviction that the religion clauses of the First Amendment do not require a public square scrubbed clean of religious faith and expression. Rehnquist never forgot what it felt like to arrive at the Court as a slightly westerstruck and appropriately apprehensive law clerk. He never lost his sense of gratitude for the opportunity to serve the law in that great institution. And he never outgrew or got tired of teaching young lawyers how to read carefully, write clearly, think hard, and live well.

William Rehnquist served well his country, his profession, and the Constitution. All the while, he kept and nurtured a healthy focus on his family, his spouse, his clerk, his clerks a commitment to building and living an integrated life as a lawyer, a life that is the end of all human endeavor.” In a 2000 commencement address, he invited the wonderful old Jimmy Stewart movie, You Can’t Go Home Again, with You, this advice to ambitious young lawyers to “[d]evelop a capacity to enjoy pastimes or pretense. Although he was already the last Chief Justice in history to preside over an impeachment trial, confronted a disputed presidential election in 2000, and led the Court in deciding pressing questions involving civil liberties and security in the context of the war on terror and the attacks of September 11, 2001.
In the final years of his life, he recalled happily that the “structure of the law practice” in Phoenix when he practiced there was such that I was able to earn a decent living, while saving during the time needed for my wife and children and some civic activities. Lawyers were not nearly as time conscious then as they are now; this meant that they probably earned less, but that they might have, but had a more enjoyable life.” He exalted law school graduates to realize that because of their abilities and opportunities, they would have “choices,” and that “how wisely you make these choices will determine how well spent you think your life is when you look back at it.” Gathered here together, his words are a timely reminder that the Members of the Bar of the Supreme Court are pleased and honored to announce the opinion that his was a great life, and well spent.

Wherefore, it is Resolved, That we, the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, express our great admiration and respect for Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, our deep sense of loss upon his death, our appreciation of his contribution to the law, the Court, and the Nation, and our gratitude for his ex-sense of loss upon his death, our appreciation of his contribution to the law, the Court, and the Nation, and our gratitude for his example of a life well spent; and it is further

Resolved, That the Solicitor General be asked to present these resolutions to the Court and that the Attorney General be asked to move that they be inscribed on the Court's permanent records.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as President pro tempore, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement from the President of the United States be entered into the record today pursuant to the War Powers Resolution (P.L. 93–148) and P.L. 107–40.

There being no objection, it is so ordered:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

HON. TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am providing this supplemental consolidated report, prepared by my Administration and consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148), to inform the Congress about deployments of U.S. combat-equipped Armed Forces around the world. This supplemental report covers operations of the war on terror, Kosovo, and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

THE WAR ON TERROR

Since September 24, 2001, I have reported, consistent with Public Law 107–40 and the War Powers Resolution, on the combat operations in Afghanistan against al-Qaeda terrorists and their Taliban supporters, which began on October 7, 2001, and the deployment of various combat-equipped and combat-support forces to a number of locations in the Central, Pacific, and Southern Command areas of operation in support of those operations and of other operations in our war on terror.

I will direct additional measures as necessary to exercise the right of the U.S. to self-defense and to protect U.S. citizens and interests. Such measures may include short-notice deployment of special operations and other forces for sensitive operations in various locations throughout the world. It is not possible to know at this time either the precise scope or deployment of U.S. Armed Forces necessary to counter the terrorist threat to the United States.

United States Armed Forces, with the assistance of numerous coalition partners in Afghanistan and training capability. United States Armed Forces, with the assistance of numerous coalition partners in Afghanistan and their Armed Forces Command, Afghanistan, ended the Taliban regime, and are actively pursuing and engaging remnant al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters in Afghanistan. Approximately 200 U.S. personnel are also assigned to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The U.N. Security Council authorized the ISAF in its Resolution 1386 of December 20, 2001, and has reaffirmed its authorization since that time, most recently for a 12-month period beginning October 12, 2006, in U.N. Resolution 1625 of September 13, 2005. The mission of the ISAF under NATO command is to assist the Government of Afghanistan in creating a secure environment that allows reconstruction and the reestablishment of Afghan authorities. Currently, all 26 NATO nations contribute to the ISAF. Ten non-NATO countries also participate by providing military and other support personnel to the ISAF.

The United States continues to detain several hundred al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters who are believed to pose a continuing threat to the United States and its interests. The combat-equipped and combat-support forces deployed to Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in the U.S. Southern Command area of operations since January 2002 continue to conduct secure detention operations for the approximately 250 prisoners held on the prison personnel to the ISAF.

The U.N. Security Council authorized a Multinational Force in Iraq under unified command in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1511 of October 16, 2003, and reaffirmed its authorization in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1546 of June 8, 2004. In U.N. Security Council Resolution 1637 of November 8, 2005, the Security Council, noting the Iraqi government’s request to retain the presence of the MNF, extended the MNF mandate for a period ending on December 31, 2006. Under Resolutions 1546 and 1637, the mission of the MNF is to contribute to security and stability in Iraq and support the reconstruction of the country. The MNF, consisting of approximately 131,000 military personnel, continues to conduct training and support of the Iraqi security forces and institutions as the Iraqi people drafted and approved a constitution and established a constitutionally elected government. The U.S. contribution to the MNF is approximately 131,000 military personnel.

In furtherance of our efforts against terrorists who pose a continuing and imminent threat to the United States, our friends and allies in the region, and our forces abroad, the United States continues to work with and supports the UNMIK at most levels; provides a security presence in towns, villages, and countryside; participating in the Kosovo Liberation Army; provides security and stability in the geographic combatant commanders.

I will direct additional measures as necessary to exercise the right of the U.S. to self-defense and to protect U.S. citizens and interests. Such measures may include short-notice deployment of special operations and other forces for sensitive operations in various locations throughout the world. It is not possible to know at this time either the precise scope or deployment of U.S. Armed Forces necessary to counter the terrorist threat to the United States.

United States Armed Forces, with the assistance of numerous coalition partners in Afghanistan and their Armed Forces Command, Afghanistan, ended the Taliban regime, and are actively pursuing and engaging remnant al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters in Afghanistan. Approximately 200 U.S. personnel are also assigned to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The U.N. Security Council authorized the ISAF in its Resolution 1386 of December 20, 2001, and has reaffirmed its authorization since that time, most recently for a 12-month period beginning October 12, 2006, in U.N. Resolution 1625 of September 13, 2005. The mission of the ISAF under NATO command is to assist the Government of Afghanistan in creating a secure environment that allows reconstruction and the reestablishment of Afghan authorities. Currently, all 26 NATO nations contribute to the ISAF. Ten non-NATO countries also participate by providing military and other support personnel to the ISAF.

The United States continues to detain several hundred al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters who are believed to pose a continuing threat to the United States and its interests. The combat-equipped and combat-support forces deployed to Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in the U.S. Southern Command area of operations since January 2002 continue to conduct secure detention operations for the approximately 250 prisoners held on the prison personnel to the ISAF.

The U.N. Security Council authorized a Multinational Force in Iraq under unified command in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1511 of October 16, 2003, and reaffirmed its authorization in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1546 of June 8, 2004. In U.N. Security Council Resolution 1637 of November 8, 2005, the Security Council, noting the Iraqi government’s request to retain the presence of the MNF, extended the MNF mandate for a period ending on December 31, 2006. Under Resolutions 1546 and 1637, the mission of the MNF is to contribute to security and stability in Iraq and support the reconstruction of the country. The MNF, consisting of approximately 131,000 military personnel, continues to conduct training and support of the Iraqi security forces and institutions as the Iraqi people drafted and approved a constitution and established a constitutionally elected government. The U.S. contribution to the MNF is approximately 131,000 military personnel.

In furtherance of our efforts against terrorists who pose a continuing and imminent threat to the United States, our friends and allies in the region, and our forces abroad, the United States continues to work with and supports the UNMIK at most levels; provides a security presence in towns, villages, and countryside; participating in the Kosovo Liberation Army; provides security and stability in the geographic combatant commanders.
NATO HEADQUARTERS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Pursuant to the June 2004 decision made by NATO Heads of State and Government, and in accordance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1515 of November 22, 2003, NATO concluded its stabilization force operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and established NATO Headquarters-Sarajevo to continue to assist in implementing the Peace Agreement in conjunction with a newly established European Force. The NATO Headquarters-Sarajevo, to which approximately 250 U.S. personnel, assigned in support of operational supporting tasks, such as counterterrorism and supporting the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in all of these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. Officials of my Administration and I communicate regularly with the leadership and other Members of Congress with regard to these deployments, and we will continue to do so.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.


EDUCATING NEW MOTHERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the importance of educating new mothers about postpartum depression. The bill I am introducing today with Senator MENENDEZ will provide screening and education for women who have given birth and will promote research into the causes, diagnoses and treatments for postpartum depression.

The Commonwealth Fund released a study last month that finds postpartum depression inhibits a mother’s ability to safely and effectively care for her children after pregnancy. Mothers who are affected by postpartum depression are less likely to provide essential developmental support for the child through playing, talking, showing picture books, and following daily routines.

For many mothers, the depression worsens if it isn’t diagnosed, which can lead to substance abuse, loss of employment, divorce, further social alienation, self-destructive behavior, and even suicide. A few years ago in Chicago, within a 4-week period, several new mothers who were affected by postpartum depression took their own lives.

Melanie Stokes jumped from a 12-story Chicago hotel, taking her life only a few months after her daughter was born. The day before her daughter’s first birthday, Amy Garvey’s body was found floating in Lake Michigan. Jennifer Mudé Houghtaling, from Wisconsin, jumped in front a subway train in Chicago less than 5 months after giving birth. Her 3-month-old daughter, giving birth to quaduplets, Ariceli Erivas Sandoval drowned herself in Lake Michigan.

These are tragic, heart-wrenching stories. I wish I could say that is the end of the story, but the problem is far more common than that. Each year, far more than half of women giving birth suffer from postpartum mood changes. The more mild “baby blues” affect up to 80 percent of new mothers. Postpartum mood and anxiety disorders impair 10 to 20 percent of new mothers, and postpartum psychoses strikes 1 in 1,000 women after birth.

The Menendez-Durbin bill authorizes postpartum depression screening and information for mothers before they leave the birthing center. Through a State grant program, health care providers are given the tools they need to recognize signs of depression and to educate women and their families about the disorder and how to access help.

We also call on the National Institutes of Health to convene a series of national meetings on postpartum depression and psychosis and then to expand and intensify research around that consensus.

Our bill has been endorsed by the Illinois Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics; the Illinois Psychiatric Association; Support International; the Association of Women’s Health; Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, AWHONN; the Family Mental Health Institute, Inc.; the National Mental Health Association and the New Jersey Chapter of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, ACOG.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator MENENDEZ and me in supporting the MOTHERS Act, which will ensure that new mothers are educated about postpartum depression and that research will help us prevent and treat postpartum depression in new mothers.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PETTY OFFICER 2ND CLASS JAIME JAENKE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the first female Iowan to have lost her life in the Iraq conflict. Petty Officer 2nd Class Jaime Jaenke was a naval reservist who had been in Iraq for only 3 months. She was killed on Monday, June 5, when the humvee she was traveling in was hit by an improvised explosive device. She was 29 years old and was assigned to the Naval Construction Battalion 25 at Fort McCoy, WI.

Petty Officer Jaenke has given her life for our country, and I would ask that all Americans join me today in remembering and honoring Petty Officer Jaenke. Her loss will be felt deeply in the town of Iowa Falls. Although she had lived in Wisconsin for a number of years, she returned to Iowa 2 years ago and last fall opened an equestrian business outside Iowa Falls. My thoughts and prayers go out to Petty Officer Jaenke’s daughter, Kayla, her parents, Susan and Larry, as well as all those other family and friends who are grieving the loss of this young mother.

We owe a huge debt of gratitude to Petty Officer Jaenke for her sacrifice. I am greatly saddened by her passing but deeply proud and grateful for what she gave for America. Her loss remains tragic but she died a true patriot.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to support traditional marriage, the bedrock of our society, and therefore support the Marriage Protection Amendment.

Like some of my colleagues, I believe that marriage is typically a State issue. Unlected, lifetime-appointed judges, however, have forced our hand on this issue. We can no longer sit idly by while a handful of activist judges lay the groundwork to overturn the Defense of Marriage Act and redefine marriage for the entire Nation.

I voted in favor of the Defense of Marriage Act a decade ago, which reinforced States rights on this issue. Since then, 26 States have passed statutes designed to prevent same-sex marriage by defining marriage only as the union of a man and a woman. Further, 19 States now have constitutional amendments that contain this same definition. Voters in seven additional States will vote on constitutional amendments this year. Another four State legislature—including that of my own State, Iowa—are considering sending constitutional amendments to voters within the next 2 years. Ballot initiatives are currently in three States. Only a handful of States have redefined marriage to include same-sex partnerships, created a version of civil unions, or lack actual or planned protection for traditional marriage.

The states have spoken. A great majority of them have decided that marriage, in their States, shall consist solely of the union of a man and a woman. But, it has become a common prediction that the Federal sense of Marriage Act will be overturned by the judiciary. In that case, the full faith and credit clause of our Constitution would require every State to recognize so-called marriages performed in States that allow the union of same-sex couples, many only by judicial decree. We cannot allow unelected judges to force their will upon the people, who have acted through the democratic process to defend traditional marriage. Under our Constitution, Congress has the responsibility to enact legislation. Congress also has the responsibility to initiate the constitutional amendment process. We must fulfill this duty to protect traditional marriage. We must provide the States the opportunity to defend marriage as they have defined it.

SCHOOL SAFETY ACQUIRING FACULTY EXCELLENCE ACT

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my support...
for H.R. 4894, the School Safety Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act.

As the father of three children, I know that nothing is more important than protecting their safety. We do everything to ensure that our children are safe while they are in our care. But just as in our personal lives, we must do everything we can to make sure they are safe when we cannot be right there beside them. One of the ways we can accomplish this is to provide for a safe school environment.

We trust teachers, principals, coaches, and other school employees to teach our children, to protect our children, and to nurture our children during the school day. Therefore, it is imperative that our school districts have the necessary tools to thoroughly review all school employees before they ever come into contact with our children.

The School Safety Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act will help school districts better examine job applicants by having the FBI General and the Department of Justice provide localities with direct access to the FBI's national crime information databases and assistance with fingerprint background checks for potential employees. Currently, there is a myriad of laws across the States pertaining to background checks for school employees. This legislation will ensure a more thorough process and encourage information sharing across State borders.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, which is a step forward in promoting safe schools and protecting our children.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR RECOMMENDATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to inform my colleagues of my request to Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to strongly recommend the nomination of MSG Woodrow W. Keeble for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Last week, the Secretary of the Army made a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense that the late MSG Woodrow W. Keeble be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I strongly encourage and request that the Secretary of Defense recommend Mr. Keeble for this award and that action be taken quickly, particularly for the sake of Mr. Keeble's widow, to recognize Mr. Keeble's heroic actions. Mr. Keeble was a full-blooded Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux, who fought in both World War II and the Korean war. He was born in Waubay, SD, and attended Wahpeton Indian School in North Dakota. While attending Wahpeton Indian School, Mr. Keeble excelled as a baseball pitcher. His outstanding athletic ability, for which he is remembered in the Wahpeton community, would later serve him well during his acts of bravery and courage in the military.

The brave actions that make Mr. Keeble deserving of the Congressional Medal of Honor occurred during Operation Nomad of the Korean war on October 20, 1951. During the Korean war, Mr. Keeble was assigned to Company G, 19th Infantry, 24th Division of the U.S. Army. He was charged with leading the 1st platoon of Company G as master sergeant.

Mr. Keeble's actions on October 20, 1951, were reminiscent of Hollywood movies, but this was real heroism. On that date, Mr. Keeble's company was charged with the mission of taking and holding Hill 765, a densely forested and well-defended terrain near Kumsong, Korea. As they began to reach their final objective, the lead platoon of Company G was ambushed with heavy fire from three enemy machine gun nests. The platoon's situation became grave as Mr. Keeble, acting platoon leader of a support platoon, left his position of cover and bravely made his way forward and joined the trapped platoon.

It took Mr. Keeble little time to decide that immediate action had to be taken. He courageously crawled directly into the line of fire to take out the enemy machine guns. He successfully crawled up the rocky terrain and neutralized the first two machine gun positions and rendered them useless. The remaining enemy machine gun nest brought terrific fire down upon him. Undaunted by the rain of concussion and fragmentation grenades, Mr. Keeble proceeded to take out the third position. After commissioning the enemy with his last grenade, he launched a one-man assault with his M-1 rifle. By this time, he sustained multiple shrapnel wounds. Fearlessly, he took out the final machine gun position with his rifle. While awaiting the arrival of his fellow soldiers, he continued to singlehandedly take out two additional nearby trenches of enemy troops, and he effectively neutralized the enemy stronghold, inaction in an important and critical struggle. Mr. Keeble's heroic actions led to the successful accomplishment of Company G's mission and, no doubt, saved the lives of many American troops.

Those who served with Mr. Keeble twice recommended him for the Congressional Medal of Honor, but the recommendations were lost. The first was due to the regiment's move from the Korean theater, and the second was an inability to meet mapping requirements. However, Mr. Keeble's service record noted that both instances of application only required two signatures, but in each case, all the men in Master Sergeant Keeble's company signed the Congressional Medal of Honor request. Eventually, the deadline for the Medal of Honor passed. However, Mr. Keeble's family was granted their request in 2002 that his file be reopened.

For his acts of heroism, he was awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Distinguished Service Cross. The criteria for the Congressional Medal of Honor include deeds of personal bravery, self-sacrifice, or an action that conspicuously distinguishes the individual above his comrades. Should the President agree to this recommendation, Mr. Keeble would be the first Sioux Indian to be awarded the Nation's highest military honor if he is chosen to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. Certainly, the courage and patriotic acts exhibited by Mr. Keeble during times of war make him a long overdue and deserving recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. President, I urge the Secretary of Defense to strongly recommend the nomination of MSG Woodrow W. Keeble for the Congressional Medal of Honor to the President of the United States, and I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting a truly brave and courageous American.

MAGNUSON- STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank Senators STEVENS and INOUYE, the chair and ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, for their efforts in incorporating my amendment into the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006, S. 1224. My amendment makes Oregon's salmon fishermen eligible for disaster assistance. Their willingness to accommodate my concerns and help Oregon's salmon fishermen means that I can withdraw the objection I issued 2 weeks ago to any unanimous consent request for the Senate to act on the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act. I also wish to thank Senator SMITH and Senator BOXER for their important contributions and assistance. I look forward to swift passage of the legislation, as amended.

The inclusion of the disaster declaration in the Magnuson-Stevens authorizations is an important first step in getting relief for our salmon fishermen and coastal communities that depend on salmon for their livelihoods. After waiting months for a disaster declaration from the administration, our salmon fishermen now finally have some movement to help address their immediate financial needs. Even with this important language, the fight to help Oregon's salmon fishermen is far from over, and I will continue to press for congressional appropriations to fund the disaster assistance fishing families and the coastal fishing communities need.

WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. As ranking member on the Special Committee on Aging, I am pleased that the international community has designated this day. It is important to recognize the grim reality of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation and focus on...
what we can do to end these horrible crimes.

In the past 40 years, our Nation has struggled to address some of our society’s worst ills: child abuse and domestic violence. Now we must confront elder abuse.

For the past 25 years, Congress has heard hearings on the devastating effects of elder abuse, yet we have taken no comprehensive action. Abuse of the elderly is nothing new, but as our Nation has aged and the baby boom generation stands on the cusp of retirement, the prevalence of elder abuse will only get worse. The time to act is now. We can no longer ignore or tolerate the shame and scandal of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of our Nation’s seniors.

I have long made ending elder abuse a top priority. I worked hard to develop a national criminal background check system for nursing home, home health, and home care employees. While the vast majority of these employees are diligent, dedicated, and professional, it is too easy for people with abusive and criminal backgrounds to find work in long-term care. This is unacceptable. Today, seven States, including the State of Wisconsin, are engaged in a pilot project based on my legislation which requires long-term care employers to run FBI criminal background checks on potential employees before they are hired and trusted to care for our loved ones. My hope is that upon completion of this pilot project, we will move to a national criminal background check system and protect seniors in all 50 States.

I am also a proud original cosponsor of the Elder Justice Act, which takes a number of steps to prevent and treat elder abuse. It will improve prevention and intervention by funding State and local projects that keep older Americans safe. It will ensure that health of- ficials, social services, law enforcement, long-term care facilities, consumer advocates, and families are all working together to confront this problem; and, it will establish training programs so health professionals in both forensic pathology and geriatrics can better detect elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

Finally, the bill will establish victim assistance programs, create “safe havens” for seniors in dangerous situations, and help train law enforce- ment officers to prioritize and investigate cases of elder abuse.

Researchers have warned us that the reported cases of elder abuse might only be the tip of the iceberg; that is why World Elder Abuse Awareness Day is so important. We must spread the word: elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation is occurring every day and, if left unchecked, will only grow more prevalent. As I continue my efforts here in Congress, I look to my fellow leagues and Americans everywhere to join me in putting an end to this terrible scourge of elder abuse.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HOOSIER DADS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to pay tribute to 17 Hoosier Dads whose outstanding commitment to fatherhood serves as example of how responsible, involved dads can promote stronger families and raise exceptional children.

This year, I invited Hoosier children to pay tribute to their dads by writing essays about what makes their father an Outstanding Hoosier Dad.

In a nation that leads the world in absentee fatherhood, it is particularly important this Father’s Day to recognize outstanding dads who are doing their part to raise bright, healthy children. Children whose fathers are absent are five times more likely to live in poverty and twice as likely to commit a crime, drop out of school or become substance abusers. The essays provided a touching reminder to all men of the impact they have when they play an active role in their children’s lives.

It is an honor today to recognize the 17 Hoosier children who submitted essays and their outstanding dads by reading their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States.

R. Bradley Allen, father of John Allen, South Bend
Ronnie Asher, father of Jessica Asher, Martinsville
Brian Bolsen, father of Brennan Bolsen, Chesterton
Noll Day, father of Adam Day, Fort Wayne
Chris Dixon, father of William Dixon, Bloomington
Kevin Ford, father of Kimberly Ford, Schererville
Jeff Gratz, father of Clare Gratz, Batesville
Tom Gutzwiller, father of Lawson Gutzwiller, Batesville
Samuel Hale, father of Greg Hale, Granger
Dennis Mansfield, father of Alison Mansfield, Fort Wayne
Matt McKaig, father of Caleb McKaig, Urbana
Jonathan Plucker, father of Paige Plucker, Bloomington
Frederick Richards, father of Corey Richards, Churubusco
Andy Schultz, father of Mary Kate Schultz, DeMotte
Mike Stefaniski, father of Matthew Stefaniski, Valparaiso
Amitav Thamba, father of Aish Thamba, Fishers
Wiley Traylor, father of Stephanie Traylor, Mooresville

IN HONOR OF GEORGE WINGATE HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to honor George Wingate High School in Brooklyn, NY. Wingate High School, my alma mater, will graduate its last class on June 27, 2006.

In 1954, Wingate High School accepted its first class of students and had its first graduating class in 1957. It was the first high school built in New York after the end of World War II, and it embodied many of the ideals of the baby boomer generation. Wingate High School was so different from the standard design plan for schools that it became known as “The Banjo School” because of its open design.

Wingate High School was also innovative in its approach. Instead of focusing strictly on academic classes, Wingate was one of the first high schools in the Nation to offer a comprehensive range of classes in vocational, commercial and academic fields. Wingate High School has been known for its outstanding science, culinary arts, nursing and law programs, and many of its students have gone on to become successful pilots, chefs, nurses and attorneys.

Wingate has had a few famous graduates such as former New York State senator and current Brooklyn Borough president, Marty Markowitz, and Roger Brown, a New York City playground legend who went on to greatness in the American Basketball Association. However, thousands of other Wingate graduates have made priceless contributions to their communities, in part because of the valuable lessons they learned there.

I firmly believe that a quality education is the key to our youths’ success and our nation’s future. I commend Wingate’s teachers, faculty, staff, and volunteers for their many years of hard work and dedication to Wingate High School’s students. Their work has re- sulted in thousands of students who are better prepared to face the world and its challenges. I commend them for their commitment to quality education. Their enthusiasm and love of teaching means a brighter future for all of our children.

Wingate High School’s motto is: “Ad Astra per Ardua”—“To the stars through struggle.” In its 52-year history, George Wingate High School has graduated thousands of students who went on to become successful pilots, chefs, nurses and attorneys.

Wingate High School was also innovative in its approach. Instead of focusing strictly on academic classes, Wingate was one of the first high schools in the Nation to offer a comprehensive range of classes in vocational, commercial and academic fields. Wingate High School has been known for its outstanding science, culinary arts, nursing and law programs, and many of its students have gone on to become successful pilots, chefs, nurses and attorneys.

Wingate High School’s motto is: “Ad Astra per Ardua”—“To the stars through struggle.” In its 52-year history, George Wingate High School has graduated thousands of students who went on to become successful pilots, chefs, nurses and attorneys.
It brings me great pleasure to pay special tribute to Emily Brown, as she is recognized for her scholastic achievements in National History Day.

Emily is a student at Sunrise Park Middle School in White Bear Lake, MN, and was one of 12 students chosen from across America to display and present her history project at the White House Visitors Center on June 15. Emily’s project is titled “The Iron Jawed Angel: Alice Paul takes a stand for women’s right to vote.”

I congratulate Emily as she is honored for her presentation and commend her for her dedication and commitment. I join with the citizens of Minnesota in wishing Emily well in all her future endeavors.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF STEELE, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I recognize a community in North Dakota that will be celebrating its 125th anniversary. On June 30—July 2, the residents of Steele will gather to celebrate their community’s history and founding.

Steele is a thriving community in North Dakota. The city was founded by Wilbur F. Steele in 1878. He purchased the land from the railroad and had hopes that the city would house the State capitol. Mr. Steele constructed a building in the city to serve as a place for the legislature to meet. Since Steele was not chosen as the State’s capital, the building became the Kidder County Courthouse, which is still in use today.

Steele is best known for its 38½ foot high Sandhill Crane. This piece of art was inspired by the numerous birds and ducks that migrate through Steele each year. Steele has plenty to offer to its residents and visitors, from the golf course and parks to fishing, hunting, and golfing.

The community has planned a wonderful weekend celebration to commemorate its 125th anniversary. The celebration includes an all school reunion, parade, fireworks, auction, outdoor concert, a street dance, and much more.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in congratulating Steele, ND, and its residents on their first 125 years and in wishing them well through the next century. By honoring Steele and all the other historic small towns of North Dakota, we keep the great pioneering frontier spirit alive for future generations. It is places such as Steele that have helped to shape this country into what it is today, which is why this fine community is deserving of our recognition.

Steele has a proud past and a bright future.

ASSOCIATION OF ENERGY SERVICE COMPANIES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Association of Energy Service Companies and the beneficial contributions it has made to the oil and gas industry since February 1956. This organization has helped unite the oil and gas industry and advocates the most efficient production models for all of the domestic companies, resulting in vastly superior oil and gas operations across the Nation.

The association formed when six service contractors met and formed the Association of Oil Well Servicing Companies to combat increasing government regulations, rising insurance costs, and the rising difficulty in employee recruitment. With Mr. Frank Poole appointed as the first president, the association continued to grow and promote the oil and gas industry. Soon after formation, the group grew to represent 35 wells and 15 trucks and eventually placed an association chapter in 17 oil-producing States.

Over the past 50 years, the organization has blossomed from 6 members to over 400. The association currently boasts representation of over 70 percent of the rig count in domestic oil production. In 1996, due to a rapidly growing national membership and expansive chapter representation, the Association of Oil Well Servicing Companies changed their name to the Association of Energy Service Companies.

The AESC continues to lead the oil and gas industry by providing a host of services including safety training and seminars on current and new technology, environmental protection initiatives, monthly meetings of State and local chapters, as well as national meetings, conferences, and tradeshows.

Mr. President, as the members of the AESC prepare to celebrate 50 years of dedicated service, I extend my congratulations to all of those members who have remained committed to excellence in the oil and gas industry. In a world driven by oil and gas production, this organization has provided guidance and regulation to maintain equal standards in a competitive industry. For the next 50 years and beyond, I sincerely hope this organization’s leadership and dedication to fairness remains as strong as it has been the past 50 years.

TRIBUTE TO ROGER MEIER

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a great man, Roger Meier.

The late Oregon Governor Tom McCall once said, “Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky. They are the people who say, ‘This is my community and it is my responsibility to make it better.’”

When Roger Meier passed away on June 5, I lost a trusted friend and Oregon lost a true hero. Through leadership, vision, and generosity, Roger made his community of Portland and his State of Oregon a better place in which to live, work, and raise a family.

Roger was a fourth-generation Oregonian and a descendant of the founders of the Meier and Frank Company, one of Oregon’s most beloved institutions. Roger spent 33 years working in the family business before venturing out on his own and serving as president and CEO of a retirement investment company for more than 30 years.

Roger earned a reputation as a savvy analyst of the business and financial scene. He put his intelligence and knowledge to work for all Oregonians, serving for 13 years as chairman of the Oregon Investment Council, which helps to manage pension funds for Oregon’s public employees. Under his stewardship, Oregon’s portfolio of investments grew from $400 million to $7 billion.

Roger was also a tireless advocate for and a generous philanthropist to countless worthy causes and charitable organizations, including the Oregon Health Sciences University, Good Samaritan Hospital, and the Oregon Historical Society. Roger and his wonderful and gracious wife of 54 years, Laura, also had a special love of art. Along with their good friends, Pete and Mary Mark, Roger and Laura’s generosity has helped to make the Portland Art Museum into a world-class institution.

It was fitting that a memorial tribute to Roger was held at the Portland Art Museum on June 11. My predecessor, Senator Mark Hatfield, spoke at the service and said that there was one word he believed best summed up Roger: gentleman.

Senator Hatfield was right. A man of courtesy, kindness, honesty and integrity, Roger Meier was a true gentleman. He will be greatly missed by Laura, his daughters Alix and Jill and their families, by his friends, and by the community and State he served so ably.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize South Dakota State University, which is celebrating its 125th year anniversary.

Over the past 125 years, SDSU has proven to its students, faculty, and alumni that “you can go anywhere from here.” South Dakota University, or SDSU, was founded in 1881 as the primary agriculture university in my home State of South Dakota, and 125 years later it now holds the distinction of being the State’s largest university. SDSU not only provides students with an excellent academic environment, but beginning in 2004, the SDSU Jackrabbits started participating in NCAA Division I athletics.

It gives me great pleasure to rise to recognize the students, faculty, and alumni of South Dakota State University in celebrating their 125th year anniversary and wish them continued success in the years to come.
MESSENGERS FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5576. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. Stevens) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, Colorado, as the “William H. Emery Post Office”.

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 4939. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. Stevens).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5576. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-7159. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation relative to the using device to technologic aids in Class II gaming in Indian Country; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7170. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Secretary, White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Department, received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-7171. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report on Small Arms Programs”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7172. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report on Small Arms Programs”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7173. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the executive report of a coordinated communications (Notice 2006-10) received on June 5, 2006; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-7174. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-useable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7175. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13320 of March 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7176. A communication from the Chairman and President (Acting), Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7177. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the designation of an acting officer for the position of Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7178. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December 31, 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-7179. A communication from the Chairman, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2005 Audit of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps (NSCC) and the 2005 Annual Report of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-7180. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation entitled “Restitution for Victims of Crime Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 3524. An original bill to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve health care provided to Indians under the Medicare, Medicaid, and State Children’s Health Insurance Programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3525. A bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve outcomes for children in families affected by methamphetamine abuse and addiction, to reauthorize the promoting safe and stable families program, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPECTER for the Committee on the Judiciary:

Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Frank D. Whitney, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

Thomas D. Anderson, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Ms. SOWE, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr.,const.THOMAS, MR. QUINN, MR. ANDERSON, MR. SMITH, MR. DAVIS, MR. SMITH, MR. CONRAD, and MR. KOHL):

S. 3517. A bill to enhance the services available to members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom to assist such members in transitioning to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 3517. A bill to enhance the services available to members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom to assist such members in transitioning to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3518. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to establish a new disclosure statement; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH, for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. KOHL:

S. 3519. A bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.
S. 3520. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. AXELROD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. Kyl, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. TRUAX, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. Bunning, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 3521. A bill to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CRAIG, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3522. A bill to amend the Bonneville Power Act, to establish an Advanced Multi-billion dollar plan for clean energy and water, to expand certain authorities to enhance water supplies, to withdraw lands for water projects, to accelerate certain projects, to establish a Columbia Basin Hydroelectricatomium, and provided with essential services, and to increase research at the National Institutes of Health on postpartum depression; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3550. A bill to revise the limitation on Impact Aid special payments; to the Committee on Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MUKILSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. Voinovich, Mr. SAENZ, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DODD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. RYDER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. DOLE):

S. Res. 513. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning September 10, 2006, as ‘‘National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week’’; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. Con. Res. 102. A concurrent resolution condemning the decision by the city of St. Denis, France, to name a street in honor of Mumia Abu-Jamal, the convicted murderer of Philadelphia Police Officer Danny Faulkner; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 337. At the request of Mr. Graham, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service, to expand certain authorities to provide assistance for the retirement of reservists and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 459. At the request of Mr. LANDREI, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 900, a bill to reinstate the Federal Communications Commission’s rules for the description of video programming.

S. 914. At the request of Mr. McCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 914, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a competitive grant program to build capacity in veterinary medical education and expand the workforce of veterinarians engaged in public health practice and biomedical research.

S. 1393. At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1496. At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1496, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a pilot program under which up to 15 States may issue electronic Federal migratory bird hunting stamps.

S. 1524. At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1524, a bill to repeal the sunset on the reduction of capital gains rates for individuals and on the taxation of dividends of individuals at capital gain rates.

S. 2199. At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2140, a bill to enhance protection of children from sexual exploitation by strengthening section 2257 of title 18, United States Code, requiring producers of sexually explicit material to keep and permit inspection of records regarding the services of performers, and for other purposes.

S. 2266. At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2266, a bill to establish within the United States Marshals Service a short-term State witness protection program to provide assistance to State and local district attorneys to protect their witnesses in homicide and major violent crime cases and to provide Federal grants for such protection.

S. 2253. At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2253, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to offer the 181 Area of the Gulf of Mexico for oil and gas leasing.

S. 2254. At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage gap in prescription drug coverage under part D of such title based on savings to the Medicare program resulting from the negotiation of prescription drug prices.

S. 2495. At the request of Mr. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2465, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased assistance for the prevention,
treatment, and control of tuberculosis, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DUBBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to ensure that State and local emergency preparedness operational plans address the needs of individuals with household pets and service animals following a major disaster or emergency.

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. CORBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require prompt payment to pharmacies under part D, to restrict pharmacy co-branding on prescription drug cards issued under such part, and to provide guidelines for Medication Therapy Management Services programs offered by prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans under such part.

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to prohibit the confiscation of firearms during certain national emergency.

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2603, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, supra.

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2814, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for support of funeral ceremonies for veterans provided by details that consist solely of members of veterans organizations and other organizations, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2915, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve screening for colorectal cancer for TRICARE beneficiaries over the age of 50.

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide free credit monitoring and credit reports for veterans and others affected by the theft of veterans' personal data, to ensure that such persons are appropriately notified of such thefts, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3275, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State.

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3475, a bill to provide housing assistance for very-low-income veterans.

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 507, a resolution designating the week of November 5 through November 11, 2006, as 'National Veterans Awareness Week' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country.

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 508, a resolution designating October 20, 2006 as "National Mammography Day".

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Ms. SANTORUM), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 512, a resolution celebrating the 231st birthday of the Army and commending the men and women of the Armed Forces and exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service.

AMENDMENT NO. 4199

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4199 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4205

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4205 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4224

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FEUST) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4224 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.
At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4234 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as cosponsor of amendment No. 4234 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4252 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 3516. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permanently extend the floor on the Medicare work geographic adjustment under the fee schedule for physicians’ services; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today with Senators SNOWE, COCHRAN, CANTWELL, DOMENICI, LINCOLN, JEFFORDS, COLLINS, MURRAY, HARKIN, LANDRIEU, OBAMA, SALAZAR, and SESSIONS, the “Rural Equity Payment Index Reform Extension Act of 2006.” The legislation would extend a provision that was included as part of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 and came from my original legislation, S. 881 in the 108th Congress, with Congressman DOUG BEREUTER of Nebraska to ensure that the work component of the Medicare physician payment formula is set to ensure that no geographic region is paid less than the national average.

The Medicare physician payment formula, known as the Medicare Resource-Based Relative Value Scale, or RBRVS, is based on three components of care: personnel costs, professional liability insurance, and non-personnel expenses in the payment formula.

The relative value of each service is then multiplied by a geographic adjuster for each Medicare locality, which is known as the Geographic Practice Cost Indices, or GPCIs.

Prior to the enactment of this provision as part of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, the physicians in States that have the worst workforce shortages were being paid far less than their counterparts in States with adequate or even an oversupply of physicians due to the GPCI adjustment.

For the “work component” in particular, which accounts for about 55 percent of the total Medicare physician payment, an adjustment to geographic adjustments made little sense. An office visit to a rural physician is no different in time, effort, or workload compared to an office visit to an urban physician. The idea that physicians are reimbursed for their work and their skills at a lower rate simply on the basis that they choose to practice in a rural area and serve our rural communities is completely ludicrous.

In addition, since Medicare beneficiaries pay the same premium for all Part B services, inequitable physician fee payments result in substantial cross-subsidization from people living in low payment States to people living in higher payment States.

Congress determined that such extensive geographic disparities were unfair and, as part of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, language from my bill was included that brought all geographic areas up to the national average for the calculation of this piece of the Medicare physician payment formula.

It is important to highlight that the importance of this formula extends well beyond Medicare. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics in its February 8, 2006, update on the Medicare payment formula, . . . over 74 percent of private payers, including state Medicaid programs, have adopted components of the Medicare RBRVSs to reimburse physicians, while many other payors are exploring its implementation.

Furthermore, Medicare Advantage plan payments are based in large part on fee-for-service payments made in various geographic locations. Disparities in Medicare Advantage payments are also caused, in part, by such geographic adjustments made to physician payments.

Unfortunately, these disparities will increase if the “work component” in the physician payment rate is allowed to once again fully adjust based on geography. The provision bringing payment levels up to the national average for every geographic area was in effect for 2004–2006 and is set to expire at the end of this calendar year. As a result, physicians, who already face a potential reduction in their overall Medicare payment rate, might also see their payment rates further reduced unless this legislative extension is passed.

According to the November 21, 2005, Federal Register notice, if payment rates were not brought up to the national average, there would be reductions in physician payments to the following States: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia outside of Atlanta, Idaho, parts of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland outside of Baltimore region, Michigan outside of Detroit, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, most of New York outside of New York City and suburbs, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon outside of Portland, Pennsylvania outside of Philadelphia, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas outside of Houston, Dallas, and Brazoria, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington outside of Seattle, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Lack of equitable reimbursement is a critical factor leading to the shortage of physicians in many rural areas, including the State of New Mexico. The extension of the Rural Equity Payment Index Reform Extension Act of 2006 will ensure that the disparity in physician payments between states such as New Mexico and other geographic areas does not once again widen.

I urge prompt passage of this important legislation and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Equity Payment Index Reform Extension Act of 2006.”

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF FLOOR ON MEDICARE WORK GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT.

Section 1848(e)(1)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(e)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “and before January 1, 2007,”.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 3517. A bill to enhance the services available to members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom to assist such members in transitioning to civilian life, by requiring, in the Federal Register notice, to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce the Heroes
at Home Act of 2006. This legislation would take several important steps toward assisting our brave men and women in uniform in transitioning back home to their families, workplaces, and communities after deployment in Iraq and Afghanistan. Hundreds of thousands of troops have rotated through Iraq and Afghanistan as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom, OIF, and Operation Enduring Freedom, OEF, including thousands of courageous men and women from New York. More military service members than ever are surviving these conflicts because of better body armor and helmets and improved battlefield medicine.

But surviving these wars and transitioning home can be an uphill battle. Many OIF and OEF service members, including the unprecedented number of National Guard and Reserve members, face readjustment challenges after war, such as medical, mental health, relationship, and work problems. Family members also are affected by the transition as they struggle to reconnect with their war heroes, some who may be deployed two, three, or if not more times.

As I meet with returning service members and their families around the State of New York and the country, I hear about the real hardships they battle after deployment—just how difficult it can be to adjust back to life at home.

Several articles and reports have highlighted these struggles. According to a March 2006 study, 19 percent of Iraq veterans and 11 percent of Afghanistans veterans reported mental health problems. Among the OIF and OEF veterans seeking care at Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, hospitals, nearly a third have been diagnosed with mental disorders, with over 40 percent of those posttraumatic stress disorder, PTSD. Another report found that 10 to 30 percent of National Guard and Reserve members who come home from Iraq searching for work. Others return to civilian jobs dissatisfied with old tasks that pale in comparison to wartime responsibilities.

In addition to these challenges, a large number of service members are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan with life-threatening brain injuries from roadside blasts that can cause brain damage. It is estimated that 5 to 20 percent of OIF and OEF service members have experienced traumatic brain injuries, TBI, and other problems, as well as other traumatic brain injuries, TBI, and other problems, as well as other mental health consequences and rehabilitation needs of traumatic brain injured service members. This study would examine ways to help prevent future generations of service members from sustaining such injuries while assessing what types of programs and services are available to treat those who have already been injured in the years ahead.

To further assist the mushrooming number of traumatic brain injured service members and their families, this legislation would establish a TBI family caregivers and family support program. Health professionals at DOD and VA hospitals would use this training to teach family members how to care for traumatic brain injured service members after they leave the hospital. It is crucial that we give family members the tools they need to effectively assist their loved ones at home in their communities.

Those who have proudly served our Nation in OIF and OEF have made extraordinary sacrifices in the battlefield in defense of democracy and freedom. Back home, these heroes deserve our love, support, and resources offered at DOD facilities, VA hospitals, public, and VA hospitals, community mental health clinics, and family support organizations. None of our returning service members should suffer alone in silence. Nor should their families. We all must do our part. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to ensure passage of this bill that champions the successful transition of our newly returning heroes to their families, workplaces and communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Heroes at Home Act of 2006.”

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–183; 119 Stat. 3345) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND ENDURING FREEDOM.—
SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE CENTER FOR EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) Establishment of Center.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an office to assist employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers to assist them in facilitating the successful transition to civilian employment, including difficulties arising from employment services available under this subsection through such mechanisms as the head of the Center considers appropriate, including the Internet, video conferencing, telephone services, workshops, trainings, publications, group forums, and other mechanisms.

(b) Provision of resources, services, and assistance available under this subsection through such mechanisms as the head of the Center considers appropriate, including the Internet, video conferencing, telephone services, workshops, trainings, publications, group forums, and other mechanisms.

(c) Personnel and other resources.—The Secretary of Defense shall assign to the Center such personnel, funding, and other resources as are required to ensure the effective discharge by the Center of the functions under this subsection.

(d) Reports on activities.—

(1) Annual report by center.—Not later than one year after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the head of the Center, in consultation with the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health, shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a written report on the progress and outcomes of the Center during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(2) Reports to Congress.—Not later than 60 days after receipt of a report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a copy of the report from the Center on the progress and outcomes of the Center during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.
such report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Represenatives, together with—

(A) such comments on such report, and such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(B) such recommendations on means of improving the effectiveness of the Center, as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(3) Provision for recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(4) Availability to public.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report available, as applicable, to the public, including through the Internet website of the Center.

(5) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Employment assistance organization.—The term "employment assistance organization" means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.

(6) Department of Defense task force on mental health.—The term "Department of Defense task force on mental health" means the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health, established under section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, as amended by section 2 of this Act.

(2) Definitions of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 4. GRANTS ON ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED SETTINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE AND THEIR FAMILIES DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) In general.—The Secretary of Defense may award grants to eligible entities to carry out demonstration projects to assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing community-based settings for the provision of assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve who serve in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families, after the return of such members from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, as follows:

(1) services to improve the reuniting of such members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families;

(2) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on their return from such deployment, including education on—

(A) Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI); and

(B) mechanisms for the referral of such members of the National Guard and Reserve for medical and mental health screening and care when necessary; and

(3) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that family members of such members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on the return of such members from such deployment, including education on—

(A) depression, anxiety, and relationship problems; and

(b) Eligible entities.—(1) Eligibility for award of grant under this section is any public or private non-profit organization, such as a community mental health clinic, family support organization, military support organization, law enforcement agenc-y, community college, or public school.

(b) Application.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require for purposes, including a description of how such entity will work with the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, State health agencies, other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, family support organizations, and other community organization in undertaking activities described in subsection (a).

(c) Selection of recipients.—An entity awarded a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on the activities undertaken by such entity during the preceding year utilizing amounts under the grant. Each report shall include such information as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of this subsection.

(d) Annual reports to Congress.—(1) General.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(b) Selection of entity for conduct of study.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(c) Elements.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries.

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(d) Periodic and final reports.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the appropriate elements of the Department of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(1) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study.

(e) Annual reports to Congress.—(1) General.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report under this subsection available to the public.

(b) Selection of entity for conduct of study.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(c) Elements.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries.

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(d) Periodic and final reports.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the appropriate elements of the Department of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(1) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study.

(f) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Employment assistance organization.—The term "employment assistance organization" means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.

(2) Department of Defense task force on mental health.—The term "Department of Defense task force on mental health" means the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health, established under section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, as amended by section 2 of this Act.

(g) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 5. LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) Study.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(b) Selection of entity for conduct of study.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(c) Elements.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries.

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(d) Periodic and final reports.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the appropriate elements of the Department of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(1) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study.

(e) Annual reports to Congress.—(1) General.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report under this subsection available to the public.

(b) Selection of entity for conduct of study.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(c) Elements.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries.

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(d) Periodic and final reports.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the appropriate elements of the Department of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(1) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study.

(f) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Employment assistance organization.—The term "employment assistance organization" means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.

(2) Department of Defense task force on mental health.—The term "Department of Defense task force on mental health" means the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health, established under section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, as amended by section 2 of this Act.

(g) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 6. TRAINING CURRICULA FOR FAMILY CAREGIVERS ON CARE AND ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel.—(1) Establishment.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, establish within the Department of Defense a panel to develop coordinated, uniform, and consistent training curricula to be used in training family members in the provision of care and assistance to members and former members of the Armed Forces for traumatic brain injuries incurred during service in the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(b) Designation of Panel.—The panel established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the "Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel".

(c) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008, such sums as may be necessary for the activities of the panel.
(3) MEMBERS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel established under paragraph (1) shall consist of 15 members appointed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, equally represented from among—

(A) physicians, nurses, rehabilitation therapists, and other individuals with an expertise in caring for and assisting individuals with traumatic brain injury, including those who specialize in caring for and assisting individuals with traumatic brain injury incurred in war;

(B) representatives of family caregivers or family caregiver associations;

(C) Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs health and medical personnel with expertise in traumatic brain injury, and Department of Defense personnel and readiness representatives with expertise in traumatic brain injury;

(D) representatives of military service organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans;

(E) representatives of veterans service organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans;

(F) psychologists or other individuals with expertise in individual and family health treatment and care of individuals with traumatic brain injury;

(G) experts in the development of training curricula;

(H) researchers and academicians who study traumatic brain injury; and

(I) any other individuals the Secretary considers appropriate.

(4) MEETINGS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall meet not less than monthly.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall develop training curricula to be utilized during the provision to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) on techniques, strategies, and skills for care and assistance for such members and former members with the traumatic brain injuries described in that subsection.

(2) SCOPE OF CURRICULA.—The curricula shall—

(A) be based on empirical research and validated techniques; and

(B) shall provide for training that permits recipients to tailor caregiving to the unique circumstances of the member or former member of the Armed Forces receiving care.

(3) PARTICULAR REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall—

(A) specify appropriate training commensurate with the severity of traumatic brain injury; and

(B) identify appropriate care and assistance to be provided for the degree of severity of traumatic brain injury for caregivers of various levels of skill and capability.

(4) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricular, materials, and resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.

(5) CONSULTATION.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall consult with the Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee, as appropriate.

(6) DEADLINE FOR DEVELOPMENT.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall develop the curricula not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF CURRICULA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel, develop mechanisms for the dissemination of the curricula referred to in paragraph (2) to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who treat or otherwise work with members and former members of the Armed Forces who incurred in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. In developing such mechanisms, the Secretary may utilize and enhance existing exchanges, including the Military Severely Injured Center.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.—The health care professionals referred to in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Personnel at military medical treatment facilities.

(B) Personnel at the polytrauma centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(C) Personnel and care managers at the Military Severely Injured Center.

(D) Such other health care professionals of the Department of Defense as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(E) Such other health care professionals of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, considers appropriate.

(3) SCOPE.—The mechanisms developed under paragraph (2) shall provide for the provision of reference training in the curricula developed under subsection (a) to the extent practicable, for the degree of severity of traumatic brain injury, and in the curricula developed under subsection (b) shall provide training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces who incurred traumatic brain injuries during service in the Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom in the care and assistance to be provided for such injuries.

(4) PROVISION OF TRAINING TO FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who are trained in the curricula developed under subsection (b) shall provide training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces who incurred traumatic brain injuries incurred in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom and Department of Veterans Affairs personnel with expertise in traumatic brain injury.

(B) TREASURY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide, to the extent practicable, for a public notice to be transmitted to the public, health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) and to Congress, a report on the following:

(A) The actions undertaken under this subsection.

(B) The results of the tracking of outcomes based on training developed and provided under this section.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the development of the curricula required by subsection (a) and in any subsequent year thereafter, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Training Panel shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a report on the following:

(A) The actions undertaken under this subsection.

(B) The results of the tracking of outcomes based on training developed and provided under this section.

(C) Recommendations for the improvement of training developed and provided under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act, CROA, to stop abusive class action lawsuits against companies offering legitimate credit file monitoring products. The following is a summary of why we need to pass this legislation.

Credit-monitoring products are offered by consumer reporting agencies, their affiliates, and resellers. These products help consumers access their consumer report information and credit scores on a regular basis. They inform consumers of derogatory information appears in the consumer’s file or someone obtains the consumer’s report. The products give consumers a front-line defense against identity theft, and are routinely made available to victims of security breaches. Credit-monitoring products also educate consumers about their credit scores and credit histories. The market is highly competitive. Banks and other creditors also provide these products to their customers.

These products are threatened by abusive class action lawsuits, based on CROA’s language. CROA was to combat the assault on the integrity of accurate credit file data by credit repair organizations and by consumers acting on their advice. Under CROA, a credit repair organization is subject to a number of appropriately harsh and specific requirements. The most significant of these is a prohibition on collecting fees before completion of performance of the promised services. CROA also mandates that consumers be given a written warning that the services cannot result in the change or deletion of negative but accurate data. This “warning” would be confusing and inappropriate if given to a consumer of credit monitoring products or services.

CROA was enacted before credit monitoring products were created. The CROA definition of “credit repair organization” is intentionally broad in available to protect consumers of its coverage. Among other things, the definition includes an entity that implies its activities or services can “improve” a consumer’s credit record, credit history or credit rating. The breadth of the definition has been used by plaintiff attorneys to lend statutory damages against consumer reporting agencies and their resellers soley for offering these monitoring products. This approach has proven ineffective and has cost the credit repair industry millions of dollars.
products. The class action lawsuits threaten the viability of the credit-monitoring industry.

This result can be prevented through the enactment of a technical amendment to CROA that clarifies the definition of a "credit repair organization" as it includes "insignificant" consumer actions such as venison, pheasant, quail, rabbit, and numerous others that are typically inspected under State programs.

It is important to point out that this ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected beef, poultry, pork, lamb, and goat products are the only food commodities that are banned from interstate shipment.

Many perishable products, including milk and other dairy items, fruit, vegetables, and fish, which are inspected under State programs, are shipped freely across State lines.

There is no legitimate reason for the ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected meats to continue. The State programs are equal or superior to the Federal program. In fact, the 1967 and 1968 Meat and Poultry Inspection Acts require State inspection programs to be "at least equal to" the Federal program. Since 1967, USDA has conducted comprehensive reviews of each individual State inspection program to verify whether or not the program meets the statutory requirement to be "at least equal to" the Federal program. In the nearly 30 years that USDA has been conducting these reviews, the agency has never unilaterally found that a State inspection program should be discontinued due to an inability to meet Federal food safety standards.

Furthermore, the 2002 farm bill required USDA to conduct an additional comprehensive review of State inspection programs. After a 2-year study, USDA issued an interim report which found that State inspection programs are indeed "at least equal to" the Federal inspection program. In addition, three USDA Advisory Committees have recommended that the ban on interstate shipment be lifted.

In short, there is no distinction between the Federal and State inspection programs. Without exception, State inspection programs meet or exceed Federal food-safety requirements, and USDA has verified the safety of these programs for decades.

In Utah, we have 32 establishments that inspect meat under a State's inspection program. These establishments, like the nearly 2,000 similar plants nationwide, are, for the most part, small businesses. And, generally speaking, their shipments cater to the needs of small, family-run farms and ranches. The outdated ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected meats clearly disrupts the free flow of trade, restricts market access for countless small businesses, and creates an unfair advantage for big businesses.

But it gets worse. Current regulations also favor foreign meat producers over small businesses in our Nation. In fact, meat inspected in 34 foreign countries can be sold in the United States because the USDA has certified that the inspection programs in these foreign countries are equivalent to the Federal program. As I have pointed out, State inspection programs must meet the same Federal equivalency standard. In fact, USDA supervision of State inspection programs is far more frequent and thorough than its oversight of foreign inspection programs.

In my view, it is absurd that meat inspected in 34 foreign countries can be shipped anywhere in the United States without restriction, but small businesses in 28 States are prohibited from shipping their products across State lines, even though these small businesses meet the same Federal food safety requirements as their foreign competitors.

A ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected meat unfairly hinders our Nation's economy. My legislation would provide farmers and ranchers with the opportunity to sell their products at a better price. It will not do anything more than level the playing field and ensure that our small businesses have the opportunity to economically compete in the market.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defending America's small businesses by supporting this important legislation.
proposed in the House of Representatives by Representative Pallone and 32 of his Republican and Democratic colleagues.

This act would direct the U.S. Government’s independent Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to receive, evaluate, and determine awards with respect to the claims of U.S. citizens and businesses that lost property as a result of Turkey’s invasion and continued occupation of northern Cyprus. To provide funds from which these awards would be paid, the act would urge the President to authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate an agreement for settlement of such claims with the Government of Turkey.

The act would further grant U.S. Federal courts jurisdiction over suits by U.S. nationals against any private persons—other than Turkey—occupying or otherwise using the U.S. national’s property in the Turkish-occupied portion of Cyprus. Lastly, the act would expressly waive Turkey’s sovereign immunity against claims brought by U.S. nationals in U.S. courts relating to property occupied by the Government of Turkey and used by Turkey in connection with a commercial activity carried out in the United States.

This bill represents an important step toward righting the internationally recognized wrong of the expropriation of property, including American property, in northern Cyprus in the wake of the 1974 invasion by the Turkish Army. I strongly urge my colleagues to promptly consider and pass this critical piece of legislation.

By Mr. Gregg (for himself, Mr. Frist, Mr. Allard, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Craig, Mr. Brownback, Mr. Isakson, Mr. DeMint, Mr. McCain, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Thune, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Bunning, and Mr. Domenici):

S. 3521. A bill to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Gregg. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill which is sponsored by myself and 20 other Members of the Senate.

The purpose of this bill is to put some control over spending—or at least put procedures in—to allow us as a Congress to begin to control spending. I think we all recognize that in the short run we are headed toward a budget that looks like it may actually move toward balance. We have seen some very significant, positive gains. A deficit that was supposed to be about $425 billion this year is down to about $300 billion, and it may well go below that. That does not solve our problem even though we have gotten things moving in the right way because in the outyears we face a fiscal crisis. That is reflected in this chart.

The fact is, there is facing this country a situation where we have a generation known as the baby boom generation which has basically overwhelmed the systems of America at each point in its evolution. It started out in the early 1950s and late 1940s. It overwhelmed the school systems it was so big. As it moved forward in the 1960s, it created the civil rights movement, and in the 1980s and 1990s it created the greatest prosperity in the history of our country as a result of its size and productivity.

But now that generation is beginning to retire. It will start to retire in the year 2008. It will be fully retired by the year 2020. It will be the largest retired generation in the history of our Nation by a factor of two. There will essentially be 20 million people retiring during that period.

What are the implications? The implications are rather severe for our Nation’s fiscal policy, and especially for our children. All of our retirement systems—Social Security, Medicare—all our major safety nets were built around the concept created by FDR, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that there would always be many more people working than retiring.

In fact, in the early 1950s there were about 12 people working and paying into the Social Security system for every one person taking it out of Social Security. Today there are about three and a half people working for every one person who is retired. By the years 2020 to 2025, there will only be two people working for every one person taking out of the system. That means this pyramid concept goes to a rectangle, and our children and our grandchildren who will then be the working people in America will not be able to support the benefit structure which is in place for the retired.

This chart reflects the dramatic effect of this situation rather starkly. The blue line represents what percent of gross national product the Federal Government usually spends. Historically, since World War II, the Federal Government has spent about 20 percent of the gross national product. This is in place for the retired. The red line represents three programs in the Federal process: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The red line grows dramatically beginning in about the year 2008 and proceeds at an exponential rate of growth, so that by the years 2025 to 2026 those three programs alone will actually cost more than 20 percent of the gross national product of America.

What does that mean? It means if we were to spend the historic amount we have spent on the Federal Government, those three programs would use up all that money and there would be no money available for education, for national defense, for laying out roads, for health care for everyone else, other than those who are retired, or for anything else the Federal Government is supposed to do. Everything would have to be spent on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It does not stop there. We are looking at a rather dramatic movement.

The point, of course, is that our children will have to pay the cost. They will find themselves confronted with a dramatic increase in our burden unless we address the cost of those programs from the spending side.

The point, also, is we really cannot tax our way out of this problem. We cannot possibly raise taxes high enough to keep up with the cost of these programs and still have a viable country. If we did that, we would eliminate the ability of our children to buy a new home, to send their kids to college, to even buy cars. The lifestyle of an American, our children and our grandchildren, would be radically reduced—their quality of life—were we to raise taxes to try to keep up with this rate of growth of spending.

Again, it is not a revenue problem; it is a spending problem. That is important for us to look at the revenues over the last few years, this reinforces this point. Revenues dropped precipitously at the beginning of this President’s term for two reasons. One, we had the largest bubble in the history of the Internet bubble, back in the late 1990s, where we were essentially producing false income, paper returns through the issuance of stock which wasn’t backed up by productive companies. This bubble burst, and it was the biggest bubble in history, bigger than the tulip or south seas bubble. And the effect of it was to cause our economy to retrench.

Then we had the attack of September 11, which dramatically impacted our perceptions as a nation. Obviously, it had a horrific effect in the area of loss of lives, but it had a dramatic effect on our economy. Those two back-to-back events basically forced a significant drop in revenues.

So President Bush came in and said: Let’s try to get out of this recession—and it was a shallow recession but would have headed a lot deeper—by cutting taxes and giving people an incentive to be more productive. We have seen from the beginning how it is terrible we cut taxes at the beginning of this administration. But what those tax cuts did was create an atmosphere where people who wanted to be entrepreneurial, who wanted to go out and take risks, who were willing to put their own personal savings and their dollars behind an effort to be productive, and, thus, create jobs, did exactly that.

Then the economy started to recover. We had 28 straight months of recovery. We had one of the largest expansions of the post-World-War-II period. The practical effect of that is that we have created more economic activity, created
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more jobs, and created more revenue to the Federal Government. So in the last 2 years, the revenue to the Federal Government has actually jumped greater in a 2-year period than at any time in the post-World-War II period. Each of the last 2 years has had historic increases of revenue for the Federal Government.

We are at a point where revenues are essentially at the same place they would normally be as a percent of gross national product. We are essentially generating about the same amount of revenue we have always generated to the Federal Government.

The other side of the aisle says: Let’s raise taxes some of our total revenue. It is a package, redesign package, re- 
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Mr. SESSIONS. First, I wish to say to any Americans listening and all our colleagues, when Chairman GREGG speaks about long-term financial challenges facing this Nation, we ought to listen. "E.F. Hutton" speaks. So our "fast, Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth of revenue to our Government by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn’t that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth of revenue to our Government by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn’t that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth of revenue to our Government by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn’t that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth of revenue to our Government by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn’t that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth of revenue to our Government by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn’t that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth of revenue to our Government by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn’t that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.
of growth of revenues to the Federal Government last year was about 14 percent. This year, through the first 6 months, it was about 11 percent and continues to grow dramatically. That is a function of the fact that we now have social programs which encourage people to go out and take risks and create jobs, which creates revenue.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator because he has given us optimism and hope that we can reduce this deficit, and he has shown us we can do this without slashing our social programs or any other spending but just contain the growth.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CRAIG, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3522. A bill to amend the Bonneville Power Administration portions of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 through 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today by Senator GORDON SMITH, Senator LARRY CRAIG and Senator PATTY MURRAY in introducing the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2006—or FRIMA. Our legislation extends a homegrown, commonsense program that has a proven track record of protecting and restoring Northwestern salmon runs. Dollar-for-dollar, the fish screening and fish passage facilities funded by our legislation are among the most cost-effective uses of public and private restoration dollars. These projects protect fish while producing significant benefits. That is why it is important that this program be reauthorized and funding be appropriated.

Since 2001, when the original Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000, FRIMA, was enacted, more than $9 million in Federal funds has leveraged nearly $20 million in private, local funding. This money has been used to protect, enhance, and restore more than 550 river miles of important fish habitat and species throughout Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana. For decades, State, tribal and Federal fishery agencies in the Pacific Northwest have identified the screening of irrigation and other water diversions, restored fish passage, and improved fish passage, as critically important for the survival of salmon and other fish populations.

This program is very popular and has the support of a wide range of constituents, from conservation groups, to environmental organizations, and agricultural producers. Senator SMITH and I are proud of the successful collaborative projects that irrigators and members of the Oregon Water Resource Council have completed by putting this program to work in our home State. Our program also has the support of Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski, irrigators throughout the Northwestern States, Oregon Trout, American Rivers and the National Audubon Society.

FRIMA authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to plan, design, and construct fish screens and fish passage facilities and related features. It also authorizes inventories to provide the information needed for planning and making decisions about the survival and propagation of all Northwestern fish species. The program is currently carried out by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on behalf of the Interior Secretary.

FRIMA provides benefits by: keeping fish out of places where they should not be—such as in an irrigation system; easing upstream and downstream fish passage; improving the protection, survival, and restoration of native fish species; helping avoid new endangered species listings by protecting and enhancing the fish populations not yet listed; making progress toward the delisting of listed species utilizing a positive, win-win, public-private partnership; and, assisting in achieving both sustainable agriculture and fisheries. Since FRIMA’s enactment in 2001, 103 projects have been installed. This is truly an example of how our fishermen and farmers can work together to protect fish species throughout the Northwest.

While he was Governor of Idaho, Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne said, ‘‘...the FRIMA program serves as an excellent example of government and private land owners working together to promote conservation. The screening of irrigation diversions plays a key role in Idaho’s efforts to restore salmon populations while protecting rural economies...’’ [from ‘‘Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Programs, FY 2002-2004’’, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C., July, 2005, p. 13].

The bill that we are introducing today specifically extends the authorization for this program through 2012; gives priority to projects costing less than $2.5 million—a reduction in a targeted project’s cost from $5,000,000 to $2,500,000; clarifies that projects funded under the act are viewed as recipients of a ‘‘pass through program’’ and not a ‘‘grant’’ program; that any Bonneville Power Administration, BPA, funds provided either directly or through a grant to another entity to carry out projects under the act shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the costs of the project; and...
(ii) the review, processing, and provision of applications for funding under the Program.

(B) LIMITATION.—

(i) in general.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a percentage of amounts up to 6 percent made available for each fiscal year, as determined under clause (ii), may be used for Federal (including tribal) and State administrative expenses of carrying out this Act.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of determining the percentage of administrative expenses to be made available under clause (i) for a fiscal year:

(I) 1 percent shall be provided if less than $1,000,000 is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

(II) 2 percent shall be provided if $1,000,000 or more, but less than $6,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

(III) 3 percent shall be provided if $6,000,000 or more, but less than $11,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

(IV) 4 percent shall be provided if $11,000,000 or more, but less than $15,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

(V) 5 percent shall be provided if $15,000,000 or more, but less than $21,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

(VI) 6 percent shall be provided if $21,000,000 or more is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year.

(III) STATE EXPENSES.—Amounts made available to States for administrative expenses under clause (i)—

(I) shall be divided evenly among all States that provided assistance under the Program; and

(II) on request of a project sponsor, may be used to provide technical support to the project sponsor.

(C) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts expended by the Secretary for the provision of technical assistance relating to the Program shall not be subject to the 6 percent limitation on administrative expenses under subparagraph (B)(i).

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of clause (i), expenditures for the provision of technical assistance include any staffing expenditures (including staff travel expenses) associated with—

(I) arranging meetings to promote the Program to potential applicants;

(II) assisting recipients with the preparation of applications for funding under the Program; and

(III) visiting construction sites to provide technical assistance, if requested by the applicant.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May 2006

Hon. Pete V. Domenici, Chairman, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Hon. Jeff Bingaman, Ranking Member, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS DOMENICI AND BINGAMAN: I write in support of the re-authorization of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act (FRIMA). In addition, I support the funding levels recently authorized by Congress of $25 million per year.

The Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act is one of the most successful regional conservation programs in the Pacific Northwest, funding the installation of fish screens and ladders at irrigation diversions in Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington. Conservationists support it because it saves wild, migrating Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed fish such as Steelhead, Coho and Chinook salmon, as well as those produced in state and federal hatcheries. Irrigated agriculture supports the program both for its conservation effects and because it helps protect operators from possible federal enforcement actions resulting from ESA fish.

It is widely accepted that correcting fish barrier, diversion and screen problems is a very cost-effective investment. Each federal FRIMA dollar has been matched by $1.37 in state or local dollars. Participants have contributed a total of 58 percent toward the cost-share—exceeding the legal requirement of 35 percent—and also pay 100 percent of project operation and maintenance costs. The FRIMA projects are completed quickly because existing state fish screening and passage programs are used to implement projects.

The program, which I have summarized for you in the enclosed fact sheet, has resulted in fish-friendly irrigation projects in fish-friendly irrigation projects. As you read the enclosed fact sheet, has resulted in fish-friendly irrigation projects as well as increased spawning and rearing habitat.

Since FRIMA's introduction in 2000, 103 projects have been installed, providing fish access to 553 miles of habitat upstream and downstream.

FRIMA funds leverage $1.37 in state/local funds; participants have contributed 58% in cost-share, which is much more than the required 35%.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. KYL);

S. 3523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running of the period of limitations while such claims are pending; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that enhances the innocent spouse equitable relief provision of the Internal Revenue Code. Through only minor legislative modifications, this bill clarifies the statute's original intent, affording innocent spouses the necessary recourse to ensure their cases and circumstances are given a fair hearing.

According to section 6015(f) of the Internal Revenue Code, the IRS may relieve an innocent spouse of liability for unpaid taxes generated through the filing of a joint tax return, if "taking into account all the facts and circumstances" it would be inequitable to hold the spouse responsible.

Little recourse exists, however, to prevent the IRS from seizing assets or garnishing wages if a petition for innocent spouse equitable relief is not approved.

Recent decisions of the Eighth and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals have denied the Tax Court jurisdiction over petitions for equitable relief under the Innocent Spouse Statute. Consequently, there is no mechanism for review or appeal of these IRS decisions.

The story of one of my constituents provides a stunning example of the problem.

The IRS seized all of her husband's income to pay a tax liability incurred 20 years earlier, before they were married. Because the IRS seized the entirety of the income, the taxes on the income remained unpaid.

When her husband died, the IRS pursued the innocent spouse for the taxes...
on her husband’s income. She was forced to sell her family home and all property owned jointly with her husband. My constituent is employed, but due to financial hardship she must live with friends. Even so, the IRS may have her wages garnished along with funds set aside for her in trust by a probate court.

Because the Tax Court does not have jurisdiction to review claims for innocent spouse equitable relief, my constituent can do little to prevent the IRS from taking what remains.

The aim of this legislation is to provide an avenue through which innocent spouse equitable relief decisions may be appealed, if originally denied by the IRS.

This bill: expressly provides that the Tax Court has jurisdiction to review the denial of equitable innocent spouse relief under Internal Revenue Code section 6015(f); and suspends IRS collection activity while a request for relief under section 6015 of the Internal Revenue Code section 6015(f) is pending.

I believe that my proposal would provide a straightforward and uncontroversial solution to the unfair treatment of innocent spouses under current law. Moreover, without this bill, an increasing number of innocent spouse equitable relief appeals will remain in limbo—pending, with no method for consideration.

When this body enhanced innocent spouse protections through passage of the 1998 Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act—the goal was to modernize, simplify, and streamline the cumbersome process of seeking relief from liabilities of tax, interest, and related penalties.

Unfortunately, the conference report on the 1998 act included vague language, which ultimately has left innocent spouses with no avenue for appeal. It is worth noting that the IRS grants fewer than three in 10 requests for innocent spouse relief. This bill in no way guarantees relief, but rather fixes the broken appeals process for these IRS decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support this small change that will have a profound effect on the lives of many innocent spouses—mostly women—who deserve their day in court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to print the text of this amendment in the RECORD.

The Senate ayes have it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the text of the amendment ordered printed in the RECORD be committed to the Senate Finance Committee for further consideration.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment ordered printed in the RECORD be ordered to appear in the record under the provisions of the Indian Land Consolidation Act to modify certain requirements under that Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to clarify provisions of the Indian Land Consolidation Act, ILCA. Some of these amendments are of a technical or clarifying nature; others have the effect of delaying the effective date of certain provisions of the Indian Land Consolidation Act set forth in ILCA section 207.

Section 1 of the bill clarifies the meaning of certain defined terms used in ILCA—“trust or restricted interest land” and “land”—and also delays the application of the act’s probate code to permanent improvements located on Indian trust lands until after July 20, 2007. This delay will provide additional time to analyze how the probate code should apply to permanent improvements and determine whether further amendments are needed.

The definition of land is amended to clarify that a decedent’s interest in such improvements is included in the term “land” only for purposes of intestate succession under ILCA section 207(a) and even then only when the improvements are located on a parcel of trust or restricted land that is itself included in the decedent’s estate. Thus, “land” would not include a decedent’s interest in permanent improvements located on tribal trust land or for that matter on individually owned trust land if the underlying parcel of land is not itself part of the decedent’s estate.

Section 2 of the bill also amends the “single heir rule” of ILCA section 207(c), which governs the inheritance of interests that are less than 5 percent of the total undivided interest in a parcel of land. By making it inapplicable to any interest in the estate of a decedent who dies during the period beginning on the enactment date of the clause and ending on July 20, 2007, and authorizing the Secretary of Interior to extend this period for up to 1 year. The bill would also delay until July 21, 2007, the application of the presumption in ILCA section 207(c) that a decedent’s interest in land is an undivided interest in a parcel of land. The bill also amends the “equal division rule” of ILCA section 207(d), which requires an equal division of interests in the estate of a decedent. The bill would delay the application of the clause until July 20, 2007. The bill would also delay until July 20, 2007, the application of the “equal division rule” of ILCA section 207(d), which requires an equal division of interests in the estate of a decedent.

The bill would also delay until July 21, 2007, the application of the presumption in ILCA section 207(c) that a decedent’s interest in land is an undivided interest in a parcel of land. The bill also amends the “equal division rule” of ILCA section 207(d), which requires an equal division of interests in the estate of a decedent. The bill would delay the application of the clause until July 20, 2007. The bill would also delay until July 20, 2007, the application of the “equal division rule” of ILCA section 207(d), which requires an equal division of interests in the estate of a decedent.
207(o), which authorizes purchase of interests during probate, in various ways, but most significantly limiting nonconsensual purchases to the Secretary and the Indian tribe; clarifying that the 5 percent threshold applies to the decedent’s interest rather than to the interest passing to an heir; and holding the rule allowing nonconsensual purchase at probate of small interests inapplicable to interests in the estate of any decedent who dies on or before July 20, 2007. This section would also authorize the Secretary to extend this period for up to 1 additional year.

The amendments delaying the application of these provisions will give Indian landowners more time to understand how these provisions work and plan their estates accordingly. The delays of the single heir rule and nonconsensual purchase option at probate will also allow the Department more time to have procedures and systems in place to determine whether a given interest is, or is not, below the 5 percent threshold that triggers application of the rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indian Land Consolidation Act Amendments of 2006”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 202 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2201) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting “(ii) after (‘‘4’’);”;

(B) by striking “trust or restricted interest in land or”; and

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting the following:—

“(ii) ‘trust or restricted interest in land’ or;” and

(C) in clause (ii) (as designated by subparagraph (B)), by striking “an interest in land, the title to which” and inserting “an interest in land, the title to which interest’’;

and

(D) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) the term ‘land’—

“(A) means any real property; and

“(B) for purposes of intestate succession only under section 207(a), includes, with respect to any decedent who dies after July 20, 2007, the interest of the decedent in any improvements permanently affixed to a parcel of trust or restricted land (subject to any valid mortgage or other interest in such an improvement) that was owned in whole or in part by the decedent immediately prior to the death of the decedent.’’;

SEC. 3. DESCENT AND DISTRIBUTION.

Section 207 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2206) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(2)(D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “clauses (ii) through (‘‘4’’)” and inserting “clauses (ii) through (‘‘5’’)’’; and

(B) by striking clause (v) and inserting the following:

“(v) EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH; NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN INTERESTS.—Nothing in this subsection applies to a valid will in accordance with subsection (b); or

“(ii) applies to any interest in the estate of a decedent who dies during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section and ending on July 20, 2007 (or the last day of any applicable period of extension authorized by the Secretary under subsection (vii)).

“(v) NONAPPLICABILITY.—The Secretary may extend the period of nonapplicability under clause (vi) for not longer than 1 year if, by not later than July 2, 2007, the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice of the extension.’’;

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “the date that is” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:—

“(July 21, 2007);’’; and

(iii) in subsection (A) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii) and indenting the clauses appropriately;

(B) by striking “(3)” and all that follows through “No sale” and inserting the following:

“(3) REQUEST TO PURCHASE; CONSENT REQUIREMENTS; MULTIPLE REQUESTS TO PURCHASE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No sale; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

“(B) MULTIPLE REQUESTS TO PURCHASE.—

Except for a purchase pursuant to paragraph (5), if the Secretary receives a request with respect to an interest from more than 1 eligible purchaser under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall sell the interest to the eligible purchaser that is selected by the applicable heir, devisee, or surviving spouse.

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by adding ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, and”’;

and

(iii) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) The establishment of an advanced multidisciplinary computing software institute; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3527

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Blue Collar Computing and Business Assistance Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Computational science, the use of advanced computing capabilities to understand and solve complex problems, including the development of new products and processes, is now critical to scientific leadership, economic competitiveness, and national security.

(2) Advances in computational science and high performance computing provide a competitive advantage because they allow businesses to run faster simulations of complex systems or to develop more precise computer models.

(3) The Federal Government is one of the investors in research aimed at the development of new computational science and high-performance computing capabilities.

(4) As determined by the Council on Competitiveness, the Nation’s small businesses and manufacturers must “Out Compute to Out Compete”. However, new computational science technologies are not being transferred effectively from the research organizations to small businesses and manufacturers.

(5) Small businesses and manufacturers are especially well-positioned to benefit from increased availability and utilization of high-performance computing technologies and software.

(6) Current cost and technology barriers associated with high-performance computing and software algorithms often inhibit small businesses and manufacturers from successfully making use of these technologies.

(7) The establishment of an advanced multidisciplinary computing software institute will help make existing high performance computing resources more accessible to small businesses and manufacturers. This will create new opportunities for economic growth, jobs, and product development.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide grants for the creation of an Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Institute that will—
(1) develop and compile high-performance computing software and algorithms suitable for applications in small business and manufacturing;
(2) effectively carry out the transfer of new computational science and high-performance computing technologies to small businesses and manufacturers; and
(3) actively assist small businesses and manufacturers in utilizing such technologies.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—
(1) ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY COMPUTING SOFTWARE CENTER; CENTER.—The term "Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Center" means any organization created by an eligible entity with a grant awarded under section 4.
(2) ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY COMPUTING SOFTWARE INSTITUTE.—The term "Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Institute" means a network of up to 5 Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Centers located throughout the United States.
(3) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term "nonprofit organization" means any organization if such organization is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.
(4) SMALL BUSINESS OR MANUFACTURER.—The term "small business or manufacturer" means a small business concern as that term is defined by section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)), including a small manufacturing concern.
(5) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term "Under Secretary" means the Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 4. GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce shall award grants to establish up to 5 Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Centers at eligible entities throughout the United States. Each Center shall—
(1) conduct general outreach to small businesses and manufacturers in all industry sectors within a geographic region assigned by the Under Secretary; and
(2) conduct technology transfer, development, and utilization programs relating to a specific Federal program, for all firms in that sector nationwide, as assigned by the Under Secretary.
(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—For the purposes of this section, an eligible entity is any—
(1) nonprofit organization;
(2) consortium of nonprofit organizations; or
(3) partnership between a for-profit and a nonprofit organization.
(c) APPLICATION.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that desires a grant under this Act shall submit an application to the Under Secretary, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such additional information as the Under Secretary may reasonably require.
(2) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Under Secretary shall publish the requirements described in paragraph (1) in the Federal Register no later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.
(3) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:
(A) An application that conforms to the requirements set by the Under Secretary under paragraph (1).
(B) A proposal for the allocation of the legal rights associated with any invention that may result from the activities of the proposed Center.
(C) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall be evaluated by the Under Secretary on the basis of merit review. In carrying out this merit review process, the Under Secretary shall consider—
(A) the extent to which the eligible entity—
(i) has a partnership with nonprofit organizations, businesses, software vendors, and academia that matches the expertise in their selected industry sector;
(ii) makes use of State-funded academic supercomputing centers and universities or colleges with expertise in the computational needs of the industry assigned to the eligible entity under subsection (a)(1);
(iii) has a history of working with businesses;
(iv) has experience providing educational programs aimed at helping organizations adopt the use of high-performance computing and computational science;
(v) has partnerships with education or training organizations that can help educate future workers on the application of computational science to industry needs;
(vi) is accessible to businesses, academia, incubators, or other economic development organizations via high-speed networks; and
(vii) is capable of working with small businesses and manufacturers for the purpose of enhancing the ability of such entities to compete in the global marketplace.
(B) the ability of the eligible entity to enter successfully into collaborative agreements with small businesses and manufacturers in order to experiment with new high performance supercomputing and computational science technologies; and
(C) such other factors as identified by the Under Secretary.
(d) AMOUNT.—A grant awarded under this section shall not exceed $5,000,000 for any year of the grant period.
(e) DURATION.
(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for a renewal under paragraph (2), the duration of any grant awarded under subsection (a) may not exceed 5 years.
(2) RENEWAL.—Any grant awarded under subsection (a) may be renewed at the discretion of the Under Secretary.
(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall provide an amount equal to the grant funds and actual operating and maintenance funds required to create and maintain a Center.
(2) FUNDING FROM OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The funds provided by the eligible entity under paragraph (1) may consist of amounts received by the eligible entity from a Federal department or agency, other than the Department of Commerce, or a State or local government agency.
(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The funds provided pursuant to this Act may establish a reasonable limitation on the portion of each grant awarded under subsection (a) that may be used for administrative expenses or other overhead costs.
(h) FEES AND ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES AUTHORIZED.
(1) IN GENERAL.—A Center established pursuant to this Act may, according to regulations established by the Under Secretary—
(A) collect a nominal fee from a small business or manufacturer for a service provided pursuant to this Act, if such fee is utilized for the budget and operation of the Center; and
(B) accept funds from any other Federal department or agency for the purpose of covering capital costs or operating budget expenses.
(2) CONDITION.—Any Center that is supported with funds that originally came from a Federal department or agency, other than the Department of Commerce, may be selected, and if selected shall be operated, according to the provisions of this section.

SEC. 5. USE OF FUNDS.

The eligible entity that receives a grant under section 4(a) shall use the funds for the benefit of businesses in the industry sector designated by the Under Secretary under section 4(a), and the eligible entity shall use such funds to—
(1) create a repository of nonclassified, nonproprietary new and existing federally-funded software and algorithms.
(2) test and validate software in the repository;
(3) determine when and how the industry sector will benefit from resources in the repository;
(4) work with software vendors to commercialize repository software and algorithms from the repository;
(5) make software available to small businesses and manufacturers where it has not been commercialized by a software vendor;
(6) help software vendors, small businesses, and manufacturers test or utilize the software on high-performance computing systems; and
(7) establish a research and outreach team that will work with small businesses and manufacturers to aid in the identification of software or computational science technology which can be used to solve challenging problems, or meet contemporary business needs of such organizations.

SEC. 6. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each center that establishes an entity who receives a grant under section 4(a) shall submit to the Under Secretary on an annual basis, a report describing the goals of the Center established by the eligible entity and the progress the eligible entity has achieved towards meeting the purposes of this Act.
(b) EVALUATION.—The Under Secretary shall establish a peer review committee, consisting of representatives from industry and academia, to review the goals and progress made by each Center during the grant period.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009, and $5,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 2011 to carry out the provisions of this Act.
(b) AVAILABILITY.—Funds provided for the establishment and operation of Centers under this Act shall remain available until expended.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, the manufacturing sector is under siege from cheap imports, unfair trade agreements, and escalating health care and energy costs. Instead of working to alleviate this burden, the Bush administration has turned its back on manufacturing; focusing instead on tax cuts for the rich and their heirs. Indeed, the Bush administration is seeking funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, and the Advanced Technology Program, ATP, in this year's budget. MEP helps manufacturers streamline operations, integrate new technologies, shorten production times, and lower costs. ATP provides grants to support research and development of high risk technology, cutting edge technologies. Both MEP and ATP help manufacturers survive and compete with countries like China.

Today, offer, with Senator DeWine, some more help for beleaguered manufacturers. The Blue Collar Computing and Business Assistance Act of 2006 was
drafted from recommendations made by the Council on Competitiveness regarding high performance computing. The legislation would provide grants for the creation of five Advanced Computing Software Centers throughout the United States that would transfer high performance computing technologies to small businesses and manufacturers. High Performance Computing will allow manufacturers to visualize and simulate parts and products before they can be created which will cut the time and cost required to experiment with new materials. General Motors, for example, uses high performance computing to simulate collisions, saving millions of dollars in development costs and substantially shortening design cycle times.

Presently, only large companies like GM have the resources to reap the benefits of high performance computing. This bill would provide grants to small and medium businesses to implement this technology and create new opportunities for economic growth, job creation and product development and allow manufacturers and businesses to harness the full potential of high performance computing.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3529. A bill to ensure that new mothers and their families are educated about postpartum depression, screened for symptoms, and provided with essential services, and to increase research at the National Institutes of Health on postpartum depression; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today with my good friend Senator DURBIN to introduce the Mom’s Opportunity to Access Help, Education, Research, and Support for Postpartum Depression Act. Senator DURBIN has been and continues to be a leader on this issue and I am grateful for the opportunity to work with him on this important legislation. I would also like to recognize Representative Hults, who has been a champion for women battling postpartum depression, PPD, in the House for many years. I am proud to say that his bill, The Melanie Stokes Postpartum Depression Research and Care Act, shares the same goals as the legislation I am introducing today.

In the United States, 10 to 20 percent of women suffer from a disabling and often undiagnosed condition known as postpartum depression. Unfortunately, many women are unaware of this condition and often do not receive the treatment they need. That is why I am introducing the MOTHERS Act, so that women no longer have to suffer in silence and feel alone when faced with this difficult condition.

Recently, the great state of New Jersey passed a first-of-its-kind law requiring doctors and nurses to educate expectant mothers and their families about postpartum depression. This bill was introduced in the State legislature by State Senate President Richard Codey. The attention Senator Codey and his wife, Mary Jo Codey—who personally battled postpartum depression—have brought to this issue is remarkable. Brooke Shields, a graduate of Princeton University, has also shared her struggle with postpartum depression publicly and should be commended for her efforts to bring awareness to this postpartum depression affects women across the country, not just in New Jersey, and that is why I believe the MOTHERS Act is so important.

In America, 10 to 20 percent of women experience some level of depression after childbirth. This is what people often refer to as the “baby blues.” However, each year, there are between 400,000 and 800,000 women across America who suffer from postpartum depression, a much more serious condition. These women often experience signs of depression and may lose interest in friends and family, feel overwhelming sadness or guilt, and even thoughts of harming their baby or harming themselves. People often assume that these feelings are simply the “baby blues,” but the reality is much worse. Postpartum depression is a serious and disabling condition, and new mothers deserve to be given information and resources on this condition so, if needed, they can get the appropriate help.

The good news is that treatment is available. Many women have successfully recovered from postpartum depression with the help of therapy, medication, and support groups. However, mothers and their families must be educated so that they understand what might occur after the birth of their child and what to do to get help. The legislation I am introducing today will require doctors and nurses to educate every new mother and their families about postpartum depression before they leave the hospital and offer the opportunity for new mothers to be screened for postpartum depression symptoms during the first year of postnatal check-up visits. It also provides social services to new mothers and their families who are suffering and struggling with postpartum depression. By increasing education and early treatment of postpartum depression, mothers, husbands, and families will be able to recognize the symptoms of this condition and help new mothers get the treatment they need and deserve.

The MOTHERS Act has another important component. While we continue to educate and help the mothers of today, we must also be prepared to help future generations by funding research on postpartum conditions at the National Institutes of Health, so we can begin to unravel the mystery behind this difficult to understand illness. The more we know about the etiology of postpartum depression, the more tools we have to treat and prevent this heartbreaking condition.

We must attack postpartum depression on all fronts with education, screening, support, and research so that new moms can feel supported and safe rather than scared and alone. Many new mothers sacrifice anything and everything to provide feelings of security and safety to their innocent, newborn child. It is our duty to provide the same level of security, safety and support to new mothers in need.

**SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS**


Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MUKULSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ISAACS, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. LANDRIEU, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DODD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. Res. 513

Whereas there are 103 historically Black colleges and universities in the United States;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities provide the quality education essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities have a role to play that have played a prominent role in the history of the United States;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities have allowed many underprivileged students to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of historically Black colleges and universities are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved.

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK.**

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning September 10, 2006, as “National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week”;

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The Senate requests the President to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the week beginning September 10, 2006, as “National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week”; and

(2) calling on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for historically Black colleges and universities in the United States.
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—CONDEMN THE DE-
DITION BY THE CITY OF ST. DENIS, FRANCE, TO NAME A
STREET IN HONOR OF MUMIA ABU-JAMAL, THE CONVICTED
MURDERER OF PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER DANNY FAULK-
NER
Mr. SANTORUM submitted the follow-
ing concurrent resolution; which was
referred to the Committee on For-
eign Relations:

Whereas on the night of December 9, 1981, Police Officer Danny Faulkner was shot and
killed in cold blood during a traffic stop in
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

Whereas in the process of arresting the driver of a car traveling the wrong way down a
one-way street, the driver’s brother ap-
peared from across the street and proceeded to
open fire on Officer Faulkner while his
back was turned away;

Whereas the driver’s brother was identified as Mumia Abu-Jamal;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal shot Officer Faulkner 4 times in the back;

Whereas, although seriously injured, Offi-
cer Faulkner returned fire, striking his
attacker;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal was undeterred
and stood over Officer Faulkner and shot
him in the face, mortally wounding him;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal attempted to
flee, but collapsed several feet from the slain
Officer Faulkner, murder weapon in hand;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal was charged and
crimed of first degree murder by a
jury of his peers;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal has had nu-
merous legal appeals, including appeals to
the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and the
United States Supreme Court, and his
conviction has been upheld each time;

Whereas, on April 29, 2006, the municipal
government of St. Denis, a suburb of Paris,
dedicated a street in the honor of Mumia
Abu-Jamal; and

Whereas the official recognition and cele-
braiton of a murderer of a police
officer of the United States is an affront to
law enforcement officers across the Nation:
Now, therefore, be it
Resolved by the Senate (the House of Repre-
sentatives concurring), That Congress:
(1) condemns the murder of Philadelphia
Police Officer Danny Faulkner;
(2) encourages the municipal government of St.
Denis to take immediate action to change
the name of Rue Mumia Abu-Jamal and, if
such action is not taken by the municipal
government of St. Denis, urges the Govern-
ment of France to take appropriate action
against the city of St. Denis to change the
name of Rue Mumia Abu-Jamal; and
(3) commends all police officers in the
United States and throughout the world for
their commitment to public service and pub-
col safety.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise
today to submit a resolution to condemn
an action that I find terribly appalling. On April 29, 2006, the munic-
pal government of St. Denis, France, name the corner of Rue Mumia
Abu-Jamal, the convicted killer of Philadelphia Police Officer Danny Faulkner. Representative FITZPATRICK has intro-
duced a similar resolution in the House of Represen-
tatives.

On the morning of December 9, 1981, Officer Danny Faulkner, a 5 year vet-
eran of the Philadelphia Police Depart-
ment, made a traffic stop at Locust Street near Twelfth Street. The car
stopped by Officer Faulkner was driven by William Cook who was driving the
wrong way down a one-way street. Wil-
liam Cook’s brother, Mumia Abu-
Jamal, was across the street. As Faulk-
ner attempted to handcuff William
Cook, Abu-Jamal ran across the street and shot the officer in the back. Faulkner was able to fire one shot that
struck Abu-Jamal in the chest; the wounded officer then fell to the paver.
Mumia Abu-Jamal stood over the officer and shot him four more
times at close range, including one di-
rectly in the face. Abu-Jamal was found at the scene of the shooting by
officers who arrived there within sec-
onds.

Official ballistics tests on the fatal
bullet confirmed that Officer Faulkner was killed by a bullet identical in type,
brand, and caliber to the bullet found in Abu-Jamal’s gun. Witnesses to the
brutal murder identified Mumia Abu-Jamal as the killer both at the scene and during
his trial. In July 1982, Mumia Abu-
Jamal was convicted of murdering Offi-
cer Danny Faulkner and was sentenced to death. Abu-Jamal has had numer-
ous legal appeals, including appeals to the PA State Supreme Court and the U.S.
Supreme Court, and his conviction has been upheld each time.

I am outraged that the municipal
government of St. Denis, France would
make such a thoughtless and insensit-
ive decision as to name a street after the
murderer of a Philadelphia police
officer. This is a monumental insult to the
memory of Danny Faulkner, to his
family, and to the courageous men and
women who put on a police uniform
every day to protect our communities.

I hope my Senate colleagues will join
me in condemning the murder of Offi-
cer Faulkner, and urging the municipal
government of St. Denis to take imme-
 diate action to change the name of
“Rue Mumia Abu-Jamal.” If such
action is not taken, this resolution urges
the French Government to take appro-
 priate action against the city of St.
Denis to change the name of the street.

Finally, this resolution appropriately
recognizes Faulkner as the ultimate sacri-
ifice.

I urge my colleagues to sup-
port this important resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED
SA 4253. Mr. DURBAN (for himself, Ms.
COLINS, Ms. INOUEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OBAMA,
Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INOUEY, and
Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to
the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for
fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the
Department of Defense, national security con-
struction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe per-
sonnel strengths for such fiscal year for the
Armed Forces, and for other purposes.
SA 4254. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr.
COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4255. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amend-
ment to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4256. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr.
LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LASAK) proposed an amend-
ment to the bill S. 2766, supra.
SA 4257. Mr. HIDEN (for himself, Mr.
HAGEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, and
Ms. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to
the bill S. 2766, supra.
SA 4258. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr.
SALazar) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4259. Mrs. STABENOW (for herself and
Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment inten-
ded to be proposed by her to the bill S.
2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4260. Mr. REID submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the
bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4261. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr.
HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INOUEY, Mr.
LIEBERMAN, Mr. COPE, Mr. BENNETT, and
Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment inten-
ded to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4262. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr.
OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, and
Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4263. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr.
OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, and
Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4264. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr.
LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment inten-
ded to be proposed by her to the bill S.
2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4265. Mr. NELSON, of Florida (for him-
self, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) pro-
posed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.
SA 4266. Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr.
JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr.
KING, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WyDEN,
Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment inten-
ded to be proposed by him to the bill S.
2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4267. Mr. KYL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the
bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4268. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the
bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4269. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amend-
ment to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
SA 4270. Mr. BURNS (for himself and Mrs.
DOLK) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4271. Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr.
LRAHY) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra;
which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 4272. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amend-
ment to the bill S. 2766, supra.
SA 4273. Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr.
KERRY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amend-
ment to the bill S. 2766, supra.
SA 4274. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and
Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amend-
ment to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the
table.
At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. PILOT PROGRAM ON TROOPS TO NURSE TEACHERS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and potential benefits of a program to—

(A) assist nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in achieving necessary qualifications to become nurse educators and in securing employment as nurse educators at accredited schools of nursing;

(B) provide scholarships to nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in return for continuing service in the Selected Reserve or other forms of public service; and

(C) help alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(2) DURATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the pilot program shall be conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2012. A nurse corps officer may not enter into an agreement to participate in the pilot program after December 31, 2012.

(3) REGULATIONS.—The pilot program shall be conducted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The pilot program required by subsection (a) shall be known as the "Troops to Nurse Teachers Pilot Program" (in this section referred to as the "Program").

(c) NURSE CORPS OFFICERS.—A nurse corps officer described in this subsection is any commissioned officer of the Armed Forces qualified and designated as an officer in a Nurse Corps of the Armed Forces who—

(1) is a registered nurse;

(2) is serving in a reserve component of the Armed Forces; or

(3) is a retired member of the Armed Forces.

(d) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAM.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An eligible nurse corps officer seeking to participate in the Program shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application to participate in the Program. The application shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Secretary may require.

(2) SELECTION.—After the commencement of the Program, the Secretary shall select participants in the Program from among qualified nurse corps officers applying for participation in the Program who enters into an agreement to participate in the Program under subsection (e) that continues in force after that date.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall undertake any administration of the Program that is required after December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program after that date.

(1) REPORT.—In general.—Not later than three years after the commencement of the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall—

(A) describe the activities undertaken under the Program; and

(B) include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in—

(i) facilitating the development of nurse educators;

(ii) encouraging service in the Selected Reserve and other forms of public service; and

(iii) helping alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(2) PILOT PERIOD.—In general.—The Program shall be conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program for any period to which paragraph (1) applies.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall undertake any administration of the Program that is required after December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program after that date.

(1) REPORT.—In general.—Not later than three years after the commencement of the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall—

(A) describe the activities undertaken under the Program; and

(B) include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in—

(i) facilitating the development of nurse educators;

(ii) encouraging service in the Selected Reserve and other forms of public service; and

(iii) helping alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(2) PILOT PERIOD.—In general.—The Program shall be conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program for any period to which paragraph (1) applies.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall undertake any administration of the Program that is required after December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program after that date.

(i) REPORT.—In general.—Not later than three years after the commencement of the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall—

(A) describe the activities undertaken under the Program; and

(B) include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in—

(i) facilitating the development of nurse educators;

(ii) encouraging service in the Selected Reserve and other forms of public service; and

(iii) helping alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(A) NURSE EDUCATOR.—The term ‘‘nurse educator’’ means a registered nurse who—

(i) is a member of the nursing faculty at an accredited school of nursing;

(ii) holds a graduate degree in nursing from an accredited school of nursing or a doctoral degree in a related field from an accredited institution of higher education; and

(iii) has an unrestricted license to practice nursing from one or more of the states; and

(C) holds a valid, unrestricted license to practice nursing in at least one state; and

(D) has successfully completed additional coursework in the field of higher education that provides competency in an advanced practice area of nursing.
SA 4254. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CONTRACTIVE CONTRACTING IN HURRICANE RECOVERY.

The exceptions to full and open competition otherwise available under paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of section 3305 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to Federal contracts worth over $500,000 for the procurement of property or services in connection with relief and recovery efforts related to Hurricane Katrina and the other hurricanes of the 2005 season.

SA 4255. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICES.

(a) In General.—

(1) INCLUSION OF CONTRACTS UNDER TERMINATION AUTHORITY.—Subsection (b) of section 305 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (30 U.S.C. App. §355) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) CONTRACTS FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICE.—A contract for a cellular phone, or an agreement for cellular phone service, under which the Government pays for cellular phone service for a servicemember’s dependent for a personal or business purpose if—

(1) the contract is executed by or on behalf of a person who thereafter and during the term of the contract enters into military service under call or order specifying a period of not less than 90 days (or who enters military service under a call or order specifying a period of 90 days or less who, without a break in service, receives orders extending the period of military service to a period of not less than 90 days); or

(2) the servicemember, while in military service, executes the contract and thereafter receives military orders for a permanent change of station to a location within the continental United States or to deploy with a military unit for a period of not less than 90 days; or

“(C) the servicemember, while in military service, executes the contract and thereafter receives military orders for a permanent change of station to a location within the continental United States where the contract cannot be transferred at the same rate, terms, and quality of service.”.

(b) MANNER OF TERMINATION.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” and inserting “; and”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) in the case of a contract for a cellular phone described in subsection (b)(3), termination of the contract under subsection (a) is effective on the date to which the requirements of subsection (c) are met for such termination.”.

(2) ARREARAGES.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking ‘‘(e) ARREARAGES AND OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND LIABILITIES.—Rents or lease amounts’’ and inserting the following:

“(e) ARREARAGES AND OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND LIABILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Rents or lease amounts’’;

(B) by designating the second sentence as paragraph (3); and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) TERMINATION CHARGES FOR CELLULAR PHONE CONTRACTS.—In the case of a contract for a cellular phone, the contractor may not impose an early termination charge, but may request the return of equipment provided to the contractor as part of the contract which would normally remain the property of the contractee at the end of the contract term if the contractee is given the option of paying a pro-rated amount to retain such equipment based on the original retail price of such equipment, the amount previously paid for such equipment by the contractee, and the time remaining on the contract.

“(4) REACTIVATION FEES.—In the event a contractor and contractee jointly agree to treat the termination of a contract for a cellular phone under this section as a suspension of such contract, the contractor may not impose a fee for not imposing a fee for reactivation of such service under such contract at the completion of suspension of such contract.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a)(1)(B) of such section is amended by striking “(or (2)(B))” and inserting “, (2)(B), (3)(B), or (3)(C)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 305. TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL OR MOTOR VEHICLE LEASES OR CONTRACTS FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICE.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such section is amended by striking the item relating to section 305 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 305. Termination of residential or motor vehicle leases or contracts for cellular phone service.”.

SA 4256. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. LEVIN and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1054. STRENGTHENING THE SPECIAL INPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of discharging the duties of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction under subsection (f) of section 3001 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (5 U.S.C. 8G note), and for purposes of determining the date of termination of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction under subsection (o) of such section, any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2006 for the reconstruction of buildings and infrastructure owned by the United States Government or otherwise designated by the United States Government if such funds may be designated, shall be treated as amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

SA 4257. Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1231. UNITED STATES POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The pursuit by the Iranian regime of a capability to produce nuclear weapons represents a threat to the United States, the Middle East region, and international peace and security.

(2) On May 31, 2006, Secretary of State Rice announced that the United States would join negotiations with Iran, along with the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, provided that Iran fully and verifiably suspends its enrichment and reprocessing activities.

(3) On June 1, 2006, President George W. Bush stated that “Secretary Rice, at my instructions, said to the world that we want to solve the problem of the Iranian nuclear issue diplomatically. And we made it very clear publicly that we're willing to come to the table, so long as the Iranians verifiably suspend their program, which, we said to the Iranians [that] the United States of America wants to work with our partners to solve the problem.”

On June 1, 2006, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the People’s Republic of China, and the Russian Federation agreed upon a package of incentives and disincentives, which was subsequently presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union, Javier Solana.
(b) Sense of Congress.—Congress—
(i) endorses the policy of the United States, announced May 31, 2006, to achieve a successful diplomatic outcome, in coordination with other members of the international community, with respect to the threat posed by the efforts of the Iranian regime to acquire a capability to produce nuclear weapons;
(ii) calls on Iran to suspend fully and verifiably its enrichment and reprocessing activities, cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enter into negotiations, including with the United States, pursuant to the package presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union and
(iii) urges the President and the Secretary of State to keep Congress fully and currently informed about the progress of this vital diplomatic initiative.

SA 4258. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007 for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

FUNDING TO ADDRESS CHANGES IN POPULATION AND INFLATION.

(a) Funding to Address Changes in Population and Inflation.—(1) In General.—The Secretary of Defense, in proposing the budget for the fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2007, shall include a funding amount to address changes in population and inflation.

(b) Method of Calculation.—The funding amount shall be calculated as follows:

(i) The funding amount for fiscal year 2008 shall be the amount that is rounded to the nearest whole number of the amount that would be determined by the following formula:

\[
\text{Funding Amount} = \left( \frac{\text{Budget Authority}}{\text{Previous Year's Budget Authority}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \text{Previous Year's Budget Authority}
\]

where:

- \( \text{Budget Authority} \) is the amount appropriated for the purposes specified for subsection (d) for fiscal year 2006;
- \( \text{Previous Year's Budget Authority} \) is the amount equal to the product of the per capita baseline amount, as defined in subsection (c), and the number of veterans enrolled in the Department health care system for fiscal year 2006.

(ii) The funding amount for fiscal year 2009 and each subsequent fiscal year shall be calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Funding Amount} = \left( \frac{\text{Budget Authority}}{\text{Previous Year's Budget Authority}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \text{Previous Year's Budget Authority}
\]

where:

- \( \text{Budget Authority} \) is the amount appropriated for the purposes specified for subsection (d) for fiscal year 2008;
- \( \text{Previous Year's Budget Authority} \) is the amount equal to the product of the per capita baseline amount, as defined in subsection (c), and the number of veterans enrolled in the Department health care system for fiscal year 2007.

(c) Per Capita Baseline Amount.—The per capita baseline amount shall be adjusted for changes in population and inflation as follows:

(i) The per capita baseline amount for fiscal year 2006 shall be the amount that is rounded to the nearest whole number of the amount that would be determined by the following formula:

\[
\text{Per Capita Baseline Amount} = \text{Previous Year's Per Capita Baseline Amount} \times \left( \frac{\text{Population Index} \times \text{Inflation Index}}{1000000} \right)
\]

where:

- \( \text{Previous Year's Per Capita Baseline Amount} \) is the amount determined for fiscal year 2005;
- \( \text{Population Index} \) is the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the 12-month period ending on the June 30 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which the increase is measured, expressed as a percentage of the Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period preceding the 12-month period described in clause (i).

(ii) The per capita baseline amount for fiscal year 2007 and each subsequent fiscal year shall be calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Per Capita Baseline Amount} = \text{Previous Year's Per Capita Baseline Amount} \times \left( \frac{\text{Population Index} \times \text{Inflation Index}}{1000000} \right)
\]

where:

- \( \text{Inflation Index} \) is the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers, United States City Average, Hospital and related services, Seasonally Adjusted, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with respect to the 12-month period ending on the June 30 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which the increase is measured, expressed as a percentage of the Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period preceding the 12-month period described in clause (i).
‘‘(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the purposes for which amounts made available pursuant to subsection (b) shall be all programs, functions, and activities of the Veterans Health Administration.

‘‘(2) Amounts made available pursuant to subsection (b) are not available for—

(A) construction, acquisition, or alteration of buildings or facilities; or

(B) any purpose as provided in subchapter I of chapter 81 of this title (other than for such repairs as were provided for before the date of the enactment of this section through the Health Care appropriation for the Department); or

(B) grants under subchapter III of chapter 81 of this title.

‘‘(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent or limit the authority of Congress to reauthorize provisions relating to veterans health care.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

‘‘320. Funding for veterans health care to address changes in population and inflation.’’.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—(1) Not later than January 31, 2009, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which section 320 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), has achieved the purpose set forth in subsection (a) for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

(2) The report under paragraph (1) shall set forth the following:

(A) The amount appropriated for fiscal year 2006 for the programs, functions, and activities of the Veterans Health Administration consistent with subsection (b) in section 320 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) The amount appropriated by annual appropriations Acts for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 for such programs, functions, and activities.

(C) The amount provided by section 320 of title 38, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 for such programs, functions, and activities.

(D) An assessment whether the amount described in subparagraph (C) has resulted in a reduction in costs to the Veterans Health Administration for such programs, functions, and activities that were attributable to changes in population and inflation over the course of such fiscal years.

(E) An assessment whether the amount provided by section 320 of title 38, United States Code, or any other modifications of law, to better ensure adequate funding of such programs, functions, and activities in each such fiscal year.

(F) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General makes appropriate for purposes of modifying modifications of the formula under subsection (c) of section 320 of title 38, United States Code, or any other modifications of law, to better ensure adequate funding of such programs, functions, and activities.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘‘joint resolution’’ means only a joint resolution which is introduced in the House of Representatives by the Speaker of Representatives (or the Speaker’s designee) or the Minority Leader (or the Minority Leader’s designee) and in the Senate by the Majority Leader (or the Majority Leader’s designee) or the Minority Leader (or the Minority Leader’s designee) within the 10-day period beginning on the date on which Congress receives the report of the Comptroller General of the United States under subsection (b), and—

(A) which does not have a preamble;

(B) which only states the clause of which consists of amendments of title 38, United States Code, or other amendments or modifications of laws under the jurisdiction of the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate or the House of Representatives to implement the recommendations of the Comptroller General in the report under subsection (b)(2)(F); and

(C) the title of which is as follows: ‘‘Joint resolution to ensure adequate funding of health care for veterans.’’

(2) REFERRAL.—(A) The report described in paragraph (1) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives. A resolution described in paragraph (1) introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

(B) If the committee to which a resolution described in paragraph (1) is referred has not reported such resolution (or an identical resolution) by the end of the 20-day period beginning on the date on which the Comptroller General submits to Congress the report under subsection (b), such committee shall be, at the end of such period, discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(3) DISCHARGE.—(A) On or after the third day after the date on which the committee to which such a resolution is referred has reported, or has been discharged (under paragraph (3)) from further consideration of, such a resolution, it is in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disposed of) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (but only on the day after the calendar day on which such Member announces to the House concerned the Member’s intention to do so). The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the decision of the House (or of the Senate) not to discharge the resolution shall occur.

(B) An amendment to the resolution described in paragraph (1), and it supersedes any other rule of that House.

(II) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(IV) The vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(5) CONSIDERATION BY OTHER HOUSE.—(A) If, before the passage by the House of a resolution described in paragraph (1), that House receives from the other House a resolution described in paragraph (1), then the pending procedure (i) shall be continued (ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(5) With respect to a resolution described in paragraph (1) of the House receiving the resolution—

(A) if, before the passage by the House of a resolution described in paragraph (1), the House receives from the other House a resolution described in paragraph (1), then the pending procedure (i) shall be continued (ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(5) Upon disposition of the resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the resolution that originated in the receiving House.

(5) RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) to establish the power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in paragraph (1), and it supersedes any other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SA 4260. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of the Army, to authorize military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —NEVADA TEST SITE VETERANS’ COMPENSATION

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ‘‘Nevada Test Site Veterans’ Compensation Act of 2006’’.

SEC. 02. FINDINGS.

(a) Congress makes the following findings:—

(1) Congress notes that Cold War-era nuclear weapons programs were employed in facilities owned by the Federal Government and the private sector producing and testing nuclear weapons and engaging in related atomic energy defense activities for the national defense beginning in the 1940s.

(2) These Cold War atomic energy veterans helped to build and test the nuclear arsenal that served as a deterrent during the Cold War, sacrificing their personal health and well-being in service of their country.

(b) Employees working on Cold War-era nuclear weapons programs were exposed to radiation and placed in harm’s way by the Department of Energy and contractors, subcontractors, and vendors of the Department without their knowledge and consent, without adequate radiation monitoring, and without necessary
protections from internal or external occupational radiation exposure.

(4) The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7281 et seq.) (in this section referred to as ‘‘EEOICPA’’) was enacted to ensure fairness and equity for the men and women who, during the past 60 years, performed duties uniquely related to the nuclear weapons production and testing programs of the Department of Energy, its predecessor agencies, and contractors by establishing a program that would provide timely, uniform, and adequate compensation for beryllium- and radiation-related health conditions.

(5) Research by the Department of Energy, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), NIOSH contractors, the President’s Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, and congressional committees indicates that at certain nuclear weapons facilities—

(A) workers were not adequately monitored for internal or external exposure to ionizing radiation; and

(B) records were not maintained, are not reliable, are incomplete, or fail to indicate the radioactive isotopes to which workers were exposed.

(6) In order to root out the inequities posed by the factors described above and the resulting harm to the workers, Congress designated classes of occupational radiation exposure at the Paducah, Kentucky, Portsmouth, Ohio, Oak Ridge K-25, Tennessee, and the Amchitka Island, Alaska, sites as members of the Special Exposure Cohort under EEOICPA.

(7) The contribution of the State of Nevada to the security of the United States throughout the Cold War and since has been unparalleled.

(8) In 1950, President Harry S Truman designated what would later be called the Nevada Test Site as the country’s nuclear proving grounds and, a month later, the first atmospheric test at the Nevada Test Site was detonated.

(9) The United States conducted 100 above ground and 828 underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site from 1951 to 1992.

(10) Out of the 1,034 nuclear tests conducted in the United States, 928, or 88 percent, were conducted at the Nevada Test Site.

(11) The Nevada Test Site has served, and continues to serve, as the premier research, testing, and development site for our nuclear defense capabilities.

(12) The Nevada Test Site and its workers are an essential and irreplaceable part of our national defense capabilities.

(13) It has become evident that it is not feasible to estimate with sufficient accuracy in a timely manner the radiation dose received by employees at the Department of Energy facility at the Nevada Test Site for many reasons, including the following:

(A) The NIOSH Technical Basis Document, the technical basis document for radiation dose reconstruction under EEOICPA, has incomplete radionuclide lists.

(B) NIOSH has not demonstrated that it can estimate exposure to external and nonrespirable hot particles.

(C) There are significant gaps in environmental measurement and exposure data.

(D) Reurrence dosimetry is seriously underestimated.

(E) NIOSH has not been able to estimate accurately exposure to bombs assembly workers and raddiators.

(F) NIOSH has not demonstrated that it can accurately sample tritiated water vapor.

(G) External dose records lack integrity.

(H) Dose data is dated before 1966, and only partial data after such date.

(J) There are no internal dose data until late 1955 or 1956, and limited data until well into the 1960s.

(K) NIOSH has ignored exposure from more than a dozen, large一款 not highly vented, including Bianca, Des Moines, Baneberry, Camphor, Diagonal Line, Niola, Agrini, Midas Myth, Misty Rain, and Mighty Oak.

(L) Monitoring, individual groups were monitored, resulting in unreliable personnel monitoring.

(11) The United States conducted 100 above-ground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site or other similar sites located in Nevada during the period beginning on January 1, 1950, and ending on December 31, 1993, and, during such employment,—

(i) was present during an atmospheric or underground nuclear test or performed drillbacks, re-entry, or clean-up work following such tests; or

(ii) was employed at the Nevada Test Site for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days and was employed in a job activity that—

(1) was monitored through the use of dosimetry badges or biosassays for exposure to ionizing radiation; or

(2) was employed in a job activity that is or was, comparable to a job that is, was, or should have been monitored for exposure to ionizing radiation through the use of dosimetry badges or biosassays.


(1) by redesigning subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

(C) The employee was so employed at the Nevada Test Site for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days and was employed—

(i) was present during an episodic event involving radiation releases (without regard to the duration of employment); or

(ii) was present during an episodic event involving radiation releases (without regard to the duration of employment); or

(iii) was employed at the Nevada Test Site for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days and was employed in a job activity that—

(1) was monitored through the use of dosimetry badges or biosassays for exposure to ionizing radiation; or

(2) was employed in a job activity that is or was, comparable to a job that is, was, or should have been monitored for exposure to ionizing radiation through the use of dosimetry badges or biosassays.

(13) Claims for compensation under section 3621(b)(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, as added by subsection (a), shall be adjudicated and a final decision issued—

(1) in the case of claims filed after the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 30 days after such claim; or

(2) in the case of claims filed before the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 30 days after the date of such filing.

SA 4261. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, strike lines 6 through 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 116. FUNDING FOR PROCUREMENT OF F-22A FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.-(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF INCREMENTAL FUNDING.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall not use incremental funding for the procurement of F-22A fighter aircraft.

(b) MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year for procurement of not more than 60 F-22A fighter aircraft.

SEC. 147. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT OF F-119 ENGINES FOR F-22A FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.-

The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year for procurement of the following:

(1) Not more than 120 F-119 engines for F-22A fighter aircraft.

(2) Not more than 13 spare F-119 engines for F-22A fighter aircraft.

SA 4262. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSLATION-RELATED COVERAGE PROGRAMS.-(a) PRESEPARATION COUNSELING.—Section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘provide for individual preseparation counseling’’ and inserting ‘‘shall provide individual preseparation counseling’’;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

‘‘(4) For members of the reserve components who have been serving on active duty continuously for at least 180 days, the Secretary concerned shall ensure that commanders of members entitled to services under this section authorize the members to obtain such services during duty time;’’

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ‘‘(4) Information concerning’’ and inserting the following:

‘‘(4) Provision of information on civilian occupations and related assistance programs, including information concerning application for certification and licensure requirements that are applicable to civilian occupations;’’

SEC. 176. FUNDING FOR PROCUREMENT OF F-22A FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.—
(B) civilian occupations that correspond to military occupational specialties; and

(C); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

(11) Information concerning the priority of service for veterans in the receipt of employment, training, and placement services provided under qualified job training programs administered by the Department of Labor.

(12) Information concerning veterans small business ownership and entrepreneurship programs of the Small Business Administration and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation.

(13) Information concerning employment rights and obligations under chapter 43 of title 38.

(14) Information concerning veterans preference in federal employment and federal procurement activities.

(15) Information concerning homelessness, including risk factors, awareness assessment, and contact information for preventative assistance associated with homelessness.

(16) Contact information for housing counseling assistance.

(17) Description developed in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, of health care and other benefits to which the member may be entitled under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(18) If a member is eligible, based on a preseparation physical examination, for compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a referral for a medical examination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (commonly known as a 'compensation and pension examination');

(3) by adding at the end the following:

(4) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that

(A) preseparation counseling under this section includes material that is specifically relevant to the needs of—

(i) persons being separated from active duty by discharge from a regular component of the armed forces; and

(ii) members of the reserve components being separated from active duty;

(B) the locations at which preseparation counseling is presented to eligible personnel include—

(i) each military installation under the jurisdiction of the Secretary;

(ii) each armory and military family support center of the National Guard;

(iii) inpatient medical care facilities of the uniformed services where such personnel are receiving inpatient care; and

(iv) in the case of a member on the temporary disability retired list under section 1202 or 1205 of this title who is being retired under another provision of this title or is being discharged as a location reasonably convenient to the member;

(C) the scope and content of the material presented in preseparation counseling at each location under this section are consistent with the scope and content of the material presented in the preseparation counseling at the other locations under this section; and

(D) follow up counseling is provided for each member of the reserve components described in subparagraph (A) not later than 90 days after separation from active duty.

(2) The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of the materials used by the National Veterans Training Institute and such officials' other activities that provide direct training support to personnel who provide preseparation counseling with respect to—

(e) NATIONAL GUARD MEMBERS ON DUTY IN STATE STATUS.—(1) Members of the National Guard, who are separated from long-term duty to which ordered under section 502(f) of title 32, shall be provided preseparation counseling under this section to the same extent that members of the reserve components being discharged or released from active duty are provided preseparation counseling under this section.

(2) The preseparation counseling provided to personnel under paragraph (1) shall include material that is specifically relevant to the needs of such personnel as members of the National Guard.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, by regulation, the standards for determining long-term duty under paragraph (1); and

(4) by amending the heading to read as follows:

§1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TRANSITIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking 'paragraph (4)(A)' in the second sentence and inserting 'paragraph (6)(A)';

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

§1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling. .

(c) PARTICIPATION.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require participation by members of the armed forces eligible for assistance under the program carried out under this section.

(2) The Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security need not require, but shall encourage and otherwise promote, participation in the program by the following members of the armed forces described in paragraph (1):

(A) Each member who has previously participated in the program.

(B) Each member who, upon discharge or release from active duty, is returning to—

(i) a position of employment; or

(ii) pursuit of an academic degree or other educational or employment objective that the member was pursuing when called or ordered to such active duty.

(3) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that compensation or benefits entitled to service members under this section authorize the members to obtain such services during duty time; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

(4) UPDATED MATERIALS.—The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of all materials used by the Department of Labor that provide direct training support to personnel who provide transitional services counseling under this section.

(d) CONSENT OF MEMBERS REQUIRED.—Access to a member of the armed forces under the program under this section is subject to the consent of the member.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term 'benefits delivery at discharge program' means a program administered jointly by the Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide information and assistance on available benefits and other transition assistance to members of the armed forces who are separating from the armed forces, including assistance to obtain any disability benefits for which such members may be eligible.

(2) The term 'representative', with respect to a veterans' service organization, means a representative of an organization who is recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

§1709. Veteran-to-veteran counseling

(a) COOPERATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to facilitate the access of representatives of military and veterans service organizations and representatives of veterans' service agencies of States to veterans furnished care and services under this chapter to provide information and counseling to such veterans on—

(1) the care and services authorized by this chapter; and

(2) other benefits and services available under the laws administered by the Secretary.

(b) FACILITIES COVERED.—The program under this section shall provide for access to veterans described in subsection (a) at each facility of the Department and any non-Department facility at which the Secretary furnishes care and services under this chapter.

(c) CONSENT OF VETERANS REQUIRED.—Access to a veteran under this program under this section is subject to the consent of the veteran.
“(d) Definition.—In this section, the term ‘veterans’ service organization’ means an organization that is recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under this title.

(2) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of this title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1708 the following new item:

‘‘1709. Veteran-to-veteran counseling.’’.

SA 4263. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) In General.—Section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-183; 119 Stat. 3348) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

‘‘(d) Assessment and Recommendations on Transition to Civilian Life of Members of the National Guard and Reserve Returning from Deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.—

(1) In general.—In addition to the activities required under subsection (c), the task force shall, not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Secretary a report containing an assessment of, and recommendations for improving, assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(2) Plan matters.—In conducting the assessment and recommendations required by paragraph (1), the task force shall utilize the assistance of a working group that consists of individuals selected by the task force from among individuals as follows:

(A) With the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, personnel of the Small Business Administration;

(B) Representatives of employers who employ members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) on their return to civilian life as described in that paragraph;

(C) Representatives of employee assistance organizations that assist wounded, injured, and disabled members of the National Guard and Reserves in finding or sustaining employment.

At the end of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 681. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ‘‘Heroes at Home Act of 2006’’.

SEC. 682. RESPONSIBILITIES OF TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) In General.—Section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-183; 119 Stat. 3348) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

‘‘(d) Assessment and Recommendations on Transition to Civilian Life of Members of the National Guard and Reserve Returning from Deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.—

(1) In general.—In addition to the activities required under subsection (c), the task force shall, not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Secretary a report containing an assessment of, and recommendations for improving, assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(2) Plan matters.—In conducting the assessment and recommendations required by paragraph (1), the task force shall utilize the assistance of a working group that consists of individuals selected by the task force from among individuals as follows:

(A) With the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, personnel of the Small Business Administration;

(B) Representatives of employers who employ members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) on their return to civilian life as described in that paragraph;

(C) Representatives of employee assistance organizations that assist wounded, injured, and disabled members of the National Guard and Reserves in finding or sustaining employment;

(F) Representatives of such other public or private organizations and entities as the co-chairs of the task force, in consultation with the members of the task force, consider appropriate.

(3) Report Elements.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the following:

(A) The provision of outreach and training to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers on the employment, readjustment, and mental health needs of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) upon their return from deployment as described in that paragraph;

(B) The provision of outreach and training to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers on the needs of family members of such members;

(C) The improvement of collaboration between the public and private sectors in order to ensure the successful transition of such members.

(4) Other Duties.—In the period between the submittal of the report required by paragraph (1) and the task force under subsection (h), the task force (including the working group established under paragraph (2)) shall serve as an advisor to the Employment Assistance Centers and Employment Assistance Organizations established under section 683 of the Heroes at Home Act of 2006.

(b) Report.—Subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ‘‘Report’’ and inserting ‘‘Reports’’;

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph (1):

‘‘(1) In general.—The report submitted to the Secretary under each of subsections (c) and (d) shall include—

(A) a description of the activities of the task force under such subsection;

(B) the assessment and recommendations required by such subsection; and

(C) such other matters relating to the activities of the task force under such subsection as the task force considers appropriate.’’; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ‘‘the report under paragraph (1)’’ and inserting ‘‘a report under paragraph (1)’’; and

(B) by striking ‘‘the report as’’ and inserting ‘‘such report as’’.

(c) Plan Matters.—Subsection (g) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘the report from the task force under subsection (e)(1)’’ and inserting ‘‘a report from the task force under subsection (d)(1)’’;

(2) by inserting ‘‘contained in such report’’ after ‘‘the task force’’ the second place it appears.

(d) Termination.—Subsection (h) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by inserting ‘‘with respect to the assessment and recommendations required by subsection (d) after ‘‘the task force’’’;

(2) by striking ‘‘subsection (e)(2)’’ and inserting ‘‘subsection (f)(2)’’.
SEC. 683. ASSISTANCE CENTER FOR EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) Establishment of Center.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an office to assist employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers in facilitating the successful transition or civilian employment of members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) Designation.—The office established under this subsection shall be known as the “Assistance Center for Employers and Employment Assistance Organizations” (in this section referred to as the “Center”).

(b) Head.—The Secretary shall designate an individual to act as the head of the Center.

(c) Integration.—In establishing the Center, the Secretary shall ensure close communication between the Center and the military departments, including the commands of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(d) Functions.—The Center shall have the following functions:

(1) To provide education and technical assistance to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employees in facilitating the successful transition of civilian employment of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a) on their return from deployment as described in that subsection.

(2) To provide education and technical assistance to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employees to assist them in facilitating the successful adjustment of family members of the National Guard and Reserve to the deployment and return from deployment of members of the National Guard and Reserve as described in that subsection.

(e) Resources to Be Provided.—

(1) In general.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Center shall provide employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employees with resources and assistance that include the following:

(A) Guidelines on best practices and effective strategies.

(B) Information on the physical and mental health difficulties that can and may be experienced by members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a) on their return from deployment as described in that subsection in transitioning to civilian employment, including difficulties arising from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI), including education on—

(i) the detection of warning signs on such effects on family members of members of the National Guard and Reserve;

(ii) the medical, mental health, and employment services available to such family members, including materials on such services as described in subparagraph (B)(i); and

(iii) mechanisms for referring such family members for services described in clause (ii) that are needed for mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(D) Education on mechanisms, strategies, and resources for accommodating and employing family members of the National Guard and Reserve in work settings.

(2) Provision of resources.—The Center shall make resources, services, and assistance available under this subsection through such mechanisms as the head of the Center considers appropriate, including the Internet, video conferencing, telephone services, workshops, trainings, presentations, group forums, and other mechanisms.

(d) Personnel and Other Resources.—

The Secretary of Defense shall assign to the Center such personnel, funding, and other resources as are required to ensure the effective discharge of the functions of the Center under subsection (b).

(e) Reports on Activities.—

(1) Annual report by center.—Not later than one year after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the head of the Center, in consultation with the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health (while in effect), shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a written report on the programs and outcomes of the Center during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(2) Transmittal to Congress.—Not later than 45 days after receipt of a report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit such report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with—

(A) such comments on such report, and such assessment of the effectiveness of the Center, as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(B) such recommendations on means of improving the effectiveness of the Center as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(f) Availability to Public.—The Secretary shall take steps to make such report under paragraph (2) available to the public, including through the Internet website of the Center.

(g) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Employment assistance organization.—The term “employment assistance organization” means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.

(2) Department of defense task force on mental health.—The term “Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health” means the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health established under section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, as amended by section 682 of this Act.

(3) Authorization of Appropriations.—

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal years 2006 and 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 684. GRANTS ON ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED SETTINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE AND THEIR FAMILIES AFTER DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM OR OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense may award grants to eligible entities to carry out demonstration projects to assess the feasibility and effectiveness of establishing community-based settings for the provision of assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve who serve in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families, after the return of such members from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, as the case may be, to—

(1) services to improve the reuniting of such members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families;

(2) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on their return from such deployment, including education on—

(A) Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI); and

(B) mechanisms for the referral of such members of the National Guard and Reserve for medical and mental health screening and care when necessary;

(3) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that family members of such members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on the return of such members from such deployment, including education on—

(A) depression, anxiety, and relationship problems; and

(B) mechanisms for medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(b) Eligible Entities.—An entity eligible for an award under this section is any public or private non-profit organization, such as a community mental health clinic, family support organization, military support organization, law enforcement agency, community college, or public school.

(c) Application.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a proposal for such demonstration therefor in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require for purposes of this section, including a description of how such entity will work with the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, State health agencies, other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, family support organizations, and other community organization in undertaking activities described in subsection (a).

(d) Annual Reports by Grant Recipient.—An entity awarded a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense on an annual basis a report on the activities undertaken by such entity during the preceding year utilizing amounts under the grant. Each report shall include such information as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of this subsection.

(e) Final Reports to Congress.—

(1) In general.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on activities undertaken under the grants awarded under this section. The report shall include recommendations for legislative, executive, administrative, or other appropriate action to improve or enhance activities under the grants awarded under this section.

(2) Availability to Public.—The Secretary shall make each report under this section available to the public.
SEC. 685. LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(b) SELECTION OF ENTITY FOR CONDUCT OF STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, select an entity to conduct the study required by subsection (a) from among private organizations or entities qualified to conduct the study.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces;

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries;

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom;

(4) The mental health care, and rehabilitation needs of such members for such injuries after the completion of impatient treatment through the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, or both;

(5) The type and availability of long-term care rehabilitation programs and services within and outside of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for such members for such injuries, including community-based programs and services and in-home programs and services;

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) PERIODIC AND FINAL REPORTS.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(A) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study;

(B) In the case of a report to elements of the Department of Defense—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for programmatic and administrative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries; and

(ii) such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate based on the outcomes of the study;

(C) In the case of a report to elements of the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for programmatic and administrative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries; and

(ii) such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate based on the outcomes of the study;

(D) In the case of a report to Congress—

(i) all recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for legislative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries;

(ii) such recommendations as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers appropriate for legislative action to improve long-term care and rehabilitative programs and services for members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injuries incurred by such members in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly take appropriate actions to make each such report available to the public.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 686. TRAINING CURRICULA FOR FAMILY CAREGIVERS ON CARE AND ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY IN CONNECTION WITH OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY FAMILY CAREGIVER PANEL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, establish within the Department of Defense a panel to develop coordinated, uniform, and consistent training curricula to be used in training family caregivers of members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2)สมาชิกของทีม.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall consist of at least 15 members appointed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and senior representatives with expertise in traumatic brain injury from the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs, including Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs health and medical personnel with expertise in traumatic brain injury, including those who specialize in traumatic brain injury in war; representatives of family caregivers and family organizations; representatives of the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs health and medical personnel with expertise in traumatic brain injury; representatives of organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans; representatives of organizations who specialize in matters relating to service-disabled veterans; psychologists or other individuals with expertise in the mental health treatment and care of individuals with traumatic brain injury; researchers and academicians who study traumatic brain injury; and any other individuals the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) MEETINGS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall meet not less than once every six months.

(b) DISSEMINATION OF CURRICULA.—

(1) GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel, develop mechanisms for the dissemination of the curricula developed under subsection (b) to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who work with members and former members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury incurred in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricula and other resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.

(c) SELECTION OF ENTITY FOR CONDUCT OF STUDY.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall consult with the Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee, as appropriate.

(d) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricula and other resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.

(e) DISSEMINATION OF CURRICULA.—

(1) GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel, develop mechanisms for the dissemination of the curricula developed under subsection (b) to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who work with members and former members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury incurred in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricula and other resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.

(f) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricula and other resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.
(4) PROVISION OF TRAINING TO FAMILY CARE-
GIVERS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who are trained in the curricula developed under subsection (b) shall provide training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces who incur traumatic brain injuries during service in the Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom in the care and assistance to be provided for such injuries.

(b) TRAINING OF TRAINING.—Training under this paragraph shall, to the extent practicable, be provided to family members while the member or former member concerned is undergoing treatment at a facility of the Department of Defense or Department of Veterans Affairs, as applicable, in order to ensure that such family members receive practice under the guidance of qualified health professionals.

(C) PARTICULARIZED TRAINING.—Training provided under this paragraph to family members of a particular member or former member shall be tailored to the particular care needs of such member or former member and the specific caring needs of such family members.

(5) QUALITY ASSURANCE.—The Secretary shall develop mechanisms to ensure quality in the provision of training under this section to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) and in the provision of such training under paragraph (4) by such health care professionals.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the development of the curricula required by subsection (b), and annually thereafter, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Training Panel shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a report on the following:

(A) The actions undertaken under this subsection.

(B) The results of the tracking of outcomes based on training developed and provided under this section.

(C) Recommendations for the improvement of training developed and provided under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

SA 4266. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to pre-
scribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE GRANT-
ing of amnesty to persons known to have killed members of the armed forces in IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving he-
rocally in Iraq to provide all of the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of mili-
tary operations in March of 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 members of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) the Government of Iraq should grant amnesty to persons known to have at-
tacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) the President should immediately no-
tify the Government of Iraq that the Govern-
ment of the United States opposes granting amnesty to persons who have at-
tacked members of the Armed Forces of the United States.
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success, the nature and substance of the allegations, and the amount of funds in controversy for each case. If there is a showing of extraordinary circumstances that disclosure of information would pose an imminent threat of harm to a relator and be detrimental to the public interest, then this information should be redacted in accordance with standards adopted by the Department of Justice.

(E) A detailed description of any interagency task force that exists to work specifically on these cases of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(F) The names of the senior officials directly responsible for oversight of the efforts to address these cases of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(G) Specific information on the number of investigations and other personnel that have been provided to the Department of Justice by other agencies and departments in support of the efforts of the Department of Justice to combat contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including data on the quantity of time that these investigators have spent working within the Department of Justice structures dedicated to this effort.

(H) Specific information on the full number of investigations, including grand jury investigations currently underway, that are addressing these cases of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(I) Specific information on the number and status of the criminal cases that have been launched to address contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(J) Specific information on the number of civil cases that have been filed to address contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including data on the quantity of cases initiated by private parties, as well as the quantity of cases that have been referred to the Department of Justice by other agencies and departments.

(K) Specific information on the resolved civil cases that have been resolved to address contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including the specific results of these cases of waste, fraud, and abuse that took place, the amount of funds that were returned to the United States Government as a result of resolution of these cases, and a full description of the type and substance of the waste, fraud, and abuse that took place, including its direct and indirect impacts on United States troops, officers, and other individuals working for the United States Government in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror. If there is a showing of extraordinary circumstances that disclosure of information would pose an imminent threat of harm to a relator and be detrimental to the public interest, then this information should be redacted in accordance with standards adopted by the Department of Justice.

(L) The best estimate by the Department of Justice of the scale of the problem of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

SA 4287. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 1223. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On October 13, 1999, the Senate voted not to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

(2) Immediately following such vote, then-Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright sent a letter to the government representatives of the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of Russia, China, India, Japan, and Australia assuring them that the Administration would work to ratify the treaty in accordance with its obligations as a signatory under international law, and will seek reconsideration of the Treaty at a later date when conditions are better suited for ratification (in this section referred to as the “assurances letter”).

(b) REPORT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall specifically address each of the following issues:

(A) Whether the assurances regarding United States obligations under the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty that were provided in the assurances letter are consistent with the current policy of the United States.

(B) If the assurances are not consistent with United States policy, a description of the steps taken by the President to communicate with the foreign governments that received the assurances letter that such assurances are no longer operative.

(C) If the assurances are not consistent with United States policy, whether the President has provided to the foreign governments that received the assurances letter written notice that the letter is no longer operative.

(D) Whether the President agrees with the statement by then-Secretary of State Albright in the assurances letter that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty imposes on the United States continuing "obligations as a signatory under international law," irrespective of the October 13, 1999, vote by the Senate not to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Treaty.

(E) If the President believes that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty does not impose on the United States continuing obligations as a signatory under international law:

(i) whether the President believes that the assertion in the assurances letter that such obligations existed was erroneous; and

(ii) if not, a description of the steps taken by the President to terminate the obligations that existed at the time of the assurances letter.

(F) Whether the President believes that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty does impose on the United States continuing obligations as a signatory under international law, a description of the nature and extent of such obligations.

(G) Whether, as a matter of international law, the United States is, as of the time of the vote, a signatory to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

(H) Whether the official list of signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, as published by the Depository of the Treaty accurately reflects whether the United States is still a signatory to the Treaty.

(I) Whether the President has a constitutional duty to ensure that United States international legal obligations conform with domestic legislation subsequently enacted that is inconsistent with such obligations, and whether any such duty extends to reconciling or changing internationally-maintained records that purport to reflect the official status of the United States as a signatory to a treaty the ratification of which has been rejected by the Senate and is no longer supported by the President.

SA 4268. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION OF FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION.

None of the funds authorized or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended in connection with United States participation in, or support for, the activities of the United Nations Disarmament Commission as long as Mr. KRIEGER serves as a vice-chair of the Commission.

SA 4269. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4255 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following:

SEC. 8. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ.—

(1) SCHEDULE FOR WITHDRAWAL.—The President shall reach an agreement as soon as possible with the Government of Iraq on a schedule for the withdrawal of United States combat troops from Iraq by December 31, 2008, or otherwise only to the extent critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces.
activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IX, add the following:

Subtitle D—National Guard Bureau Matters

SEC. 831. SHORT TITLE

This title may be cited as the ‘‘National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006’’.

SEC. 832. EXPANDED AUTHORITY OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AND EXPANDED FUNCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) EXPANDED AUTHORITY.—

(1) In general.—Section (a) of section 10501 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘‘joint bureau of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force’’ and inserting ‘‘joint activity of the Department of Defense’’.

(2) PURPOSE.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking ‘‘between’’ and all that follows and inserting ‘‘between—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the commanders of the combatant commands for the United States, and

(2) the several States,’’.

(b) ENHANCEMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—

(1) ADVISORY FUNCTION ON NATIONAL GUARD MATTERS.—Subsection (c) of section 10502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ‘‘to the Secretary of Defense, to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,’’ after ‘‘principal advisor’’.

(2) GRADE.—Subsection (e) of such section, as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, is further amended by striking ‘‘lieutenant general’’ and inserting ‘‘general’’.

(3) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON VALIDATED REQUIREMENTS.—Section 10504 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(1) ANNUAL REPORT ON VALIDATED REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 31 each year, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit a report to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense to address the requirements validated under section 10503a(b)(1) of this title during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) ENHANCEMENT OF FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF CHARTER.—Section 10503 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2), and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (1):

‘‘(1) To validate the requirements of the several States and Territories with respect to military assistance to civil authorities.

(2) To develop doctrine and training requirements relating to the provision of military assistance to civil authorities.

(3) To administer amounts provided the National Guard for the provision of military assistance to civil authorities.

(4) To carry out any other responsibility relating to the provision of military assistance to civil authorities as the Secretary of Defense shall specify.

(5) CONFERMENT AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONFIRMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 10503 of such title is amended to read as follows:

‘‘10503. Functions of National Guard Bureau charter’’.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 10503 and inserting the following new item:

‘‘10503. Functions of National Guard Bureau charter.’’.

SEC. 833. REQUIREMENT THAT POSITION OF DEPUTY COMMANDER OF THE UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND BE FILLED BY A QUALIFIED NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The position of Deputy Commander of the United States Northern Command shall be filled by a qualified officer of the National Guard Bureau.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the requirement in subsection (a) is to ensure that information received from the National Guard Bureau regarding the operation of the National Guard of the several States is integrated into the plans and operations of the United States Northern Command.

SA 4272. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year
2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

SEC. 375. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the new Government of Iraq is commended for its statement by the National Security Adviser of Iraq on June 15, 2006 that:

(1) "American wives and American mothers have come forward to express their grief for the loss of their men who are serving in Iraq. . . . We are ever so grateful."

(2) "We will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians."

SA 4273. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) Policy.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to improve the fuel efficiency of weapons platforms, consistent with mission requirements, in order to—

(1) enhance platform performance;

(2) reduce the size of the fuel logistics systems;

(3) reduce the burden high fuel consumption places on agility;

(4) reduce operating costs; and

(5) dampen the financial impact of volatile oil prices.

(b) Report Required.—

(1) In General.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(2) Elements.—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility of designating an official within the Department of Defense as the "leader" to be responsible for implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(B) A summary of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(i) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics;

(ii) the Defense Science Board Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Strategy established by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006; and

(iii) the January 2001 Defense Science Board Task Force on Improving Fuel Efficiency of Platforms.

(C) For each recommendation summarized under subparagraph (B)—

(i) the steps that the Department has taken to implement such recommendation;

(ii) any additional steps the Department plans to take to implement such recommendation; and

(iii) for any recommendation that the Department does not plan to implement, the reasons for the decision not to implement such recommendation.

(D) An assessment of the extent to which the research, development, acquisition, and logistics guidance and directives of the Department for weapons platforms are appropriately designed to address the policy established by subsection (a).

(E) An assessment of the extent to which such guidance and directives are being carried out and implemented, acquisition, and logistics programs of the Department.

(F) A description of any additional actions that, in the view of the Secretary, may be needed to implement the policy established by subsection (a).

SA 4274. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. THOMAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 147. MINUTEMAN III INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee on H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the conference states that the policy of the United States "is to deploy a force of 500 ICBMs". The conference further notes that the "modernization development plans may compel the United States to make changes to this force structure in the future."

(2) The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) conducted under section 118 of title 10, United States Code, in 2005 finds that maintaining a robust nuclear deterrent "remains a cornerstone of the United States national power." However, notwithstanding that finding and without providing any specific justification for the recommendation, the Quadrennial Defense Review recommends reducing the number of deployed Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) from 500 to 450 beginning in fiscal year 2007. The Quadrennial Defense Review also fails to identify what unanticipated strategic developments compelled the United States to reduce the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force structure.

(3) The commander of the Strategic Command, General James Cartwright, testified before the Committees of the Senate that the reduction in deployment of Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles is required so that the 50 missiles withdrawn from the deployed force could be used for test assets and spares to extend the life of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile well into the future. If these missiles are not modernized, the Air Force may not have sufficient replacement missiles to sustain the force size.

(b) MODERNIZATION OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.—The Air Force shall modernize Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles in the United States inventory such that a sufficient supply of launch test assets and spares is retained to sustain the deployed force of such missiles through 2030.

(c) LIMITATION ON TERMINATION OF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.—No funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the termination of any Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force with multiple independent warheads before 2030.

(1) A detailed strategic justification for the proposal to reduce the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force from 500 to 450 missiles, including an analysis of the effects of the reduction on the ability of the United States to assure allies and disuade potential competitors.

(2) A detailed analysis of the strategic ramifications of continuing to equip a portion of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force with multiple independent warheads rather than single warheads as recommended by past reviews of the United States nuclear posture.

(3) An assessment of the test assets and spares required to maintain a force of 500 deployed Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles through 2030.

(4) An assessment of the test assets and spares required to maintain a force of 450 deployed Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles through 2030.

(5) An inventory of currently available Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile test assets and spares.

A plan to sustain and complete the modernization of all deployed and spare Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, a test plan, and an analysis of the funding required to carry out modernization of all deployed and spare Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

(7) An assessment of whether halting upgrades to the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles withdrawn from the deployed force would compromise the ability of those missiles to serve as test assets.

(8) A description of the plan of the Department of Defense for extending the life of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force beyond fiscal year 2030.

(9) ICBM MODERNIZATION PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "ICBM Modernization program" means each of the following for the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles:

(1) The Guidance Replacement Program (GRP).

(2) The Propulsion Replacement Program (PRP).

(3) The Propulsion System Rocket Engine (PSRE) program.
The Safety Enhanced Reentry Vehicle (SERV) program.

SA 4275. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 215. ADVANCED ALUMINUM AEROSTRUCTURES INITIATIVE.**

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force is hereby increased by $2,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force, as increased by subsection (a), $2,000,000 may be available for Aerospace Technology Development and Demonstration (PE #603211F) for ARDEC Commercial Partnership, Project No. 859.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army is hereby decreased by $1,000,000.

SA 4276. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 215. LEGGED MOBILITY ROBOTIC RESEARCH.**

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $1,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by subsection (a), $1,000,000 may be available for Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology (PE #6902601A) for legged mobility robotic research for military applications.

(c) OFSRRT.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army is hereby decreased by $1,000,000.

SA 4277. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 215. ARDEC COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIP, PROJECT NUMBER 859.**

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $1,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by subsection (a), $1,000,000 may be available for Munitions Sustainability, Effectiveness, and Safety (PE #605805A) for ARDEC Commercial Partnership, Project No. 859.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army is hereby decreased by $1,000,000.

SA 4278. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

**SEC. 1008. INCORPORATION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.**

(a) STATUS OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The Classified Annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to accompany S. 2766 of the 109th Congress and transmitted to the President is hereby incorporated into this Act.

(b) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in the Classified Annex may be appropriated for a program, project, or activity referred to in the Classified Annex only if they are available for such program, project, or activity in accordance with such terms, conditions, limitations, restrictions, and requirements as are set out for such program, project, or activity in the Classified Annex.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in the Classified Annex are made available for a program, project, or activity only if they are available for such program, project, or activity in accordance with such terms, conditions, limitations, restrictions, and requirements as are set out for such program, project, or activity in the Classified Annex.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The President shall provide for the appropriate distribution of the Classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

SA 4279. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. SALAZAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 93, strike lines 23 through 25 and insert the following:

(c) AMENDMENT TO LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENT CONDITIONAL ON PERFORMANCE.—No payment may be made under an incentives clause under this section unless the contractor concerned has satisfactorily performed its duties under such incentives clause.

(2) PAYMENT CONTINGENT ON APPROPRIATIONS.—An incentives clause under this section shall specify that the obligation of the Government to make payment under such incentives clause is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose. Amounts appropriated for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction or Demilitarization shall be available for payments under incentives clauses under this section.

SA 4280. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

**SEC. 1223. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) REPORTS ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMON DEFENSE.—Section 1008 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(b) COST-SHARING REPORT.—Section 1313 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-357; 108 Stat. 3261, 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

SA 4281. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 296, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

“(c) INCREMENTS.—In the event any increment of a major automated information system program separately meets the requirements for treatment as a major automated information system program, the provisions of this chapter shall apply to such increment as well as to the overall major automated information system program of which such increment is a part.”

On page 297, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

“(c) BASELINE.—(1) For purposes of this chapter, the initial submittal to Congress of the baseline estimate required by subsection (a) with respect to a major automated information system program shall constitute the original estimate or information originally submitted on such program to the reports and determinations on program changes in section 2445e of this title.

(2) An adjustment or revision of the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program may be treated as the original estimate or information originally submitted on the program if the adjustment or revision is the result of a critical change in the program covered by section 2445c(d) of this title.”
“(3) In the event of an adjustment or revision to the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense shall include in the next budget justification documentation submitted under subsection (a) after such adjustment or revision a notification to the appropriate congressional defense committees of such adjustment or revision, together with the reasons for such adjustment or revision. On page 302, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following: ”

“(g) PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—(1) If the determination of a critical change in a program is made by the senior Department official responsible for the program under subsection (d)(2) and a report is not submitted to Congress within the 60-day period specified in subsection (d)(1), appropriated funds may not be obligated for any major contract under the program. ”

“(2) The prohibition on the obligation of funds for a program under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply on the date on which Congress has received a report on compliance with the requirements of subsection (d)(2). ”

SA 4282. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO SERVE IN THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of offering incentives to covered members and former members of the Armed Forces, to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(b) COVERED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—For purposes of this section, covered members and former members of the Armed Forces are the following:

(1) Members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(2) Former members of the Armed Forces within two years of separation from service in the Armed Forces.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—

(1) NATURE OF INCENTIVES.—In considering incentives for purposes of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretaries shall consider such incentives, whether monetary or otherwise and whether or not authorized by current legislation or by the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(2) TARGETING OF INCENTIVES.—In assessing any incentive for purposes of the report, the Secretaries shall give particular attention to the utility of such incentive in—

(A) encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former of the Armed Forces who have provided border patrol or border security assistance to the Bureau as part of their duties as members of the Armed Forces; and

(B) leveraging military training and experience by accelerating training, or allowing credit to be applied to related areas of training, required for service with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(3) PAYMENT.—In assessing incentives for purposes of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretaries shall assume that any costs of such incentives shall be borne by the Department of Homeland Security.

(d) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of various monetary and non-monetary incentives considered for purposes of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(A) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in April 2006;

(B) the Defense Energy Security Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Security Policy established by the Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006; and


(2) An assessment of the desirability and feasibility of utilizing any such incentive for the purpose specified in subsection (a), including guidance to the Secretary of Homeland Security on the desirability of such incentive in encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (c)(2).

(3) Any other matters that the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 4283. Mr. LEVIN (for Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. BINGHAMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to improve the fuel efficiency of weapons platforms, consistent with mission requirements, in order to—

(1) enhance platform performance;

(2) reduce the size of the fuel logistics systems;

(3) reduce the burden high fuel consumption places on agility;

(4) reduce operational costs; and

(5) dampen the financial impact of volatile oil prices.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility of designing a senior Department of Defense official to be responsible for implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(B) A summary of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(i) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in April 2006;

(ii) the Defense Energy Security Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Security Policy established by the Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006; and

(C) For each recommendation summarized under paragraph (2), the Secretaries shall assume that any costs of such incentives shall be borne by the Department of Homeland Security.

SA 4284. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE UNDER THE AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS’ PROTECTION ACT OF 2002.


SA 4285. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. LUGAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 480, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 1304. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON PROVIDEMENT OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) SOVIET NUCLEAR THREAT REduction ACT OF 1993.—Section 211(b) of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (title II of Public Law 102-238; 22 U.S.C. 2551 note) is repealed.

(2) COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 1998.—Section 1203(d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1998 (title XII of Public Law 105-112; 22 U.S.C. 5952(d)(2)) is repealed.

(3) RUSSIAN CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION FACILITIES.—Section 1305 of the Non-proliferation and Disarmament Assistance Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) is repealed.
SA 4286. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 822 and insert the following:

SEC. 822. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS REGARDING SPECIALTY METALS.

(a) Exemption for certain commercial items.—Subsection (i) of section 253a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “, Dual-Use Items, and Electronic Components” after “Commercial Items”;

(2) by inserting “(1)” before “this section”; and

(3) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by inserting “described in subsection (b)(1)” after “commercial items”;

and by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) This section is not applicable to—

(A) a contract or subcontract for the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metals described in subsections (b)(2) and (b)(3); or

(B) specialty metals that are incorporated into an electronic component, where the value of the specialty metal used in the component is de minimis in relation to the value of the electronic component.

“(3) For purposes of paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (3), a commercial item does not include—

(A) any item that contains noncommercial modifications that cost or are expected to cost, in the aggregate, more than 5 percent of the total price of such item;

(B) any item that would not be considered to be a commercial item, but for sales to government entities or inclusion in items that are sold to government entities;

(C) forgings or castings for military unique end items;

(D) fasteners other than commercial off-the-shelf items (as defined in section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c)); or

(E) specialty metals.;”

(b) Exception for certain dual-use items to facilitate civil-military integration.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) Exception for certain dual-use items to facilitate civil-military integration.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the procurement of an item from a contractor or subcontractor if the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department determines that—

“(1) the item is or will be produced using the same facilities, a supply chain, and the same or similar production processes that are used for the production of similar items delivered to non-defense customers that is not less that the greater of—

(A) the amount of specialty metals that is purchased by the contractor for use in the item delivered to the Department of Defense; or

(B) 40 percent of the amount of specialty metals that is purchased by the subcontractor for use during such period in the production of the item and similar items delivered to non-defense contractors; 

(c) Dual-use standard for specialty metals.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) Minimum threshold for specialty metals.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may accept delivery of an item containing specialty metals that were not grown, repro­cessed, reused, or produced in the United States if the total amount of noncom­pliance specialty metals in the item does not exceed 2 percent of the total amount of specialty metals in the item.”.

(2) Effective date.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to items accepted for delivery on or after that date.

(2) CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to contracts entered into on or after that date.

SA 4287. Mr. LEVIN (for Mr. BINGA­MAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. SENSE OF SENATE ON NOMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO SERVE AS DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION ON A PERMANENT BASIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Congress established the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense in 1983 to ensure the operational effectiveness and suitability of weapon systems in combat.

(2) The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation serves as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on operational test and evaluation and is vital to ensuring the operational effectiveness of weapon systems in combat.

(3) The position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has been held on an acting basis since February 15, 2005.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should submit to the Senate the nomination of an individual for the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as soon as practicable.

SA 4288. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 707. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY OF SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) General Eligibility.—Subsection (a) of section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) Eligibility.—A member of the reserve component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for TRICARE...” and inserting “(a) Eligibility.—A member of the reserve component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for TRICARE if the member—”;

(b) URANIUM-EXPOSED SOLDIERS.—In this section, the term “uranium-exposed soldiers” means a member or former member of the Armed Forces who handled, came in contact with, or had the likelihood of contact with depleted uranium munitions while on active duty, including members and former members who—

(1) were exposed to smoke from fires resulting from the burning of vehicles containing depleted uranium munitions or fires at depots at which depleted uranium munitions were stored;

(2) worked within environments containing depleted uranium dust or residues from depleted uranium munitions;

(3) were within a structure or vehicle while it was struck by a depleted uranium munition;

(4) climbed on or entered equipment or structures struck by a depleted uranium munition; or

(5) were medical personnel who provided initial treatment to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4).

SA 4289. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subsection (k).

SA 4290. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 708. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY OF SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) General Eligibility.—Subsection (a) of section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) Eligibility.—A member of the reserve component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for TRICARE...” and inserting “(a) Eligibility.—A member of the reserve component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for TRICARE if the member—”;

(b) URANIUM-EXPOSED SOLDIERS.—In this section, the term “uranium-exposed soldiers” means a member or former member of the Armed Forces who handled, came in contact with, or had the likelihood of contact with depleted uranium munitions while on active duty, including members and former members who—

(1) were exposed to smoke from fires resulting from the burning of vehicles containing depleted uranium munitions or fires at depots at which depleted uranium munitions were stored;

(2) worked within environments containing depleted uranium dust or residues from depleted uranium munitions;

(3) were within a structure or vehicle while it was struck by a depleted uranium munition;

(4) climbed on or entered equipment or structures struck by a depleted uranium munition; or

(5) were medical personnel who provided initial treatment to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4).
The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2747, to enhance energy efficiency and conserve oil and natural gas, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation, or in writing, where appropriate.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on "The OPHEO Report of the Special Examination of Fannie Mae."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on a nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on "Judicial Nominations" on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 2 p.m., in the Senate Dirksen Office Building Room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: The Honorable Thad Cochran; the Honorable Trent Lott; the Honorable James Inhofe; and the Honorable Luis Fortuño.

Panel II: Jerome A. Holmes to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Panel III: Daniel P. Jordan III to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi; Gustavo A. Gelpe to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed briefing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Subcommittee on Fisheries and the Coast Guard be authorized to meet on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 10:30 a.m. on the Coast Guard’s Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund and Waste Management be authorized to hold a hearing on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct oversight of the Superfund Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Pollock and Alison Garfield, detailles
with the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KING OF THAILAND TO THE THRONE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 482, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 409) commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble as amended be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 409) was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to, as follows:

On page 2, in the third Whereas clause of the resolution strike “Agency” and insert “Program”.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF AN ANNUAL NATIONAL TIME-OUT DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 482, and that the Senate then proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 482) supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD as read, without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 482) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 482) was agreed to.

Whereas according to an Institute of Medicine (referred to in this resolution as the ‘‘IOM’’) report entitled ‘‘To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System’’, published in 2000, between 44,000 and 98,000 hospitalized people in the United States die each year due to medical errors, and untold thousands more suffer injury or illness as a result of preventable errors;

Whereas the IOM report recommends the establishment of a national goal of reducing the number of medical errors by 50 percent over 5 years;

Whereas there are more than 40,000,000 inpatient surgery procedures and 31,000,000 outpatient surgery procedures performed annually in the United States;

Whereas it is the right of every patient to receive the highest quality of care in all surgical settings;

Whereas a patient is the most vulnerable and unable to make decisions on their own behalf during a surgical or invasive procedure due to anesthesia or other sedation;

Whereas improved communication among the surgical team and a reduction in medical errors in the operating room are essential for optimal outcomes during operative or other invasive procedures;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Society for Healthcare Risk Management celebrated a National Time-Out Day on June 22, 2004, to promote the adoption of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations’ universal protocol for preventing wrong site surgery errors in operating rooms in the United States;

Whereas the Senate during the 109th Congress supported a National Time-Out Day in 2005 on behalf of the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Society for Healthcare Risk Management to promote the adoption of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations’ universal protocol for preventing errors in the operating room;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, joined by coalition partners, celebrated a National Time-Out Day on June 22, 2005, for the purpose of promoting safe medication administration practices and the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses distributed ‘‘Safe Medication Administration Tool Kits’’ to more than 5,000 hospitals and 13,000 nurse managers or educators;

Whereas the 109th Congress passed the Patient Safety and Quality Improvement Act of 2005 to provide for the improvement of patient safety and to reduce the incidence of events that adversely affect patient safety;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses develops and issues, with coalition partners, universally-accepted authoritative statements, recommended guidelines, best practice guidelines, and competency statements for how to provide optimal care for patients in the operating room;

Whereas there is nationally-focused attention on improving patient safety in all healthcare facilities through the reduction of medical errors;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, the recognized leader in patient safety in the operating room, promotes the highest quality of patient care during all operative or invasive procedures; and

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses designates and celebrates National Time-Out Day on June 21, 2006, and each third Wednesday of June thereafter to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room by focusing on the reduction of medical errors, fostering better communication among the members of the surgical team, and collaborating with coalition partners to establish universal protocols to improve quality and safety for surgical patients; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate
1. supports the goals and ideal of an annual National Time-Out Day as designated by the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses for ensuring patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room; and
2. congratulates perioperative nurses and representatives of surgical teams for working together to protect patient safety during all operative and other invasive procedures.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today’s Executive Calendar:

Calendar Nos. 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, and 712.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT


James B. Lockhart, III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development for a term of five years.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Phyllis C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring July 15, 2013. (Reappointment)

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2007.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.
ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, June 16. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2766, the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we sent the emergency supplemental appropriations conference report to the President with a 98-to-1 vote. We also made some progress on the Defense authorization bill, and we will continue on that bill tomorrow. Chairman WARNER and Senator LIEBERMAN will be here tomorrow. However, we will not have any rollcall votes during Friday’s session. Senators should be reminded that there is a rollcall vote scheduled for Monday’s session at 5:30 p.m. on a U.S. circuit judge, and there may be additional votes Monday evening on amendments to the Defense bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Friday, June 16, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged, pursuant to an order of the Senate of January 20, 2005, from further consideration of the following nomination and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*JON T. RYMER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, June 15, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ROBERT M. COUCH, OF ALABAMA, TO BE PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION.

JAMES B. LOCKHART III, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION


SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees’ commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE NASHVILLE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to mark the final performance of the Nashville Symphony Orchestra at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center this May 27th.

Since its premiere season in 1980–1981, the Tennessee Performing Arts Center has provided a magnificent setting for the Nashville Symphony.

Today we remember fondly the years our symphony has spent at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center, but look forward to many wonderful performances in the new world class Schermerhorn Symphony Center.

It is appropriate that the new facility be named after Principal Conductor Kenneth Schermerhorn, who led the symphony so capably for 20 years. We miss Maestro Schermerhorn, but I know he'd be pleased to see the symphony making the move to this new, world class space.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the members, staff, and many, many fans of the Nashville Symphony Orchestra as they celebrate their success.

HONORING THE JOHN OVERTON HIGH SCHOOL BAND

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 65th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Every December Americans gather in Hawaii to remember the day that so changed the world. This year, the John Overton High School band has been selected to represent Tennessee as we commemorate Pearl Harbor and honor those who died there on that fateful December day. Making their second appearance at this event, it’s clear we’re being well represented by members of the John Overton High School band.

The band will take part in a parade marking the day, perform at the USS Missouri Memorial and lay a wreath at the USS Arizona Memorial. This once in a lifetime opportunity will provide firsthand experience and insight into the bombing of Pearl Harbor and I know the students will never forget their time there.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating the John Overton High School band, and their leader Jo Ann Hood, on this wonderful honor. We applaud their hard work and their commitment to honoring America’s fallen heroes.

ON DRILLING IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I made the attached statement in opposition to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge on May 25, 2006:

Here we go again. For decades, this Congress has rejected attempts to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in recognition of the fact that American working families do not want it. It is bad for our economy and it is a violation of human rights.

The effect on our economy of choosing a path of yesterday over a positive vision of a renewable energy future is stark. A report by researchers at the University of California at Berkeley found that “Across a broad range of scenarios, the renewable energy sector generates more jobs per average megawatt of power installed, and per unit of energy produced, than the fossil fuel-based energy sector.”

Drilling in the Arctic Refuge is also a violation of the international human rights of the native Gwich’in people. It threatens the Porcupine Caribou Herd on which the Gwich’in depend for subsistence, culture and religion. We have no right to threaten their culture and livelihood in order to prop up an archaic energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

ON DRILLING FOR OIL AND GAS ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

HON. DENNIS KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I gave the attached statement, in support of the OCS Drilling Ban Amendment to the FY2007 Interior Appropriations Bill, H.R. 5386 on May 18, 2006:

I rise in strong support of this amendment to preserve the popular and longstanding ban on drilling off our coasts. First, let’s be clear that there is no such thing as drilling for gas only. Even the Administration and the energy industry have dismissed the idea as unworkable. So this is nothing more than a fig leaf.

But it’s a fig leaf that will bring toxic contamination to our marine environment merely three miles off our coasts. And it could open the door to drilling in the Great Lakes, which is also opposed by Great Lakes residents.

We cannot forget that new drilling will have no effect on energy prices for years. In contrast, we have technologies to reduce our addiction to oil and natural gas that are ready to go today. The problem is that we’re subsidizing unsustainable energy production like drilling for natural gas and oil while failing to fund real renewable solutions.

TRIBUTE TO WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the California Democratic Congressional Delegation, I rise in gratitude to recognize the efforts of the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, INPEA, in their extraordinary attempts to raise awareness of elder abuse (which encompasses neglect or maltreatment) throughout the world. The nature of abuse as a hidden problem is now universally accepted.

INPEA, as coauthor of the report Missing Voice, 2002, with the World Health Organization, states that “abuse and neglect and financial exploitation of elders are much more common than societies admit.” Missing Voices demonstrates clear links between elder abuse, and disempowerment and discrimination. INPEA claims that “ultimately the challenge for us all is not only to listen to what has been said, but to believe and act upon it.” The key objective of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day WEAAD is to raise awareness of the ubiquity of elder abuse and its consequences throughout the world.

World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, seeks to foster independence and empowerment for older adults to act for themselves and on their own behalf, and to enable older adults to exercise their rights and advocate for their own interests. WEAAD also attempts to educate people that older adults need to be aware of the problem and of their rights, as well as available services and resources in their community. Due to the collaborative efforts across the nation, World Elder Abuse Awareness Day places an emphasis on the need to encourage closer and more positive contact between generations and to strengthen the positive attitudes among youth toward their elders.

Continued education and prevention efforts worldwide need to emphasize closer relations between generations and I join my colleagues in recognizing all of those community groups across our great Nation that have made this issue a priority in their value system. Such laudable family tenets will only serve to create a more caring, thus stable society.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues—Representatives CAPPS, CARDOZA, ESHOO, HONDA, LANTOS, LEE, LINDA SANCHEZ, LORETTA SANCHEZ, SCHIFF and TAUSCHER—join me in recognizing INPEA for their dedication and tireless efforts in raising awareness of elderly abuse and its consequences. Our communities will be strengthened as a result of such international efforts being promoted today, June 15, 2006, at the United Nations Headquarters.
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urged my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL J. SCOTT BURHOE

HON. JO ANN DAVIS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Coast Guard Officers are measured by the depth of their dedication to protecting our country and its citizens from all enemies, natural disasters and inclement weather. On June 16, 2006 Rear Admiral J. Scott Burhoe will conclude his tenure as Commanding Officer, Coast Guard Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia. Training Center Yorktown is the largest training center in the Coast Guard offering over 100 courses annually to over 8,000 U.S. Coast Guard active duty, reserve, civilian and auxiliary personnel, employees of numerous state and federal agencies, and members of allied nations.

Since assuming Command of the Training Center in June of 2003, Rear Admiral Burhoe has demonstrated exemplary professional competence, leadership, and initiative, ensuring the safe and effective training to 25,000 Coast Guard members, personnel from U.S. and foreign armed forces, and civilian agencies from more than 75 countries.

Envisioning improved global maritime security, Rear Admiral Burhoe empowered deployable teams on 400 missions to 87 countries, training over 4,000 foreign students which led to events such as the first seizure of a fishing vessel in the Republic of Georgia and reduced fees that Lloyd’s of London charges world maritime shipping entering the Port of Aden, Yemen.

His leadership cultivated stellar performance and planning as he hosted two Joint Civilian Orientation Conferences and Mission Day events, providing an opportunity for a diverse group of influential U.S. leaders and Congressional staff to understand the missions and capabilities of the Coast Guard.

Throughout his time as Training Center Commanding Officer, Rear Admiral Burhoe, fostered and encouraged strong community support through several command sponsored events such as blood drives, Boy Scouts, Toys for Tots, Salvation Army, Yorktown Day, Partnership in Education and others. In the last two years alone, Rear Admiral Burhoe has arranged for more than 600 computers to be donated to local public schools through the Federal Computers for Schools Program.

With his full support, a Memorandum of Understanding was developed with York River Academy, providing local students with a summer job opportunity and an introduction to both the Coast Guard and government employment as well as affording students the opportunity to use and improve their technical skills.

Rear Admiral Burhoe displayed visionary leadership as he revised and guided the mission of the Training Center’s Learning Center. Today’s Learning Center not only provides a quiet place for junior personnel to study and take military advancement tests, but serves as a liaison for members to more than 36 colleges and universities offering on-line education, provides office space for two universities who have offered 11 college courses attended by 100 members, hosted two Education Fairs attended by 15 colleges and universities and has assisted 9 members complete bachelor degree requirements.

Rear Admiral Burhoe has also become active in both the Williamsburg and Peninsula Chambers of Commerce, educating members of the on and off duty efforts of Training Center personnel as well as providing recommendations on how the Chambers could best support area military personnel.

On behalf of the students and the communities adjacent to the Training Center, I extend our congratulations to a friend and neighbor, Scott Burhoe, on his accomplishments and recent promotion to Rear Admiral, Lower Half and extend best wishes to him during his next assignment as Assistant Commandant for Governmental and Public Affairs.


SPEECH OF
HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007 and for other purposes:

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the misclassification of employees as independent contractors is a significant problem that annually leads to lost Federal tax revenue. Employers who misclassify workers as independent contractors do not pay payroll and other taxes on those workers. The employers also gain an unfair advantage over their competitors by eliminating a piece of their labor costs. In the construction industry, for example, a company that chooses to misclassify its workers as independent contractors would be able to easily underbid other construction companies who followed the law. Misclassification hurts workers and fair employers and has a significant monetary impact on government revenues.

The misclassification of employees as independent contractors is not a new problem. Over the past several decades, the IRS and Congress have periodically investigated the issue of misclassification. In 1984, in an estimate of the extent of misclassification for 5.2 million businesses, the IRS found employers had misclassified 3.4 million employees. Approximately 750,000 employers had misclassified employees as independent contractors. More recent estimates in the 1990s have estimated that the percentage of employer misclassifying employees has grown even beyond the 15 percent found in 1984. An independent study issued by Harvard Law School’s Labor and Worklife Program, found abuses of the term “independent contractor” led up to 19 percent of workers across all industries being misclassified in the State of Massachusetts. Clearly, this problem is not going away on its own.

This misclassification is not merely a problem for workers who can unfairly be left without workers compensation or unemployment insurance. It also impacts local, State and Federal government revenue streams. In 1984, an IRS review found at least $1.6 billion in Federal tax revenue was lost due to misclassification in that year alone. A 2005 study on the issue in Maine also found a significant loss of State income tax revenue. While the statewide study of misclassification in Maine did not estimate the loss of Federal income tax revenue, it is evident the misclassification issue continues to negatively impact the revenues of the Federal Government as well.

We cannot, in good conscience, continue to ignore the problem of misclassification and its impact on Federal revenues. In a budget climate where many good and necessary programs are shortened, we cannot afford to continue losing billions of dollars each year to a problem for which there is no excuse and that we all can agree needs to be fixed.

IN RECOGNITION OF CARLOS E. PERNELL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, SGT Carlos E. Pernell, 25, from Prattville, Alabama, died on June 6, 2006, in Iraq. Sergeant Pernell was assigned to the Army’s B Company, 46th Engineer Battalion at Fort Rucker, Alabama, and according to initial reports was killed due to injuries when his camp came under indirect fire. His survivors include his wife Tiffanie; his daughter Kassidie; his mother Hattie of Prattville, Alabama; and his father, Eugene of Montgomery, Alabama.

Carlos Pernell loved sports, and was a proud father. Like all soldiers, he dutifully left behind his family and loved ones to serve our country overseas.

Words cannot express the sense of sadness we have for his family, and for the gratitude our country feels for his service. Sergeant Pernell died serving not just the United States, but the entire cause of liberty, on a noble mission to help spread the cause of freedom in Iraq and liberate an oppressed people from tyrannical rule. He was a true American.

We will forever hold him closely in our hearts, and remember his sacrifice and that of his family as a remembrance of his bravery and willingness to serve. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the House’s remembrance on this mournful day.
WAIVING POINTS ON ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

SPREECH OF
HON. NITA M. LOWEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 2006

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FY2006 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, which provides $2.325 billion for international assistance programs, $162 million above the House-passed level. The bill provides $1.485 billion for Iraq reconstruction and fully funds the administration’s request for Afghanistan.

I am particularly pleased that the conference report provides $50 million above the President’s request for Sudan, Liberia and Jordan as well as $50 million for Haiti. I am also pleased that we were able to include an additional $25 million for refugee assistance and $25 million in disaster assistance above the request level.

In light of the escalating security costs in Iraq and Afghanistan, I regret that we were not able to fully fund the administration’s request for operating expenses, but I am pleased that the conference report significantly increases funding above the House-passed level.

While the conference report fully funds the President’s request for assistance to Afghanistan, $46 million in program funds for that country is not even a drop in the bucket. In light of the increasing violence and fragile political situation in Afghanistan, it is shameful that the administration failed to push for the $600 million that Ambassador Neumann indicated was necessary.

I applaud the funding in this bill for Sudan and for other humanitarian needs in Africa. However, I was disappointed that the administration did not seek robust funding for the fledgling post-conflict Liberia and the critical transition in Haiti. The funding added by Congress—an additional $50 million for Liberia and $20 million for Haiti—will provide critical short-term support to meet refugee and humanitarian needs as well as help to stabilize these countries during the initial months of their transitions.

I regret that our conference allocation only allowed us to maintain half of the $100 million for Jordan that was passed by the Senate. Jordan has been a steadfast and important ally in the war on terror, as was clearly demonstrated by the assistance of Jordanian intelligence in the targeting of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. It is a shame that arbitrary limits placed on this supplemental have prevented us from fully funding this priority country.

Finally, let me speak to the bulk of the funding in the Foreign Operations section of the bill, which is for activities in Iraq. I support the additional funding because I think we owe our men and women in uniform in Iraq every chance to enhance their safety and return home speedily. To that end, I am glad that the conference report includes at least $50 million for democracy and governance activities and $50 million for the Community Action Program. These programs are having a tremendous impact and are more cost effective than many of the investments we have made thus far.

However, I am dismayed that neither the House nor the Senate included these additional funds under the oversight mandate of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. By failing to include this language, the House and Senate majority sent a clear message to American taxpayers that while Congress expects them to bear the burden of reconstructing Iraq, we are not interested in taking every precaution necessary to ensure that their money is accountable and effectively spent.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

HONORING DR. DONALD R. KENNON ON HIS 25TH ANNIVERSARY AT THE U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and pay tribute to a friend who, today, is marking his 25th anniversary with the United States Capitol Historical Society. Dr. Donald R. Kennon is the Historian and Vice President of Scholarship and Education. A humble man, Dr. Kennon’s career has been marked by accomplishment. He is the author of two books for the Society, including The Speakers of the House of Representa-tives: A Bibliography (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), and The Committee on Ways and Means: A Bicentennial History, 1789–1989 (Government Printing Office, 1989), and has edited more than a dozen volumes of the Society’s symposia publications.

He has been Chief Historian since 1987 after joining the Society in 1981 as an Associate Historian. He holds a Ph.D. in American History from the University of Maryland and has taught as a visiting professor at the University of New Mexico. His doctoral dissertation focused on antebellum reform in a changing society, both legally and morally in the years surrounding the Civil War.

He is treasurer of the Abraham Lincoln Institute, which was founded in 1964 to garner public attention on writings and research regarding our nation’s 16th president. Dr. Kennon has also very ably directed educational symposia, publications and outreach programs, while writing and lecturing about the history of this body, Congress, and the Capital.

An avid collector, Dr. Kennon has one of the area’s largest collections of antique stereo graphic images, including many of the Capitol building and Congress. He has a keen sense of humor and loves baseball. When he’s not at games, he collects antique radios and vintage slot machines.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to honor Dr. Kennon and I ask my colleagues to rise and join me in congratulating him on 25 years at the United States Capitol Historical Society and in wishing him continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. GALLEGY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the following bills on June 12, 2006: H. Res. 794, Recognizing the 17th anniversary of the massacre in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, in the People’s Republic of China, and for other purposes (Rollcall No. 251): Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

H. Res. 804, Condemning the unauthorized, inappropriate, and coerced ordination of Catholic bishops by the People’s Republic of China (Rollcall No. 252): Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

H. Res. 808, Condemning the escalating levels of religious persecution in the People’s Republic of China (Rollcall No. 253). Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

And finally, Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” with regard to Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 857, waiving points of order against consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (Rollcall No. 255).

HONORING ZACH SHEEHAN

HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a student from Southeron Hills Middle School in Boulder, Colorado.

Zack Sheehan has been selected to present his award winning history project at the Smithsonian National Museum of America. Zack’s project was one of a handful selected by the National History Day program from hundreds of thousands nationwide.

Each project reflected on this year’s National History Day theme, “Taking a Stand in History: People, Ideas, Events.” Zack’s project highlighted a scientist in Boulder who has had a major impact on increasing public awareness of global warming and helping spur the government to slow global warming.

It is my view that, as the world leader in science and technology, the United States must develop solutions that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These solutions are of vital importance to protecting our planet’s resources and permitting the economic and social progress for our Nation and the world.

In the Old Hall of the House of Representa-tives, Clio, the Muse of History, stands in a winged chariot representing the passage of time. Clio is looking back; recording events as they occur. Mr. Speaker, this statue serves as a poignant reminder to our generation of the importance of history as a guide to and a watchdog for the history that is made here every day.
History education is an integral part of the education of future generations of Americans. I would like commend the National History Day program for empowering teachers to improve history education and influencing students to follow Zack Sheehan’s exemplary example.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO THE BASCOM MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay tribute to a special company in Ohio. This year, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company in Bascom, Ohio, celebrates 100 years of dedicated service.

Mr. Speaker, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company, founded in 1906, is one of the oldest mutual telephone companies in the State of Ohio. The company has succeeded in providing quality telephone service to the residents of Bascom, Ohio, for over 940 members.

At the time of its inception in 1906, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company began operations with only eighteen members seeking the company’s services. Today, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company, who is a vital component to the telecommunications infrastructure of Northwest Ohio, proudly serves over 940 members.

Throughout the decades, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company, as a product of Seneca County, has clearly distinguished itself as an innovator and industry leader. A dedicated workforce, top-notch facilities, and excellent customer service, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company has set a benchmark for how to run a successful business.

The real success of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company comes not only from the technological advancements of its facilities, but from its employees. The management and staff of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company have indeed provided their customers with the service and dependability that are expected of a first-class company.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to the employees and the legacy of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company. As all who benefit from this fine establishment gather to celebrate its 100th anniversary of service, I am confident that the excellent employees will continue the successes of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company into the future.

TRIBUTE TO MOUNT PISGAH BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the historic Mount Pisgah Baptist Church in Orangeburg, South Carolina as it celebrates its 153rd anniversary on June 25, 2006. Mount Pisgah has been a beacon in the lives of the Orangeburg community, and I congratulate Reverend D. Edward Chaney and his congregation on this significant milestone in the life of the church.

Mount Pisgah Baptist Church began as a gathering of a small group of Christian slaves in 1863. Two years later, this group broke off from the First Baptist Church in Orangeburg. They called their new church Sunny Side Baptist. By 1868, the congregation had grown to fifty members, and two years later they changed the name to Mount Pisgah Baptist Church. The church began to grow in size and its ministry. By 1877, Mount Pisgah boasted a congregation of 283 members.

The 20th century was momentous in the life of Mount Pisgah. Remarkably from 1901 until 2000, the church had only three pastors. Reverend Nelson Nix presided over the congregation from 1900–1945. During his ministry, the first church building burned in 1902. However, Reverend Nix and the congregation rebuilt the structure that is still in use today.

Reverend John D. Rhodes served as Mount Pisgah’s pastor from 1945–1968, and was followed by Reverend F. G. Everett who led the congregation from 1969–2001. During Reverend Everett’s distinguished service, Mount Pisgah was listed on the Registry of Historical Places.

Today, Reverend Chaney presides over a dynamic church that is among the oldest in Orangeburg and South Carolina. The church has added a multipurpose education complex, and more property has been acquired for future expansion. Due to the enormous growth in the church, Reverend Chaney has initiated a Million Dollar Capital Campaign for church improvements and new construction.

Mount Pisgah currently has 17 ministries that include an outreach radio broadcast that reaches far beyond Orangeburg County into neighboring Calhoun, Colleton, and Dorchester counties. The church is also renowned for its music ministry that performs inspired Christmas and Easter concerts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mount Pisgah Baptist Church on its 153rd anniversary. This vibrant church has contributed to the rich history of Orangeburg and South Carolina, and I offer my congratulations and wish Mount Pisgah continued success and Godspeed!

INTRODUCTION OF THE STEEL FINANCING FAIRNESS ACT

HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Steel Financing Fairness Act. This bill helps our Nation’s beleaguered steel industry by stopping the government from forcing American steel workers to subsidize their foreign competitors. Specifically, the bill prohibits the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and the Export-Import Bank (EXIMBANK) from providing any assistance to countries that subsidize their steel industries. The Steel Financing Fairness Act also instructs the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce America’s contribution to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) by a prorated share of the IMF’s assistance to countries that subsidize their steel industries.

One of the problems facing America’s domestic steel industry is that it must compete with foreign industries that receive subsidies from their governments. Some of these subsidies are explicitly intended to provide these companies with a non-market advantage over American steel producers. The U.S. Government further compounds the damage caused by these subsidies by forcing the domestic steel producers to support their major competitors through taxpayer-funded programs.

For example, according to the most recent figures available, the five countries with the greatest EXIMBANK exposure are all among the top ten exporters of steel and/or steel products to the United States. In fact, EXIMBANK has provided almost $20 billion of U.S. taxpayer support to these countries.

Meanwhile, OPIC has provided almost $6 billion of the taxpayers’ money to leading steel exporters. Thus, the American taxpayer has provided at least $26 billion worth of support to the countries that are the leading competitors of the domestic steel industry. This does not count the funds provided these countries by the IMF. Since money is fungible, the practical effect of providing aid to countries which practice industrial policy is to free up resources these governments can use to further subsidize their steel industries. Thus, taxpayer dollars sent to foreign governments and industries can benefit foreign steel manufacturers. If American taxpayer money is not sent to directly benefit those industries.

However, hard as it may be to believe, organizations funded by American taxpayers actually use American tax dollars to directly assist foreign steel producers! For example, among the projects funded by EXIMBANK in recent years is a $18 million loan guarantee to the overseas competitors is not free trade. Instead, it is corporatism designed to benefit certain politically powerful interests at the expense of American entrepreneurs and workers.

I have no doubt that America’s steel industry can compete fairly the world over if allowed to compete on a level playing field. Unfortunately, due in part to government policy, today’s playing field is in no way level. Congress must end this economically
HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF KATHERINE DUNHAM

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the life and extraordinary achievements of Katherine Dunham, who passed away on May 21, 2006. Katherine Dunham was born in Glen Ellyn, Illinois, on June 22, 1909. Her father, Albert Millard Dunham, was a descendant of slaves from Madagascar and West Africa. Her French Canadian mother, Fanny June Taylor, died when Miss Dunham was young. Her father then married Annette Pointdexter, a schoolteacher from Iowa, and moved his family to Joliet, Ill., where he ran a dry-cleaning business.

Katherine Dunham became interested in dance at an early age. While a student at the University of Chicago, she formed a dance group that performed in concert at the Chicago World’s Fair in 1934 and with the Chicago Civic Opera in 1935–36. With a bachelor’s degree in anthropology, she soon undertook field studies in the Caribbean. She left the conventional dance world of New York that year to work in East St. Louis at an inner-city branch of the Southern Illinois University, running a school attached to the University and working with neighborhood and youth groups.

The Dunham tradition has persisted. She was considered a woman far ahead of her time. She considered her technique “a way of life.” The classes at her Manhattan school—attended by many artists, including Marlon Brando and Eartha Kitt, during the 1940s and the 1950s, were noted for their liberating influence.

Her mastery of body movement was considered “phenomenal.” She was hailed for her smooth and fluent choreography and dominated a stage with what has been described as “an unmitigating radiant force providing beauty with a feminine touch, full of variety and nuance,” otherwise known as the Dunham Technique, which is still practiced today.

Katherine Dunham’s intellectual, artistic, and humanitarian contributions have earned her many coveted awards over the years, including the Presidential Medal of Arts, the Kennedy Center Honors, French Legion of Honor, Southern Cross of Brazil, Grand Cross of Haiti, NAACP Lifetime Achievement Award, Lincoln Academy Laureate, and the Urban Leagues’ Lifetime Achievement Award. She was also one of 75 women whose lives were celebrated in the book, I Have a Dream. Katherine Dunham is survived by a daughter, Marie-Cristine Dunham-Pratt, who lives in Rome.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Katherine Dunham on her service, her lifetime of experiences and her contribution to the world of dance which serves as an invaluable resource to not only the people of East St. Louis but to the world.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE CITY OF WEST ALLIS’ 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GWEN MOORE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th anniversary celebration of the City of West Allis. I am proud to serve this community, a portion of which lies within the Fourth Congressional District. Happy 100th Birthday to this remarkable community!

The City of West Allis was incorporated in 1906, but this vibrant community’s roots go back much further. In the 1820s and 1830s, prominent visitors to the Honey Creek area, now the heart of West Allis, were impressed with its dense woods and abundance of fresh water springs. Settlement proceeded and by 1860, Honey Creek boasted a school, blacksmith shop, post office and chapel that served Baptist and Episcopalian worshippers. In 1860, Honey Creek boasted a school, blacksmith shop, post office and chapel that served Baptist and Episcopalian worshippers. In 1891, the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society purchased the land that is now home to the State Fairgrounds, and by 1894, the Milwaukee Street Car Company had extended transportation routes to this destination. The Allis Company moved from the heart of Milwaukee to West Allis in 1900, fueling the engines of economic growth and development. Throughout its history, West Allis has been known for its strong community, numerous recreational amenities, and the work ethic that underlies its industrial economy.

With the decline of the regional manufacturing economy, West Allis has undergone fundamental changes. It is a testament to the strength of this community and its visionary leadership that urban redevelopment initiatives have brought new economic benefits without compromising the community spirit that characterizes West Allis. The award-winning redevelopment of the Allis-Chalmers campus, for example, has preserved the structures of West Allis’ industrial history while creating an exciting and unique office park that has rapidly attracted new tenants to the area. The bike path, currently under construction, serves as a reminder that early settlers were attracted by the beautiful natural landscape. The farmers’ market, due to open this year, promises to further strengthen residents’ ties to the community.

I am proud to represent the community of West Allis, congratulate it on 100 remarkable years, and look forward to continuing to work with its leaders and residents as its revitalization continues.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 2006, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall 283. The vote I missed was an amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR to H.R. 5576. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall 283.

TRIBUTE TO JEAN “GENE” NORMANDIN

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to my dear friend Jean “Gene” Normandin, who passed away on Thursday, May 4, 2006 at the age of 78. Gene was a devoted husband, loving father to his three sons and two daughters, man of compassion, and a...
caring friend and mentor to many, including myself.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the eulogy delivered by his son, Robert Normandin on May 10, 2006.

A LIFE WELL LIVED—THE EULOGY FOR GENE
NORMANDIN

Dedication, determination and devotion, are terms that sum up my father’s life.

He was dedicated to his family, his 5 children, 3 grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. He was extremely fortunate to be blessed with 2 successful marriages. First, to our mother, to whom he was married to for almost 55 years. When our mother became ill, he dedicated himself to her, for every minute of every day for the rest of her life. His love for her never ended.

He was so fortunate to meet, fall in love and marry, Jeannine. Their marriage lasted almost 20 years and, as he did with my mother; she dedicated herself to him, taking care of him until the moment of his death. Jeannine, we are eternally grateful for the love, devotion and care that you gave him. We will never forget.

He was a successful businessman. He was a young man when he went to work for Manzi Dodge, at the time a struggling car dealership. Through this determination when he left, it became a thriving business. He founded other businesses, Custom Sentry Alarms and Normandin Liquors. He brought a determination to any endeavor in which he become involved. As he was fond of saying when someone said how lucky he was, “yes, and the harder I work, the luckier I get.” He was truly a lucky man.

He brought that determination and devotion to his church as well. When Frs. Hassett, Handley, O'Brien or Joyce had a problem at the Sacred Heart, one of the first people they would seek out was Gene Normandin. Whether it was the men’s club, 100 club, or Bingo he was always there for them.

When he moved to Florida, he brought that dedication there. Whether it was serving food at a soup kitchen, clothing drives or washing dishes, he assisted the indigent migrant workers at Omoklee, Florida.

He was blessed during his life with many, many great friends, people like Kay and Pat and Armand and Connie, with whom he shared many hours and a few tears.

It was in short, a life well lived. Dad, we will miss you.


SPREAD OF
HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5706) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the FY07 Transportation, Treasury, HUD Appropriations bill. I am very pleased that included in this bill is $4 million for the much needed Second Avenue Subway.

This worthy project will ease the incredibly overcrowded Lexington Avenue subway line, which is one of the busiest in the nation. It is unquestioned that the Second Avenue Subway will improve the life of many tens of thousands of area residents. The 9/11 attack on New York City and the transportation restrictions imposed afterward only further magnify the importance of providing the region with an adequate mass transit system.

Just for some background on the project, construction of the full-length Second Avenue Subway has been divided into four phases, each of which will produce a minimum operating segment that will carry a significant number of passengers. The first phase of the Second Avenue Subway project will include stops at 96th, 86th and 72nd Streets, and tunnels from 99th to 62nd Streets. At 63rd Street, the subway will link onto the existing N and R tracks, providing a one-seat ride from the Upper East Side to Times Square, Wall Street and Brooklyn.

This phase is completed in 2012, 202,000 riders are expected to board the new line each day.

I am very grateful to the Committee for recognizing the importance of the Subway and thank Chairman Knollenberg and Ranking Member Oliver for this essential funding. I would also like to thank the bipartisan Members of the New York delegation for their continued support of this project.

IN HONOR OF THE JUST RUN PROGRAM OF MONTEREY COUNTY
HON. SAM FARR
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Just Run program of Monterey County that has been a collaboration of the Big Sur International Marathon as well as other local organizations.

Designed to assist school and other youth organizations in providing vital fitness programs to youth in Monterey County, Just Run is a group running program that teaches children activity, fitness principles, goal setting, and physical development with the help of teachers and parent volunteers.

This program engages local fitness and running experts, such as future Olympic runners from the Big Sur Distance Project, to work with students at free on-site clinics and serve as role models and motivators. In conjunction with running and physical activity, the program also promotes good citizenship and good deeds by emphasizing a drug-free and healthy active lifestyle. In a time when it has become so easy for children to make unhealthy choices, this program is a much needed reminder to our kids of the importance of fitness.

I also want to highlight Just Run’s involvement in supporting the new initiative in Monterey County called HELP (Healthy Eating Lifestyle Principles) that works towards including more healthy fruit and vegetables in school lunch programs and increased role for physical activity in school. The Central Coast is an ideal area for the implementation of this policy because of the abundance of fresh produce cultivated within the 17th district.

Students learn that eating fresh fruits and vegetables, in addition to participating in the Just Run program are both steps in the right direction to fostering a healthier lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Just Run program and its affiliates for their outstanding work whose benefits will be reaped throughout our community.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE DELIVERY OF THE 28TH AND FINAL M31 MARINE CORPS EXPEDITIONARY ARRESTING GEAR SYSTEM TO THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

HON. CURT WELDON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, June 15, a celebration is being held in Aston, Pennsylvania, marking the delivery of the 28th and final M31 Marine Corps Expeditionary Arresting Gear System, MCEAGS, to the United States Marine Corps.

Initial production of the Expeditionary Arresting Gear started in March of 2002 and the final delivery of the one on June 15 will provide the Marine Corps full operational capability for the Expeditionary Arresting Gear. The M31 Arresting Gear is now employed worldwide, including operations in Iraq. The great news is that the contractor, Engineeried Arresting Systems Corporation, ESCO, delivered all these systems on schedule and under cost.

The M31 program is unique and a great success story. Designed and developed under an integrated product team arrangement, the Marines, NAVAIR Lakehurst and the contractor have produced equipment that demonstrated meeting Marine Corps requirements at government test facilities. Additionally, ESCO is providing all spare parts and logistics support for the system. Best of all—it works. It works very well. ESCO, in conjunction with its teammates of the M31 Integrated Product Team from NAVAR Expeditionary Airfield Support Team at Lakehurst, NJ have been providing full logistics to the fielded M31 systems for the past 4 years. This team’s support includes full system supply support, depot maintenance, continuing, engineering support and configuration management. A 5-year indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contract was put in place in December 2005 to provide the above support through December 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the other great story is the teamwork between ESCO and the Naval Air Systems Command Team. The support and dedication of personnel from both NAVAIR, Lakehurst, New Jersey and Patuxent River, Maryland cannot be overemphasized. Both the military and civilian government employees have played a very active and crucial role in the development, production, fielding and support of the M31 Expeditionary Arresting Gear System.

This program is a model program for the entire Department of Defense to emulate. Congratulations to ESCO and the Naval Air Systems Command for a job “well done.”
CALLING FOR AN END TO IMPUNITY FOR PREDATORS OF PRESS FREEDOM

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 18-month anniversary of a tragic event that is symptomatic of the deterioration of press freedom in the Gambia and elsewhere.

On December 16, 2004, one of the most respected journalists in West Africa, Deyda Hydara, was shot in the head and chest by unidentified gunmen. He died instantly, but the repercussions of his murder sent a shock wave through media and human rights advocates throughout the region. Mr. Hydara co-founded the Gambia’s first independent newspaper and served as a foreign correspondent for a French newspaper and the media rights organization, Reporters Without Borders.

Hydara’s murder is just one incident in an alarming crackdown by Gambian authorities on the independent press. In July 2002, the government passed legislation requiring journalists and media organizations to register with a media commission for one-year renewable licenses. In September 2003, Hydara and three other independent journalists filed a lawsuit challenging the law in a case that is still pending before the Gambian Supreme Court.

Two days before Hydara’s murder, the Gambian National Assembly passed a new round of repressive media legislation that imposed mandatory prison terms of six months to three years for any published work judged to be “seditious” and increased the scope of what might be deemed libelous. Hydara and other independent journalists had publicly opposed the law and Hydara had published an editorial denouncing it the day before he was killed.

In the 18 months that have elapsed since Deyda Hydara was killed, Gambian authorities have ignored calls for a thorough investigation into his murder. It is widely believed to have been politically-motivated and related to a string of similar attacks. Meanwhile, at least 3 journalists are currently detained in Gambia in violation of regional and international human rights law. I will be sending a letter to Gambian President, Mr. Yahya Jammeh, urging him to appoint an independent board of inquiry to investigate the murder of Deyda Hydara and improve protections for journalists and the principle of press freedom in his country. I would like to submit this letter for the RECORD.

Resistance to impunity is essential to maintain civil peace and demonstrate a commitment to democratic values. In a time when repeated anonymous attacks against media professionals have created tense relations between the state and the media in many countries, Deyda Hydara’s unrequited murder is deeply worrisome to those who are committed to democracy and justice in Africa. I hope that the Gambian Government will take this occasion to reverse its record on press freedom and set an example for the rest of the region.
Thursday, June 15, 2006
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HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5903–S5986

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3516–3530, S. Res. 513, and S. Con. Res. 102.

Measures Reported:
- S. 3524, to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve health care provided to Indians under the Medicare, Medicaid, and State Children's Health Insurance Programs.
- S. 3525, to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve outcomes for children in families affected by methamphetamine abuse and addiction, to reauthorize the promoting safe and stable families program.

Measures Passed:
- Commemorating King Adulyadej of Thailand: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 409, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:
  Frist (for Biden) Amendment No. 4291, to amend the preamble.

National Time-Out Day: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 482, supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room, and the resolution was then agreed to.

National Defense Authorization: Senate continued consideration of S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:
- Adopted:
  Durbin Amendment No. 4253, to require a pilot program on troops to nurse teachers.
  Feingold Amendment No. 4256, to strengthen the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction.
  By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 173), Biden Amendment No. 4257, to state the policy of the United States on the nuclear programs of Iran.
- Page S5917, S5921–22
  Warner Amendment No. 4278, to provide for the incorporation of a classified annex.
  Warner Amendment No. 4279, to modify the limitations applicable to payments under incentives clauses in chemical demilitarization contracts.
  Warner/Levin Amendment No. 4280, to repeal requirements for certain reports applicable to other nations.
  Warner Amendment No. 4200, to modify the requirements for contingency program management to require only a Department of Defense plan for such management.
  Warner Amendment No. 4201, to make a technical correction to section 871, relating to a clarification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects.
  Warner/Levin Amendment No. 4198, to improve the authorities relating to policies and practices on test and evaluation to address emerging acquisition approaches.
  Warner/Levin Amendment No. 4281, to improve the authorities relating to major automated information system programs.
  Warner Amendment No. 4282, to require a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of incentives to encourage certain members and former members of the Armed Forces to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

Page S5993
Levin (for Clinton/Bingaman) Amendment No. 4283, relating to energy efficiency in the weapons platforms of the Armed Forces.  Page S5934

Warner (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4284, to modify limitations on assistance under the American Servicemembers' Protection Act of 2002.  Page S5934

Warner (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 4252, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members.  Pages S5934-36

Warner (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4225, to require that, not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army transport to an authorized disposal facility for appropriate disposal all of the Federal Government-furnished uranium in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma.  Page S5936

Warner (for Salazar) Modified Amendment No. 4218, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention.  Page S5936

Warner (for Lugar) Amendment No. 4285, to improve authorities to address urgent nonproliferation crises and United States nonproliferation operations.  Page S5936

Warner Amendment No. 4286, to provide for the applicability of certain requirements to the acquisition of certain specialty metals.  Page S5936

Warner (for Warner/Snowe) Modified Amendment No. 4199, to authorize a pilot program on the expanded use of mentor-protege authority.  Page S5937

Warner (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 4287, expressing the sense of the Senate on the nomination of an individual to serve as Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense on a permanent basis.  Page S5937

Rejected:

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 172), Santorum Amendment No. 4234, to authorize, with an offset, assistance for pro-democracy programs and activities inside and outside Iran, to make clear that the United States supports the ability of the people of Iran to exercise self-determination over their own form of government, and to make enhancements to the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act of 1996.  Pages S5917-21

McConnell Amendment No. 4269 (to Amendment No. 4265), to require the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq and urge the convening of an Iraq summit. (By 93 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 174), Senate tabled the amendment.)  Pages S5927-29

Withdrawn:

Feingold Amendment No. 4192, to provide for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.  Pages S5913-14

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.  Page S5909

Nelson (FL)/Menendez Amendment No. 4265, to express the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States.  Pages S5922-27

McConnell Amendment No. 4272, to commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 10:45 a.m. on Friday, June 16, 2008.  Page S5986

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations—Conference Report: By 98 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 171), Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, clearing the measure for the President.  Pages S5905-09

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:


James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development for a term of five years.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring July 15, 2015.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2007.

Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2011.  Page S5986

Nominations Discharged: The following nomination was discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was sent to the Senate on February 14, 2006, from the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.  Page S5986

Messages From the House:

Measures Referred:
Executive Communications: Page S5949
Executive Reports of Committees: Page S5949
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S5950–S5952
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S5952–S5957
Additional Statements: Pages S5947–S5949
Amendments Submitted: Pages S5967–S5984
Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S5984
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S5984–S5985
Privileges of the Floor: Pages S5984–S5985
Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—174) Pages S5909, S5921, S5922, S5929
Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, June 16, 2006. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S5986.)

Committee Meetings
(Committees not listed did not meet)

FANNIE MAE
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Report of the Special Examination of Fannie Mae, after receiving testimony from James B. Lockhart III, Acting Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Christopher Cox, Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission; and Daniel H. Mudd, and Stephen B. Ashley, both of Fannie Mae, Washington, D.C.

BUDGET: COAST GUARD
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Fisheries and the Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine the Coast Guard budget, after receiving testimony from Admiral Thad W. Allen, Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; and Stephen L. Caldwell, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

SUPERFUND PROGRAM
Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Superfund and Waste Management concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Superfund Program, which was created by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), focusing on efforts to stabilize and clean up National Priority list (NPL) sites through the United States, after receiving testimony from Senators Durbin and Cantwell; Susan Parker Bodine, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; Leonardo Trasande, Mount Sinai School of Medicine Department of Community and Preventive Medicine Center for Children’s Health and the Environment, New York, New York; Michael W. Steinberg, Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, LLP, on behalf of the Superfund Settlements Project; and Katherine N. Probst, both of Washington, D.C.; Robert Spiegel, Edison Wetlands Association, Edison, New Jersey; and J. Winston Porter, Waste Policy Center, Leesburg, Virginia.

NOMINATION
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:
S. 2145, to enhance security and protect against terrorist attacks at chemical facilities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 1554, to establish an intergovernmental grant program to identify and develop homeland security information, equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services to further the homeland security of the United States and to address the homeland security needs of Federal, State, and local governments, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 1741, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to carry out a program for the protection of the health and safety of residents, workers, volunteers, and others in a disaster area;
S. 2068, to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia;
S. 2146, to extend relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees; and
H.R. 3508, to authorize improvements in the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
S.J. Res. 12, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, with amendments; and

The nominations of Frank D. Whitney, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, and Thomas D. Anderson, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont, all of the Department of Justice.

NOMINATIONS
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jerome A. Holmes, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Inhofe, Daniel Porter Jordan III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, who was introduced by Senators Cochran and Lott, and Gustavo Antonio Gelpi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, who was introduced by Representative Fortuño, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

---

House of Representatives

**Chamber Action**

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 5622–5630; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 871 were introduced. Pages H4133–34

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H4134–35

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:


Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary: The House began consideration of H. Res. 861, to declare that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary. Further consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, Friday, June 16.

Pages H4024–H4123

H. Res. 868, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 287, after ordering the previous question without objection.

Pages H4014–24

Senate Message: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H4024.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4025–24. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at midnight.

**Committee Meetings**

CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM
Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing to review Efforts to Eliminate Waste, Fraud and Abuse in the Crop Insurance Program. Testimony was heard from Eldon Gould, Administrator, Risk Management Agency, USDA; Daniel Bertoni, Acting Director, Natural Resources and Environment Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION PUBLIC LANDS EFFECTS
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Effects of Illegal Immigration on Public and Tribal Lands. Testimony was heard from Representatives Tancredo and Grijalva; the following officials of the Department of the Interior: William T. Civish, District Manager, Dila District, Bureau of Land Management; and Selanhongva McDonald, Southwestern Regional Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and public witnesses.

COMBAT EQUIPMENT—IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN
Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing to receive an update on the use of combat helmets, vehicle armor, and body armor by ground forces in Operation Iraq
Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: MG Stephen M. Speakes, USA, Director, Force Development, Army G8; MG William D. Catto, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Systems Command; Roger M. Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Littoral and Mine Warfare; and MG (sel) Gary McCoy, USAF, Director, Logistics Readiness, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics, Installations and Mission Support.

HEALTH MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Ordered reported the following measures: S. 655, amended, A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; H.R. 5573, Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006; H.R. 5574, amended, Children’s Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006; H. Con. Res. 426, Recognizing the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drugs Act for the important service it provides to the Nation; and H.R. 4157, amended, Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2005.

SILICOSIS INVESTIGATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations approved a motion authorizing the issuance of subpoenas in connection with the Committee’s investigation on silicosis.

NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA’S HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled “Regional Insecurity: DHS Grants to the National Capital Area.” Testimony was heard from George W. Foresman, Under Secretary, Preparedness, Department of Homeland Security; Edward D. Reiskin, Deputy Mayor, Public Safety and Justice, District of Columbia; Robert Crouch, Assistant to the Governor for Preparedness, State of Virginia; Dennis Schrader, Director, Office of Homeland Security, State of Maryland; and David Robertson, Executive Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT—SHIRLINGTON LIMO CASE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight held a hearing entitled “An Examination of the Department of Homeland Security’s Procurement Process Regarding Shirlington Limousine and Transportation, Inc.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Elaine C. Duke, Chief Procurement Officer; and Kevin Boshears, Director, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization; and Calvin Jenkins, Deputy to the Associate Deputy Administrator, SBA

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPERTY—PREVENT DISCRIMINATORY TAXATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law approved for full Committee action H.R. 1369, To prevent discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property.

OVERSIGHT—PATENT TROLLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property held an oversight hearing on Patent Trolls: Fact or Fiction? Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FISHERIES/HATCHERY MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4957, Tylersville Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; H.R. 5061, Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance Act; and H.R. 5381, National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Boucher; Marnie Parker, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Douglas Austen, Executive Director, Fish and Boar Commission, State of Pennsylvania; Gary Martel, Director, Fisheries, Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT

Committee on Rules: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 4890, Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006.

OVERSIGHT—INTERMODALISM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines held an oversight hearing on Intermodalism. Testimony was heard from Jeffrey Shane, Under Secretary, Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation; Katherine Siggerud, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO; J. Robert Bray, Executive Director, Port Authority, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—RECENT PATIENT SAFETY ISSUES

Committee on Veterans Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held an oversight hearing on recent patient safety issues. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: James P. Bagian, M.D., VHA Chief
Patient Safety Officer and Director, VA National Center for Patient Safety; and John D. Daigh, Jr., M.D., Assistant Inspector General, Healthcare Inspections; Daniel Schultz, M.D., Director, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services; and Laurie Ekstrand, Director, Health Care, GAO.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROMOTION ACT OF 2006
Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 4157, Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2006.

SSA’s IMPROVED DISABILITY DETERMINATION PROCESS
Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on the Social Security Administration’s Improved Disability Determination Process. Testimony was heard from Jo Anne B. Barnhart, Commissioner, SSA; Robert E. Robertson, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings
SOUTH CENTRAL EUROPE
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission): Commission concluded a hearing to examine human rights challenges that countries in South Central Europe face as they seek integration into the European Union and/or North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), focusing on legal restrictions on religious activities and other attacks on religious freedom, lagging efforts to combat trafficking in persons, discrimination and violence against Roma, and the prevalence of official corruption and organized crime, after receiving testimony from Rosemary A. DiCarlo, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasia Affairs; Daniel Serwer, United States Institute of Peace, Janusz Bugajski, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Joseph K. Grieboski, Institute on Religion and Public Policy, all of Washington, D.C.; and Nicolae Gheorghe, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw, Poland.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS
(For last listing of Public Laws, see Daily Digest, p. D 572)
H.R. 1953, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Old Mint at San Francisco, otherwise known as the “Granite Lady”. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–230)
H.R. 3829, to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Muskogee, Oklahoma, as the Jack C. Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–231)
S. 1235, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and extend housing, insurance, outreach, and benefits programs provided under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to improve and extend employment programs for veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Labor. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–233)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
JUNE 16, 2006
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
Committee on Government Reform, hearing entitled “Disabled Services in the District of Columbia: Who is Protecting the Rights of D.C.’s Most Vulnerable Residents?” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing entitled “Evaluating the Synthetic Drug Control Strategy,” 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Friday, June 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:45 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of S. 2766, National Defense Authorization.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Friday, June 16

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Continue consideration on H. Res. 861—Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.
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