United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2006 No. 78

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 16, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PAUL E. GILLMOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

As one Nation, indivisible, constant in vigilance, seeking liberty and justice for all, we place all our fears, anxieties, problems and concerns under Your protection, Almighty God.

As we pray for our troops, first responders in times of emergency, peacekeepers and all who fight the war against terrorism, this Chamber also seeks your guidance in all decision-making that we may prove ourselves worthy of their noble sacrifice.

Motivated by their bravery and willingness to shed their blood for our life and liberty as a Nation, we ask what is it You require of us that we may become the virtuous people responsible to uphold the sound principles that brought this country into being?

May law and order not only be the words echoed in the halls of government and the courts of this land, but let us give firm evidence to our promise to uphold the Constitution of this Nation by deeds. May goodness flow from the way we live. May integrity be found in the common practice of business and in the daily discourse of our people.

Lord, finally, awakened from our indifference to violence, evil and poverty, may we be a people truthful in our words and committed only to those actions which exhibit justice and lead to peace, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches on each side.

STREET TERRORIST STRIKES AGAIN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a self-claimed sadistic pervert, Jerry Inman, is branded with tattoos of skulls, daggers, bats and the pentagram, the symbol of hell. The two-time convicted sex offender, after serving time in two southern States for several rapes, kidnappings and robberies, has been released and has struck again.

He recreated hell for 20-year-old Clemson University student Tiffany Souers. He stalked her, and in the shroud of darkness of the night, he broke into her apartment, strangled her, raped her and then murdered her. This devil of the South should not even have been in South Carolina, but the good behavior got him released from another State prison.

Mr. Speaker, rapists try to steal the very souls of their victims. Then they steal their lives. And as we fight the global war on terror, we need to fight the street terrorists in America. Repeat rapists are never cured. We cannot say they are misunderstood or need therapy or counseling, because some are just evil, and if we do not lock them up indefinitely, then it seems that outlaws like Inman are wasting good air breathing.

And that's just the way it is.

LEAVE IRAQ NOW

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

Mr. KUCINICH. While soldiers are killing insurgents, insurgents are killing our soldiers. Iraq's Prime Minister is said to have considered amnesty for the growing number of insurgents, quote, as long as their hands weren't stained by Iraqi blood.

This kind of talk will only encourage more aggression against U.S. troops, more U.S. casualties, more U.S. deaths. Our soldiers are sitting ducks in a shooting gallery. If we really cared about them, we would bring them home.

Iraq's leaders will ultimately seek peace and reconciliation with its diverse armed groups through renouncing U.S. presence. Yet we are building permanent bases there.

It is time for our Nation to seek truth and reconciliation over 9/11 and

Printed on recycled paper.

the war in Iraq. Otherwise our national agenda will continue to be held captive in Iraq.

The Bible says, ''Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free''. The truth is, Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11, did not have weapons of mass destruction. The truth is that in the name of fighting terrorism, we are creating more terrorists.

''Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.'' We must free ourselves from this war. We must reconcile with those who wrongly took us into Iraq. We must seek the truth.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE IS DRIVING DOWN THE DEFICIT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have been working hard to exercise fiscal restraint and keep taxes low. These pro-growth policies are not only helping our economy grow at a fiery pace, they are helping drive down the Federal budget deficit as well.

This past Tuesday, the Wall Street Journal published a story I would like to quote. ''Surging individual and corporate income tax receipts in May continued to help the Federal Government shrink the budget deficit to $227 billion for the first eight months of the fiscal year, down 16.6 percent from the same period a year earlier. To date, much of the deficit reduction stems from taxes being paid by corporations, which are seeing increased profits, and from high-income individuals, who are paying taxes on capital gains.''

Mr. Speaker, fiscal restraint and tax relief is boosting the economy and increasing tax revenues. The Treasury Department predicts that if these Republican-led trends continue, we will cut the Federal deficit in half well before President Bush's goal of 2009.

BOGUS RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders say that this unamendable, nonbinding, purely oratory resolution crafted behind closed doors is a referendum on the war on terror. And it is, but not in the way they characterize it.

It is a blanket endorsement of the failed policies, of the diversion of troops and resources from Afghanistan, and the effort to eradicate the Taliban, al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. Remember him, the leader of the 9/11 plot? We have not heard much about Osama bin Laden. He is still out there.

It is about the redirection of the bulk of our military intelligence efforts to an unnecessary, preemptive war against the bloody, loathsome dictator who did not have weapons of mass destruction, was not involved in 9/11, was contained, and no direct threat to the United States.

Secretary Rumsfeld, Vice President CHENEY said we would be in and out of Iraq in 90 days. Three years, 3 months later, 2,500 dead, we are still there in the middle of a civil war.

A vote for this resolution is a vote to stay the course, unconditionally, indefinitely in Iraq, and leave our troops in the middle of that war. You should not support it. If you want to lead our troops out of the middle of a civil war in Iraq, redeploy and redirect these efforts to a more productive use of our Nation's resources and put an end to al Qaeda and the Taliban once and for all.

VICTORY 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 of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is another significant day in the global war on terrorism, as the House will adopt the resolution supporting our troops to achieve victory over terrorism, to protect American families.

I know firsthand of the capabilities and competence of our troops, as a veteran with 31 years, service with the Army Reserves and National Guard. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have visited our troops eight times in Kuwait, Iraq and Afghanistan. I know especially firsthand of the progress from my oldest son, who served with the National Guard for a year in Iraq, and this year I will have four sons in the military keeping me informed.

Today we can join with the Senate's 93–6 vote for success in Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to put aside partisanship to stand with our troops promoting freedom.

I want to especially commend Chairman HENRY HYDE for the clarity and vision of the resolution. As cochairman of the Victory in Iraq Caucus, I believe our choice is to defeat terrorism overseas, or we will face them again on the streets of America.

The only way to achieve peace is through victory. In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

CONSOLIDATION OF STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership is doing nothing to help with rising college education costs. The average cost for 4 years in college at a State university is now over $40,000, and the cost to attend a private university now tops $107,000.

These massive costs are far too much for many families to cover. Republicans have limited the availability of student aid, and both students and their parents are forced to take on huge loans in order to earn their college degree.

In fact, the average college senior is graduating this year with more than $17,000 in student debt. Another problem looms for them, however, if they do not consolidate their loans before July 1st. That is when interest rates will nearly double on their Federal student loans.

Mr. Speaker, to avoid dramatic hikes in interest rates and to lock in rates as low as 4.75 percent, I strongly encourage students and graduates to consolidate their Federal loan payments before July 1. Consolidating your loans could save you thousands of dollars over the next decade.

□ 0915

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting our troops in Iraq last month. I asked General Casey, the commander of our troops, how the political carping in Washington affected the troops. He responded, It doesn't really affect the troops so much, but it really grates on their families back home.

During Vietnam, I will never forget, as a young Air Force officer flying combat, how much we despised the politicians in Washington who were undermining the war effort. We visited the Iraqi leaders and Prime Minister al Maliki said, Welcome to a free and democratic Iraq. He said, Please tell the American people of our deep gratitude for the sacrifices that your sons and daughters have made to give us our freedom. He said, Please finish the job. Don't abandon us. Don't go backward.

Mr. Speaker, I don't question the patriotism of our opponents in this manner, just their judgment. The cause of freedom is too important to quit. The world and the terrorists are watching. Let's not lose our resolve.

GLOBAL WAR NOT WORTH THE COST

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the full day's debate yesterday was of no consequence because the premise of the resolution before us is a false one. It suggests that the goal of a secure, stable, and unified Iraq is an achievable one. It is not.

Iraq has always been a failed state because it was created artificially by the British to serve the British interest, not the Iraqi's interest. The fact is, when you have no tradition of civil institutions at the local level, the only way that a country can be governed is by a brutal secular dictator or by a repressive religious theocracy, and neither of those options is going to be in

America's interest, certainly not the pro-American liberal democracy that we have talked about.

Neither of those options, most importantly, will be worth the cost of the thousands more of American men and women who will lose their lives, the tens of thousands who will be seriously wounded or the hundreds of billions of dollars that we will have to borrow to finance this war. This resolution is not in America's interest, and it should be defeated.

HONORING MATT MAUPIN

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, as we focus on the global war on terror, I am reminded of the brave actions of our military, including Matt Maupin, the only soldier missing and captured in Iraq on April 9, 2004.

Matt and his family live in my district. His parents, Keith and Carolyn Maupin, continue to support our military through their yellow ribbon campaign, sending literally thousands of boxes of food and other items to Iraq and Afghanistan for our brave men and women.

Please continue to pray for Matt and all who are fighting for us.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 868, proceedings will now resume on 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 Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Thursday, June 15, 2006, 61 minutes of debate remained on the resolution.

The Committee on International Relations has 2 minutes remaining, the Committee on Armed Services has 5½ minutes remaining, the Committee on the Judiciary has 23 minutes remaining, and the minority leader's designee has 30½ minutes remaining.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) with whom I had the honor of visiting our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, the front line of the war on terror.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I think most of us understand we must succeed in Iraq if we are to win this global war on terror. Like any war, we may not want to be there, but now we must successfully complete the task before us.

It is not and will not be easy. But as one said, there is no substitute for victory. We must prevail. But at the same time, we also need to make it undeniably clear to the Iraqi Government that our patience and support are not blank checks that can be cashed with American lives and tax dollars ad infinitum.

To do that properly and effectively, it is imperative that the Congress do its job to proactively and comprehensively evaluate the current level of progress of the Iraqi Government and clearly report its findings on an ongoing basis to the American people.

By doing so, we would be firmly pushing the Iraqis themselves to continue their efforts to stand up and take charge of their destiny. The American people are looking to us to answer their questions on how much progress is being made, what are the Iraqis themselves willing to do to fight for their freedom, and when will the men and women come home.

For this very reason, I recently introduced a resolution calling on certain House and Senate committees to evaluate and issue specific findings and conclusions on the progress of the Iraqi Government to take over operational control to maintain proper civil order, to foster economic growth and self-sufficiency and preserve the Iraqi people's freedoms as set forth in their Constitution.

It is my firm belief that if this fact-finding and reporting process is undertaken, it will set the stage for further evaluation and consensus-building both inside and outside of Congress on our role in Iraq and will go a long way to ensure that our future involvement there continues to be the right policy, both for Iraq and America.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, through the years I have had the opportunity to visit and watch those in uniform as they trained, as they sailed aboard ship. I have visited with them in difficult places through the years, most recently in Iraq and Afghanistan. I must tell you how immensely proud I am of those young men and young women who wear the uniform of the United States.

We asked for a debate on the issue of Iraq. We were led to believe that we would be debating and discussing at length the issue of Iraq. Then the resolution was put forward for us, which we are discussing today, which is a shotgun blast all across the Middle East and its problems and terrorism, and a footnote is Iran.

So we should be discussing the future of our young people as they proceed in Iraq, not everywhere else, because the issue we thought was before us was that. I must tell you that I take a back seat to no one in providing for the troops, the young people in uniform and their families, because their families are so very, very important. Having members of my family in uniform, I understand the importance thereof.

Sadly, this is not about Iraq. Last year this Congress drafted, and the President signed into law, words that said 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 what we should be discussing. It should be narrow, intellectual discussion, a serious discussion about that country and its future, full sovereignty transition to their government and how it is being stood up, how their security forces and Iraqi police forces are being stood up, and how we are training them and also creating conditions for the phased redeployment of American forces from that country.

That is the law of the land, signed by the President, passed by this Congress. That is in conflict with the resolution before us. As we say back home, they have done gee and haw together very well. But the law of the land is what we should be discussing today and all the parts thereof.

But what concerns me most of all is at the end of the day, what about the future of our military? Our forces will come out of this effort seriously strained, both in personnel and in equipment. The equipment in Iraq is wearing out two to nine times the peace time rate. Some equipment has added as much as 27 years' worth of wear and tear in the last 3 years in Iraq. We must continue to fund defense requirements to meet unpredictable future security needs.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, after I recognize the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), who sits on the Judiciary Committee, be allowed to control the remaining time on our side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize for 3 minutes the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) who chairs the House Agriculture Committee and who sits on the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, just over 3 years ago the world watched as a treacherous tyrant disregarded United Nations resolutions and burrowed into the bunkers of Baghdad. Within a short period of time, coalition forces dismantled Saddam Hussein's regime, which was built on fear, murders, assassinations, torture and lies. And today this despotic dictator stands on trial before the Iraqi people in a courtroom that is a stone's throw from his prison cell.

While insurgents and terrorists continue their attempts to dismantle the progress that the Iraqi people have made, our resolution to see a free Iraq

must remain as strong as ever. Iraqis have also demonstrated their commitment to rebuilding their nation from the ashes of tyranny by their overwhelming participation in three democratic elections.

On the eve of completion of Iraq's democratically elected government, coalition forces and Iraqi police tracked down and killed the man Osama bin Laden referred to as the prince of al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu Musab al Zarqawi. Zarqawi led one of the bloodiest insurgent groups in Iraq in a bloody campaign of shootings, bombings beheadings and kidnappings aimed at derailing democracy in Iraq.

America is the world's leader in laying the foundations for freedom and future peace. We have stood for the spread of democracy around the world. We believe in it and have stood for it, not only for ourselves, for Europeans, Latin Americans, Asians and Africans. We have stood for it in the Middle East for the Israelis and now for Arabs in the wider Muslim world, in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

With our leadership ideals that have inspired our history, freedom, democracy and human dignity are increasingly inspiring individuals in nations throughout the world, because free nations tend toward peace. The advance of liberty will make America more secure.

Americans have felt the sting of the terrorist threat on our own soil, and we must make clear that we are dedicated to preventing any future attacks by tracking and eliminating terrorist threats. America is more secure today, thanks to the brave men and women of our Armed Forces whose dedication, patriotism and bravery are helping advance freedom and democracy in Iraq and around the world.

President Bush said it best while speaking to our troops during his recent visit to Iraq: this is a moment, this is a time where the world can turn one way or the other, where the world can be a better place or a more dangerous place. The United States of America and citizens such as yourselves are dedicated to making sure that the world we leave behind is a better place for all. Support freedom, support peace, support our troops, support this resolution.

□ 0930

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the debate on this resolution on Iraq. I will vote for House Resolution 861 because I strongly support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from Iraq, which was my second trip to that war zone. I am tremendously proud of all the men and women serving there, especially all the North Carolinians who have served and continue to serve there. I am pleased that we have made progress in training the Iraqi military to begin to provide for that country's security needs. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of work to be done to train Iraqi police, government and other civil institutions that are critical to a stable and functioning society. There is a long way to go to make Iraq a sustainable, peaceful country, and the administration must change course to build coalitions with our allies and all peaceful nations of the world to cooperate in rebuilding Iraq.

Although I strongly support our troops, I have serious concerns about the administration's current policies regarding Iraq. I believe the ultimate goal must be victory in Iraq. We need more burden-sharing support from other countries because the whole world has a tremendous stake in a stable Iraq and a peaceful Middle East. The administration must do a better job of providing for our soldiers in the field and our veterans and military families here at home. Specifically, the communities surrounding Fort Bragg in my district need more Federal funds to build new schools to meet the needs of the children of our servicemembers. I have voted every time to approve the funds to rebuild Iraq, but if we can spend billions of American tax dollars on building new roads, water treatment plants and schools in Iraq, we can invest some public resources in our urgent infrastructure needs here at home.

Congress has played a critical role in issues like providing armor for our troops and their vehicles, improving pay and incentives for better recruitment and retention of our troops and care for their families and creating the Homeland Security Department to protect our people from the threat of terrorist attack. I call on Congress to reject the administration's proposed cuts to our vital National Guard, and I will continue to work on the U.S. House Committee on Homeland Security to support our first responders who keep our people safe.

I will vote for this resolution because I support our troops, but I have serious concerns both with certain provisions in the resolution and the administration's approach to Iraq. Specifically, the resolution states support for the goal of a "unified Iraq." I do not believe that the Congress should dictate the contours of the map of the Middle East. As long as they do so in a peaceful manner, the Iraqi people should be free to decide whether or not unity, confederation or independence is the best form of government to meet their needs. And the administration's failed approach of going it alone and refusing to hold high level officials accountable for clear mistakes must end. Stubbornness is not a strategy and slogans will not win this conflict.

Let me state clearly that last week's elimination of terrorist leader Abu Musab Al Zarqawi by American special forces is an important accomplishment. I commend our military personnel who carried out the operation. This success points out the importance of human intelligence methods and demonstrates the usefulness of offering awards of large sums of money for information on America's enemies. This success stands in sharp contrast to the administration's continued failure to find Osama bin Laden. We should immediately double the bounty on bin Laden and continue to increase it at regular intervals until the terrorist mastermind is defeated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I regret the partisan manner in which this resolution has been brought to this floor, which my North Carolina colleague Republican Congressman WALTER JONES has rightly termed "a charade." From the very beginning, the Bush White House and Republican congressional leadership have exploited the Iraq war for partisan gain. I believe the blood of our soldiers should be off limits for political gamesmanship, and with more than 20,000 American soldiers killed or wounded in Iraq, the American people deserve better than petty politics on this issue.

I will vote for this resolution because I support our troops, but we can do so much better.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to go over a couple of things here that some of it was talked about yesterday and I said we need a plan. We also need a change of direction.

Now, why do I say we need a change of direction? A number of people brought up Beirut. I remember being on the floor, and the Speaker of the House asked me to go to Beirut after the President had deployed 1,400 troops to Beirut. Go over to Beirut, see what is going on. I did.

A friend of mine who had been in Vietnam with me was there, the commanding officer, and the rules we engaged in were very loose. Only had 1,400 people, did not even have people on the high ground to protect themselves. They were shooting down at the Marines down in the valley.

I came back and I told the President, I told Weinberger, I told Tip O'Neill, you have got to get them out of there. They did not, 241 Marines were killed.

The President saw it was a mistake; he changed direction. One thing about President Reagan, he understood when to change. He understood when you change direction. He had one of the biggest tax cuts in the history of Congress, and then he had one of the biggest tax increases. People forget he had a tax increase because he wanted to change direction.

He changed directions in Central America. I supported him. They burned me in effigy back at home because I supported Reagan all through the Central American thing, but we came to compromise in the end, and he saw we had to change direction and he did.

What I am saying today, Somalia, I told President Bush I, do not go into Somalia because if you go into Somalia you will not be able to get out. He said to me, I will have them out by inauguration day. He had lost the election by that time. He went in after the election was over, and he said, I will have them out by inauguration day. Well, he did not get them all out by inauguration day, and we changed direction there. We changed direction in the wrong direction. We went after Adide, who was a tribal leader. We sent in special forces. They bungled the thing. They fired the Secretary of Defense. They had accountability, and President Clinton changed direction. We redeployed.

So these are not times to criticize Presidents. This is something that needed to be done.

Now, we are in the same position here. Iraqi civilian deaths, 2003, 250; Iraqi civilian deaths in 2006, 1,500 a month. Went from we are there, we are not someplace else, we are there, and that is how many deaths. Iraqi kidnappings per day, 2003, two; today, there is 35 a day, 35 a day. U.S. troop fatalities, there were 37 in May of 2003; in May of 2006, 68. We are there. We are there as occupiers in Iraq. Iraqi Army police fatalities were 10 in 2003; 149 in May of this year.

Now, this is not progress. We are on the ground with 138,000 troops. The number of estimated insurgents, and I do not know how they find out who they are, but he said there is 3,000, Mr. Speaker, in May of 2003. There is now 20,000 insurgents. Now why did that come about? Because they look at us as occupiers.

Only the Iraqis can solve this problem. The United States cannot solve the problem as a foreign occupier, and our troops are caught in between a civil war.

Daily attacks by insurgents, 2003, there were five per day; today, there is 90. Monthly incidents of sectarian violence, you want to know what sectarian violence is? Sectarian violence is civil war. May 2003, 5; May of 2006, 250. We are there. We are there in the country, and it has increased from 5 to 250.

So do not tell me stay the course is the answer. We need a change in direction. We need to assess this situation and change. All of us want the same solution. We want a stable Middle East. It is important not only to the United States; it is important to the international community.

Bush I worked with the international community, and he got a coalition together, and it was successful, and he knew the limitations of what he could do. He did not go into Iraq, even though there were some zealots who wanted to go into Iraq. He knew, and he said in his book, If I go into Iraq, I will have to occupy it, I will have to reconstruct it, and I will lose the coalition. So he did not go into Iraq, and he was absolutely right. I supported him at the time, even though a lot of people had said they did not support what he was doing.

Somebody yesterday said, oh, you cannot measure the amount of water they have per day, that does not mean anything, the amount of electricity. Let me tell you something. I was without electricity for 8 hours last winter. It is not pleasant. I was cold. Now, it does not get that cold in Iraq, but I was without it for 8 hours and the house got cold. I thought to myself, in Iraq, they only have sometimes 8 to 10 hours of electricity a day. Water, they have 1 hour of water.

There is less oil production than before. Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz said we are going to pay for this with the oil production. Well, it has fallen far short of that. I think the OMB chairman, I think he at the time predicted this war would cost maybe $50 billion, and Wolfowitz said it would cost nothing because they would pay for it. Well, right now we have spent $450 billion. The longer we stay, the more we pay, in lives, in hurt to the families, the more we pay in financial resources.

It took us 15 years to get over the Vietnam War. We had 18 percent interest rates. We had 13 percent unemployment. Through the Reagan administration the Federal Reserve had to increase rates to 21 percent. I remember because at the time I was trying to buy a house. I remember trying to buy it at first, and I said 7 percent, I am not going to pay 7 percent. It went up to 21 percent. So we suffered because it was guns and butter. Here it is the tax cuts and troops in the field paying for the war.

So stay and pay is not a solution. I say redeploy and be ready. Get our troops out of harm's way and put them on the periphery and let the Iraqis settle this themselves. Only the Iraqis can settle this, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say I do not dispute the figure given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I dispute his logic.

I question the cause-and-effect relationship. Our presence has not created terrorists. Terrorists were around much before that. In the instance he cited with previous Presidents, yes, they did react, but obviously the totality of their reaction did not stop terrorism. We have a different plan, a different approach. That is what this President is following.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and commend the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives for facilitating this extraordinary debate over the war on terror and our military efforts in Iraq.

I have made three trips to Iraq over the last 3 years. I have led delegations to Baghdad, Basra, Ramadi, Balad and Mosul, and I have two messages to contribute to this discussion.

In the course of those trips, I have met with our soldiers in mess halls. I have flown in the belly of C–130s. I have talked with soldiers far away from anyone with any brass on their shoulders, and I have never met a soldier that did not believe in the effort in Iraq. Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, in all of my three different travels throughout the lengths and bounds of Iraq, I have never met a U.S. soldier in uniform who did not believe in the mission. Each and every one I met believed in the nobility of the cause.

Each of them expressed the view of an Indiana soldier by the name of Jim Newland from Washington, Indiana, in Baghdad. I will never forget the day I said to Jim, what do you think, Jim; are we doing the right thing here? He looked me in the eye and he said, Congressman, we are out on patrol every day on the streets of Baghdad. We look this enemy in the eye every day, and he said to me very solemnly, we have got to stop these people right here. They kill Americans because they like it. That is the sentiment I heard from our soldiers.

My other message is very simply and plainly and humbly, while it will be hard for some around this country to hear, we are winning the war in Iraq. We are defeating the enemy in every engagement. The enemy has never taken down so much as a full platoon in any military engagement. It is an extraordinary credit to our soldiers.

We have had three national elections. We have stood up a quarter of a million Iraqis in uniform, and there is now a freestanding elected government in Iraq. We are winning the war in Iraq, Mr. Speaker. It is a message that I would deliver and from the hearts of the soldiers that I met. I would also say I believe in this mission.

Support the resolution.

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

Vietnam is the same thing. I believed in my mission in Vietnam. All of us believed in it, but in 1967 when I came back from Vietnam, they had an election. President Lyndon Johnson said everything's all right. Matter of fact, I have a bullet that they gave me, that the first Marines gave to us when we left there that said everything's all right. We all believed in our mission. That did not mean we were going to win the war. That is the problem.

At times we have to change direction. When we look at the Vietnam War, there was an election right after I came back in 1967, and President Lyndon Johnson said, now it is all over, they will be able to do this themselves. 37,000 Americans killed after that, and you know the results. It was not because of the public. It was because the enemy kept forcing us into the type of war they were fighting. It was the kind of war we cannot fight. We could have gone all out and obviously destroyed Hanoi, but we had to worry about the Russians and the Chinese.

This is a real problem. It is guerrilla-type war, and when we fight, we have to use overwhelming force. When we use overwhelming force, you make enemies, and when you make enemies, you lose the hearts and minds.

I am saying the same thing you are. We want to win some kind of, I do not say victory. We want to win stability in the Middle East. That is the key because it is important to the free world. That is what is so important.

So we all are saying the same thing. One of the top generals said to me, that part cannot be won militarily all the time they will say. General Pace said it cannot be won militarily. So how do we do it? Diplomatically, politically and when the Iraqis say we are going to give amnesty to people that kill Americans, I mean, they fired the guy, okay, but that is a signal to them. We have 47 percent of the Iraqis say that they want to kill Americans. They think that is patriotic for them to kill Americans. That is disturbing to me.

The reason I started speaking out, one of the reasons, I remember I was in the hospital. One young woman said to me, with her husband lying there on the bed, wounded after a second trip, she said, you know, he did not enlist, this woman said, to fight for the Iraqis. He enlisted to fight for America.

It has got to be in the national security interest of America.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), a member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Government Reform Committee.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Today, the global war on terror is being waged on two primary fronts, as we know: Afghanistan and Iraq.

In Afghanistan, a resurgent Taliban is attempting to undermine the efforts of the United States and our NATO allies. The threat from these murderous extremist terrorists remains real, and if one does not believe us, then I suggest reviewing the events of recent days in Canada, where the terrorists, motivated by Canada's participation in Afghanistan, unsuccessfully attempted to decapitate the Canadian government. Mr. Speaker, the United States and our NATO allies must remain resolute in Afghanistan.

In Iraq, which I visited last year, I believe it is important and imperative that this Congress must have a serious, sober discussion about the consequences of failure in Iraq and what that means for the future. Failure in Iraq means a more destabilized Middle East that will be manifested by increasing sectarian strife and a political vacuum that will be filled by murderers and anarchists who most assuredly are not committed to the rule of law.

What is worse, the war will continue, not only in a destabilized Middle East, but elsewhere and in places we would rather not fight. Our friends and allies will be at greatest risk and more exposed than is currently the case.

To be sure, mistakes have been made in Iraq, from pre-war intelligence to de-Ba'athification to the destructive events of Abu Ghraib, but these mistakes should not stop us from our goal: the establishment of a stable, representative, national unity government that can manage the security situation much better itself and that lives in peace with its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to submit additional remarks for the RECORD detailing the efforts of the House Homeland Security Committee's contributions in fighting this global war on terror.

The Global War on Terror is, by virtue of its title, a war with world-wide scope. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am particularly concerned about the way in which this war can impact our way of life here, in these United States. And I believe that we have been doing a fine job of trying to make sure that terrorists or agents of foreign powers Do Not harm us on our shores.

Since September 11, the Homeland Security Committee has enacted or sponsored legislation designed to insure the safety of the people living in this country. In H.R. 1544, the Faster and Smarter First Responders Act, we tried to make sure that homeland security grant dollars are spent according to risk, and not with regard to political concerns. In H.R. 1817, the Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, we authorized the recruitment and training of 2,000 new border patrol agents to insure that terrorists are not able to penetrate our land borders.

As part of the Global War on Terror we have likewise worked hard to make sure that goods moving into this country are secure. In H.R. 4954, the SAFE Port Act of 2006, the Committee authorizes $821 million annually for port security programs. This bill further requires the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, to deploy nuclear and radiological detection systems at 22 U.S. seaports by the end of FY07, an action that will cover 98 percent of incoming maritime containers. Further, it makes sure that the people working at our port facilities are properly cleared and identified by forcing DHS to set deadlines for the implementation of the Transportation Worker Information Credential, TWIC, program, a biometrically-enhanced identification card system designed to make sure that those who would seek to commit acts of terrorism against us are Not allowed to work within the U.S. port system.

We have also worked hard to make sure that our transportation modalities are also protected in this Global War on Terror. In H.R. 5441, the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which the House passed on May 25, 2006, we appropriated $2.05 billion for Coast Guard port and waterway security operations, $2.6 billion to screen airline passenger baggage, $13.2 million for rail security inspectors and explosive detection canines, and $458 million for biological, chemical, and explosives countermeasures to protect the Nation's critical infrastructure.

Of course, in addition to securing our transportation modalities, we have also taken steps to make sure that terrorists in the Global War on Terror are not able to access what they clearly would most like to get their hands on—nuclear materials. The SAFE Port Act codifies in law the establishment of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, DNDO. Earlier this year I had the opportunity to visit the DNDO facility in Nevada, and I am firmly convinced of the importance of maintaining the vitality of this organization. The DNDO has one of the most important missions within the DHS—the detection and identification of nuclear materials. During my visit, I observed first-hand the testing of nuclear and radiological countermeasures, including detection devices designed to identify vehicles transporting nuclear explosive devices, fissile material, and radiological material intended for illicit use. The SAFE Port Act further requires the DNDO to conduct testing of next-generation nuclear and radiological detection equipment and to put forth a timeline for completing installation of such equipment at all U.S. seaports.

Members of the Homeland Security Committee have worked hard to insure the safety of Americans, our commerce, and our infrastructure. Since September 11, we have not had a major terrorist incident in this country. And I believe that it is appropriate to attribute this positive development at least in part to the efforts of the leadership of this Committee, which is determined to make sure that the homeland is indeed a safe place.

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

□ 0945

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), who sits on the Government Reform Committee, 2 minutes.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the new freedoms women have recently discovered in the Middle East, freedoms that the hard-working heroes in uniform have given them, freedoms they now not only cherish but themselves will fight for.

There are 50 million new lovers of freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan. Their liberation from oppression should compel every freedom-loving citizen on Earth to rejoice. I too am so proud of the freedom we as a Nation have brought to the oppressed.

However, some were more oppressed than others. Women had no voice, no opportunity, no hope, no dreams. All of that is changing, changing because we have championed the cause of freedom. Millions of young girls this very day are getting something they dared not dream about a few short years ago: an education. Today, women are voting. They are also serving as legislators in town councils and places where, before our commitment to liberation, they dared not even look a man in the face. They have been liberated. We are their liberators. We can and should be proud.

Yes, more needs to be done, but in lands where women were treated worse than cattle, a revolution is occurring, a revolution of respect, a liberation of lives. Our actions have made the lives of millions of women not just better on the margins but have actually giving them hope, endowed them with freedom, and dared them to dream.

We have much to be proud of. I am proud of our men and women in uniform who stand in harm's way. I am proud that this great country stands for good and opposes evil. I am proud that this Congress and this President

understand that freedom is God's gift to all mankind and that evil tolerated is evil assisted.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who, on her first trip overseas went with me to Iraq to talk to the troops and tell them how much she supported the troops.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the debate, Mr. SKELTON asked the House to observe a moment of silence for the 2,500 troops that we have lost in the war in Iraq. The number is a staggering one, but we warned them one person at a time. I hope their families live with great pride. I know they will live with great sorrow.

My uncle was killed at the Battle of the Bulge, and for my father's entire life it was as if it had happened yesterday. As if it had happened yesterday. We know that experience has been repeated over and over again across our country.

In remembering those who died, and their families who mourn them, let us also salute all of our men and women in uniform who are doing their jobs with great courage, with great patriotism and dedication, and their families who are making enormous sacrifices; 2,500 killed, 18,000 wounded, more than half of them permanently, straining our military readiness and eroding our reputation in the world.

The President of the United States says, stay the course. Stay the course? I don't think so, Mr. President. It is time to face the facts.

On every important aspect in the Iraq war, President Bush and his advisors have been wrong: wrong on the reason to go to war, wrong on the reception our troops would receive, wrong on the rapidity with which the Iraqi economy would be able to pay for the war and reconstruction, and wrong on the willingness of the international community to join in efforts to stabilize Iraq.

But don't take my word for it. This gross incompetence has driven some of our fighting generals to level devastating public criticism. MG John Batiste, who led the 1st Infantry Division in Iraq, has said: ''My own decision to speak out goes back to watching firsthand the arrogant and contemptuous attitude of Rumsfeld as he ignored the advice of military experts during preparations for war, and then living with the impact of those strategic blunders as a division commander in Iraq. Secretary Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.''

That is why over 2 years ago I asked for the resignation of Secretary Rumsfeld, and I do so again today. No one has been held accountable for all of these mistakes in Iraq.

The incompetence comes at a great cost. The Bush administration is so obsessed with the effort to paint an optimistic picture of the situation in Iraq that it refuses to face the facts. The facts are these: more than 2,500 American troops have been killed. Again, more than 18,000 have been injured, half of them permanently. And as the war costs have grown to over $400 billion, key construction projects remain unfinished.

As defense and intelligence expert Anthony Cordesman recently wrote: ''The U.S. aid process has failed. It has wasted at least half of the $22 billion in U.S. funds and much of the $34.6 billion in Iraq funds it attempted to use to secure and develop Iraq's economy.''

I repeat: defense and intelligence expert Anthony Cordesman recently wrote: ''The U.S. aid process has failed. It has wasted at least half of the $22 billion in U.S. funds and much of the $34.6 billion in Iraq funds in an attempt to secure and develop Iraq's economy.''

This is outrageous. Where is the accountability?

In fact, Mr. Cordesman concludes that the U.S.-managed Iraq reconstruction efforts have been as failed as the U.S. response to Hurricane Katrina.

The Bush Iraq policy has diverted resources and attention from what should be the focus of our effort against terrorism in places like Afghanistan. The lack of stability and the deteriorating security situation in Afghanistan is a casualty of the war in Iraq. The war has not made our country safer. It has not made our military stronger. It has caused great damage to our reputation in the world, and it has hindered the fight against terrorism.

In face of all of this incompetence and the cost of the war, I repeat, the President urges us to ''stay the course.'' Stay the course, Mr. President, is not a strategy. It is a slogan.

I will vote against this resolution because it is an affirmation of the President's failed policy in Iraq, and in doing so I will be pleased to join Mr. MURTHA and Mr. SKELTON. And I would like to at this moment salute them for their patriotism and their dedication to our country. They are second to none, as Mr. SKELTON said in his remarks. They are second to none in this Congress and in this country in looking out for the troops and being concerned and knowledgeable about troop readiness, about the strains on our military this war is putting on them and in deterring our ability to respond to other threats.

I salute them for their leadership and, in fact, their courage. Because here we have the Republicans putting on the floor a vacuous resolution, a challenge that if you say that you support the troops, you have to vote for this. That day is over. That day is over. The credentials on real security for our country, be it homeland security, be it willing to project military might to protect America's interests at home and abroad, we all share a that. So don't put something on the table that says you either vote for this if you support the troops or you don't.

This resolution is one thing and one thing only: it is an affirmation of President Bush's failed Iraq policy. The American people know the policy has failed. The American people know that. Hopefully, it will dawn on the President, and he, instead of stay the course, will change the course. He will stop digging the hole he is digging in Iraq and come out and see the light of day as to what is the right direction.

Across the country, Americans have had free and open debate about this war. But when the time came to debate Iraq in this Congress, Republicans shut down debate with a closed rule. This is not only an affront to the Democrats; it is an affront to the American people. Closed rule. Limited debate. Twice as many people on our side of the aisle would like to have spoken, but there wasn't enough time. There wasn't enough time to give Members of Congress the opportunity to give voice to the concerns of their constituents about a matter as important as sending and keeping our troops at war.

What a sad commentary on our democracy. We supposedly are going to Iraq to promote democracy, yet we don't even have it on the floor of the House of Representatives. What is sad about that is that we owe so much better, so much more to the American people, particularly to the brave men and women we have sent to fight in Iraq.

Democrats are calling for a new direction in Iraq. Our new direction would say to the Iraqi people that we will not be in your country indefinitely, we will not construct permanent bases, and we will not control the flow of your oil. We will work with you and your neighbors diplomatically to ensure that the reconstruction of Iraq is successful. We will do as Mr. MURTHA advocates. We will redeploy and be ready.

Republicans in Congress continue to try to mislead the American people by suggesting a link between the war in Iraq and the war on terror. They are distinct, as Mr. SKELTON has repeatedly and eloquently stated. They are distinct. And efforts to portray one as part of the other are a disservice to the truth and to the men and women sent to fight in Baghdad, Kirkuk, and Ramadi. The huge cost of the Iraq war in lost lives, life-altering wounds sustained, and billions of dollars spent demand better of us.

The defense authorization bill, as was quoted again by Mr. SKELTON, enacted last year, declares 2006 to be a year of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, creating the conditions of the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq. That is in the 2006 DOD authorization bill: the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq. That is the law of the land. You all voted to support it.

We are halfway through 2006, significant transition has not occurred, and the only redeployment has been of U.S. forces into Iraq, not out. The war in Iraq has been a mistake. I say a grotesque mistake. It must be our resolve

to end the war as soon as possible and to resolve to not make similar mistakes in the future. We owe it to the American people. We owe it to the young men and women that we send in to fight the fight.

Again, Democrats take our responsibility to provide for the common defense very seriously. We are proud to have leaders like Mr. MURTHA and Mr. SKELTON to lead that charge for us.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield a real 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman of the Government Reform Committee.

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us today. I would like to first offer my gratitude to those brave men and women who are fighting or have fought in Iraq and Afghanistan. We owe you a debt which we can never repay.

Since the United States invaded Iraq, I have seen this as a high-stakes gambit. If we were successful in not only defeating the Iraqi Army, but in the more difficult task of establishing a democratic government, we would be far down the road to affecting a paradigm shift in the Middle East, one which would replace potentates, dictators, and repression with representative governments, transparency, and opportunities for both men and women.

If we were to fail, the cost would be incalculable. It would be a reaffirmation for many in the world that the United States lacked the fortitude to see a mission through to its completion. It would embolden terrorists the world over; threaten those states in the Middle East, such as Jordan and Israel, that are friends of the United States.

□ 1000

Regardless, the situation in Iraq is what it is. There is no question Iraq is a petri dish for terrorists now. Our main nemesis in Iraq is called ''al Qaeda in Iraq.'' Thus, our activities in both Iraq and Afghanistan are now clearly linked to a global war on terror. There is no other way to view the situation.

I am eager to build on the recent successes in Iraq. I truly hope that we have turned a corner with the death of Zarqawi and the forming of the government. If voter turnout is any indication, the Iraqi people are eager for democracy. They had a higher voter turnout in Iraq than we did in Virginia for our gubernatorial race. But make no mistake, what we are trying to do in Iraq has been and will continue to be extraordinarily difficult. Even with Zarqawi gone, there are many dangerous people who will stop at nothing to stop us.

I don't support a public date of certain withdrawal from Iraq. Doing so creates an untenable situation for our forces and our Iraqi allies and presents a real gift of predictability to the enemy. But there has to be a sense of urgency. We are in a war that we have to win, but we cannot plod along indefinitely.

Our Founding Fathers had 13 years between the beginning of the American Revolution, the ratification of the Constitution, and the inauguration of George Washington. We don't have that luxury in Iraq. Our troops are giving their lives in Iraq. Our country is spending hundreds of billions of dollars. We can't pull the rug out from the under the Iraqis, but we can't babysit the situation either. We don't have time to waste on activities that are ineffective. We don't have money to waste on bad equipment and services.

Some have charged that this Congress has been asleep at the wheel and has done no oversight. That's not true. I have. Our committee has held four hearings on contracting practices in Iraq, including a day for whistleblowers at Halliburton, and I intend to hold more.

Our subcommittees, particularly the one chaired by Mr. SHAYS, have held dozens of others. What we have found is a lot of mistakes in management and oversight. But remember, this is the first time we have contracted this extensively in a combat situation. Everything about doing business, everything in a war zone is difficult and costly, and it is disingenuous to deny this.

If we are going to see this mission through successfully, there must continue to be vigorous, comprehensive, constant oversight to ensure we stay on the right path. We should do everything we can to hasten the day when Iraq is able to handle its own affairs. Our role in Congress is to conduct the oversight that the people expect of us.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise again today in opposition to the war in Iraq, a position I have consistently held since the President first undertook this misguided policy at the expense of our nation's men and women in uniform and our domestic priorities. While I found myself in a relative minority at the time I first voted in opposition, I find myself now situated amongst a majority of the American people in addition to some of the most knowledgeable and committed patriots this country has ever known.

I am today opposed to H. Res. 861 and remain committed to a better course, one that is in the interest of American foreign policy, America's fighting men and women, America's future security and American victory. The Resolution, which has been discussed, is flawed, not only in substance, but in process. The decision to enter into and remain involved in foreign conflict is one of the most serious responsibilities the Framers of the Constitution granted to the Congress at the drafting in Philadelphia. The Republican leaders in this Congress have shirked their oversight responsibilities and have denied a democratic process even in the debate over a nonbinding resolution.

Throughout this conflict we have heard of shortages of supplies from armor to protect the lives of our soldiers to reliable intelligence to guide their mission. Surely the most devastating shortage has been the lack of leadership in this conflict. The President has failed, since the beginning, to chart a course for victory, to correct mistakes as they have arisen and to secure that the ideals for which the American forces are fighting are never compromised.

I rise in honor of the sacrifice that far too many men and women have been called to make and in the hope that this conflict will find a new direction, one which will support American victory, security and justice. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to chart a better course and plan a better future for the people of America and the people of Iraq.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear on the points we can agree.

Every Member of this House was horrified by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Every Member of this House believes we must do what is necessary to defend our country and our people from future attacks and to eliminate the threat of terrorism.

And every Member of this House supports our troops and their families, and we commend them for their honorable service under very difficult and stressful circumstances.

But today, Mr. Speaker, this House debates the ongoing war in Iraq, not the struggle against terrorism.

I voted no when the House considered the Congressional Resolution authorizing the President to Invade Iraq.

At that time, I had several crucial questions that needed clear answers:

1. What is the nature and the urgency of the Iraqi threat to the United States?
2. What is the mission of our troops?
3. How much international support will we have?
4. Will this military operation in Iraq increase terrorism or decrease terrorism?
5. What is the exit strategy to withdraw our troops from Iraq?

Despite my questions on the rationale for the war, I have consistently supported the funding for our troops.

They deserve our full support, and they deserve to have everything necessary for their mission.

And as the father of two sons who have served in the military, I would want no less.

Mr. Speaker, we now know that Saddam Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction.

President Bush has publicly acknowledged that there was no link or connection between Saddam Hussein and the terrorist attacks on 9/11.

The mission of our troops seems to change and expand daily.

As for international support, the American taxpayer has foot the vast majority of the costs to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars.

And American fighting men and women, and their families, have borne the vast majority of the deaths and injuries to coalition troops, over 2,500 killed and 18,000 wounded.

Moreover, many of the original members of our coalition have withdrawn or are withdrawing their troops from Iraq, leaving the U.S. to shoulder the burden almost alone.

Are we safer today than we were before the invasion of Iraq?

According to U.S. State Department data, there were 175 international terrorist attacks in 2003, and that was a 20-year high.

In 2004, the number jumped three-fold to 650 attacks.

In 2005, 11,111 terror attacks were reported by the state department.

Finally, the Bush Administration does not now nor ever has had a viable exit strategy for our troops in Iraq.

Saying, "we will stand down as the Iraqis stand up" puts the fate and future of American troops completely at the mercy of the competence of the Iraqi government and its security forces.

I agree with the resolution before us, we should not set an "arbitrary" date for withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq.

But we should set intelligent, well-thought out benchmarks that make the most sense for American national interests.

Setting reasonable benchmarks for the departure of our troops would send several important messages.

To the Iraqi national government—get your house in order now!

To the Iraqi Sunnis opposing our occupation now is the time to cut your best deal with the Shiite and Kurdish factions while the U.S. is still able to act as an honest broker.

To our American military leaders—here is a date to which you can plan, knowing when the rebuilding of our military capabilities can begin.

To the American people we have done what we could.

From this point on, it is now up to the Iraqi people to find their way, with the support of the international community.

And finally, to the terrorists the Iraqi people will deal with you now if you remain in Iraq.

For all the other terrorists outside of Iraq, the United States can now shift the full force of its military, diplomatic, law enforcement, and economic resources to the single task of hunting you down and bringing you to justice.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 861 is a whitewash justification of every erroneous action of the Bush-Cheney administration in their war of choice on Iraq.

It's no surprise that Bush, CHENEY and Rumsfeld seek this late coating of whitewash that this resolution attempts to provide. The war on Iraq was unjustified, has been egregiously mismanaged, and has made all Americans less safe.

Americans were told repeatedly by President Bush and Vice President CHENEY that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. None were ever found.

President Bush and Vice President CHENEY repeatedly implied that Iraq was involved in the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. The preponderance of intelligence before the attack on Iraq contradicted that and no such evidence has been found.

The conduct of President Bush's war of choice has been plagued with incompetent civilian leadership decisions that have cost many lives and rendered the war on and occupation of Iraq a strategic policy disaster for the United States. The incompetence and corruption involved in the reconstruction have rendered that expensive effort largely ineffective.

The most critical, much-cited incompetent decision on the part of the Bush administration was to commit far too small a force for the huge, dangerous and multifaceted tasks at hand. Because of that egregious blunder in judgment and planning by the Bush administration, our severely overextended troops took many more casualties than necessary, and they could not:

Stop the looting of the treasures of Iraq's ancient culture and the public institutions of present day Iraq—its schools, universities and hospitals;

Seize control of Saddam's huge conventional weapons depots which have been used to kill our service men and women throughout the insurgency;

Control the borders against the influx into Iraq of senior terrorists from Bin Laden's international network who wanted to be part of killing Americans;

Provide the Iraqi civilian population security from the Sunni-Baathist insurgency as it grew in strength; and

Hold the ground fought over with insurgents in search and destroy missions which left whole cities in ruins and whatever remained of the civilian population a fertile recruiting ground for more insurgents.

The incompetence regarding body and vehicle armor rises almost to a level of criminal negligence.

The military's own report says that one-third of deaths and casualties could have been avoided if proper body armor and vehicle armor had been provided from the start of the war. Our soldiers' civilian leaders did not follow a first maxim of war: protect your troops. American service men and women deserved better, and the civilian leaders who failed them should be held accountable.

But instead of honoring our soldiers now with an honest debate about the war, its conduct and its prospects, we are presented today with a thick coating of whitewash. This resolution is dishonest on its very face.

Even though there was no connection between Afghanistan and Iraq, H. Res. 861 seeks desperately to make that false connection. It seeks to transform the bad decision to wage war on Iraq as a valid component of the global war on terror. It seeks to cast the missteps and incompetence in Iraq as progress in the global war on terror. Even though there was never any philosophical or operational connection between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda, the President and his Republican allies in Congress seek by this resolution to re-write history and re-cast the war on Iraq as having positive implications in the war on terrorism.

Exactly the opposite is true.

After 9/11, in part because so many nations lost citizens in the World Trade Center, America enjoyed virtually total global support and willingness to collaboratively destroy the Bin Laden Al Qaeda network. The opportunity was there to work carefully with the entire world, including almost all Muslim nations, to make Americans and the whole world safer by isolating and shutting down Al Qaeda.

Did we complete that mission? No; Bin Laden is still at large and the conditions in Afghanistan are deteriorating. Instead, President Bush started a second war unrelated to 9/11 and the hunt for Bin Laden's networks and his followers.

We've now spent well over $350 billion on an effort that has not achieved its own goals and, due to its astronomical cost and resource drain, has severely undercut our ability to pursue and destroy Bin Laden's international terrorist network with its many cells that existed in 2002, continue to exist today and certainly will exist into the future.

Twenty-five hundred fine young American men and women have lost their lives, 95 percent of whom have been killed since President Bush declared "Mission Accomplished" more than 3 years ago.

America has also forever lost the service of thousands of good soldiers who are now disabled as a result of battle wounds in Iraq. Many others will need mental and emotional rehabilitation before they can return to normal life. The multiple re-deployments of Guard and Reserve troops have severely undercut the retention and recruitment prospects for the fighting force we depend upon to protect us.

President Bush and his administration have defended torture and rendition and ignored the Geneva Conventions. America has lost the moral high ground with the rest of the world, and we have fewer allies as a result. President Bush and his administration have undermined the war on terror by using tactics outlawed by international treaty and condemned by even our closest friends.

And, finally, President Bush's war on Iraq has provided Al Qaeda a training and recruitdlent ground that it could not have hoped for in its wildest dreams, as well as a golden opportunity to target Americans right in the unprotected center of the Middle East. President Bush's war on Iraq is viewed broadly in Islamic communities as an attack on Islam, and thus the President has alienated a large part of one fifth of the world's population. The most extreme individuals and factions in Islamic countries are now more motivated than ever to kill Americans, and the number of potential terrorists has greatly expanded.

So a truthful assessment of how America is doing in the war on terror as a result of President Bush's war on Iraq is that we have been set back by decades. Bad decisions and incompetence have achieved a vast determination in countless desperate, impoverished, disaffected and oppressed young Muslim men and women to take out their anger and express their fundamentalism and radicalism by attacking Americans and American interests. We are far less safe as a nation and will remain so throughout our lifetimes and our children's lifetimes.

Clearly, a stable, unified and democratic Iraq cannot be achieved militarily by the U.S. Our servicemen and women have done the best job that can be done in the situation into which their civilian leaders have placed them, and they deserve the highest level of gratitude from all Americans. They have already taken too many casualties—too many dead, too many wounded—because they were too few and too poorly provided with the armor they needed to succeed safely.

If a unified and stable Iraq is to emerge out of the ethnic and sectarian violence that is so perilously close to civil war, the Iraqi people and their government must make the political compromises necessary to secure a successful democracy. They must find in themselves a new nation. We cannot do that for them; we can only give them the opportunity to do it.

Nor should we accept the President's mantra, "When the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down." A nice slogan, but that is simply a recipe for an unlimited occupation.

We need to make it clear that we will withdraw from Iraq within 6 to 9 months—so that the Iraqis will know that they must stand up and defend the opportunity given to them.

We should immediately state that we will seek no permanent military bases in Iraq. In the remaining months, we should focus on achieving more robust international involvement in training of Iraqi soldiers, police officers, judges, teachers, and doctors—all key elements needed to end the sectarian and civil conflict and build Iraq's future. And we should prepare for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops.

The Bush administration has made many grievous and costly errors in Iraq over the past 3½ years and made little, if any, progress in the war on terrorism thereby. It is time to bring our young people home.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of the comments, and then I will reserve my time.

The gentleman just before I spoke talked about how long it took America to get its independence. Actually, it is more than just 6 or 7 years, it went on through the Civil War, but they were all Americans. It was not an occupying force that was trying to force democracy on the United States. Can you imagine what we would have done if we had an occupying force here trying to force democracy on the United States? It would not have worked. But of course they were not democracies in most cases anyway.

So I just want to point out that in Iraq we have become the occupiers, and 47 percent of the people in Iraq, and this is a poll only 3 months old, says it is okay to kill Americans. One of the officials in the Iraqi government offered amnesty.

Since I spoke out on November 17, things have gotten worse. We have 130,000 troops in Iraq. Every day it gets worse. From May to May, it gets worse and worse. It is not a matter of stay the course. It is a matter of change direction.

I said a little earlier, Ronald Reagan understood when it was time to change direction. He did one of the biggest tax cuts in history. He turned around a little bit later and adjusted that. This didn't call it a tax increase, it was an adjustment.

In Beirut he decided we have to make a change, it won't work. In Somalia, President Clinton did the same thing. And over that mistake, and it was a substantial mistake, the Secretary of Defense resigned because he had lost the confidence of the military in the way he handled the situation in Somalia. We changed direction there. We went in the wrong direction. We went after a tribal leader named Aideed.

In Iraq, unfortunately, the way we operate as a military, and there is no one who understands better than the gentleman with the 173rd in California, understands what the military does when it goes into a place. You have to use overwhelming force. I promote that. I am in favor of that. I do everything I can to make sure that the military has what they need to prevail and protect American lives.

But when you do that, you inadvertently kill people and you make enemies. Abu Ghraib was another example of the enemies that we made, and the public relations battle has been lost worldwide. People have discredited the United States and have little confidence in our ability.

Somebody brought up Spain yesterday. They said ask Spain about terrorism. Well, 56 percent of the people in Spain think the United States is more of a threat in Iraq than Iran is in the world. So we have got a lot of things we can talk about as rhetoric. The facts are the situation is not getting better. We have 130,000 troops on the ground and only Iraqis can handle this.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, after 9/11, our nation united against terrorism and those who want to kill innocent civilians and destroy our American way of life. New York was impacted deeply by these tragic events and we understand firsthand the kind of unthinkable damage that can be inflicted by hate-filled violent extremists.

I voted to support the use of force in Iraq for many reasons. Decades of deception and violation of United Nations resolutions; invading neighboring countries; and a litany of ruthless atrocities by Saddam Hussein involving murdering his own people.

I believe that the best way to safeguard freedom in our nation increasingly depends on supporting a democratic global strategy in areas beyond our borders. That is why supporting the creation of a self-governing Iraq is so critical to the future of both our countries.

Having said that, I am deeply disappointed in this resolution because I believe we owe Americans more than a simple declaration of our resolve in Iraq. We owe them an account of our progress in the Global 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.

There are several points in this resolution that I am concerned about. It also strikes me as merely a reiteration of the resolution we passed last December.

First, I am disappointed in the choice of the word adversary in this resolution. History and reality illustrate that within Iraq and the broader Global War on Terror we do not face an adversary—we face a very real and dangerous enemy. We should not be afraid to clearly state what we as a nation are up against.

Secondly, philosophically, any state-sponsor of terror is a threat to the United States, because terrorism is an attack upon the self-evident, inalienable human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This point should be clearly expressed in a resolution of this nature.

Additionally, the second clause states ". . . 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 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.

I know first hand the difficulties we face in Iraq. I have heard it directly from the men and women that are fighting so hard in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I do hope that despite my concerns that this debate provides a clearer understanding of the threats we really face and the opportunity to develop a strategy that protects our troops and enables our military to develop a comprehensive strategy to win this war, transfer the power to the Iraqi people and bring them home. It should also demonstrate that the "cut and run" agenda of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is the wrong approach to this problem and encourages the terrorists to wait us out and undo all that our soldiers have worked through blood, sweat, tears and their lives to establish—a victory for our nation and a stable and secure democracy in the Middle East.

Lastly, and most importantly, I will continue to stand by and support U.S. troops. I must take this opportunity to pay a personal tribute to the brave lives that have been claimed from my district: Nathan Brown, Stephen Madison, Kevin Kimberly, Isaac Nieves, and Joseph Robsky. Their sacrifice, and the sacrifice of their families and loved ones embody the spirit of our great nation and principles of democracy we hold dear.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) for a unanimous consent.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the efforts of our brave men and women in uniform fighting to protect our Nation in the global war on terror. Today, some people are

trying to make this debate about politics or another opportunity to convince some of our national media that our efforts in Iraq have not been successful, these people are wrong in their facts and their intent.

I recently led a delegation of members to Vietnam, India, Singapore and Thailand. After meeting with three prime ministers and their parliamentary leaders, I am ever more convinced of the need to stay the course in Iraq and Afghanistan. One common theme came from each of my meetings—the United States must win. It is a simple theme and a powerful one. We cannot leave Iraq before the job is done. If the terrorists who have invaded Iraq can prove to the world that they are able to overcome the will of the American people and force our early withdrawal, they can do that to any nation.

Mr. Speaker, we are the world's last remaining superpower. We are the leader of democracy and the pinnacle of freedom. If bands of murderous terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan can convince this body to abandon our mission, they will have won. And they will not stop at simply expelling America from Iraq. They will work to destroy the western world, our values and our freedoms.

Our mission in Iraq has changed. Our forces easily defeated and captured Saddam Hussein and his henchmen. Now, our mission is to finish the job by building up Iraqi security forces and the Iraqi Government so that they can defend and govern themselves. I believe President Bush when he says, "as Iraqis stand up, we will stand down."

Today the Iraqi forces have gained great strength. There are now more than twice as many members of the Iraqi Security Forces as there are U.S. forces serving in Iraq. Iraqi forces are now a part of more than 90 percent of all operations in Iraq. With the complete formation of the presidential cabinet, three free elections and the elimination of al-Qa'ida leaders in Iraq, the global war on terror is indeed progressing and advancing freedom and democracy across the world.

Mr. Speaker, our debate today is a useful one. It is an opportunity to say to the world that we stand behind our troops 100 percent. This debate shows that we support the mission of our American patriots. Today, the United States Congress should pass this resolution and demonstrate to the world, once again, our commitment to freedom and democracy.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to discuss the Global War on Terror in Iraq and Afghanistan. With the events of the past few weeks, including the completion of a democratically elected government and the elimination of al-Qaeda terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, we have seen the development of democracies and another strong blow against terrorism. The importance of staying the course in Iraq and standing strong is evident with every success.

Steadfast determination in Iraq is key to the security of the United States and the global community. I strongly support the United States' continued military involvement in the Global War on Terror. The importance of keeping our country safe by standing up for democracy and freedom is our number one priority.

I had the opportunity to visit with our troops in Iraq and felt so proud. Their determination to bring peace and hope to the Middle East and end the terrorist threat to the U.S. was humbling and inspiring. Nothing demonstrates our military families' commitment more than the family of Corporal Michael Anderson Jr. who lost his life in Iraq. They came to Washington, from Modesto, California, recently to honor is life. It was a privilege to meet such an inspiring family, who, in the face of tragedy, demonstrated unwavering patriotism.

Our courageous soldiers, who are fighting for freedom and our way of life, deserve the full support of the American people. We owe it to those who have given their lives, to stay and complete this mission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution declaring the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 861, declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror.

We have made great strides in the War on Terror. The men and women of our Armed Forces along with coalition partners deserve our continued support. They have displayed nothing short of true dedication and continued professionalism in carrying out their mission.

It is with high esteem that I rise to say we are winning the Global War on Terrorism. This is highlighted by the capture of Osama bin Laden's Prince of Iraq, al-Zarqawi. This is truly a milestone and has resulted in hundreds of raids which continue to provide an enormous amount of new intelligence to our commanders in the field. As political polls show, a majority of Iraqis wants the violence to end, and that Sunnis, Shiites, and other tribes were coming together to help make that happen. As an example of progress on the ground, he said that the number of intelligence "tips" had increased from 400 per month to 4,000 which makes the capture of terrorists like al-Zarqawi possible.

The newly elected prime minister, Nuri al-Maliki, the first constitutional prime minister of Iraq since the revolutionaries toppled the Iraqi monarchy and murdered the royal family in 1958, has been successful in establishing a diverse government; one that has demonstrated a willingness to work together. This cooperation has transcended to the general population. A new Iraqi society, one that seeks to live in harmony with each other and believe the government can improve the situation in Iraq, is a society that is much safer because the Iraqi Security Forces now conducted over 32,000 patrols during the month of April.

There are 263,400 forces assigned to the Ministry of Defense and they are capable of conducting over 86 percent of the planned operations. It is projected by the end of this year, the Iraqi Security Forces will have responsibility and capability to fulfill a 100 percent of such operations.

Mr. Speaker, our goal of defeating terrorists, establishing a free and independent Iraq is obtainable if we continue to pursue our current course.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who sits on the Budget Committee and the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate very carefully for the last day. There are clearly those who want to debate whether we should have gone into Iraq. That point is moot.

There are some who want to debate immediate withdrawal regardless of the consequences. That is dangerous.

Some just want to criticize the administration yet offer no plan of their own. That is political posturing.

Finally, there are some who want to debate that victory is not only possible in Iraq, it is essential to our security. Count me among their numbers.

Like many Members of this body, I have been to Iraq to visit with our troops. Those whom I have spoken to, they believe we are winning. And they also believe it is essential, like one soldier told me, Congressman, I hate being here, but I know how important it is to my family and how important it is to my country that we succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the American people are anxious, and I know that many days progress comes three steps forward and two steps backwards. And unfortunately, the national media tends to only portray the two steps backwards.

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein has been captured. He has been defeated. Last week al Zarqawi, the number one terrorist in the region, has been eliminated. A quarter million of the Iraqi troops have been trained, equipped, and on patrol. After years of halting progress, we now have a fully functioning, democratically elected government in Iraq. This is important because we are not threatened by democracies. We are threatened by despotic regimes and terrorist ideologies.

But the news stories that are most important about why we are there are never written. I come from Dallas, Texas. I have never read the story that today no suicide bomber exploded in North Park Mall. I have never read the story that today no car bomb went off in Poteet High School, and I know I have never read the story that today JEB and Melissa HENSARLING put their 4-year old and 2-year old to bed in a safer, more secure Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.

Victory is costly. Defeat is even more costly.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for standing up for the last 10

hours in defense of our country and the troops that serve us and, most importantly, throughout his entire life, and I thank him for demanding that the Iraqi people stand up for their own country and responding to the American people who are demanding that this Congress stand up for our Nation's interest. Staying the course in Iraq is not in our Nation's interest.

Several times the proponents of this resolution have cited Winston Churchill. Wonderful, lofty rhetoric, but there's a disconnect. Saddam Hussein did not drop any bombs on the United States. He was not involved in 9/11, didn't harbor any terrorists who were.

It has been argued if we redeployed it might hurt our credibility around the world. As has been said, our approval ratings around the world are the lowest they have ever been. People rank us down with Russia in terms of trust and respect.

It has been argued if we redeploy it might encourage terrorists. Our continued presence is the rallying cry in the recruitment tool for terrorists around the world. It has been argued that it might hurt American troops' morale. Mr. Speaker, 2,500 brave men and women dead, 18,000 seriously wounded and you want to stay the course?

It has been argued that there might be a civil war if we redeploy. There is a civil war today. The fact is the Iraqis are going to have to seize control of their own country. We have to redeploy. We won't leave the region, but we will be there to fight off foreign terrorists. But the Iraqis are going to have to determine their own future.

That's why this resolution is not in America's interest. Defeat this resolution. Changing the course, having a definable objective in Iraq is in America's interest.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, resolve, untested, is only an idea.

Today we are fighting a war against Islamic extremists. Make no mistake about it, this is a generational challenge. It was my grandparents' generation that fought the Nazis. It was my parents' generation that fought the communists. It is our generation that is fighting Islamic extremists wherever they are.

The left in this country have a policy that they are advocating here today, and they are advocating a policy called cut and run. They are advocating a policy of waving the white flag to our enemies. It is a policy, make no mistake about it, that the left in this country are advocating.

But we are fighting a war. We are fighting a war against Islamic extremists that hate the very fiber of our being as Americans. They hate our freedoms and they hate the fact that we embrace equality here in this country, although imperfect. They hate the fact that we have religious freedom and freedom of speech in this country. Make no mistake about it, these are important things to Americans, and our enemy hates those important things.

We are having a great debate here, 10 hours of debate here in this Congress on this war policy, and I am proud that the majority in this House will stand to fight and win this war. It is not about status quo, it is about victory.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me, we stand here and fight in the air-conditioned Chambers of the United States Congress where these fellows are walking around in Iraq, men and women, with 70 pounds every day facing IEDs, never knowing when they may go off with tremendous stress. They are being deployed three and four times. It is easy to stay in an air-conditioned office and say I'm going to stay the course.

But let me tell you something, those troops, I hope they believe in what they are doing. That's what America is all about. But standing here and talking about policy and criticizing people just because they disagree with a policy is absolutely absurd. All of us support the troops and want them to come home as soon as they can.

What we need is a change in direction so we will be able to work this out. All of us want stability in the Middle East. That is what this whole thing is all about. We just disagree on how you do it. We disagree. Ever since the troops have been there, everything has gotten worse.

□ 1015

Electricity production is below prewar levels; water only 1 hour a day in some parts. In Anbar Province no water. 90 percent unemployment. Not one project in Anbar Province. So it is not a matter of whether it is good or not. It is a matter only that the Iraqi's should solve this thing.

And when I hear somebody standing here sanctimoniously saying we are going to fight this out, we are not fighting at all. It is the troops that are doing the fighting, the families that are doing the sacrificing, a very small proportion of families in this country are doing the sacrificing. And that is why I get so upset when they stand here sanctimoniously saying we are fighting this thing. It is the troops that are doing the fighting, not the Members of Congress that are doing the fighting.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H. Res. 861.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, H. Res. 861, and to emphatically declare that we will prevail in the War on Terror across the globe, and in Iraq.

We've already amassed a long list of accomplishments. Mr. Speaker, since being liberated from the oppressive Taliban regime, native Afghans have returned to their homeland in droves, many of whom are highly educated teachers, healthcare providers, and community leaders that were thrown out of the country by the Taliban.

The Afghan economy continues to power ahead and previously unheard-of opportunities are opening up, particularly for Afghani women.

Regrettably, these accomplishments don't seem to generate much enthusiasm with the mainstream media or our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. If you did nothing but listen to their negativity, you would not know that more than 3,600 schools in Iraq have been rehabilitated, or that 240 hospitals and 1,200 medical clinics have been reopened, nor that 13 power plants have been built, providing about 60 percent of Iraq's power generation, or that over 250,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained, equipped, and are fighting on the front line against the insurgency!

Further, Mr. Speaker, without our policies and efforts in carrying out the War on Terror, Libya would not have given up their WMD programs, free elections would not have taken place in Afghanistan and Iraq, a national unity government would not be in place in Iraq, and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi would still be carrying out terrorist operations.

Instead of heralding the unparalleled successes of our troops and our policies in prosecuting this war, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have the American people believe we are losing.

Perhaps Mr. Speaker, the hope of political gains has some of my colleagues seeking to exploit the few missteps we have incurred while ignoring a much greater number of victories.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot give in to the antiwar rhetoric, which only serves to embolden our enemies while offering little hope and little vision. It is always easier to pull back the reigns and watch from the sidelines, but we in America choose to be active in determining the course of history. Make no mistake, we are in a tough fight for the future of peace, freedom, and democracy in the Middle East and around the globe, but winning should be our only option.

As we debate this resolution today, let us not forget that nearly everyone of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when presented with the same pre-war intelligence that President Bush had concluded with high confidence that Iraq was continuing its' WMD programs contrary to U.N. resolutions. For those who now want to claim the pre-war intelligence was in some way fabricated, both the bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee in 2004 and bipartisan Robb-Silberman Committee in 2005 did not find any evidence to support that claim. It is shameful that "Monday Morning" critics who hate Secretary Rumsfeld and President Bush are now resorting to false claims about pre-war intelligence

Given that Sadaam Hussein had used weapons of mass destruction on neighboring

countries in the past, along with his desire to bring us harm, Republicans and Democrats alike reached consensus that the potential for him to either harm us directly with these weapons, or indirectly by passing them on to terrorists, was too great a risk to take. The terrible human rights atrocities committed by Sadaam and his blatant disregard for repeated U.N. resolutions were further compelling grounds for our bi-partisan actions.

Mr. Speaker, none of these facts have changed. What has changed is the resolve of many on the other side of the aisle who in the process of changing their footing on the war, have become more interested in playing politics than in defeating terrorism and defending freedom. When these Members of Congress who are advocating a defeatist strategy, sometimes referred to as ''cut and run'', were presented with the opportunity in November 2005 to vote on withdrawing our forces from Iraq immediately, only 3 of those behind these calls stood by their words.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki of Iraq made the following statements this past Friday: ''We believe we will soon reach a tipping point in our battle against the terrorists as Iraqi security services increase in size and capacity, taking more and more responsibility away from the multinational forces. With our allies, we will also 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. However, ill conceived and short sighted strategies threaten any chance of Iraq becoming a bastion for democracy in the Middle East. I sincerely hope the defeatist rhetoric of the minority party will not dishearten the brave men and women who are defending and advancing freedom around the globe.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support this resolution. Let our brave men and women in uniform know that we will never break faith with them. Let the Iraqi people know that their patriots have not died in vain.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. When I returned to this House after an absence of 16 years, he was one of the first people to greet me. I have enormous respect for the work we did together with others here 25 years ago in fighting common battles.

I have a general disagreement with him on this approach. I don't question your patriotism. I certainly am attempting not to be sanctimonious about this. But I think there are some real questions that we must pose. One of them would be this: I have heard it said from your side of the aisle that we are attempting to force democracy on this country, and it will never work.

Look at the three elections they had, the increasing participation. And, frankly, contrast that with what occurred just this last Tuesday in the Commonwealth of Virginia, where, for a primary to determine who the Democratic nominee is going to be for the Senate, 3 percent of the people showed up, 3 percent of the registered voters.

I would suggest if we were on this floor talking about Iraq where only 3 percent supported, people would say democracy is a failure. I am not willing to give up on the Commonwealth of Virginia. I hope we are not willing to give up on Iraq.

Secondly, the question about Vietnam. And I have the greatest respect for the gentleman; he served there with distinction, just as my father served in World War II with distinction. But I would suggest there are a number of differences between Vietnam and this experience. And one of the chief ones is this: when we left Vietnam they did not follow us. If we leave Iraq, the terrorists would follow us.

Some would suggest that it is a shame that we are fighting them there. I say it is wonderful that we are fighting them there rather than here.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

I didn't mean to imply that the gentleman from California is sanctimonious. It is just some of the speakers have been sanctimonious. But that is not the point. We want the same thing. We want stability in the Middle East. It is important. We use more oil than any other country in the world, 20.6 million barrels of oil a day. The closest to us is China with 6 million barrels of oil a day. The whole free world wants stability in the Middle East. It is how we get it.

What I am saying is there is more instability in Iraq because of us, because of our troops. They have become occupiers. This is the thing that worries me. That is why I think we have to change direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater obligation we have to the people of this Nation than to protect their freedom and their safety. We owe it to the public to pursue those who seek to destroy our way of life.

Democrat wartime President Franklin Roosevelt understood this when he said, ''When you see a rattlesnake poised to strike, you do not wait until he has struck before you crush him.''

Policies of appeasement did not work against Nazi Germany. They did not work against the Soviet Union, and they will most certainly not work against terrorists right now plotting violence and bloodshed against our citizens.

Our actions taken in Iraq and Afghanistan are aimed unequivocally at crushing global terrorism. We must complete our mission.

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

I would just point out to the Speaker that Franklin Roosevelt might have said that, but he waited till they attacked us at Pearl Harbor before he took any action. He tried to build up the forces, but certainly didn't take any military action until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor.

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

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

Almost, in fact a little bit more than 61 years ago, the 101st Airborne parachuted into Normandy. And a few miles away the Fourth Infantry Division was wading through bloody waters onto Utah Beach. And thousands of miles away, the First Marine Division was culminating a series of island operations, including Guadalcanal, Pelalieu and many others, very dangerous, very bloody. We call them the Greatest Generation. And you know, today, the 101st Airborne anchors the Sunni Triangle. The Fourth Infantry Division, including many of the grandchildren of those great members of the Greatest Generation, are in Baghdad. And the First Marine Division is out in that very dangerous al Anbar Province in towns called Ramadi and Fallujah. I call them the New Greatest Generation.

But there is a difference between them and their forefathers of the 101st and the Fourth Infantry Division and the First Marine Division, and that is that the Greatest Generation of World War II had a Congress that was united behind their mission. I think we owe it to this New Greatest Generation to unite behind their mission, and not just because it is their mission and we are Congress and we oversee national security, but because we gave them the mission. We voted overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives to go into Afghanistan and Iraq. We, not somebody else, we gave them the mission. They have carried out that mission. They have carried it out in thousands of firefights at 10,000-foot elevations in Afghanistan, taking down safehouses in Mosul and Tikrit and Fallujah and many other areas in Iraq, winning 45,000 bronze stars for valor and meritorious service, among many other medals; and you know, all the while taking on the enemy, they inoculated over 5 million children against diseases, re-stood up over 3,000 schools, built hundreds of hospitals, and they carried the free elections of the Afghan and Iraqi people on their shoulders. That is why we had free elections in those two countries.

Now, you know, when we started this thing, and if you look at the literature of al Qaeda and the terrorist organizations, they question the capability of the American troops. They no longer question that capability. Mr. Zarqawi does not question that capability. Saddam Hussein does not question that capability. They have been convinced of it in thousands of firefights. They don't question the troops' commitment to this mission. And the troops' commitment to this mission is manifested in reenlistments rates. For the Fourth ID, the Third ID, the 101st, the 10th Mountain Division, the First Marines, reenlistments, after multiple tours of more than 130 percent of the requirement.

They don't question the continued commitment of the President. They have seen this President go through highs and lows in the polls and continue his commitment to the mission that we launched together. The only question they have now is us. They question our commitment to this mission. And this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a chance to unite this House of Representatives by restating our commitment to this mission. Let's do it so that tonight, when those troops come home from their patrols and their recons and their convoys and they look at the news, they are going to say the United States House of Representatives, they stand with us.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The problem is, 42 percent of the people don't know what the mission is. When I talk to the young folks in the hospitals, they tell me their mission is to go out and find IEDs. That is explosive devices. Their mission is to be a target.

Hey, we all agree with everything that the gentleman from California said, Mr. Speaker. We agree. We support the troops. We have done everything we can do. It is the policy we disagree with. It is a change in direction we want. We are staying and we are paying and we are paying with troops' lives. We are paying with financial resources.

The first gulf war the United States paid $5 billion. We had 500,000 American troops. We had 160,000 coalition troops. President Bush I did a marvelous job, one of the finest international coalitions in the history of the United States. They paid and they produced and they supported. But he knew how far he could go. He understood the enemy and he understood what could be done. And he was willing to change direction. When they thought they had enough troops, General Schwartzkopf said he needed more troops, he put more troops on the ground.

So I am convinced all of us agree we want a solution. But the American troops, unfortunately, have become occupiers. And 80 percent of the Iraqis want us out of there. And I have a piece of paper here that the Vice President of Iraq, here, Tuesday night on the way home on Air Force One, President Bush said there are concerns about commitment in keeping our troops there. They are worried about it to a person. They said they will leave before capable.

Then the Associated Press reports, yesterday morning Iraqi's Vice President has asked President Bush for a timetable for withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq. And Iraq's Vice President's office said Vice President of Iraq made the request during his meeting with Bush on Tuesday when the U.S. President made a surprise visit. I supported him, the President said. Eighty percent of the Iraqi people want us out. They want to solve these problems themselves. The Americans cannot force democracy on Iraq.

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

Mr. Daniel E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, having returned from my fourth trip to Iraq over the Memorial Day break, I rise in support of H. Res. 861.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of America. I rise in support of our active troops and those who have given their lives and those who will give their lives 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 before victory.

Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have attacked our family, neighbors and friend 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 2001, 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 government decided to take the 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, civilian personnel and contractors from the Test and Evaluation Community 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 death—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. We will continue to lead 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. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

International Terrorism—when we discuss this very important issue—an issue of life and death—not just for each of us individually, but for our nation and way of life—it is imperative that we begin our discussion—at the beginning. And that beginning wasn't on 9-11! We've been under attack for at least 30 years.

We did not want this fight—we did not invite this fight—we did not wish to engage in this battle. However, once our enemy crossed over the line—confirmed for us and the world—that they were unwilling to respect international law, respect individual liberty, respect sovereignty of nations—and that they were willing and desirous of engaging in mortal battle—no other option was left to us or the civilized world.

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, on January 23, 2005, said: "We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology."

So, this discussion today comes down to a fundamental question—what is the appropriate strategy and tactic to adopt to win the War on Terror?

Will we withdraw and simply defend—a policy of isolation and containment—or will we aggressively combat terrorism—and take the battle to our enemy?

This war is unlike any other in history—without a doubt.

Our enemy has no single home. It recruits and trains its army from nations around the world. The only unifying element is hate—hate for the West—hate for democracy—hate for freedom of religion—hate for liberty.

The only message our enemy understands is force. Period. Terrorists don't negotiate—terrorists don't compromise—terrorists are not interested in peace. To them, that's weakness.

Thankfully we've stayed the course. Thankfully we've persevered in both Iraq and Afghanistan. The greatest threat to terrorism is freedom, liberty and democracy—in the Middle East and beyond.

Today the terrorists are truly on the run.

Last week U.S. and Iraqi forces eliminated Al Qaeda in Iraq's top terrorist—Abu Musab Al Zarqawi. This was accomplished with excellent intelligence—knowing where the bad guys were and when. And this information came from Iraqi civilians—that is a very positive sign.

This important step demonstrates many things: we will hunt down terrorists and eliminate them wherever they are hiding, the shackles of decades long terrorism are being removed from the Middle East, Iraqi security forces are stepping up to the challenge; Iraqi citizens want to be free of terrorists and they are not going to sit idly by.

Success breeds success.

Never has that been more evident than this past week.

While Zarqawi was eliminated—finding him brought a treasure trove of information allowing U.S. and Iraqi forces to dismantle many more pieces of Al Qaeda's puzzle.

Success breeds success.

Iraq just this past week selected 3 more officials—cabinet ministers—to serve in its standing government.

Success breeds success.

It is also important for us to recall and reiterate why we are engaged in this war.

It is imperative during this debate that we re-examine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Just a short look at recent history—just the last 27 years—vividly demonstrates the death, destruction and terror brought to Americans by our enemy.

November 4, 1979—Iranian radicals seized the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and held 53 hostages for 444 days.

April 18, 1983—Sixty-three people, including the CIA's Middle East directory, were killed when our U. S. Embassy in Beirut was bombed.

October 23, 1983—simultaneous suicide bomb attacks on American and French compounds in Beirut, Lebanon; killing 242 Americans and 58 French troops.

March 16, 1984—Islamic Jihad kidnapped and later murdered Political Officer William Buckley in Beirut, Lebanon.

October 7, 1985—Achille Lauro Hijacking—terrorists seized the Italian cruise liner and murdered one American invalid in a wheelchair.

April 5, 1986—Berlin Discotheque Bombing—Two U.S. soldiers were killed and 79 American servicemen were injured in a Libyan bomb attack in West Berlin, West Germany.

December 21, 1988—Pan Am 103 Bombing—Pan Am 103 blown up over Lockerbie, Scotland by bomb placed by Libyan terrorists—all 259 people on board were killed.

February 26, 1993—First World Trade Center Bombing—car bomb exploded in an underground garage killing 6 people and injuring over 1000.

November 13, 1995—car bomb explodes at U.S. military complex in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, killing one U.S. citizen, several foreign national employees of the U.S. government and over 40 others.

June 25, 1996—Khobar Towers Bombing—a truck bomb in Dhahran destroys Khobar Towers, a U.S. Air Force barracks, killing 19 U.S. military personnel and wounding 515 people, including 240 U.S. personnel.

August 7, 1998—U.S. Embassy Bombings in East Africa—two coordinated attacks on U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania—killing over 300.

October 12, 2000—Attack on U.S.S. Cole—a small dingy carrying explosives rammed the destroyer U.S.S. Cole, killing 17 sailors and injuring 39.

September 11, 2001—Terrorist Attacks on U.S. Homeland—Two hijacked airliners crashed into the twin towers of the World Trade Center. Soon thereafter, the Pentagon was struck by a third hijacked plane. A fourth hijacked plane, suspected to be bound for a high-profile target in Washington, crashed into a field in southern Pennsylvania. The attacks killed 3,025 U.S. citizens and other nationals.

Treating these incidents as crimes—not acts of war—and providing reactionary measures rather than moving pro actively—will not work. How do we know? Because that is precisely what we did for decades—and the consequence was 9–11.

The attacks we witnessed that day serve as a reminder of the dangers we face as a nation in a post-9/11 world. We can no longer expect oceans between us and our enemies to keep us safe.

Policy of containment has been proven to be a dismal failure.

Just as the battle in Afghanistan was not simply to remove the Taliban. The battle in Iraq was not simply to remove Saddam Hussein and his murderous regime.

One has to look no further than the action of our enemy to see that we are fighting those who want to bring their brand of terror and fear to our shores.

We must not forget those threats that have been disrupted here at home and on our allies: the West Coast Airliner Plot; The Heathrow Airport Plot; and The Jose Padilla Plot.

The campaign against the United States and its allies is ambitious, simple and clear.

Terrorists will stop at nothing to achieve their distorted sense of reality.

Now, we could have easily stayed out of this conflict . . .

However, giving terrorists free reign would not make us any safer—history has proven that.

The price would be more innocent lives lost—more bombings—and not an ounce of peace.

We must not be held hostage by terrorism—that is not living in liberty and freedom!

There are defining moments every generation must face. For this generation that defining moment is how we engage in this War on Terror—highlighted by a very different post 9–11 world. When we came to that defining moment—that tragic day—we, as a nation with our allies around the world, decided we would not allow terrorists to win.

The choice is clear, our resolve is clear. We will and must prevail.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have just two more speakers, the whip and then our majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. LUNGREN control the remaining 30 seconds of our time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished majority whip, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you for presiding over this important debate and for the opportunity to address the House as this debate nears its conclusion.

Let's be clear about what is at stake today as we debate this issue. Whether or not we are successful in winning the global war on terror will define the future, and it will define this generation in the eyes of future historians. Our resolve is being tested by clever enemies with primitive philosophies of religion and government. When my colleagues cast their vote today, they are sending a message about what they believe America's capable of doing and about whether the global war on totalitarianism is worth fighting.

Our actions here on the House floor are being watched not only by our enemies, but by our friends and allies as well. The message we send will be received by the coalition partners fighting with us, the people and leaders of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the Americans fighting for peace and freedom who believe in their mission. This vote, I know, is not being taken lightly, and believe me, it should not be taken lightly. The resolution we are considering is clear and unambiguous. We are declaring that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror.

□ 1030

This war is not a war of choice, but one initiated and sustained by the action of terrorists. It is being fought in many parts of the world with all the diplomatic, cultural, financial and, when absolutely necessary, military resources available to us. In places like Iraq and Afghanistan, terrorists have chosen to make a stand. They understand the only way they can defeat the United States is not in battle with our soldiers, who are the best in the world, but in the battle of public opinion. Information is the key weapon in that battle.

Over the week of Memorial Day, I was able to travel to both Afghanistan and Iraq to see again firsthand our Nation's efforts to combat terrorists and assist in the establishment of modern democracies. Universally in both countries, the people we talked to, including the leaders that we met with, told our delegation that withdrawing American troops before democracy has had a chance to take root would lead to disaster.

In Afghanistan, President Karzai believes that the southern part of the country is keeping a lid on the Taliban precisely because of the presence of our troops. He believes his countrymen uniquely understand how important it is that our soldiers, American soldiers, maintain a visible role, even as the day-to-day operations are often turned over to our NATO allies. And while we were there, our ambassador was able to report to President Karzai that both the Canadians and the Dutch had been vigorously and successfully engaged the day before. But President Karzai was equally vigorous in his sense that the commitment of America was the

commitment that the Afghan people were worried about.

Today we will tell our friend, President Karzai, that America will not abandon our Afghan friends, that we will not close that embassy again and lock the door and walk away for 10 years.

In Iraq, which al Qaeda has call the central front, and that is their quote, not mine, the central front in their war against the West, the sentiment for America to stay is even more pronounced. In Baghdad I spoke with Speaker Mashhadani, a Sunni politician, a leader who had been very opposed to the United States coming to Iraq, but now believes that the presence of the United States, again, until democracy takes root, is essential to the establishment of democracy in that country.

And while visiting the newly formed Kurdish regional government in Erbil, I spoke with those leaders who have recently put aside generations of differences in favor of a unified Iraq. Officials from the new Iraqi Government I met with gave me additional reasons to be hopeful for the future. These elected leaders are committed to governing. Their predecessors had been committed to a political goal in each case, to write a Constitution, to conduct a temporary election, to conduct a permanent election.

This government is the first democratically elected government in the history of not just the country of Iraq that has only been in existence since World War I, but the history of the people who live in this area have never before had a permanent democratically elected government. This government also happens to be a broad-based government that is committed to serve.

I have said many times before, as many have said on this floor in the last 2 days, that only the Iraqis are ultimately capable of solving their problems. The only way to solve them is through increased transparency, economic reform, and democratic participation in government. None of this will be easy, and I have nothing but admiration for Iraqi leaders who are undertaking these tasks in the face of enormous personal risk.

It is in the context of this personal risk that I appeal to my colleagues, who live peacefully and safely in the world's oldest constitutional democracy, the United States of America, not to turn their backs on the leaders of the world's newest democracy.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous consent requests.

I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put my statement in the RECORD on House Resolution 861.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker today we mourn the death of the 2,500th American soldier in Iraq and are disgusted by the headline in yesterday's Washington Post stating, ''Iraq Amnesty Plan May Cover Attacks on U.S. Military.'' With another American soldier killed and the news of Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki seeking amnesty for insurgents who have killed and maimed U.S. troops, this House debates H. Res. 861, a meaningless, nonbinding Republican resolution that is a political document designed as a partisan campaign ploy, not a serious attempt to address the failings and mismanagement of this disastrous Iraq policy. Our troops in Iraq are in harm's way, they are sacrificing tremendously for all Americans and the Iraqi people, and this Republican Congress honors their sacrifice with a farcical debate—it is shameful.

A majority of Americans know that the Bush administration's Iraq policy is strategically bankrupt and it has put U.S. troops in the untenable position of refereeing an Iraqi civil war. It is a policy that has made America less safe and more at risk in a dangerous world.

Earlier this week President Bush returned from a 5-hour visit to Baghdad and said, ''I sense something different happening in Iraq.'' This profoundly unenlightened observation after 5 hours inside the safety of the ''green zone'' contrasts with U.S. troops who are on their third tour of duty in the midst of a chaotic, deadly and deteriorating civil war. This White House has made ''victory'' the basis for an end to the U.S. occupation of Iraq, but the only exit strategy this president has thus far developed was his own—for his departure from Baghdad after only 5 hours.

Outside of the safety and security of Baghdad's ''green zone,'' there is ''something different happening'' and U.S. troops are surrounded by it—the depravity and brutality of an Iraqi civil war. Murderous militias, government sponsored death squads, paramilitary brigades, insurgents and organized criminals who kidnap and kill children—these are the forces that control neighborhoods, rule the streets and are on the payroll of Iraq's Ministry of the Interior.

Let me cite a May 7, 2006 article from the Los Angeles Times to underscore how different Iraq is today, ''More Iraqi civilians were killed in Baghdad during the first 3 months of this year than in any time since the toppling of Saddam Hussein's regime—at least 3,800, many of them found hogtied and shot execution-style. Others were strangled, electrocuted, stabbed, garroted or hanged. Some died in bombings. Many bore signs of torture such as bruises, drill holes, burn marks, gouged eyes or severed limbs.''

This horrific depravity does not reflect a global war on terror, it is a civil war and American troops have no business separating religious groups determined to kill each other in order to settle old scores or accumulate political power. ''Now the killings are systematic, personal. Masked gunman storm into houses, and the victims—the majority of them Sunnis—are never seen alive. Such killings now claim nine times more lives than car bombings, according to figures provided by a high-ranking U.S. military official, who released them only on the condition of anonymity,'' the same Los Angeles Times article states.

Is this the vital American interest for which 2,500 Americans have given their lives? If we don't stop these barbarous murders in Iraq does it really mean they will then bring their torture and executions to America's towns and neighborhoods as the Republican scare tactics purport? Of course not; this simple-minded ''fight them over there so we don't have to fight them here'' Republican rhetoric reflects their blindness to the real situation on the ground in Iraq. Iraq's endless domestic atrocities and brutality is their domestic tragedy, not a global phenomenon, but the Republicans are more interested in using this argument in their political campaigns than they are in bringing our troops home from this civil war safely.

We know that President Bush's stated premise for the war in Iraq, weapons of mass destruction, was a fabrication and a deceptive exaggeration. But is it now the duty of U.S. soldiers to police the death-squads that are operating within the Iraqi police and committing gross human rights violations? Is it the duty of our brave troops to disarm Shiite militias that are extensions of the Iraqi Government and responsible for imposing religious law and hunting down violators of their sect of faith? Absolutely not.

The mantra from President Bush and the Republican Congress is ''stay the course.'' It is an outrageous and irrational strategy that reflects the bankruptcy and myopic nature of this administration's assessment of the situation inside Iraq. An occupied Iraq will keep U.S. troops as targets of Iraq's nationalist insurgents and never allow that country to escape the current security crisis, political crisis and financial crisis. Only if this occupation ends is Iraq capable of truly being a sovereign nation that is responsible for its own problems and future.

Instead of allowing Iraq to determine its own destiny, President Bush has made an indefinite U.S. military commitment to Iraq, almost, assuring tens of thousands of additional U.S. soldiers will be sent to confront Iraq's problems. Since U.S. forces are in the fourth year of a war that was intended to last only months and the concept of a U.S. victory over all the various factions of murderers, criminals and armed insurgents is delusional, one can only surmise that U.S. troops will be in Iraq when the Bush administration leaves office in January 2009. For this reason, Congress needs to dictate a clear position that will allow for the redeployment of U.S. troops within the region to defend U.S. interests and refocus our attention to the war on terrorism. This will allow for a restoration of Iraqi sovereignty and the opportunity for Iraqis to determine their own future.

The Bush administration's mismanagement of its Iraq policy from a military and geopolitical perspective is only exacerbated by the tremendous investment of U.S. tax dollars that have yielded such unremarkable results. To date, more than $320 billion has been borrowed and spent in Iraq. Every single dollar has been added to our Nation's national debt with the burden for the financial cost of this war on the backs of all of our children and the grandchildren, including those of the very soldiers who are now fighting and sacrificing in Iraq. Image, this Congress and White House have looked the other way as almost $9 billion has simply disappeared into a system in which corruption is endemic and financial mismanagement the norm. Every American should feel betrayed by this Congress and its

disregard for oversight and accountability with regard to the hard-earned tax dollars of U.S. citizens.

As Americans fight and die in Iraq and Americans pay hundreds of billions of dollars for this war, it is remarkable to hear the words of Iraq's Prime Minister al-Maliki. President Bush earlier this week, in a moment of poetry, looked into the prime minister's eyes. It was unclear what the president saw, but we do know the words the prime minister has used on June 1, 2006 to describe U.S. troops when he said, ''They (troops in the American led coalition) crush them (Iraqi civilians) with their vehicles and kill them just on suspicion. This is completely unacceptable.'' The Prime Minister called the U.S. violence against Iraqis a ''daily phenomenon.'' Now, President Bush's soul-mate wants to provide amnesty for those who murdered and maimed as many as 20,000 U.S. troops. Is this why the Republicans in Congress want to stay the course in Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, there is a civil war—a 21st Century civil war—raging in Iraq. It is based on religion and historical events that can never be remedied by 130,000 U.S. troops whether they remain as an occupying force for 1 more year or 50 years. What we have achieved in Iraq is certain. The end of Saddam's regime, three elections, an Iraqi constitution, a new permanent government and the training of more than 250,000 Iraq security forces are the frequently stated highlights of this war. These achievements are the sole result of U.S. troops and their sacrifice and bravery. Yet, this mission is confronting a reality that is darker and much more ominous in large part because this ill-conceived pre-emptive war has unleashed forces that are beyond the control of U.S. troops that are antithetical to U.S. interests.

On May 26, 2006, Tom Lasseter reported for Knight Ridder that ''Southern Iraq, long touted as a peaceful region that's likely to be among the first areas returned to Iraqi control, is now dominated by Shiite Muslim warlords and militiamen who are laying the groundwork for an Islamic fundamentalist government, say senior British and Iraqi officials in the area.''

Even with 130,000 U.S. troops and thousands more from coalition partners, Iraq is not on a path that will yield a free, democratic state in the Middle East. The occupation has cleared the way for the establishment of a theocratic order that will ensure clerics and militiamen dictate obedience to religious law—Sharia law—with absolutely zero tolerance for any form of pluralism. The current situation in Basra only highlights the incomprehensible ignorance of the designers of U.S. Iraq policy to consider the powerful cultural and religious forces the U.S. invasion of Iraq unleashed. Tragically, the 2,500 U.S. troops who have been killed, the almost 20,000 who have been wounded and the tens of thousands of Iraqi women, children and men who have been killed—often times brutally—have suffered the consequences of President Bush's Iraq policy.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 861 purposely avoids the dangerous reality and dismisses the tremendous challenges confronting U.S. troops in Iraq and America's real challenges with regard to terrorism and extremist threats. This resolution is a dishonest attempt to inject raw politics into a congressional debate that will do nothing to keep America secure or bring U.S. troops home safe and soon. As we look to the future, my intention is to continue to support a comprehensive strategy to combat terrorism, keep America secure from real strategic threats and to redeploy U.S. troops from Iraq's civil war. All Americans support our troops, but it is time for Congress to support a policy that ensures U.S. troops have an exit strategy from Iraq. This resolution should be defeated and I will vote against it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to serve as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee for 28 years here in the House of Representatives and to often engage in debates over important issues of national defense and national security here on the floor of this Chamber. It has always been my view that partisanship should end at the water's edge, and that all of us here in this body have a solemn obligation to consider the best interests of the Nation as we debate military involvement, especially at times when U.S. troops are involved in ongoing military actions.

With that said, let me make two points about this debate today over H. Res. 861. First, the House Leadership has brought this Resolution before the full membership of the House with the assertion that it will launch a full and open debate on U.S. policy in Iraq. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the process of drafting the Resolution we are to consider today was totally closed to members of the Democratic party, and that the expressed intent of the Republican Leadership, as betrayed by the memorandum that was sent to Republican members by the Majority Leader, was to demonstrate that the Democrats are interested in ''conceding defeat on the battlefield'' and that we as a party ''sheepishly dismiss the challenges that America faces in a post 9/11 world.'' Mr. Speaker, no political party has a monopoly on patriotism, and I can state with certainty that no member of either political party has any interest in conceding defeat or in ignoring real threats to our national security. This type of partisanship is unnecessary at any time, but especially in this debate today.

Secondly, if we are to have a full and open debate over U.S. policy in Iraq, it should be an ongoing activity here in the House, where we legitimately share the constitutional responsibility to ''provide for the common defense'' and to provide the funds necessary to adequately defend our Nation against aggression and any threats to the security of our people. As any observer of the House of Representatives knows, since the start of the war in Iraq we have rarely debated the merits of our policy in Iraq, and we have conducted very little oversight as we have spent $318 billion, as 2,500 American soldiers have been killed, and more than 18,000 troops have been wounded in battle. On the eve of the 2002 elections we were pushed into a premature debate and vote authorizing the use of force, based on what we now know was inaccurate or overstated information about the capability and intentions of the Iraqi government. Since the start of the military action in Iraq three years ago, we have been called together in this Chamber to debate resolutions commending the abilities and the bravery of our troops, which all of us in this Chamber were united in approving. But we have not, Mr. Speaker, conducted what I believe is the proper level of oversight of the decisions that took us to war, the decisions about troop levels at the outset of the conflict, the post conflict mistakes that were made, the handling of the insurgency and the overall plan for victory and redeployment of our troops. It is not sufficient to bring these occasional resolutions to the floor, drafted by the Republican caucus, intended to express political talking points rather than stimulate genuine discussion about our policy in Iraq.

So as we debate this particular Resolution today it must be said that all Members of this House support the troops who have been engaged in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, and that we are all encouraged when terrorists such as Abu Musab al-Zarqawi are brought to justice. To imply any different in today's debate would be an injustice.

But that is not all that this Resolution states. Nor is it all that it implies by the words that are printed in it or, even more revealingly, by the things that are omitted from it. Again, this is why it is inappropriate to draft a Resolution of this importance without any input or consultation with Members of the Democratic Party, and why this exercise today is not, in my judgment, worthy of the trust that the American people put in their Representatives here in the House.

The Resolution we are debating today, Mr. Speaker, misstates the mission of the United States actions in Iraq—implying very directly that there was a direct relationship between the 9/11 attacks and our invasion of Iraq, in addition to ignoring the use of the WMD threat in justifying the invasion to our coalition partners and to the American people. Beyond that, the only actions it says that we, as the House of Representatives, resolve to promote are actions that support the status quo, inferring that the Members of this Chamber are clearly satisfied with the status quo and believe the Administration's policy is headed in the right direction. I would contend, Mr. Speaker, that very few of the Members of this Chamber actually are satisfied with the status quo, and certainly it is clear that the American people, whom we represent individually and collectively in this House, believe we need to change course and adopt a new strategy in Iraq.

That is precisely what I believe the House should be doing today, instead of debating the merits of a partisan measure that effectively congratulates Secretary Rumsfeld for pursuing a responsible course of action. We need to change direction. Our strategy in Iraq is not working. It will not produce the victory we all say we believe in. Nor will it allow us to see far enough ahead to the time when we can legitimately redeploy our troops and bring them home. What has been needed, and what is still required, is accountability, and we can only accomplish that, Mr. Speaker, by greater oversight, more thoughtful questioning of the decisions that are made at the Pentagon and in the field, and more openness in considering new directions and new strategies, even if it risks conceding that some of the actions this Administration has taken have been wrong. The Resolution we are addressing today, Mr.

Chairman, allows for no such questioning and it only assumes that we are all committed to a strategy that has put us in a position from which no one can say how long it will be . . . a year, two years, five years . . . before our mission is accomplished and our troops can return home.

It is not irresponsible for us to suggest that other members of our coalition in Iraq should be assuming a greater share of the burden. It is not irresponsible for us to suggest that we should be scaling back our role, accelerating the training of the Iraqi forces and encouraging the new Iraqi leaders to understand that they need to take charge of their own government, their own security and their own economy. We are helping, and should continue to help, restore the power grids, the water supplies and the oil production facilities so the Iraqi people will see signs of progress that thus far have disappointed them. We must continue to encourage the new Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki and his government in its campaign for national reconciliation and in its effort to disarm the militias, reduce the sectarian violence and bring social and economic stability to the nation. I remain hopeful about the future of a Democratic Iraq, but as we work with the new government to accomplish these objectives, Mr. Speaker, I believe it may be time to take the training wheels off, and to communicate directly to the Iraqis that they are running their own nation, as unsteady as it may seem in the near future.

But above all, what we should be doing today in the House of Representatives is sending a clear signal to the American people and to the international community that we are in favor of changing course . . . of moving beyond the status quo and adopting a new and more successful strategy to achieve a peaceful and stable Iraq.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, unquestioningly endorses the status quo, and for that reason I cannot and will not support it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the outstanding service provided by our men and women in the armed forces for the terrific job they do for us across the globe each and every day, often in very difficult and dangerous circumstances. This is especially true today in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq.

Active military, guard, and reserves forces from western Wisconsin have answered the call to service in the most recent conflict with global terrorism. I have been to numerous deployment ceremonies and witnessed the anguish in the hearts and faces of family and friends as they say goodbye to their loved ones being deployed abroad for lengthy stays. I have also been to numerous welcome home ceremonies to honor their service and to thank them for their sacrifice.

During my three visits to Iraq, I met with our military command and troops in the field, as well as numerous Iraqi leaders and civilians. I can honestly say that nothing made me prouder to be an American than seeing the performance of our troops in the field. They are well-trained, well-motivated and an inspiration to us all. They are, in short, the best America has to offer. I am sure everyone here today wishes them godspeed and safe travels as they carry out their missions.

Specifically, I would like to take a moment to recognize the soldiers from the Third Congressional District of Wisconsin who have lost their lives in the Iraq war: First Lieutenant Jeremy Wolfe of Menomonie, Major Christopher Splinter of Platteville, Private First Class Bert Hoyer of Ellsworth, Private First Class Andrew Halverson of Muscoda, Staff Sergeant Todd Olson of Loyal, Staff Sergeant Andrew Bossert of Fountain City, Specialist Charles Kaufman of Fairchild, Sergeant First Class Trevor Diesing of Plum City, Benjamin Smith of Hudson, Private First Class Anthony Gaunky of Sparta, Sergeant Andy Allen Stevens of Tomah, and Petty Officer 2nd Class Jaime S. Jaenke of Bay City. I would also like to recognize Christopher Lem of Lyndon Station who lost his life while working in Iraq as an independent contractor.

Furthermore, I would like to highlight the good work of the 128th infantry division out of western Wisconsin; the 1158th transportation company out of Tomah, Black River Falls, and Beliot; the Wisconsin Army National Guards' 229th Engineer Company out of Prairie du Chien and Platteville; the 829th Engineer Detachment out of Richland Center; the Army Reserve's 652nd Engineer Company out of Ellsworth; and the 32nd Engineer Company out of Onalaska. These units have served or are serving in Iraq, and I am extraordinarily proud of their service to our country.

But as good and capable as our troops are, it is incumbent upon us policy-makers to do everything in our power to get the policies right. We must ensure that they are fighting on our behalf for the right reasons and with the support and resources they need to do their job as safely and effectively as possible.

That's why this discussion we're having today is a disappointment. This resolution is a political document timed just before the fall elections rather than a serious substantive debate about our involvement in Iraq, Afghanistan and across the globe. Why else would the majority republican party prevent amendments from being offered or even the right of the others to offer an alternative resolution. Such an alternative resolution would more honestly focus on the shortcomings of this administration's policies, which has been highlighted by numerous retired military officers in recent months. Only through an honest assessment of those shortcomings will we have the ability to find the solutions and make adjustments to the goals being pursued.

As someone who supported the Iraq resolution in the fall of 2002, I believed it was important that we get weapons inspection teams back in Iraq to check on the status of Saddam Hussein's WMD capability. I also believed at the time that Hussein would not allow inspection teams back in unless there was a credible threat of force hanging over his head.

To this day, those who opposed the resolution have not been able to explain how they would have accomplished getting inspection teams back in Iraq or whether they viewed that as an important objective.

After we were successful in getting inspection teams back in, however, I led the effort in congress, with representative Sherrod Brown, to send the president a letter signed by 150 of our colleagues to give the inspection teams more time to do their job. At that time, we were informed in intelligence briefings that we were cooperating with those inspection teams by directing them to suspected sites of WMD. They, however, were not finding what the president suspected Hussein was hiding.

I felt increasingly uncomfortable with what I perceived to be faulty intelligence information given to us members of congress and the manipulation of intelligence to fit a preconceived ideological outcome.

Rather than have the intelligence facts shape our policy, I believe today that it was preconceived notions or ideology that distorted the intelligence to make the case for war. Even former Secretary of State Colin Powell has acknowledged his disappointment with the intelligence information he used to make the case before the United Nations. Numerous intelligence officers and State Department Officials have expressed similar reservations.

I also felt increasingly concerned about the President's haste to go to war, the lack of real effort to build international support, the lack of a plan for the day after or even a clear exit strategy once we got there. We now know by many retired generals, the president ignored the advice of our military leaders. My big regret is in believing the president when he said that the decision to go to war would be a matter of last resort. That is what the resolution required but instead the president ordered the inspection teams out of Iraq, even though they wanted to stay and finish their work, and then he ordered our military in. Today, our troops and our country are paying a very high price in loss of lives and resources due to this rush to war.

I was concerned that the main threat against the United States, Al Qaeda, was still a global threat with global reach, and that the person who was directly responsible for 9–11, Osama Bin Laden, was still at large and safe. I believed the President was taking his eye off the ball in Afghanistan and not doing everything in our power to bring those responsible for 9–11 to justice. It sends a terrible message to would-be terrorists who may be interested in striking us that all they have to do is go in hiding and lie low until we get distracted on another adventure.

Instead, the President should have, with the support of the American people and international community which we enjoyed at the time, made it our mission to never rest, never sleep until those responsible for 9–11 were brought to justice. Instead he diverted precious resources and personnel from Afghanistan and redirected them into Iraq. As a consequence, Osama Bin Laden is still at large, the Taliban are reconstituting themselves and Al Qaeda remains a global threat.

But we are where we are today. The question now is how do we move forward and what is at stake. Now that we have gone into Iraq, I believe the outcome in Iraq is important, not only for the Iraqi people, to whom we owe a duty to be responsible, but also for the region and for our Nation's long-term security interest. If the Iraqi people are successful in establishing a representative government, a government that respects human rights, religious tolerance, minority rights and the empowerment of women in their society, then Iraq could become a powerful model for change and reform in a region of the world that's in desperate need of reform.

I believe that a precipitous withdrawal from Iraq today will leave chaos, bloodshed and civil war in our wake. I believe that setting an artificial time for withdrawal will force our policy to merely revolve around that date rather than on the mission to be accomplished. And I've been informed by our military command in Iraq as well as our troops, that they do not desire a date certain because we could be setting them up for failure. They fear that conditions could change on the ground that they have no control over which might make adhering to that date difficult or ill-advised. They do not want artificial dates for the sake of political expediency.

I also believe, however, that this must be a crucial year of transition for us. Now that the Iraqis have established a coalition government and now that we have helped train over 250,000 Iraqi security forces, now is the time to put pressure on the Iraqi people to take control of their own future, through self-government and security responsibilities. We cannot do this for them; we cannot stay there indefinitely as the President proposes; we cannot want a free, stable and secure Iraq more than the Iraqi people want it. Such a change in tactics will enable us to begin the redeployment of our troops first within Iraq, off the front lines, then within the region and eventually back home to their families. It's time for a responsible and successful exit strategy to be implemented. In short, it's time to take the training wheels off.

There have been recent successes in Iraq that we all can applaud. Thanks should be given to our troops in their successful campaign against Abu Musab Al Zarqawi, the notorious and ruthless terrorist whose goal was to create chaos and destruction and fan the flames of civil war.

The Iraqis should be commended for finally, 5 months after national elections, forming a coalition government in which to govern, as well as making the important appointments to the interior and defense ministries.

Yet, even though our forces have proven they can kill the likes of Zarqawi, the question remains whether we can defeat Zarqawism? That is a question that should be discussed and debated.

Purple fingers alone do not make a democracy. Democratic institution building is vital, yet this administration is slashing funding for these programs dedicated to creating viable, long-lasting democratic institutions in Iraq. Getting support for the new Iraqi government from the United Arab League and the international community is also crucial to Iraq's ultimate success or failure. But again, it is difficult to work together and leave together when you didn't go in together.

Clearly, current conditions do not lend for much optimism. Over three years into this conflict, electricity generation is still below prewar conditions. Oil production is still below prewar conditions. Access to safe, clean drinking water is still below prewar conditions. The level of violence against coalition forces and the Iraqi people are at an all time high. Sectarian militias within the country and police forces and growing in numbers and strength. Unemployment, at 45 percent, is at an all time high which creates abject poverty and provides fertile ground for militia recruitment and more sectarian violence throughout the country.

Crime and corruption is rampant and increasing. Iraqi reconstruction is way behind schedule and infected with corruption and fraud. In my last visit to Iraq in October of 2005, I specifically sought explanations for the administration's failure to account for 9 billion dollars of missing reconstruction funds. No explanation could be given.

We're losing approximately 600 military personnel every month due to death or injuries. The administration is literally breaking our military with no plan to save it. We are spending 9 billion a month in Iraq with no plan on how to pay for it other than more borrowing and spending and legacy of debt for our children to inherit.

If there is a big winner in Iraq, it is Iran. The record high oil prices that Iraq helped bring is directly benefiting Iran. Iran continues down the path of developing nuclear cap ability because we have no leverage over them. Iran's influence grows in the region with the majority Shiite population in southern Iraq and their support of Hamas who recently won Palestinian elections.

What our involvement in the Middle East clearly demonstrates is the need for a new energy policy for a new century so we can break our dependence on foreign oil. Today we are financing both sides of global terror, the huge costs of our military excursions but also, through the petro-dollars flowing to many regimes in the Middle East, to charities and schools that support the teaching of radical Islam and helps turn a new generation of young people against us in the region. And again, there is no plan by the administration for a new direction.

Equally disturbing is a recent study that shows that anti-Americanism is rampant and growing throughout the world, not just throughout the Arab and Muslim world but also in those countries that have been traditional friends and allies of the United States. No matter how good and capable our military is, we cannot fight this battle against global terror without help and assistance in the international community.

And still, here today, there is no plan by this administration to turn these conditions around. Iraq and these other challenging issues deserve an honest and open debate. Unfortunately, that opportunity was taken from us today by the majority who would rather whitewash conditions and pretend we're heading in the right direction. The American people deserve better than this, our troops and their families deserve better than this and this Congress deserves better than this. We must reassert our role as a co-equal branch of government, capable of conducting proper oversight, demanding accountability of this and future administrations, and willing to make policy changes to address and overcome the challenges we face today.

I end as I began, by offering heartfelt thanks and undying admiration for our men and women in uniform for their service to our country. May God provide his special blessings and care for those who fell in the line of duty. And may God continue to bless these United States of America.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me go over what I said before.

All of us applaud the elections. All of us applaud the fact that Zarqawi was caught and the way he was caught, using Iraqis, giving information to Iraqis, and the United States operating and going in and eliminating Zarqawi.

The problem is because of the way we handled this at first, it got out of hand, and United States forces had to use overwhelming force in many cases. Fallujah, for instance, they went in and put 300,000 people outside their homes. Only 100,000 have come back.

Now, in Anbar Province they have no electricity at all. They have 2 million people there. They have zero projects in Anbar Province. That is the province where we had the most trouble. And then as I go through the liturgy of things that have happened with 130,000 troops there, this is the point: in May of 2003, we had 3,000 insurgents. In May of 2006, we have 20,000 insurgents. Now, we are there. The United States forces are occupying Iraq. The estimated number of foreign fighters in 2003 was 100. This comes from our intelligence people. And today there is an estimated 1,500. I think it is a little less than that, but it is estimated at 1,500.

Now, think. We have got 130,000 troops. They supposedly have 265,000, police and army trained. They have more confidence in their army than they have in the United States forces; yet there are only 1,000 foreign fighters. We have sectarian violence which is, in my estimation, a civil war and we are caught in between. Our troops have become the targets in a civil war.

All of us want this thing to be resolved. This is absolutely essential to stability in the free world because of the energy that comes from the Middle East. But how we do it is what we disagree with. As long as American troops are there, we actually are attracting terrorism.

Do you know who wants us in Iraq? al Qaeda wants us in Iraq. Iran wants us in Iraq. North Korea wants us in Iraq. Russia wants us in Iraq, and China wants us in Iraq. Why? Because we are depleting our financial resources and our human resources. Because we are destroying the future viability of the Army. We have $50 billion in backlog right now for the Army, equipment that needs to be repaired. We have had to lower the standards for the Army, taking category 4s, which we did not take for a long time. We have had Air Force people and Navy people we transferred over to the Army because they do not have enough people. And we can talk about reenlistment, but they had no reeinlistment bonuses that I know of during the old days. They now have up to $150,000 that they pay people in reenlistment bonuses. So we are having real problems. I agree the troops are doing everything they can. Their mission is actually accomplished.

But let me go on. Monthly attacks on oil and gas assets: there were five in 2003, and it has gotten worse in 2006. Oil production is less than the prewar level. Oil production. Somebody complained not long ago that electricity doesn't make any difference. Let me tell you something. If you have ever gone without electricity in your house, you know that it makes a difference.

I am just saying that we have 130,000 troops there, and it is not going well. That is what I am saying. I am saying we have a problem, and our troops are not able to solve the problem. We have become the enemy. It has got to be won on the ground.

We are giving a microphone to be people like Zarqawi. We talk about Zarqawi. We talk about all these foreign leaders and what they say. Why should we pay attention to what they say? Why should we pay attention when Zarqawi says they are going to drive us out of there? That is just rhetoric. That is only rhetoric.

The only way it is going to be won is a change of direction. I gave some examples before. When President Reagan went into Beirut, he went in with 1,400 people, and he decided he needed to change direction. When he had the biggest tax cut in history at that time, he decided he had to make some adjustments later on. He changed direction.

When President Bush went into Somalia, President Clinton changed direction in Somalia because we made a mistake and we went after Adid. There are times in our history when we have to be big enough as a country to change direction.

All of us want the same thing: stability in the Middle East. All of us want to find a way to stabilize the Middle East. If we stay, we are going to pay; and we are going to pay long term. After the Vietnam War, it cost us through the Reagan administration to pay for it. Now, I voted against every tax cut because I felt very strongly that we couldn't fight a war and cut taxes. Now, there is an argument about that and you can argue about the benefit of the tax cut. But you cannot fight a war and have tax cuts. And we will have spent $450 billion by the end of this fiscal year.

My proposal, if anybody has read, is to redeploy and be ready. Redeploy to the periphery. Now, we went after Zarqawi. What happened when we went after Zarqawi? The Iraqis reported to the Iraqis, and then the Iraqis reported to the United States forces and they worked together. This did not come from inside Iraq. This came from outside Iraq. This was the periphery. The F–16s came from outside of the country to go after him. And this was not something that just happened overnight. This was a long-term thing that they had been working on for a long time.

So in my estimation, the only way we can change things in Iraq is to change direction. It has to be changed on the ground. What we say here today, as President Abraham Lincoln said in the Gettysburg Address, is going to mean very little. It will get lost in the rhetoric. What means something is what happens on the ground. All of us support the troops. If you vote for the appropriation bill, the defense appropriation bill, you vote to support the troops. If you voted for the Armed Services bill, you voted to support the troops.

I believe this resolution, if you vote for it, you are voting to support a failed policy wrapped in illusion. And I would recommend to the Members they vote against this resolution.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished majority leader (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

This week the House has engaged in an important debate on the war in Iraq and how best to combat terrorism in a post-9/11 world. And there are major differences between those of us who support a strong national defense and national security policy and understand what we have at stake and those who would prefer to retreat from the world stage and attempt to manage the threat of terrorism and the danger that it poses.

During the 1990s, the enemies of freedom used terror and violence in futile attempts to intimidate the United States and the cause of freedom. I will remind all of my colleagues that on February 26, 1993, we had the first World Trade Center bombing. It killed six people and injured more than 1,000 people. And on June 25, 1996, a U.S. facility in Saudi Arabia, the Khobar Towers, was bombed, killing 20 people and injuring some 372 more. On June 7, 1998, our embassy in Kenya was bombed, killed 213 people and injured 5,000 people. And on June 7, 1998, the same day, our embassy in Tanzania was bombed, killed 11 people, injured 68 more. On October 12, 2000, the USS *Cole* was bombed, killing 17 of our sailors and injuring 39 more.

What was our response? During the 1990s, world leaders looked at the mounting threat of terrorism, looked up, looked away, and hoped the problem would go away. But what happened on September 11, 2001? 3,000 Americans were killed by these same terrorists. And in a post-9/11 world, looking up, looking away, and hoping the problem would go away is no longer the answer.

That is why we are having this important debate here on the floor today. The American public deserves to hear how their elected leaders will respond to international terrorism and those enemies who seek to destroy our American way of life.

□ 1045

Will we fight or will we retreat? That is the question that is posed to us. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle often refer to Iraq as a distraction.

They have called Operation Iraqi Freedom a war of choice that isn't part of the real war on terror. Someone should tell that to al Qaeda. Let's be clear here. Those who say this is a war of choice are nothing more than wrong. This is a war of necessity that we must fight.

But you don't have to believe me. Just listen to al Qaeda's own leader, their number two leader. Ayman al Zawahiri knows how important the future of Iraq is to his cause. In a 6,000-word letter to al Qaeda's then commander in Iraq, the recently eliminated Zarqawi, he made clear that the terrorists view Iraq as a central battlefield in the global war on terror.

For some reason, this brazen declaration from one of our nemesis about Iraq's importance hasn't registered with many opponents of the war who insist on conceding defeat and withdrawing. If the terrorists tell us directly they see Iraq as a central front on their violent ambitions across the globe, should we dismiss it? Should we dismiss their claims and simply wait for them to attack America?

Operation Iraqi Freedom was hardly a war of choice. Saddam was already a menace and a threat to international order when he ordered several divisions of the Iraqi army into Kuwait in 1990. He routinely supported and openly encouraged acts of terrorism. He relentlessly persecuted and tortured his own civilian population, including Shiias, Sunnis, Kurds and others. He engaged in a multi-billion dollar scandal involving a number of our allies aimed at thwarting the sanctions that were put in place after the gulf war, and abusing the Oil-for-Food Program, thus causing even greater harm to his own people.

He refused to disclose and foreswear his maniacal pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, and he ignored international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council. Saddam made the case for his ouster better than anyone else could.

President Bush said, on the eve of the American-led invasion, that we would meet the threat before it became imminent, so that we would not have to meet it later with armies of firefighters, police, doctors and others on the streets of our own cities.

September 11 made it clear that we could no longer afford to ignore madmen who threaten our peace and stability. We can no longer let rogue regimes go unchecked and unchallenged.

And because of the combination of modern technology and a murderous ideology, we can no longer count on vast oceans or our own military supremacy to keep America safe. The enemy we must confront does not accept political negotiations or coexistence. The aims of our enemies are clear, to destroy anyone who stands for values, beliefs or political systems which are contrary to their warped and repressive ideology.

Their aims are to destroy the cause of freedom and democracy itself. That is why retreat is not an option in Iraq. As part of the global war on terror, the stakes for the American people are too great. The action we took in Iraq was in the best interests of the American people and the world community.

The events of 9/11 demonstrated that we had to show our own resolve as the world's premier defender of freedom and liberty before such ideals were

preyed upon rather than after standing witness to their demise at the hands of our enemies.

Some of my friends on the other side have called the war in Iraq a failed effort. This is curious, given the constant drumbeat of progress since the toppling of the Hussein regime. More children are going to school now in Iraq than at any point in their country's history. The Iraqis have held successful elections, drafted and ratified a national constitution, and have put together the first sovereign, free and unified government in Iraq's history.

Just in the past week we have seen several positive developments in Iraq and the global war on terror. The U.S. military forces eliminated the terrorist al Zarqawi, al Qaeda's top commander in Iraq, and a cold-blooded killer.

The Iraqi Government named new Interior, Defense and Security Ministers as part of their new government's continued progress. And President Bush traveled to Baghdad to meet the newly appointed Prime Minister, Mr. Maliki, to discuss our growing partnership with our new democratic ally.

Yes, there have been some setbacks. No war is easy, but an honest account of our effort must acknowledge the staying power of the insurgency and the support it has received from foreign forces. But the effort and savagery of these insurgents and their sponsors only underscores our progress and the importance of this effort in the global war on terror.

If we had adopted the irrational policies of those who lack commitment to winning this fight, the terrorist, al Zarqawi, would still be alive and plotting attacks against Iraqis and Americans.

Defeating repressive, radical terrorists and their allies is our defining task of the 21st century. Crushing their deadly and poisonous ideology, freeing from tyranny the millions threatened with its bondage, is an effort which the United States and her allies are uniquely suited.

We are the primary target of radical terrorists, and the leader of nations with the capability and fortitude to wage a prolonged fight against these people. In my view, we must not shy away, if only so our children and their children may live in peace.

The American people are understandably concerned about our mission in a post-Saddam Iraq. There have been many tough days since Iraq's liberation and transition to a sovereign democracy. Advancing freedom and building democracies in a part of the world that has known nothing but tyranny is a difficult task. But achieving victory there and gaining a democratic ally in the region will be the best gift of security we can give to future generations of Americans and Iraqi people who have longed to rid themselves of tyranny and oppression.

The world scoffed at Ronald Reagan when he said, tear down this wall. They said communism could never be replaced by freedom. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Reagan was right. And the editorial writers and many in Congress back then were wrong. It is that same faith in humanity, that same faith in freedom that compels us to win in Iraq and to win the global war on terror. Freedom wins. And we will win, because Ronald Reagan noted at the Brandenburg Gate, freedom trumps those ancient hatreds. The freedom to raise your family, the freedom to walk your kids to school, the freedom to live in peace. As Ronald Reagan said, it is always freedom that is the victor.

President John Kennedy said once so eloquently, the cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission.

This week's debate has given all of us an opportunity to answer a fundamental question, are we going to confront the threat of terrorism and defeat it, or will we relent and retreat in the hope that it just goes away?

Achieving victory is our only option. And for the sake of the American people and our kids and theirs, we have no choice but to confront these terrorists, win the war on terror, and spread freedom and democracy around the world.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq reached another troubling milestone yesterday with the announcement that 2,500 American soldiers have now been killed in the 3-year conflict. In Massachusetts alone, more than 35 families have mourned the loss of a loved one, killed in action in places like Ramadi, Fallujah and Najaf. And since President Bush declared an end to "major combat operations," more than 17,000 troops have been wounded in combat.

Every Member of Congress supports the heroic efforts of our troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and around the globe. These brave men and women in uniform, and their service to our country, should never be forgotten. We have the finest armed forces in the world and they represent the United States of America with remarkable courage, honor and dignity.

During a recent memorial service for a young soldier from western Massachusetts who was killed in Iraq, a Marine Commander paid tribute to our fallen service members by saying: "we weep at their passing, honor their service and cherish their memories." I would simply add that we are also grateful for the enormous sacrifice they have made for our nation.

We are here today in this historic chamber to discuss the future of a war that has already taken so much from so many. A war that a majority Americans now disapprove of.

In October 2002, when this institution first debated authorizing the use of military force, I raised a number of concerns about a pre-emptive war with Iraq including its cost, the lack of connection between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and the fact that Iraq was not a credible threat to the United States. I also believed that a pre-emptive strike would act as an effective recruiting tool for radical Islamic fundamentalism worldwide. For these reasons, I was 1 of 133 House Members who against the Iraq war resolution.

Unfortunately, as I stand on the floor of the House, nearly 4 years later, many of these concerns still exist. According to the non-partisan Congressional Research Service (CRS), the war in Iraq has now cost the U.S. taxpayer roughly $319 billion to date. That's $6.4 billion a month and more than $100,000 per minute. If you live in Massachusetts, $9 billion of your money has been spent in Iraq. And there is no end in sight.

I would point out to my colleagues that former White House economic adviser Lawrence Lindsey lost his job for predicting that the war would cost a mere $200 billion. From the start, the Bush administration has not been straight with the American people about the cost of the war in Iraq. And this partisan resolution does nothing to address that.

In fact, the White House has not been straight about most aspects of the war from the existence of weapons of mass destruction to the threat of the insurgency, and from Iraq's purchase of yellow cake uranium to Saddam's ties to al-Qaeda. And with this resolution, House Republicans will simply rubberstamp President Bush's poor planning and mismanagement. I believe it is time for a new direction in Iraq.

More importantly, so do many military leaders. Marine Corps General Anthony Zinni, Army Major General Charles Swannack, Army General John Batiste, Marine Corps Lieutenant General Gregory Newbold and others have all expressed real concerns about our future in Iraq. These are individuals who were deeply involved in the planning and execution of the war. And they do not like what they see.

As General Zinni recently said, "we are paying the price for the lack of credible plan. Ten years worth of planning were thrown away, troop levels dismissed out of hand . . . These were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here."

Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I believe it is time for a new course in Iraq. I believe we need to develop an honorable exit strategy. I will vote against this resolution to give President Bush an open-ended commitment in Iraq. Let's bring the troops back home.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives. I respect them for their service and for their dedication to their constituents. However, Mr. Speaker, I take offense that any member of this House would stand here and challenge the patriotism of a colleague—such a charge is unworthy of this institution and the democracy we fight for every day. I refuse to allow anyone on the other side, as they have done today and have since this war in Iraq began, to question—whether directly or indirectly—my love of our country, my unwavering commitment to our troops, and my firm belief that we must do whatever necessary to defend the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the resolution before us today. And, I do so because I love this country and who we are and what we stand for. My reason for opposing this particular resolution comes down to one word—accountability. At every level, the Republican majority here in Congress, has failed to hold this Administration accountable. It is simply astonishing that most of my Republican colleagues have time and time again simply bent to the will of the Administration and allowed themselves to believe meaningless rhetoric without asking tough questions. I urge my colleagues on the other side to abandon their blind faith

in this Administration's rhetoric and instead demand accountability. For it is through information, recognition of errors, and the development of an honest plan that we will ultimately ensure our success in Iraq.

Misjudgments and miscalculations have led to a conflict that continues three years after the President declared ''mission accomplished.'' History will judge the President and his cabinet for their performance. But, it is our responsibility as members of Congress to call for a clear plan going forward. It is past time that this Administration implement a strategy to meet our mission and bring our troops home, and it is past time that this Congress demand it.

Instead, this resolution supports a ''stay the course'' policy that has failed our troops and failed our nation. We all want to see a safe and democratic Iraq. However, the President's open-ended declaration to stay as long as it takes—a policy that this resolution defends—will not require the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people to make the tough choices that need to be made. That is why we must make clear that our military presence is contingent upon progress in the formation of a stable and functioning Iraqi government. We have to make it clear that we expect the Iraqis to take responsibility for their government and for their security. We will support them, but the time for a serious U.S. military presence is limited. To make that clear, we should begin to bring our Reservists and National Guard home, and put in place a strategy to bring the rest of our young men and women out of Iraq as soon as possible.

My colleagues, today, we could have had the opportunity to discuss these important policy issues, demand answers, and work together to better define our objectives in Iraq and our strategy for completing our mission. Instead, we are once again stuck in neutral—playing politics with resolutions about whether Republicans or Democrats support the troops and whether Republicans or Democrats are stronger against terrorism. Let's be clear: we all support the troops and we are all committed to fighting terrorism. That is not the issue—the issue is the Bush Administration's failed policy in Iraq and how Congress—as a separate and independent branch of government—should demand accountability for their failures and demand a real strategy to achieve success and bring our troops home. We owe this to our constituents. We owe it to the brave Americans serving this country overseas. And, we owe it to our great country and its legacy.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to offer supplemental remarks to the remarks I entered into the RECORD yesterday. I offer these supplemental remarks as a continuation of my thoughts relative to the debate held yesterday, Thursday, June 15 and continuing into this morning, Friday, June 16.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, to anyone who reads the 730 words contained within the body of H. Res. 861 that this resolution concerns three principal objectives: (1) general support for American troops, (2) the Congress's stated belief that the United States will win the war on terror, and (3) the encouragement of the new permanent unity government in Iraq and Prime Minister Nuri Al-Maliki to succeed, toward the ultimate goal of stabilizing Iraq and returning American troops back to the United States. Like so many of my colleagues, I wish this resolution said much more: I wish that the Rules Committee had allowed amendments to this legislation; I wish that a Democratic substitute had been allowed. But none of those things occurred.

Try as they might, the spin doctors and the pundits on the other side of the aisle are trying to make this vote something which it is not—a vote indicating support for the war in Iraq. It is most certainly not that, but is instead a political football that this Majority sees no problem kicking around.

I was not a member of Congress when initial authorization was given to this President to enter into this conflict; I neither support this war nor President Bush's handling—or, rather, his mishandling, of it. This mismanagement has been evident practically from the conflict's inception.

The very simple fact is that the vote today on H. Res. 861 and the surrounding circumstances, are highly political, and not substantive in nature. All those voting on this measure today know and understand that this is a vote scheduled by the Republican majority in Congress only to put Democrats into what Republicans perceive is a potentially difficult political spot. While I did not take a vote to authorize this war, it is my responsibility to work with my colleagues to deal with its aftermath—something that is far more difficult. And I take that responsibility very seriously.

American troops are in Iraq right now. In my view, the establishment of an arbitrary deadline for a pullout—whether it is tomorrow, a month or a year from now—is irresponsible. Our military intervention has destabilized Iraq; as a result, this Nation maintains a duty to stabilize the situation before turning full control back over to the Iraqis. We must leave Iraq as soon as possible, but we must do so responsibly.

Unfortunately, H. Res. 861 does nothing toward ending the instability. It is emotive. It inflames passions. It is red-meat election year politics at its worst.

As I have said throughout my time in Congress, Iraq will be, in the end, what Iraqis themselves will make of it. Congress and the administration need to press forward and convert the well-intentioned but arbitrary deadlines for withdrawal of our troops into responsible, tangible plans that will serve to bring our troops home. We need to shunt aside the inflamed politics of the day—the politics that leads the House to take a day and a half to consider a resolution that accomplishes nothing—and begin a serious discussion about a responsible date for withdrawal of American troops from Iraq—a plan that builds upon the small but substantial positive steps we have seen in Iraq, such as the approval of a constitutional government, the holding of free elections and the institution of a democratic government under the leadership of Prime Minister Al-Maliki.

It is sad that June 15 to June 16, 2006, will be known more for slogans and empty election-year rhetoric than for a realistic solution to a difficult problem. Sadder still is the majority's steadfast commitment to inflaming the passions of the American populace for political gain. I supported H. Res. 861 today, but I eagerly look forward to a day when the majority overcomes its singular focus on politics and commences a serious discussion about how to responsibly bring conclusion to our role in Iraq. I look forward to the day when we can set aside the rhetoric and meaningless nonbinding resolutions and focus on a responsible and workable solution to the morass that the President and this administration have created half a world away.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed in the Republican Congress' unwillingness to focus on the truth in Iraq. Calling today's spectacle a true debate of ideas on Iraq does not pass the ''straight face test.'' If House Republican leadership choose to have a real debate on Iraq, Members of the House should be able to offer alternatives and ideas. Instead, they have blocked all alternatives by Democrats and for 10 hours the American people are left with the same empty rhetoric they have been hearing from the House Republicans on the floor for 3 years.

My constituents in the 37th District want a strategy in Iraq. They want to know when our brave young soldiers will return home to their families safely. Given this, I find it disingenuous for Republican leadership to talk tough about the war on terror when this debate is supposed to be about American troops in Iraq. It was the Republican leadership who could not wait to divert resources from the war on terror to chase after Saddam Hussein in the first place. Many Democrats said this was a dangerous path, and sadly, that is exactly where we find ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I support withdrawing our troops at a specific time and redeploying them to the periphery of the arena. Redeploying our troops is the natural and timely evolution to our mission in Iraq. But now is the time that we need to start the process and planning of bringing our troops home. Our troops have contributed to the building of a democracy, assisted in training an Iraqi police and military force and overseen three elections as well as the drafting of a national constitution. They have accomplished a great deal. And we have supported them throughout.

I join the American people in their deep patriotism and love for our great land, and I join them in their solemn appreciation for the thousands of American families who have sacrificed a son or daughter.

However, our troops have been in Iraq for over 3 years. We knew that when we entered this conflict that our troops were not going to be a permanent fixture in Iraq. This was the understanding Congress had with the administration and the American people. The men and women who have given their lives in liberating Iraq have completed their mission and they have done so with valor.

Now it is time for the Iraqi people to rebuild their communities and it is time for us to make our communities whole again by bringing our troops home.

The resolution today is not what the Republican leadership had notified us of. I can only hope that the next Iraq debate on House floor takes place both soon and with greater substance.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, although I am in opposition to the resolution, I strongly support our men and women in uniform who are fighting to protect our freedom. These brave men and women have made, and continue to make, the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our great country. Approximately 2,500 soldiers have given their lives for our country in this war. Approximately 2,500 families across America have been left devastated by the loss of a loved one. Mothers and fathers have lost their cherished sons and

daughters, men and women have lost their spouses, children have lost parents. Their sacrifices will forever be remembered.

Our Government has spent more than $250 billion on the war in Iraq, and that number is increasing at the rate of $177 million per day. However, just as we cannot put a dollar figure on the cost of lives and limbs our brave soldiers have lost, we also cannot put a dollar figure on the amount of pride that we as citizens have for them. While our soldiers fight and persevere because they, more than anyone, realize what is at stake in Iraq, it is my sincere hope that we can bring them home soon and reunite them with their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, although I am in opposition to this resolution, today, tomorrow, and as long as our precious Republic shall exist, we should continue to honor our men and women for their sacrifice, devotion, and continued defense of our country.

God bless America and thank God for the sacrifices made by our brave men and women in uniform.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, all of history—and indeed, all of life—is a series of choices. International relations—and our national security—are mostly about choices.

The world chose to watch when Hitler published his blueprint for genocide in Mein Kampf. The world also chose to watch as Hitler took power on January 30, 1933; directing the boycott of Jewish businesses and opening the first concentration camp just 6 weeks later.

The world continued to stand by and watch as Hitler breached the Treaty of Versailles while denying Jews their fundamental rights through the Nuremberg Race Laws.

Then, on September 30, 1938, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain hailed ''peace for our time'' after appeasing Hitler in Munich.

Thirty-four years later, a terrorist massacre at the 1972 Munich Olympics launched a new era of appeasement. The world met the terrorists' murderous ambitions with an invitation to the negotiating table. Within weeks of the Munich Massacre, the German government let three jailed terrorists go to secure the release of a hijacked Lufthansa jet.

When terrorism first came to American soil with the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, our government treated it as a police matter rather than what it was: an act of war. Then came the Khobar Towers bombing in 1996 and the U.S.S. *Cole* attack in 2000. America—and the world—chose to stand by and watch.

9/11 was the most visible manifestation of a war that had been raging between the terrorists and civil societies around the world for decades. But even as the terrorists plotted to kill us, we had refused to engage them until President Bush committed America to fighting the global War on Terror.

The global War on Terror isn't just a struggle against al Qaeda. It's a war against a violent, evil ideology with which we can never compromise or achieve an armistice. We can't walk away from the fight and hope our enemy goes away.

Any withdrawal—any retreat—in Iraq or elsewhere will be met with more attacks, more bloodshed. Except that the blood could once again run in our streets, in our neighborhoods.

We will learn history's painful lessons at last? That's the choice this resolution poses today.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 861. The resolution declares that ''the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq.'' That's a big job. Ask the British, who tried and failed to do this in the 20th century, what a big job it is. While President Bush has said repeatedly that when the Iraqis stand up we will stand down, this resolution asserts that our troops will remain in Iraq indefinitely. That is unfortunate.

A group of Republicans and Democrats tried to offer a more concrete and meaningful alternative to this resolution, which would have substituted the essence of H.J. Res. 55 for H. Res. 861. This is in line with every benchmark set by President Bush. Unfortunately, we were not allowed to offer an amendment.

Our approach is so reasonable that I believe 75 percent of the American public would strongly support it. Our amendment would simply require the President to develop and implement a plan for the withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq in a reasonable time frame. It does not give a specific date to complete a withdrawal. It does not say to be out in 30 days or else. It just says try to define an end point for the benefit of everybody. This is exactly in line with what the President himself has stated; it supports his statements.

We are not taking a radical approach. It is a very modest approach, a very mild approach. The reason that there was not a vote on our amendment is that we would have won. So this entire exercise is designed for politics. And men are dying. Women are dying! And we're going broke—we spend $300 million every single day in Iraq, at the same time programs here at home are being denied. So we're going to have a financial crisis, and we'll have a political crisis.

I I would like to see this effort taken out of the political realm and put it into the realm of policy discussions. We need to look for real solutions rather than just making political statements.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate that now is not the time to bring our troops home from Iraq. Our soldiers have done a valiant effort in fighting terrorism and bringing a semblance of law and order to the chaos in the region and it would be short-sighted to lay out a specific timetable to bring U.S. troops home prematurely before their mission is accomplished. Over the last 12 months, enormous progress has been made in training Iraqi security forces and already we are seeing the fruits of our labors. Iraqi forces took the lead in election security and maintaining order during the December elections. In Southern Iraq control of the countryside is already in the process of being transferred from Japanese and Australian peacekeepers to Iraqi security forces. Slowly but surely this approach of having Iraqi forces take the lead in patrolling the streets of their cities while the U.S. military moves their troops to the perimeter is taking hold. As Iraqi forces continue to stand up, American forces will stand down. Congress needs to ensure that by our actions we don't send a message to our Iraqi allies that the United States is lessening its resolve and going back on our commitment to achieve our strategy for victory in Iraq and defeat the terrorist insurgents who are threatening this victory. While the United States will continue to face setbacks as we move forward with our mission to transfer authority over to the Iraqi people, we have to be firm in maintaining our resolve and finish what we started by achieving a lasting peace in Iraq.

Everyone agrees that our ultimate goal is to establish a free, open and democratic Iraqi government and bring our men and women in uniform home as soon as possible. Nevertheless, we have a responsibility to our troops to ensure that terrorism does not prevail in the Middle East. Any Congressional agreement of an arbitrary time table to bring our troops home before we have accomplished our mission is unacceptable and could potentially increase the risk to our soldiers. I have confidence in our military leadership and in our troops that we will ultimately prevail in our war on terror. I look forward to the day when we can transfer U.S. authority over to Iraq's elected leaders and to a completed transition of power and governance of Iraq.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 861. Republicans aren't interested in debating or discussing the merits or conduct of the War in Iraq; they only want to play politics with it.

Republicans wrote this resolution. Democrats were not consulted or allowed any input. Republicans then rigged the process and outlawed any amendments, so that the only real choice in voting was not yea or nay, but take it or leave it.

There are serious issues we have to discuss that are being ignored.

The war in Iraq has cost our country $320 billion so far—money we have had to borrow—and it will no doubt cost hundreds of billions more. It has cost the lives of 2,500 American service men and women and more than 18,300 have been wounded. The needs of our veterans are being shortchanged. Some of our troops are on their fourth deployment since 2001. Our military readiness is affected because we are wearing out both our equipment and our troops. And House Republicans are still pretending that the war against terror somehow has to be fought in the same basic way we fought in Korea and Vietnam.

The American people deserve better than a sham resolution and a staged debate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 861.

As Americans of good conscience, we can find some comfort in the fact that Saddam Hussein is on trial for his crimes and that the Iraqi people have formed a representative government.

Yet, as we, the elected Representatives of the American people, engage in this discussion more than 3 years after President Bush declared ''mission accomplished'': 2,500 brave young Americans have died, over 18,300 have been injured, and more than 10,000 Iraqis have suffered a similar fate.

Our national treasury continues to be squandered—to date by over $300 billion, with over $9 billion of reconstruction funds squandered with no accounting.

And no believable argument has been advanced that our continued military presence in Iraq will make the American people more secure against the very real threats that we face in the Global War on Terror.

Tragically, this House is now debating a non-binding resolution that is as short-sighted and devoid of direction as the President's policy in Iraq, that purposely confuses the Global War on Terror with the war in Iraq. And despite the crafty and artful wording of the resolution—these two efforts are not synonymous. There is no connection between 9/11 and Saddam Hussein nor Saddam Hussein and Osama Bin Laden.

The President has admitted this, yet the Republican Party in the House continues to support his failed policies in Iraq under the guise of fighting terror—consistently providing billions of off-budget funding, allowing waste, fraud and abuse to go unchecked and failing to exercise even the semblance of oversight.

Upon close reading, the Resolution contains three different kinds of declarations.

Some are irrelevant—because everyone believes them to be true.

Some are cynical—because they contain assertions that no one can reasonably believe.

And some are illusory—because they assert objectives that, based upon the ''facts on the ground in Iraq'' we cannot reasonably expect to achieve in the foreseeable future.

The American people and especially the American troops deserve better than this. We all have unwavering pride for our troops—they are performing superbly. The quagmire that Iraq has become is not the fault of the troops—it is the failure of the President to plan for a transition to the peace.

As a member of the Out-of-Iraq Caucus, I have co-sponsored and continue to support Representative MURTHA's solution, House Joint Resolution 73.

It makes it clear to the Iraqi people that our Nation renounces any claim to permanent bases in their country.

It declares that we will bring our troops home at the earliest practicable date.

And it provides a plan for peace.

Saddam Hussein is no longer the ruler of Iraq.

A reasonably democratic constitution has been ratified.

A democratic government has been elected.

Now, the Iraqi people must forge their own future. Forging their own future is what 80 percent of Iraqis want—allowing them to do so would represent true freedom and democracy for Iraqis.

Now, this Congress is duty-bound to heed the reasoned assessments of American military commanders that we make both Iraqi and American soil less secure by our continued military presence there. In fact, sadly, our continued occupation has in fact increased the number of terrorist operatives in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, with this result it is time to rethink our ''help'' to the Iraqi people.

The Iraqi people should continue to receive our continued assistance as they rebuild their country, without our military occupation.

We should help them defend their borders against terrorist infiltration—if the need arises.

But, it is time for a change. Let's stop the carnage.

It is time to bring our troops home.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show support for the Out of Iraq Caucus and to add my voice to this much needed debate on the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against this war because I thought it was a mistake from the beginning. Iraq was not an imminent threat to our security, there were no weapons of mass destruction, and it has never been a part of American foreign policy to preemptively invade another country in order to spread our will on their citizens.

But Mr. Speaker we are in Iraq now, the President has committed our troops there and we now have an obligation to fix the mess that we've made over there.

But how long do we stay the course when the course that we have been on has not been a successful one. How long do we keep our troops in a country where they are not treated as liberators, but are instead fueling the violence there just by their mere presence?

The American people are starting to realize that this war was a mistake. The reason for going to war was wrong, the planning for keeping the peace after the war was nonexistent, and there does not seem to be any clear indication of what victory in Iraq looks like.

This was a war of choice and the people of Iraq are very suspicious about our motives for being there. Many people in and out of Iraq believed America's motivation for invading Iraq had more to do with its oil fields and strategic location in the Middle East, than with its supposed weapons of mass destruction.

The American public also overwhelmingly believes this war was not worth the human or financial burden, and how can we blame them?

At a time when our education system needs vast improvement, our schools are deteriorating, and our children are losing their edge in the fields of math, science, and engineering, we are sending billions of taxpayer's dollars overseas on a weekly basis.

While we have sent close to a half a trillion dollars over to Iraq, here at home many Americans still do not have the basic necessities they need to live whole, fruitful lives.

Millions of our citizens do not have healthcare, and millions more are working overtime just to make ends meet. Sadly, many Americans are not feeling the great economic boom that the Administration is trying so desperately to tout.

Constituents in my districts are feeling the pinch in their pockets due to skyrocketing fuel costs, an overpriced housing market, and debt that will follow them to their graves.

My constituents are starting to wonder, how can we continue to justify sending billions of dollars out of the country when they need better services and resources here at home?

How can we continue to ask our men and women in uniform to give their lives for a cause that was built on deceptions and misinformation?

Our national deficit is fast approaching $8 trillion, I repeat $8 trillion, and yet Congress is more concerned with enacting tax cuts for the wealthy, while simultaneously spending billions in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, something has to give. We cannot continue on this path that we are currently on. The resources of this country, as great as they are, are being stretched too thin.

Our forces, as mighty as they are, are being stretched too thin for the long-term health of the country.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of this great Nation, we need to set a new course. We need a new policy on Iraq and Congress needs to start focusing its attention on the problems facing our citizens here at home.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Murtha Resolution, which establishes a time line for a responsible troop redeployment and allows Iraqis to stand up and take responsibility for the course of their own nation.

As long as we are there doing the job that Iraqis should be doing for themselves we cannot expect them to stand up and take control of their own country.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, GEN Anthony Zinni and other retired generals have been outspoken in their opposition to the planning and execution of our occupation of Iraq. The administration rejected their sound recommendations, which predicted exactly what would happen if we didn't plan for the occupation.

These generals explain 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 post-war occupation, unaware of the growing Insurgency.

I have heard from too many military families whose children have been wounded or killed in duty. Their grief is so much harder to bear knowing that we did not adequately equip their sons and daughters in battle.

I have met many times with Lila Lipscomb, a proud mother from Flint, Michigan, who lost her son Michael in Iraq. Initially, Lila supported the war on the assumption that the government knew best. A week after finding out her son had died, Lila 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. Her willingness to speak truth to power has drawn attention to the misconduct of the war and the terrible price that servicemen and women and their families have paid.

We have endured strategic missteps and now find ourselves with insufficient troop levels to provide adequate safety in Iraq. Insurgent bombings, ethnic battles, and mass abductions by rival Sunni and Shiite militias are clear indications that our occupation has not provided for the conditions that Iraqis need to form an effectively functioning government.

United States reconstruction and infrastructure investment has had little impact in 3 years. Despite the billions of noncompetitive, cost-plus contracts given to businesses friendly to this administration, 54 percent of Iraqi households still lack access to clean water and 85 percent lack reliable electricity.

The administration's emphasis on unilateral action in this conflict has left America bearing too much of a military and financial burden. If Iraq is going to be stabilized and move toward a democracy, it will need a commitment and a will far greater than what America itself can provide on its own.

Why haven't we learned from the first gulf war? In the 1991 gulf war, our coalition partners shouldered over 75 percent of the cost of the war. We had over 100,000 Muslim troops fighting alongside a broad coalition of forces.

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.

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 the real problem we face: terrorism.

Let's heed the advice of our colleague JOHN 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 will have been worth something after all.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my comments and concerns regarding H. Res. 861. While this resolution is purely symbolic and does not have the force of law, I am voting for it, as I agree with the majority of the sentiments it expresses. In 2003, I voted for the use of force resolution, based upon what we later learned was flawed intelligence about the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. While I am glad that Saddam Hussein was removed from power and has been captured, and I hope that the new Iraqi government is successful, the U.S. must move toward a new policy in Iraq.

As I stated in a letter to President Bush last month, the time has come for the United States to give the Iraqis strong incentive to stand on their own feet and take control of their own affairs. I acknowledge this will be a challenge, as there is a persistent and strong insurgency, which continues to kill Iraqis every day. Therefore, they must speed up the process of training Iraqi security forces that are willing and capable of defending their country. There are many former members of the Iraqi Army who are still unemployed. The United States and the administration need to send a clear message to the Iraqis that we will not have a permanent military presence in Iraq. Taking this step will motivate Iraqis to take charge of their own affairs and create incentives for involvement from regional players and the international community.

Additionally, we need to begin private discussions with the leaders in Iraq regarding a timeframe for redeployment of our troops. To date, more than 2,500 U.S. soldiers have been killed and 19,000 wounded in Iraq. Extended and multiple deployments have eroded U.S. ground forces and overall military strength. A Pentagon-commissioned study recently concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operations in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force. More than three years of continuous deployment of U.S. troops in Iraq has contributed to serious problems with military recruitment, forcing the Army to lower the standards for recruits, led to military equipment shortages that hamper the ability of ground forces to do their jobs in Iraq, and undermine the ability of the U.S. National Guard to deal with problems at home.

While I agree with concerns that publicly announcing a timetable for withdrawal would put our troops at risk, I'm concerned that political parties and new governments are very much like some people. If you undertake to do something for a person, some individuals will stand back and let you continue—and never step up to the plate to do for themselves.

We have saved the Iraqi people from Sadaam Hussein, but we cannot save the Iraqi people from the Iraqi people—if they are not able and willing to fashion a political solution and bring the Iraqi people together. We must encourage the new Iraqi government and give them strong incentive to assume responsibility and stand on their own.

Our fighting men and women have served bravely. We must commit ourselves to an outcome in Iraq that honors their sacrifices.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, which inaccurately describes the war in Iraq as part of the Global War on Terror. While I strongly and proudly support our courageous and dedicated troops, coalition partners, and the Iraqi Security Forces who put their lives on the line each and every day to fight for a democratic, stable and secure Iraq, I cannot support a resolution that does not paint an accurate picture of what the true situation on the ground is in Iraq.

It is imperative that we acknowledge these realities: since we invaded Iraq in March 2003, more than 2,500 American service men and women have been killed in Iraq; 18,000 have been wounded. More than 100,000 innocent Iraqi civilians have lost their lives. Nearly $350 billion of U.S. taxpayer dollars have been spent. Terrorist leader al-Zarqawi has been killed and Saddam Hussein is in prison, but the pacification and reconstruction of Iraq have been a failure. Every single fact that the President has offered to justify both the invasion of and the sustained U.S. military presence in Iraq has proven to be wrong. The President said that the war would be short-lived, aided by our allies, paid for by Iraqi oil, welcomed by the Iraqi people, and would result in a reconstructed Iraq with an improved quality of life for its citizens. His strategy in Iraq is not working and, as we have seen so many times, he and his administration are incapable of admitting mistakes—even when those mistakes are irrefutable.

This war has exhausted our military, hurt our war on terrorism, damaged our country's credibility internationally, and strained our economy. I strongly believe that the President's current ''stay the course'' plan in Iraq is not working. We need a new strategy. We need to take our troops out of Iraq.

I strongly disagree with the assertion in this resolution that our continuing presence in Iraq is a vital part of fighting our war on terrorism. After all, the attacks on our troops in Iraq are not coming primarily from al-Qaeda. There are only approximately 1,000 al-Qaeda amidst the 26 million people of Iraq. The attacks on US. troops are planned by an insurgency that is comprised of native Iraqis. Once the American soldiers leave, we will remove the stimulus for the local Iraqi and worldwide incitement against America as an ''occupier.'' We can continue to assist the Iraqi people in strengthening their fledgling democracy, but we must remove the provocation of an American military presence and instead, reinvest our resources in strengthening U.S. border and port security, defeating al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and elsewhere, and rebuilding our much-depleted U.S. military.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution and instead, support a new plan in Iraq that will bring our troops home.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 861, a resolution declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from terrorist adversaries.

This is a critical time in American and world history. Only 5 years have passed since the al Qaeda network attacked us on our homeland. Over 3,000 people died on September 11, 2001, and the world as we knew it changed instantly.

Our principal terrorist enemies seek to establish regimes that rule according to a violent and intolerant distortion of Islam. As illustrated by Taliban-rules Afghanistan, such regimes would deny all political and religious freedoms and serve as sanctuaries for violent extremists to launch additional attacks—not only against the United States and its partners but the Muslim world itself.

The enemy uses suicide bombings, beheadings, and other atrocities against innocents as a means to achieve their dark vision. Their demonstrated indifference to human life and desire to inflict catastrophic damage on the United States and its partners around the world has fueled their pursuit of and intent to use WMD.

We cannot permit the world's most dangerous terrorists and their regime sponsors to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.

Our national strategy is to stop terrorist attacks against the United States, our citizens, our interests, and our friends and allies around the world.

We have and continue to defeat terrorists by attacking their established infrastructure, such as safe havens, management, power, and infrastructure. This disruption will naturally force the terrorists to disperse and decentralize, thereby removing their global influence.

We have and continue to deny terrorists support. Separating terrorists from their sponsors and support will deny availability of critical assets needed to plan, train for, and conduct operations. Denying sanctuary will prevent the terrorists from having the opportunity to reorganize and reestablish a global threat. A terrorist that is constantly on the move to survive does not have time to plan or conduct major operations.

We have and continue to work with the international community to diminish the underlying conditions that terrorists seek to exploit. It is in our best interest to continue focusing on resources and efforts towards at-risk regions to prevent the emergence or the re-emergence of terrorists.

The United States Government, through our dedicated public servants, courageous men and women in uniform, and attentive intelligence officers are protecting the United States, our citizens, and our national interests at home and abroad—24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year.

Today, American values, liberty, and lives are still at stake. While we engage the enemy on foreign soil, we are also simultaneously establishing homeland defenses, and extending such defenses to identify and neutralize any emerging threats as early as possible.

The American public is one of the world's most informed societies—the American people understand that the threat against our Nation and values are real and imminent.

And to mischaracterize the American people's support for the global war and the men and women in uniform fighting at the front lines of this war is unpatriotic and disingenuous. U.S. forces will withdraw from Iraq as soon as the mission is successfully accomplished. Success will be achieved when there is a free Iraq in which Iraqis themselves are sponsors of their own liberty and security. The criteria for withdrawing Coalition forces from Iraq are conditions based, not calendar based.

For America will remain the land of the free, home of the brave as long as Americans are willing to fight for the principles of freedom and democracy.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 861.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments of the

ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. IKE SKELTON. Had I not been called away to perform a funeral, I, like him, would have voted against this resolution, or, may have even walked out to protest this mockery in the People's House.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, today we debate an issue whose importance reaches farther than the citizens that live within the boundaries of our individual congressional districts—it touches citizens all over the world.

Frankly, it is easy for us in this legislative body to praise or criticize our efforts in Iraq. It is easy for us to come to this floor and talk about the violence in Iraq and the difficulties in forming a free, safe and secure government, then return to our offices and send out press releases.

It is easy because none of us have had to serve in a government that is breathing free air for the first time. None of us have had to form a government under intense international pressure to include members of all viewpoints to avoid sectarian violence. None of us have had to hold elections under the threat of terrorism and destruction. We have not lived under the oppression of a tyrant, nor have we had to fear that speaking our minds could lead to our execution or the execution of our family.

And now that the light of freedom is shining into the darkness that was Iraq, many criticize the Iraqi people for needing time for their eyes to adjust to the light. When did we become this arrogant? At what point did seeing over 70 percent of Iraqi citizens risk their lives to participate in electing a free and democratic government not be good enough for us?

It would be uninformed to characterize our nation's early history as a smooth transition. Sectarian division, violence, and human rights abuses were prevalent in the early United States. I would submit that our adversaries aren't ignorant of this. They understand that the work of forming a stable democracy cannot be accomplished in three and one half years. They are smart enough to recognize the monumental successes that have been achieved by the Iraqi people and our extraordinary men and women in uniform in the face of immense challenges. And they are determined to use the most horrific tactics to stop the spread of freedom.

Their opposition is a strategy of oppression and we must stand united to make sure it does not succeed. I would hope that every so often, the debate on this floor can be about more than temporary politics. I would hope that every once in a while, we can ask ourselves the hard questions and come together to find good answers to the problems not only in this country, but the problems facing the world.

We have risen to the challenge before. On June 9, 1944, shortly after the beginning of the D–Day invasion, the following appeared in the Washington Post: "There is a noise of wrangling on Capitol Hill which has a discordant, ugly sound today. There is a jostling among us for preferences which is incongruous in comparison with the unity among those safeguarding us oversees. Like them, we need to remember now how much unites us, and again draw together."

These words are just as relevant and commanding today as they were 62 years ago. The question we must answer is still the same as it was then: do all men and women deserve to be free? If our answer is yes, then what is our responsibility toward that goal? I was taught that to whom much is given, much is expected. In this nation we have been given a great gift of freedom. Will we now fail to remember what unites us and deny our hand of assistance to those that seek the same gift we are so fortunate to enjoy?

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee to have a frank discussion about the Iraq war. We need to make hard choices to ensure that our presence in Iraq does not do long-term damage to our military or endanger the men and women who proudly defend our Nation. However, this resolution doesn't address any of those questions nor does it provide answers for a Nation that demands them. Instead, Republicans have given us more of the same.

In October 2002, I voted against the resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq, but since then, I have supported every supplemental appropriations measure to fund our troops because it is Congress's responsibility to give them the resources needed to accomplish their mission. It is precisely that support for the troops that motivates me to point out how we may do irreparable harm to our military if we do not alter our mission in Iraq quickly. Our men and women in uniform have performed admirably in difficult conditions—in many cases adapting quickly to missions outside their traditional roles, such as policing and reconstruction. However, the current pace of operations is untenable, and we are seeing evidence of the impact it is having on our military.

Our troops have faced numerous deployments to the area, with the National Guard and Reserve in particular demand because of their expertise in needed skills such as policing, civil affairs, and engineering. Nearly 500,000 members of the Selected Reserves have been mobilized since September 11, with more than 10,000 members having been deployed more than three times. We are spending more and more money in an attempt to meet recruiting and retention goals in the active military and reserve components, and we are nevertheless starting to see increasingly more mid-level officers exiting the force—a dangerous sign for the future health of the military.

Furthermore, the harsh desert conditions in Iraq—coupled with the high operational tempo—have taken their toll on our equipment, which is wearing out at twice to nine times the normal rate. The National Guard has only one-third of its equipment on hand, which weakens our ability to respond to a natural disaster or other major event on U.S. soil. Despite the billions we have provided in supplemental appropriations, it will take years and tens of billions more dollars to restore our forces to appropriate levels.

General Barry McCaffrey recently traveled to Iraq and Afghanistan to assess U.S. operations there. Upon his return, he briefed the Armed Services Committee on his findings and gave us a very frank assessment. He has stated that we should know by the end of the year whether the new Iraqi government will be effective in controlling the insurgency. He has also claimed that we cannot sustain our current level of operations beyond Christmas without breaking our military and endangering our ability to fight future missions. In other words, we are quite possibly six months away from a point of no return that could have long-ranging effects on our military and the stability of the Middle East.

So what is our strategy to prevent the worst-case scenario from occurring? Where is the accountability? Where is the Congressional oversight? I'll tell you one thing—they're not in the resolution we're debating today. The Republican leadership promised a debate on Iraq but then refused to consider any alternatives to their own bill, preferring to embrace the status quo and ignore the very difficult decisions this Congress needs to make. We deserve better. Our brave men and women in uniform deserve better. The American people deserve better.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is right for Congress to ask the President to implement a plan to start bringing our troops home from Iraq. That would be the right message to send to the Iraqis: they must assume the responsibility for security of their own country.

Congress needs to have a real and meaningful debate on the future role of the U.S. military in Iraq as we approach the fourth anniversary of the congressional authorization to use force in Iraq. Congress should take seriously its obligation to oversee our military.

The majority has given us one option with this resolution, which is to make a political statement in support of President Bush. The House leadership has refused to allow amendments to this resolution. It is interesting that we are committed to building democratic institutions in Iraq but we are not willing to let the Members of Congress vote on alternative policies in Iraq. Our men and women in uniform that are putting their lives on the line every day deserve the full attention of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree with those parts of the resolution that: honor Americans who have taken part in the global war on terror, including our first responders, diplomats, military, and intelligence officers; honor the sacrifices of American, Iraqi, and Afghan military forces, and the families of those troops; congratulate the Iraqi people for holding free and fair elections, under a new democratic constitution; supports the efforts of the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom; and declares that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror.

We should be debating whether or not and how to withdrawal or redeploy United States Armed Forces from Iraq, and members should be permitted to offer amendments to this resolution. We should not simply be asked to "stay the course." Congress must reclaim its oversight responsibility and ask serious questions about the Iraq war and reconstruction effort.

I am convinced that we must change course. The repositioning of our troops would help us to regain the focus on the war on terror.

The President came to Congress in October 2002 and asked Congress to authorize force against Iraq. I voted against giving the President this authority, and parted ways with most of my colleagues in Congress. This was not a popular vote at the time, but it was the right vote. I was proud of my vote then as I am now.

I have remained an outspoken critic of President Bush's policies in Iraq. There was no connection between the events of 9/11 and the Saddam Hussein regime. The Bush Administration distorted and misused intelligence information about Saddam Hussein's actual

WMD capacity. Saddam Hussein did not have nuclear weapons, and did not pose an imminent threat to the United States.

During our debate in 2002, I stated on the House floor that I had ''grave concerns'' about a unilateral, pre-emptive military attack by the United States which could ''endanger our global coalition against terrorism.'' I also stated that ''we cannot overlook the massive cost and effort that the United States would have to undertake in a post-Saddam regime.'' Finally, I stated that ''the United States will need the help of its allies as it attempts to transition Iraq from a dictatorship to a democracy.'' I regret to say that I was correct on all these counts.

The President prematurely disbanded the Iraqi security forces. After overthrowing Saddam, the President protected the oil ministries, but not the weapons and ammunitions depots, which were looted by insurgents and are now being used to attack American forces. The President did not provide the heavy armor needed for our troops and equipment. The President did not plan for an insurgency. Finally, the President invaded Iraq and then attempted to reconstruct Iraq without seeking any significant assistance from the international community.

We have paid a heavy price. More than 2,500 American soldiers are dead. More than 18,000 American soldiers have been injured. We have spent over $300 billion to date on the Iraq war and reconstruction.

Mr. Speaker, in December 2004 I visited Iraq as part of a Congressional delegation. I wanted to see the situation on the ground in Iraq firsthand. It is an experience that I will not soon forget. I thanked our troops for their service, including troops from Maryland and from our Maryland Guard and Maryland Reserve. Our troops have performed with honor and distinction and have done everything that we have asked of them. Our troops deserve to come home to their families and a grateful nation.

Yet the President still says that we must stay the course. We need to immediately change course in Iraq, which must include the drawdown of U.S. troops from Iraq. We currently have approximately 130,000 troops in Iraq, roughly 20 percent of which are Guard and Reserve troops. Military experts have recommended a drawdown of at least 10,000 troops a month. It is not necessary for us to announce a specific timeline for the withdrawal of our troops. It is reasonable to expect, however, that one-half of our combat troops should come home by the end of 2006, and that all of our combat troops should come home by the end of 2007.

We should make sure that our National Guard are the first to come home, as they were never intended to be used as the primary military force for overseas conflicts. Our Guard units should be made available for local needs.

The drawdown of American troops from Iraq back home will allow us to achieve certain necessary objectives. First, we will bring our troops home to their families, and take them out of the middle of a civil war. Our soldiers should not be used as police officers. Second, we will send an important message to the Iraqi government to take responsibility. U.S. troops cannot remain in Iraq indefinitely. Third, we will remove a powerful propaganda and recruitment tool for Al Qaeda that the United States is an occupation force. Fourth, we would be able to stage our troops outside of Iraq to work with our allies and the international community to fight the war against international terrorism. The repositioning of our troops would help us to regain the focus we have lost on the war on terror. Finally, bringing our troops home would help us preserve the strength of our all-volunteer military by improving troop morale and boosting our efforts to improve recruitment of new soldiers.

The United States should convene an international conference on Iraq which would include the government of Iraq. As the sole remaining superpower, the United States needs to mend diplomatic fences. Such a conference should achieve three primary goals. First, it should produce a verifiable cease-fire. Second, it would establish a mechanism for the completion of the training of Iraqi security forces. Finally, it would coordinate all international humanitarian and reconstruction assistance to the new Iraqi government.

Finally, we must honor our commitment to our military and veterans' families, which will strengthen our recruitment efforts for new troops. Our volunteer military is in danger. The morale of our troops is suffering due to longer tours of duties and budgets that have not fully funded veterans' benefits, particularly in meeting their health care needs.

Our recruitment efforts have fallen short in the military, as both the Army National Guard and Army Reserve have only met roughly 80% of their recruiting goals.

The answer is the proper deployment of our troops, and the full funding of our veterans' benefits, particularly their health care needs. These benefits are particularly relevant considering we have 18,000 wounded veterans so far as a result of the Iraq war. We must also bear in mind that estimates indicate that 50,000 war veterans will experience battle fatigue and post traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, and will require extensive treatment and rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the President to immediately change course in Iraq, including the implementation of a plan to start bringing our troops home from Iraq.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the last two days the House has debated for over 10 hours a politically motivated resolution on Iraq. Not one word in this resolution will do anything to bring us one step closer to success in Iraq, or one day closer to bringing our troops home.

This resolution is not about the troops.

If it were, this resolution would actually do something to hold accountable those responsible for the manipulation of pre-war intelligence, the poor planning, the incompetence, and the mismanagement that has brought us to this point in Iraq. This resolution does nothing to give our troops a real plan that charts a path toward victory and home.

Instead what we have is another attempt at re-writing history to buck up fading support for this administration's failed status quo policies.

As even Secretary Condoleezza Rice has acknowledged, the administration has made mistake after mistake when it comes to Iraq. It is the military that has saved them, even as civilian policymakers have scorned and marginalized senior combat generals who have criticized them.

Last week's elimination of al-Zarqawi was a reminder of the skill and determination of our men and women in uniform. It is our troops and their families who have borne the brunt of sacrifice in this war, and they continue to persevere despite the failures of this administration.

For the past 12 years, I have voted for every bill that supports our troops and honors the sacrifices they and their families make in defending our Nation. For every year of this war, I have voted for every appropriations bill funding our troops, fighting to provide them with the bulletproof vests and up-armored Humvees that they were sent into Iraq without.

But the administration needs to understand that more of the same P.R., rosier rhetoric, better stagecraft at another rally, or viciously attacking generals who served on the ground in Iraq will not achieve success in Iraq, nor bring us one step closer to bringing our troops home.

The administration needs to wake up and stop taking the American people for a spin.

Public confidence in this administration's handling of Iraq has plummeted because the American people have seen through the rhetoric to see the reality on the ground in Iraq.

No amount of publicity stunts and political posturing can change that.

More of the same from the administration will not make our country any safer from terrorists than we were on September 11, 2001. A poll conducted by Foreign Policy magazine of our Nation's top 100 foreign policy minds, liberal and conservative alike, found that 84 percent did not believe that the U.S. was winning the war on terror. Sharing that view was 71 percent of conservatives.

The status quo is not acceptable. We need a change. The administration needs to take the ideological blinders off and acknowledge the reality of the facts on the ground.

As GEN John Abizaid and Ambassador Khalilzad have stated, the reality is that civil war is now a greater threat than insurgency.

Because of the regional destabilization that could follow, I do not believe we can pull out of Iraq precipitously. But I cannot support letting Iraq become an open-ended commitment without limit or end.

So instead of occupying themselves with defending their mistakes of the past, the administration should focus instead on achieving real measurable progress on the ground in Iraq so our troops can begin to come home.

Miss McMORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of our country's role in the Global War on Terror and to observe the heroic, enduring efforts of our men and women in uniform who are working to secure freedom and democracy for the people of Iraq.

In January, I stood with the Eastern Washington families and colleagues of nearly 100 airmen from Fairchild Air Force Base and said goodbye as they were deployed to Iraq for 4 months. In April, I had the opportunity to travel to Iraq and visit with these members of the 92nd Air Refueling Wing and the 141st Air National Guard Medical Squadron. And in May, I was privileged to welcome them back to Eastern Washington with gratitude for their work on behalf of our Nation and in pursuit of freedom and democracy in Iraq.

Troops based at Eastern Washington have long played a central role in the Global War on Terror. In Iraq, they assisted in the rebuilding of airfields and other crucial infrastructure projects. In April 2004, a crew deployed from Fairchild delivered the one-billionth pound of jet fuel in the Iraqi theater from a KC–135 to

an F–16CJ Fighting Falcon from the 555th Fighter Squadron.

Much deserved attention is given to the combat efforts of our troops serving alongside Iraqi Defense Forces to protect the fragile but promising unity government and the Iraqi people whom it represents. Yet I would draw attention also to the remarkable accomplishments of service men and women who are rapidly restoring the infrastructure—roads, airports, and utilities—that is critical to Iraq sustaining itself.

But even beyond the duty and mission charged to them, many of our troops are volunteering to help out at orphanages and day cares in Iraq. We should be encouraged by the commitment and compassion that these soldiers show to the comprehensive task of restoration in Iraq.

Congress must continue to support the unity government of Iraq as it rebuilds its country. Like the generations before them, fighting Nazis and Communists, United States warfighters are today doing a duty for which we can never repay them. I express my undying appreciation for their commitment and their sacrifice.

One of the priorities in assisting the Iraqi people is establishing an independent, self-sufficient Iraqi Security Force. Here our progress has been astounding. Today, there are over 264,600 trained and equipped members of the Iraqi Security Force. The ISF is conducting 84 percent of company-level operations independently or along side coalition forces. This will give Iraq the ability to defend itself and participate as allies in the Global War on Terror.

On the urgency of the Global War on Terror, there is no debate. And it would be irresponsible for this Congress to deny the fact that Iraq is a front in that war or to abandon our efforts there.

The fierceness of the foreign-led insurgency that was drawn to Iraq after the collapse of Saddam Hussein's regime is evidence that the presence of democracy in Iraq and the United States aggressive pursuit of the roots of terror abroad are deadly threats to al-Qaida and others across the globe. We are fighting this tyrannical and ruthless enemy precisely where we should be—thousands of miles away from American families and American soil. To think that terrorists would confine their attacks to Iraq's borders is to not recognize the reality of the threats we face.

We must not abandon the people of Iraq. We must not neglect an opportunity to strike lethal blows to the Islamic extremist network. We must assist the Iraqi people in establishing a free, stable and secure nation and not give up until then. The security of our country and our families depend on it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I rise today in support of H. Res. 861 and our efforts in Iraq. Democracy's biggest strength is also its biggest weakness. Democracy is the strongest form of government when the people and allied governments are united in a common goal. Because the United States worked hand-in-hand with Europe, we were able to defeat fascism in World War II and the totalitarian threat of Hitler and imperial Japan.

Conversely, democracy's weakness arises when the people do not wholeheartedly believe in the cause. For example, Vietnam included a hazy mission and the drafting of unwilling participants. Policy was diverted due to powerful public opinion.

We are not in Iraq and Afghanistan today because the President seeks for us to be. We are there because the public was outraged after the attacks of September 11, and rightly so. We were deliberately attacked by a terrorist regime seeking to cripple the United States. It was the dramatic escalation of decades of terrorist attacks. We felt these attacks deeply in our financial center of New York, at the Pentagon, and were almost hit at the heart of our Government, the Capitol building, were it not for the brave passengers of Flight 93.

But as a nation, we chose to not lie dormant anymore. We chose to show the resolve of America and defeat the enemy of terrorist regimes and the countries that harbor them. I support the policy of not giving in to totalitarianism or terrorist threats. And I support the military if force becomes the necessary method of resolution. Progress is being made in Iraq, and our troops will be successful in supporting this new democratic government. We are not propping up a dictatorial regime; we are working to help democracy take hold in the Middle East. And our efforts are paying off.

The idea that all people desire to be free is a powerful one. This idea is our single biggest weapon, and will ultimately bring success to this fight. The government that allows its citizens to steer their own course is undeniably stronger and more peaceful. I believe our troops are making incredible progress and so are the people in Iraq who are working for an inclusive, stable government. I remain committed to supporting all of their good works.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this resolution.

I say reluctant opposition—because I agree with much of what this resolution says.

I support its statements about honoring the sacrifices of our troops and their families. There's no question that our military is the most professional fighting force in the world, and we are all grateful to our men and women in uniform for putting their lives on the line for our country.

I support the resolution's statements congratulating the new prime minister upon forming his government and the Iraqi people for their courage in participating in elections, and calling on the nations of the world to work together for global peace.

I even agree with the statement that we should not set an arbitrary date for the redeployment of our troops.

I opposed the Iraq war resolution, but I have resisted supporting an artificial deadline for withdrawing troops. I believe that how we withdraw is as important as when we withdraw. This means giving the Iraqis time to get their newly installed permanent government up and running and establish the means for international support. We must exercise deep care in the way our country withdraws because leaving a failed state in Iraq will deeply endanger our country.

But I profoundly disagree with the overall tone of the resolution and disagree even more with the way this debate was conducted.

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 got was certainly a long debate, but it was far from "full." A full debate would mean that Members would have been able to offer alternatives to this resolution. We would then have been able to debate the merits of all the resolutions offered.

I had hoped to offer the bipartisan resolution I 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 is needed, and that the Iraqis must meet their own deadline for modifications to their new constitution.

As it is, the debate has been tightly controlled, and our only choice is to vote up or down on a status quo resolution that doesn't focus on Iraq and that doesn't reflect reality on the ground.

If this were a real debate on Iraq, it would be about where we are versus where we thought we'd be, and where we should go from here. Just last year, Congress called for 2006 to be a year of transition in Iraq that would allow U.S. forces to begin to redeploy. But we're into the middle of June, and we are actually adding troops.

A real debate would begin by recognizing that Iraq is a distinct issue, ouly part of the "global war on terror" insofar as the security vacuum in Iraq has attracted terrorists. But as the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, has said—Iraq is a separate conflict, an insurgency with terrorist elements and sectarian violence.

A real debate would have been honest about how continuous deployment in Iraq hurts our military personnel and their families, strains recruiting and retention, and damages readiness.

A real debate would have looked at the human cost. We are losing one battalion every month of killed or wounded soldiers. Just yesterday the military reported that we've hit a tragic milestone. A total of 2500 American men and women have lost their lives in Iraq. More than 18,000 have been wounded. Attacks on U.S. forces are now at their highest rate ever—900 a month.

A real debate would have looked at the financial cost. We are mortgaging our future and the future of our children. So far Congress has appropriated $320 billion for Iraq alone, a war that was supposed to pay for itself through proceeds from the sale of Iraqi oil, and the "bum rate" is now up to $8 billion per month. That's $2 billion every week, or $286 million every single day.

And if we were really concerned about the well-being of our troops, we would be talking about the fact that every one of the Army's available active duty combat brigades has served at least one 12-month tour in Iraq or Afghanistan, 40 percent of the National Guard and Reserves has been mobilized since September 11th, and nearly half of those mobilized have been deployed two or more times. We need to consider that the readiness of Army units here in the U.S. is at the lowest level since the late 1970s.

We would also have considered what it means for current and future readiness that fully 40 percent of the Army and Marine Corps ground equipment is deployed to Iraq and that equipment in Iraq is wearing out five times faster than the rate in peacetime. If the war in Iraq ended today, the Army would require two years of supplemental appropriations and at least $24 billion dollars to repair and replace equipment.

If we were properly concerned about our National Guard, we would have addressed the

fact that it only has about 34 percent of its equipment on hand, down from 75 percent of its requirement in 2001. The missing equipment has been left in Iraq or transferred to units deploying to Iraq. The Army National Guard has been directed to transfer more than 75,000 pieces of equipment valued at $1.76 billion to the Army to support operations in Iraq. There is no plan to replace these items.

No matter how 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 make it less possible for them to meet some future mission. No one wants a new mission for our troops, but if we had to fight somewhere else, we wouldn't have the equipment or forces to do it.

These are the things that we should have been debating, 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 want progress so much that we blind ourselves to the reality on the ground.

Of course, it's hard to know reality on the ground if Congress does no oversight. Congress has a fundamental responsibility to review how the money it appropriates is being spent and to ask tough questions. The Republican majority would have us believe that asking questions makes us unpatriotic.

But that's just wrong. We abrogate our responsibility to the American people if we shut our eyes to how their tax dollars are being spent.

The Republican leadership seems unable to come up with anything other than the same old tired lines. They will all toe the Administration line when they vote today, but we all know that even Republicans are having doubts as to the wisdom of the President's direction in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we were led into war as a divided nation and today we are even more divided. A successful withdrawal from Iraq can only happen if Congress and the Bush Administration work to bring unity at home.

This resolution doesn't bring us together, Mr. Speaker, and I regret that the Republican leadership continues to seek to divide this House. But that is the course they have chosen, and so they have left me no choice but to reluctantly oppose this resolution today.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave soldiers who have sacrificed so much to ensure our Nation's freedom.

I am extremely proud of all of Western North Carolina's brave men and women, including the 210th and 211th Military Police Units, who have fought courageously to establish a united, free, and sovereign Iraq.

The sacrifices these men and women make are unimaginable, whether it's spending time away from their families, enduring financial hardships, or laying their very lives on the line for freedom. And while these sacrifices are great, we must not forget that they are fighting to protect the world from the grip of terrorism. By risking their lives in Iraq and abroad, these brave men and women, including my son, are protecting the lives of American families and making our country safer.

Four men from Western North Carolina have given their lives in the Iraq conflict. Attending the funeral of one of those men—CW03 Mitchell Carver—served as a stark reminder that freedom is not free. It is not the press who protect a Nation's right to free speech; instead, it is men like Mitch Carver who choose the responsibility to do so. And Mitch Carver is not alone. In the eight years I have been privileged to serve as a representative on the Board of Visitors of our Nation's military academy at West Point, I have seen thousands of young men and women take the oath to protect us. Theirs is a simple pledge: ''Duty, Honor, Country.''

To me the great and central question in our debate is this: Are the Iraqi people capable of and deserving of democracy? The answer is quite simple. Any man or woman, nation, or civilization that thirsts to live free from tyranny, desires to speak freely, and wishes to freely and fairly elect their leaders is worthy of the great gift of democracy. We have seen the images of Iraqi men and women with tears in their eyes as they cast their first votes in the parliamentary elections. Iraq has embraced democracy with a contagious enthusiasm. Democracy is never easy, but in due time Iraq will be a beacon of hope for the Middle East. To turn our backs on the Iraqi people as they are making such great strides would be arrogant and foolish. In short, it is abandonment not only of the Iraqi people, but also of the principles which we have preached and practiced as a nation for more than two hundred years.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to our brave troops and our Iraqi allies. We owe the men and women in our Armed Forces a debt of gratitude—their courage should inspire us all. I encourage all Americans to join me in continuing to keep our troops and their families in our thoughts and prayers.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise once more to denounce our continued involvement in the Iraq war, which was the wrong decision, at the wrong time, based on wrong information. And, what are we doing today to correct all those wrong actions?—absolutely nothing—nothing but talk about it. It is time for a change; it is time for a new direction.

We are having a debate today to adopt a resolution that merely expresses this chamber's views and opinions on our current military engagements in the War on Terror. This resolution honors our men and women who have given their lives in the defense of this country and it honors our armed forces presently on active engagement overseas, among other things. These praises to our armed forces are indeed truly deserved, as they have been thrust into a very difficult conflict with perilous conditions.

However, I think our troops can better appreciate Congress' good intentions with actions rather than mere congratulatory words. This majority could have demonstrated our appreciation of the troops through laws that gave them all the equipment they needed when we sent them to war. This majority could have shown their commitment by demanding that the Commander in Chief clearly layout a plan of action and exit strategy, instead of allowing the continuing improvisation our troops have endured. This majority certainly might have demonstrated its commitment to the troops by not nickel and diming them on health care and making their reintegration to civil society more difficult and costly; and this majority definitely could have made the ultimate honor by acknowledging their well done job by bringing the troops home.

This majority only wants to praise them—but won't lift a finger to make sure our troops can come home sooner rather than later. We constantly hear the mantras such as: Stay the course; we are making progress and so on and so forth. That is the extent of their strategy. Mr. Speaker enough is enough! It is time to bring the troops home!

Iraq has a new democratic government; it is our responsibility to help them secure their country. This country can help Iraq, as it helps other countries, protect itself by providing resources and equipment. We need to let them fight for their country in their way. It is time to be friends and not guardians, let Iraq fight for Iraq. Our troops have done their job; it is time to bring them home.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say we need to bring our troops home.

Before continuing, though, I must say that this resolution before us, unfortunately, is perfectly irrelevant to the choices facing the American people and this Congress. It is transparently political, does nothing to get us out of our predicament in Iraq, and is a crude attempt to intimidate and smear those who wish to honor the desire of the American people by bringing our troops home. This resolution attempts to reinforce the lies that led us to war which have been refuted and disproved many times over.

All of the lies that were offered to justify sending our men and women to fight and die have evaporated in the light of truth. All that we are left with is this argument that we're there now, so we have to stay ''as long as it takes.'' This is nonsense.

This is the same illogical rhetoric that kept our Nation in Vietnam, the rhetoric that doubled the cost of that conflict in American lives. More than half the combat deaths in Vietnam occurred after Richard Nixon was elected on a promise to bring the war to an end, and after the American people had already decided that they did not want one more soldier to die in Vietnam.

Our vital task today in this Congress is to prevent a repeat of that tragedy in Iraq, to stop the bleeding, to make the will of the American people, which is to bring our troops home, the policy of our government as soon as possible. Our task today is to save the lives of our troops who remain in Iraq by bringing them home.

We in this Congress have a choice. The American people have a right to exercise a choice on this issue, as to whether our men and women will continue to fight and die in a war based on deception and fantasy, or to start bringing the troops home.

The American people have decided that it was a mistake to choose to go to war in Iraq.

The American people deserve some answers, as to how we could spend so much in Iraq and achieve so little. They deserve to know why all this money is being spent on a war of choice, when one on eight Americans lives in poverty, and when 46 million Americans have no health insurance, including 13 million children.

No one in this body wants to see terrorism and the rule of force prevail in Iraq. Some on the other side say otherwise, but I believe they know better.

Bringing the troops home is necessary not just for the future of Iraq, but also for the people of the United States. We must stop the

hemorrhaging of tax dollars that could go to meet our Nation's vital domestic needs.

This war of choice in Iraq is undermining the very fabric of American society.

By the end of this year, the costs of the invasion and occupation of Iraq will total $450 billion; $450 billion spent in Iraq, who knows how much of it going to corrupt, crony contractors.

All of the President's statements amount to excuses for an open-ended, seemingly never-ending commitment of our troops to occupy Iraq. He is trying to salvage the terrible wager he made in Iraq by doubling down the bet with human lives: Iraqi and American.

While this debate today is a belated effort to inform the American people, it is nevertheless an empty gesture. It is time to admit our mistake in Iraq and begin to bring our troops home with honor.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the current situation in Iraq, as are the vast majority of Americans. We need an honest assessment from the civilian leadership at the Pentagon about what is working and what is not working, and what needs to change in terms of our strategy.

I strongly oppose efforts to weaken the position of our military by setting an arbitrary deadline for withdrawal of our military forces. We all want American troops to return home from Iraq as soon as possible. Some Members of Congress have called for an immediate withdrawal from Iraq—I disagree with them.

As a longtime supporter of our military, I believe that a calendar-based date for withdrawal serves as a rallying point for insurgents. It also places a target on the backs of American troops. Finally, I am very concerned that the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops would leave a volatile vacuum of power in Iraq, which would rapidly be filled by insurgents. A better alternative is for Congress to clearly delineate the conditions that, if met, would permit a U.S. withdrawal.

Standing around arguing about why we're in this position doesn't serve a good purpose, in my opinion. Instead, I think today's debate is an opportunity to talk about how we can develop a strategy for success. Regardless of when the last American soldier leaves Iraq, I want to be able to look at him or her and be able to say that the service of our military achieved something greater than the political ends of a few here in Washington. I hope all of my colleagues share that desire. A strategy for success should be comprehensive—it should include not just a military role, but also a plan for political, diplomatic, and economic success.

In the next few weeks, a field artillery unit from my district—the 222nd—is heading home after a long year in Iraq. These soldiers have made immense sacrifices on behalf of our great Nation and I am so grateful that they're going to be back in Utah. We all have constituents serving overseas and I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank our military service members for their work on behalf of all Americans.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 861. Since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, we have pursued terrorists and brought them to justice around the world. In this Global War on Terror—where evil, bloodthirsty fanatics kill to prevent democracy and liberty from taking root—there is no option for the forces of freedom but victory. This resolution affirms our commitment to victory. It is a solemn declaration that we will prevail over the terrorists, and that we will do so hand in hand with all who cherish freedom and repudiate extremism.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress in January 2001. The Global War on Terror has been the defining issue during much of my time here on Capitol Hill. From that perspective, I can state that we have made tremendous progress in strengthening our defenses at home, and taking the fight to our enemies overseas.

I visited Iraq for the first time in December 2003, shortly before the capture of Saddam Hussein. At that time, the Iraqi Governing Council had been formed, but the Coalition Provisional Authority still exercised most of the essential functions of government. In December 2003, Iraqi sovereignty seemed possible, but distant.

I returned to Iraq this past Memorial Day recess. We are well on our way to achieving our goals. The death of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the foreign terrorist who was al-Qaeda's top commander in Iraq, puts us one step closer to neutralizing the insurgency and defeating the terrorists. Democracy and liberty have taken root in the heart of a region that is not known for either. The Iraq I visited two weeks ago had a sovereign, democratic government; the result of three successful elections.

And after much negotiation, the Iraqi government recently named interior, defense, and security ministers. These new ministers will continue to lead Iraq to security self-reliance.

As an example of the improved security on the ground, it was my honor and privilege to be part of the first Congressional Delegation to spend the night Baghdad.

The new leaders of Iraq implored me to bring back a message to this Congress: Iraq will never achieve security self-reliance if the United States leaves before its work is done. If we leave before our job is done, the terrorists and insurgents will not only wreak greater havoc upon the Iraqi people, but they will also create a terrorist state from which to perpetrate acts of violence against those who disagree with their world view.

For the sake of our own national security, we must do everything we can to support the new leaders of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I also had the opportunity to visit Afghanistan during the Memorial Day Recess. President Karzai heads a fully democratic government, the culmination of a complete transition to democracy. Women now have the right to vote and work. Although President Karzai's government has greatly extended its authority, history teaches us that we cannot let any part of Afghanistan remain a haven for terrorists. We must continue to pursue, capture, and eradicate the remaining Al Qaeda/Taliban terrorists.

What I saw overseas is not what is being reported by the media back home. The Iraqi economy is picking up steam: currency is more stable, the national stock exchange is up and running, and business registrations are on the rise. More roads and schools are being built as we speak, and the oil sector shows promise as pipeline security efforts increase. In Afghanistan, the Al Qaeda/Taliban terrorists are on the run and 28% of Afghan Parliament delegates are women.

What our troops told me is not what is being reported either. We have the finest military in the world, and morale is high. Our brave troops know the world will be safer when the mission is complete. We must stand strong and support our troops and allies in this fight against global terror.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, America and its allies are engaged in a war against a terrorist movement that spans all corners of the globe. It is sparked by radical ideologues that breed hatred, oppression, and violence against all of their declared enemies. Since September 11, 2001, the powerful coalition of nations, 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 terrorism around the world.

Last year I traveled to the Middle East to visit with troops in Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan. 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 democracy in the Middle East. Not 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 received from back home.

Their confidence in their mission is well-justified. 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 eating 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 perils that lie ahead. Danger awaits them, but they continue to make a great sacrifice each day so that you and I can be free.

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 occurred. 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 Nathan Fletcher. Sergeant Fletcher's wife, Mindy, lived in Dallas and also worked for another war hero, my fellow Texas Congressman SAM JOHNSON, on Capitol Hill. He is currently experiencing his third extended separation from Mindy since they married a few years ago and the start of the war on terrorism.

Sergeant Fletcher is serving in a very remote region in the Horn of Africa. He is part of a Combined Joint Task Force focused on defeating transnational terrorist groups operating in the region. Sergeant Fletcher and his fellow troops in Africa lack amenities like running water, reliable power, and air conditioning. There is no internet, television, or even paved roads. Because they are so far away from the main camp they eat off the local economy. There are no fruits or vegetables where he is based, and so far he has

eaten camel, goat, lamb, beef, and a couple things he could not identify. They cook their meals over an open fire and sleep outside every night.

Sergeant Fletcher's wife writes, ''His team is doing well and I know they are working very long hours. I can't imagine going 40 days without running water in temperatures over 100 degrees without air conditioning, but I know Nathan and other servicemen and women do it everyday.'' She continues, ''Iraq and Afghanistan get most of the focus, but our troops are fighting the global war on terror throughout the world. I am really proud that he is part of making sure al-Qaeda and other terrorists aren't able to expand into another part of the world.''

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fletcher and the millions of other troops fighting the War on Terror around the world believe in what they're doing. They don't want to stop. They know their mission is right. We owe it to them to see this campaign for democracy through until we are completely victorious.

Mindy no doubt wishes that Nathan was at home with her. Nathan no doubt wishes he was at home sitting in the air conditioning and eating a t-bone steak rather than camel steak. Yet they both know the reasons and the importance of the mission.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fletcher is enduring these harsh conditions for our freedom. Make no mistake—this mission is not only justified, it is essential. Let us never forget the Pearl Harbors, the attacks of 9/11. Let us never forget the freedom we have. Let us never forget the Sergeant Fletchers and the sacrifices they make for us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not lay down our arms now. We must press on, for freedom, for peace.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration today presents Congress with a single option—to endorse the Administration's handling of the War in Iraq. Such an endorsement means committing our troops to protracted, open-ended involvement for an indefinite number of years while incurring thousand of additional casualties and spending hundreds of billions of dollars.

Unfortunately, this is a counterproductive option. I do not believe the newly elected Iraqi government can achieve the politically daunting challenge of building a democracy as long as there is an expectation that the United States will always be there providing the principle security and defense roles for the country.

Exceedingly difficult compromises between the ethnic and secretarian factions in Iraq need to be made, and those compromises must be determined by the Iraqis themselves. The Administration's course currently is emboldening these factions to seek maximum advantage for their respective groups—even as the business of building a united country is harmed significantly. The result is a full blown insurgency which increasingly looks like a civil war in destruction and effect.

The Administration did not foresee these challenges, and certain officials still appear to be in denial of this reality. The United States deserves new leadership on Iraq and a new course, and the Administration should take the steps to remove those who have brought us to the present circumstances and revitalize our effort with a new leadership team.

I have traveled to Iraq on three occasions. After my last trip in October 2005, I came away strongly believing in the need for a timely transition of responsibility to Iraqis. One month later, when this House debated a resolution ordering an immediate withdrawal of troops from the nation, I opposed the resolution, but I noted the following: ''We need to come together on an exit strategy for our soldiers based upon the transition of security to the Iraqis themselves in order to give the new democratic government of the people of Iraq a fair chance of success.''

I still oppose an ''immediate withdrawal'' ordered by the U.S. Congress. Some will argue that opposition to an indefinite U.S. military presence in Iraq means support for immediately abandoning Iraq. This is completely false. I favor leaving military commanders with authority for the military redeployment and troop drawdown. I do not favor near term deadlines imposed by Congress as the way to accomplish this result.

I strongly support our troops and their families. I support giving them the resources they need to do their job, and the benefits they deserve.

I support winning the Global War on Terror.

For these reasons, I cannot support this resolution. It is too open-ended, too blind to the reality of the difficulties we are facing, and too simplistic a resolution for the complex situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us today, despite the fact that it barely touches on the war in Iraq, which is the stated purpose of our debate, and makes some claims I do not agree with. While I will vote yes, I want to be absolutely clear that I am doing so to emphatically support our troops and the bravery they display every day in fighting the war on terror. I did not vote to authorize the Iraq War and continue to believe it was a mistake. I do not agree with parts of this resolution that misstate the original administration arguments for invading Iraq. The heart of this discussion needs to be that the Bush administration has been almost totally inept in its planning and prosecution of the war and occupation of Iraq.

Time and again, the Bush administration has been wrong. Before invading Iraq, we were told that Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat to the United States. After attending the briefings provided by the administration, I did not feel that administration officials made this case, and the lack of weapons of mass destruction certainly undercuts this argument. Even worse, we were given a stream of incorrect assumptions of the costs of the invasion and occupation of Iraq. Then-Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz testified before a Senate Committee and predicted that the monetary cost of the war to the United States would not exceed $2 billion. Including money to be appropriated this year, we are approaching $400 billion, and continue to spend $8.1 billion every month in Iraq. Wolfowitz also said Iraq had no history of ethnic strife.

It is important to remember that the Bush administration assertions were not conventional wisdom at the time. Both then-Army Chief of Staff, GEN Eric Shinseki, and then-Bush economic adviser Larry Lindsey, soon left their positions after publicly stating, respectively, that the war would take large numbers of troops and hundreds of billions of dollars to prosecute.

Further, it quickly became clear that the planning of the occupation of Iraq was woefully inadequate, placing our soldiers in increasing danger. Stories of inadequate supplies of bulletproof vests and armor for humvees documented this fact. The outspoken concern of former generals in regard to these preparations further underscored the problems. The intensity of the insurgency caught the administration by surprise.

The United States has allocated $50 billion to private contractors for reconstruction and rebuilding efforts in Iraq since the beginning of the war. Nine billion dollars in reconstruction funds are unaccounted for, while the Defense Contract Audit Agency has deemed that $1.47 billion spent by the Halliburton Corporation was excessive or insufficiently documented. Oil production is at 2.2 million barrels per day—down from 2.6 million barrels per day prior to the war.

The resolution we are debating also says ''. . . the terrorists have declared Iraq to be the central front in their war against all who oppose their ideology.'' This is true only because we gave them the opportunity to do so. Iraq clearly was not the central front before the U.S. invasion—another unfortunate outcome of poor planning.

I continue to believe that part of our decision making process concerning how to move forward in Iraq must include an analysis of how we got there. It is not enough to say that since we are there, we have to make the best of it. I agree that we cannot just walk away, and do not support a certain date for our exit, but we still do not have any framework for evaluating our progress there. While the death of Al Zarqawi is great news, and it seems that Iraqi security forces are taking on more responsibility, does anyone really believe that in one year, or two years, or even five years, that Iraq will be able to defend itself?

I said at the outset of this war that the United States was going to pay the vast majority of its costs, in both lives and dollars, and this has clearly been the case. We must reengage the international community to take on more of the burdens of the occupation, and seek to bring our troops home as soon as possible.

Today, I join my colleagues in celebrating the extraordinary efforts and accomplishments of our troops. But I do not celebrate our country's undertaking of the invasion and occupation of Iraq. It was a bad decision followed by numerous other bad decisions, and while I hope it ends well, we will feel the ramifications in many ways for years to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the members of this House have had a lengthy and passionate debate today. When these hours of debate are over, I think the American people need a clear understanding of what the Democrats propose to do.

Lets look at the Democrats' blueprint, the Murtha Plan.

The Murtha Plan proposes to have our forces ''redeployed at the earliest practicable date'' with no details about what that means. Meanwhile, the Iraqi leadership only days ago requested for our forces to continue their side-by-side work with Iraqi forces. The Democrats' plan advocates redeployment before the job is done, which is nothing short of retreat.

The Murtha Plan calls for the creation of a ''quick-reaction force'' and an ''over-the-horizon presence of U.S. Marines'' with, again, no details about what exactly that means. The Democrats continue to advocate retreat, while

our President has stated time and time again that our commanders on the ground will determine the tactical plans, not politicians in Washington.

The Murtha Plan calls for America to ''pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.'' Are Democrats suggesting that we can negotiate with terrorists? This is a war unlike any other. If we leave this front now, the terrorists will come after us somewhere else. This is not about territory or conquest. This is a fight for the future of the free world.

The Murtha Plan supported by the Democrats is nothing more than an enormous step backwards in the fight against the Islamic fascists. It is a rehash of the same old policies of appeasement and retreat that contributed greatly to our lack of preparedness for the 9/11 attacks. The policy of appeasement and non-engagement has only emboldened terrorists in the past.

Thankfully, our President has charted a new course to take the fight to the terrorists so we do not have to fight them here at home. We must aggressively keep our resolve in this decades-old war with the terrorists.

Mr. SABO. I come to this House debate deeply frustrated over the chaos in Iraq. I voted against authorizing President Bush to take us to war in Iraq. I believed in 2002, and am more certain today that this war has been a grave mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but respect for the honorable American service men and women who have been put into harm's way. However, the goodwill I feel for these brave Americans is contrasted by my lack of confidence in President Bush and the Defense Department leadership. Once they got us into this war, they have, time and again, ignored sound military planning and blatantly disregarded the violent, grinding reality that has steadily descended on Iraq over the past 3 years.

As members of Congress, it is one of our highest duties to hold the civilian and military leadership accountable when they take our nation to war. To date, 2,500 American service men and women have been killed, and more than 18,000 more have been injured. There are no higher stakes than these. Unfortunately, H. Res. 861 does nothing to demand that the Bush administration correct its disastrous policies in Iraq.

Earlier this year, General Anthony Zinni, former Commander of the U.S. Central Command, pointedly expressed the views of many, many Americans about Iraq when he said, ''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. . . . These were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.''

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and people across the nation want a clear plan for success in Iraq. Americans want to believe that there can be a successful end to this conflict, and that our soldiers, marines and other personnel will return home soon. Unfortunately, it is hard to hold onto this hope given the President's stubborn refusal to acknowledge the failures in his Iraq policy. We must change course.

The United States has a critical role in helping Iraqis to build a peaceful, democratic society. I am certain, however, that an open-ended U.S. military presence in Iraq will not accomplish peace and stability there. Furthermore, waving the flag, with Congressional resolutions like H. Res 861, accomplishes nothing.

With mounting casualties and the $320 billion in spending on this war, Americans deserve to hear the unvarnished truth from their President and elected representatives. I firmly believe that Congressman MURTHA has the right idea with his resolution to redeploy our troops. We must make it clear to Iraqis that we support their transition to a peaceful and prosperous society. Hard-nosed diplomacy, Iraqi institution-building and support from the international community are better tools than the U.S. military to accomplish this goal.

I still seek answers to questions I asked Defense Secretary Rumsfeld in appropriations hearings earlier this year: What is your plan for success in Iraq? When and under what conditions can our honorable men and women serving there come home? The House debate on H. Res. 861 will not provide the answers, and I am still waiting for a thoughtful and credible response from Secretary Rumsfeld.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H. Res. 861. The Republican leadership has been promising for weeks that the House would have a genuine debate about the future of U.S. military involvement in Iraq. Given that promise, I am disappointed that H. Res. 861 is a truly hollow effort. Despite the eloquent words used, the resolution has no legally binding impact. It does nothing to require a re-evaluation of U.S. policies in Iraq or to change the status quo. It does nothing to address the mistakes that have been made in Iraq. The American people, particularly our troops serving honorably in difficult circumstances in Iraq, deserve more than cheerleading and sloganeering. Unfortunately, empty promises are all this resolution offers.

A vote for this resolution is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote for staying indefinitely in Iraq, perhaps a decade or longer. It is a vote for continuing with the current policies with no end in sight. I cannot support endorsing the status quo. On March 21, 2006, President Bush actually said that the question of bringing home U.S. troops from Iraq ''will be decided by future presidents,'' signaling that U.S. troops will not be home until 2009 at the earliest. The American people need to understand that a vote in favor of this resolution is a vote to stay in Iraq until at least 2009.

Let me address my specific concerns with the text of the resolution.

First, I am concerned that the resolution inappropriately lumps Iraq in with the so-called global war on terror. It was Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda who attacked the U.S. on September 11, 2001, not Saddam Hussein and Iraq. I believe it was a mistake to move intelligence and military assets away from the fight against al-Qaeda, which did not have a presence in Iraq prior to the U.S. invasion, in order to attack Iraq. Iraq did not pose a direct threat to U.S. national security, had not attacked the U.S., and could be contained with sanctions, inspections, and no-fly zones.

Second, and perhaps of most concern, the resolution endorses keeping U.S. troops in Iraq until there is a ''sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.'' By that standard, the U.S. will be in Iraq for a decade or more. That is unacceptable and unnecessary. And, in fact, it undermines U.S. national security by indefinitely tying up U.S. intelligence and military assets that could be better used finding Osama bin Laden and breaking the back of al-Qaeda around the world.

The U.S. cannot impose freedom, security, and unity in Iraq by force. Those worthy goals can only be achieved by the Iraqi people themselves, which will only happen when the Iraqi people and their leaders decide to put aside their sectarian differences. The U.S. cannot force Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds to make peace or to act for the common good. They have been in conflict for 1,400 years. Nor should the U.S. military be forced to remain in Iraq essentially as an army for one side of a civil war. As long as the U.S. military remains stuck with the president's pledge of unending, open-ended support, Iraqi politicians and security forces will use the U.S. presence as a crutch. Establishing a timeline to bring the bulk of our troops home and redeploy others to fight al-Qaeda would force the Iraqi people, politicians and security forces to resolve their differences, establish an effective and inclusive government, end sectarian violence and create a secure society. The U.S. military cannot solve the sectarian problems in Iraq. Only the Iraqis can.

Proponents of the resolution say that those like me who want our troops to come home are defeatist and want to cut and run from Iraq.

To the contrary, I believe the U.S. military has already done all that has been asked of them. Saddam Hussein is on trial. The threat from alleged weapons of mass destruction programs in Iraq has been neutralized. The programs do not exist, and didn't before the war for that matter. The Iraqi people have written and adopted a new constitution and elected a new government. It is time to turn over control of the country to the Iraqi government, Iraqi security forces, and the Iraqi people to build their own future.

Second, the resolution contains the blatantly false assertion that negotiating a timeline for bringing U.S. troops home with the Iraqi government undermines U.S. national security. Such a statement shows a misunderstanding of the enemy we face in Iraq.

Although today the president and proponents of this resolution fail to distinguish between the various enemies we face in Iraq, in a speech on December 12, 2005, the president actually did make important distinctions between the insurgent elements in Iraq. He mentioned ''rejectionists,'' which are mostly Sunni Arabs who miss the privileged status they enjoyed under Saddam Hussein. He mentioned ''Saddamists'', who are former regime elements who want to return to power. Again, they are Sunni Arabs. And, he mentioned foreign terrorists affiliated with or inspired by al-Qaeda, which even the president acknowledged was the ''smallest'' element of the insurgency. The one huge element he left out was nationalist Shias, such as those influenced by Moqtada al-Sadr.

The reality is that the rejectionists, Saddamists, and nationalist Shias, who combined make up the vast bulk of the insurgents in Iraq, have no interest in attacking the U.S. homeland. They just want U.S. military forces out of their own country. They have no designs on our country. So it is misleading, at best, to argue that if we don't fight the insurgents there, we will fight them in the streets of the United States. Even the foreign terrorist elements in Iraq seem more focused on igniting a Shia-Sunni civil war in the Middle East

and attacking regimes they consider infidels in the region, such the Jordanian monarchy.

It is also misleading to pretend that if the U.S. leaves that somehow Osama bin Laden will take control of Iraq. There is no chance that the Shias and Kurds, who represent around 80 percent of the population in Iraq, will allow foreign terrorist elements to take over the country. Even the majority of the Sunnis have grown tired of foreign terrorists operating in Iraq.

With respect to the argument about waiting us out, as long as the Sunni, Shia and Kurds cannot resolve their political differences, violence will continue in Iraq. It is not a matter of whether we're there or not. It is ridiculous to assume that the insurgent elements will stop attacking once a timeline for bringing U.S. troops home is announced and will wait to start again until after we leave.

I believe that negotiating a timeline for bringing U.S. forces home is a prerequisite for stabilizing Iraq over the next several months.

Announcing the termination of the open-ended U.S. military commitment in Iraq and providing a concrete plan, including a timeline negotiated with the Iraqi government, for bringing our troops home would undermine support for insurgents. Public opinion polls show that nearly 9 in 10 Iraqis support announcing a timeline for U.S. withdrawal and 70 percent want the U.S. out by the end of 2007. The U.S. cannot want to stay in Iraq more than the Iraqis themselves want us there.

As, the Commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, General George Casey, testified to Congress last year, ''the perception of occupation in Iraq is a major driving force behind the insurgency.'' A specific withdrawal plan, with benchmarks for measuring success in stabilizing Iraq, could unite Iraqis, Sunni, Shia and Kurd, against the foreign terrorists operating in Iraq. That would be a key turning point in stabilizing the country.

A timeline for bringing U.S. troops home that is negotiated with the Iraqi government would also boost the Iraqi government's legitimacy and claim to self-rule, and force the Iraqi government to take responsibility for itself and its citizens. Negotiating a timeline and strategy with the Iraqi government could, more than possibly anything else, improve the standing of the Iraqi government in the eyes of its own people, a significant achievement in a region in which the standing of rulers and governments is generally low.

Similarly, establishing a firm timeline for bringing our troops home could accelerate the development of Iraqi security forces and deepen their commitment to defending their own country and their own government. It would eliminate the conflict they now feel by working with what many of them see as an occupying force. It would allow them to defend a sovereign Iraqi government, rather than fight alongside U.S. forces.

A plan to bring the bulk of our troops home from Iraq and free up intelligence and defense assets to redeploy to fight al-Qaeda, particularly in Afghanistan and along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, could also help the United States in our broader fight against Islamic extremists with global ambitions. It would make the U.S. safer by taking away a recruiting tool and training ground. Former Director of the CIA, Porter Goss, testified to Congress that, ''Islamic extremists are exploiting the Iraqi conflict to recruit new anti-U.S. jihadists. These jihadists who survive will leave Iraq experienced and focused on acts of urban terrorism.'' He went on to say, ''The Iraq conflict, while not a cause of extremism, has become a cause for extremists.''

In addition to a timeline, I have proposed that U.S. troops be removed from front line combat positions in Iraqi cities and towns, turning over daily security patrols, interactions with citizens, and any offensive security actions to the Iraqis themselves. The training and equipping of Iraqi security forces should be accelerated. The U.S. must renounce any U.S. interest in constructing permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq. It is also important to accelerate reconstruction spending and grant the bulk of reconstruction contracts to local companies employing Iraqis rather than multinational corporations, whom have proven inefficient, inflexible, sometimes fraudulent and have even imported workers rather than employing Iraqis. The U.S. embassy in Baghdad should also be reduced to normal size and authority rather than establishing one of the largest embassies in the world.

Third, I am concerned that the resolution continues to mislead the American people, about the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein was a brutal tyrant. I am glad he is now on trial for crimes against humanity. But, opposition to a dictator is not the measure I use when deciding whether to send our men and women in uniform off to war and possible death. For me, there must be a direct threat to U.S. national security to justify the sacrifice of the blood and wealth of fellow Americans. In the case of Iraq, I didn't see that. The resolution claims that Hussein ''supported terrorists'' and ''constituted a grave threat against global peace and security.'' Saddam Hussein did pay the families of Palestinian suicide bombers. So in that sense he did support terrorists, but he did not support the terrorists who attacked the U.S. The 9/11 Commission and other experts have found no operational links between Iraq and al-Qaeda. Further, as I previously mentioned, Saddam Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction programs and could be contained by sanctions, inspections and no-fly zones.

Finally, I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to a survey of 100 top foreign policy experts just released by the Center for American Progress and Foreign Policy magazine. The survey indicates that despite the cheerleading we're hearing on the House floor today, the U.S. is not winning the war against Islamic terrorists and Iraq has undermined our efforts. More than 80 percent of the experts surveyed believe the U.S. is becoming less safe. Even 71 percent of the self-identified conservative experts said the U.S. is not winning the war on terror. Twenty-eight percent of respondents, including 26 percent of the conservatives, said the Iraq war is the principal reason the U.S. is less safe, second only to the more generic reason of rising Muslim hostility toward the U.S. An astonishing 87 percent of respondents, including 69 percent of conservatives said that the war in Iraq has had a negative impact on U.S. security and nearly 60 percent said the U.S. needs to put more focus on bringing our troops home. The results of this survey of top foreign policy experts from across the ideological spectrum are sobering and directly contradict the blind optimism and endorsement of the status quo that is reflected in H. Res. 861.

It is unfortunate that the Republican leadership continues to prohibit an open and honest debate about the fight against radical Islamic terrorists like al-Qaeda, and the distinct issue of the best strategy for bringing our troops home from Iraq. The American people deserve better.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring those serving in our Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, and all the civilians serving here at home and abroad to protect America from terrorism.

With the support of their families, the brave men and women of our Armed Forces have performed their duties with professionalism and distinction. They and their families deserve the gratitude of this nation. We especially honor, and will never forget, the more than 2,500 Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice in our nation's service. And their families have our enduring sympathies for their loss.

To honor all who have taken an active part in the war in Iraq and the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan and around the world, it is the duty of Congress to aggressively pursue the most effective strategy for winning the Iraq War by demanding accountability for poor planning, mismanagement, and lack of oversight, in addition to developing a new direction that includes a responsible redeployment of U.S. Forces.

While I agree with most of the content of H. Res. 861, I cannot vote in favor of it because it does not acknowledge the need for a new direction in Iraq. This resolution was offered without any opportunity for amendment, preventing the House of Representatives from holding a full and fair debate on the most important matter facing our nation today. Our troops, and all Americans, deserve a better and more responsible debate. While I will not support this resolution, I will always continue to stand by our troops and their families.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against this politically motivated resolution. Our country is under a real and serious threat from extremists. We do not have time to waste on cheap political resolutions that distract us from the unity and sense of purpose that we should all have together, as Americans, in confronting the real threat.

We need to have a real debate on real solutions to determine an effective course of action in Iraq. An honest debate does not undermine our soldiers' morale, as some have suggested in an attempt to silence all questions. What is actually demoralizing to our service men and women is to be sent into harm's way lacking body armor and supplies and a definitive plan for success; and then coming back as veterans only to be harassed by creditors because the VA did not take steps to protect them, or not receiving the necessary treatment for medical issues like PTSD.

In fact, a real, open discussion of the facts on the ground and the challenges we face globally would show our soldiers that we are serious about this endeavor and their safety and that we want to be successful. That is good for our troops.

The way our current debate on Iraq is conducted, with resolutions like this, hurts all of us—this is political grandstanding. We can no longer allow political leaders to shield a badly conducted policy in Iraq behind the cloak of 9/11.

We were attacked on 9/11, and we had a united country and a united world join together in approval as we sought to stop the terrorists in Afghanistan. This had nothing to do with Iraq. And now, five years later, we find ourselves with a divided nation, and few allies who support our policies. This has everything to do with Iraq.

Despite the courage, dedication and professionalism of our men and women in uniform, our military has been strained as a result of the poor and extremely shortsighted leadership of the Secretary of Defense. Recruitment is down. Our National Guard has assumed a greater burden in military operations then ever before and as a result our homeland security is weakened.

The invasion of Iraq and our continuing occupation has damaged our standing in the world. Abu Ghraib, massive civilian casualties, lawlessness and little economic hope in Iraq have undermined the global support that we had to hunt down and destroy terrorists around the world. The war has not made us safer from terrorists—it has created more terrorists. 90 percent of the insurgents in Iraq are Iraqi. The sad reality is that we have created thousands of terrorists where there were none before.

But a review of these errors does not solve the problems. Now, we must look forward. We must ask, what is the best course for our Nation, our soldiers, and the Iraqi people? A policy of ''Stay the course'' does not address the real situation on the ground in Iraq. It does not provide a clear and understandable path to success and to bringing our troops home. It does not help us to address the damage that we have seen to our moral authority around the world and it certainly does not provide a plan to destroy al Qaeda and similar terrorist organizations.

Instead, we must have a new course in Iraq, a way of instituting fundamental change in our role there, and a way of removing our military presence. It is time for the Iraqi people to take full control of their country. The United States military cannot act as the dominant security force in Iraq indefinitely. I believe, as many leading military experts do, that our presence in Iraq incites and perpetuates the violence. We need a timeline for withdrawal so that the elected government of Iraq can fully assume its duties in the political, economic, and security arenas.

The principle of our efforts must be this: that we cannot want a free and stable Iraq more than the Iraqis themselves do. It is time for them to take control of their own country, and their own destiny.

I strongly believe that we must continue to support the efforts of the Iraqi people to establish a free, secure and sovereign state, but we cannot do this by occupying the country and dominating its internal security and economic development. International cooperation, economic aide, security training, and assistance for infrastructure development should be our aims.

Too many American and Iraqi lives have been lost. Too much money has been diverted to this endeavor instead of going toward hunting down al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations, who are the true enemies of our American freedom.

It is time for us to move forward together, in support of our soldiers, in support of the Iraqi people, with the support of our allies, and in the firm belief that with a change in approach in Iraq, we can secure greater freedom and prosperity here and abroad.

Mr. SODREL. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill once said ''An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile—hoping it will eat him last.'' We followed the process of appeasement with terrorists for too long. We ignored the jihadists for too long, and they finally arrived on our soil.

Let me highlight a few examples of terrorist attacks for which we responded with appeasement.

December 21, 1988, Pan American Airlines Flight 103 was blown up by a bomb over Lockerbie, Scotland killing all 259 passengers on board;

February 26, 1993, an Islamic terrorist group attempted to blow up the World Trade Center using a bomb in an underground garage;

August 7, 1998, bombs exploded simultaneously in front of U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania killing 12 U. S. citizens and injuring thousands of innocent bystanders;

On October 12, 2000, they attacked the USS *Cole* while docked in Aden, Yemen killing 17 sailors and injuring 70 others.

After the loss of the World Trade Center and the attack on the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 our military was finally ordered to take the fight to the terrorists.

When a new recruit is inducted into the U.S. military he or she takes an oath. In part this oath pledges the soldier, sailor or airman to ''protect and defend the United States Constitution from all enemies foreign and domestic.'' If I had to distill the U.S. Constitution down to a single word I would define it as ''liberty.''

Young Americans fought and died at Trenton and Yorktown to achieve liberty. They died at Gettysburg and Vicksburg to extend liberty to all Americans. They gave their all at Normandy and Iwo Jima to restore liberty to people they did not know. Throughout American history Americans have stood up to the enemies of liberty.

In my youth I heard the President of the United States say ''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, to assure the survival and success of liberty.''. That President was John F. Kennedy. He knew the value of liberty. As part of the ''The Greatest Generation'' he risked life and limb in defense of liberty.

The Greatest Generation spent 144 percent of our Gross Domestic Product defending liberty. Not 144 percent of the Federal budget, but 144 percent of the total annual output of goods and services in our country. Over 400,000 young Americans died in the effort. There are 9,387 crosses in the American cemetery on the bluffs overlooking the beaches of Normandy. The Greatest Generation of Americans was willing to pay any price, and bear any burden, in defense of liberty.

We have some people today who know the price of everything and the value of nothing. Has liberty depreciated so much? Is she worth less to us than she was to our parents? And their parents? Shall we tell those who lay at Flanders' fields we are not willing to support any friend, and oppose any foe, to make the world safe and secure for liberty?

Anyone who does not understand that Osama bin Laden is an enemy of liberty, deludes himself. Anyone who believes al Zarqawi was not determined to kill liberty is feeding the crocodile. The value of anything is determined by the price paid. For Americans throughout our nation's history we would not sell our liberty for any price. For our Founders it was worth their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

It took us 13 years after the start of our revolution to adopt our current constitution. The Iraqi people are progressing to a constitutional government at a comparatively rapid rate. I have a great deal of respect for those who are willing to serve in their government. Serving in our government often brings verbal abuse. Serving in the Iraqi government is often life threatening for them and their families. And I have the utmost respect for those serving in the U.S. military and coalition forces.

Mr. Speaker, as a young man grows up he is often confronted with bullying and intimidation. When my son, Noah, was a little boy I gave him two rules on fighting. The number one rule is: We don't start fights. I told him if I ever caught him bullying or picking a fight I would make him regret it. Looking for a fight is unacceptable behavior for our family. He asked me what the second rule was. I told him we don't lose fights. If he finds himself in a fight he did not instigate, if he is engaged in a fight through no fault of his own, then I expect him to win.

We did not ask for this fight, Mr. Speaker. The people who went to work at the World Trade Center on September 11 were not trying to pick a fight. The Americans at the Pentagon weren't spoiling for one. The enemies of liberty after being fed for two decades came to eat us at last. We all want our soldiers, sailors and airmen home safely, but not until the job is finished. Appeasement is not a logical policy and losing is not an option.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout the centuries a test of the human spirit has arisen; a test of our foresight; and, a test of our most basic, fundamental belief that we are endowed by our Creator with inalienable rights that no person—through tyranny, terror or any other mechanism—may deprive another.

Today, we face a new evil that is unique in history. It comes not in the form of another nation. It calls radicalism home, while living in every country, spreading quietly like a cancer awaiting the most opportune time to strike.

The question we face is simple: Will we rise to that challenge or will we exit the arena leaving future generations to battle a more emboldened enemy?

We, as Americans, are blessed as a free people and are obliged to defend liberty. It is an inherited responsibility that does not end at our borders; and while the major battlefield is halfway around the globe, it is a challenge that cannot be dismissed by distance—a fact the last two World Wars should have taught us well.

On September 11, 2001, terrorists, in a murderous rage, sought to shake our foundation in hopes we would abandon the cause of freedom. Since that bloody day, our men and women in uniform have not only answered our Nation's call to duty; they have not only served ably and nobly; but they, like thousands of American soldiers before them, have responded without hesitation to freedom's call for help and they have followed her voice into the darkest comers, bringing new life and new light to generations of the oppressed.

Today, because of their actions Afghanistan is rid of the Taliban; Iraq has been released from the iron grasp of Saddam Hussein; Osama bin Laden has been sent scurrying; and, his ''Prince of Al Qaeda,'' Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, has been delivered to his final fate.

After nearly two decades of being left virtually unchecked, we are now fighting back and beating back the terrorists. This is not a war on paper; it is a war with real costs and real lives are being lost—not the least of them the more than 3,000 innocent civilians who were murdered on 9/11.

We owe them and the men and women now serving on the front lines who have given the ultimate sacrifice an un-repayable debt of gratitude. We must live our lives in such a way as to be worthy of their sacrifice and we must pick up their cause and see it through to the end.

Make no mistake about it, the debate we are having today is an important one. The war we wage will dictate the course of human freedom for years to come. We can allow the terrorists to turn Iraq into a safe haven from which they can hatch and launch their plans to destroy our way of life, or we can create a stable Iraq that is an ally to free and democratic nations around the globe.

At every turn the people of Afghanistan and Iraq have made the right choice. Despite threats of violence, Iraqis voted not once but twice in national elections to establish a new government with new leaders. They have now completed the formation of that government and are on the brink of reclaiming their country.

My friends, I choose to continue to support our new friends, the Iraqi people, in their struggle. I choose to support our men and women in uniform. And, I choose to stand steadfast in this global war on terror.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and support this resolution.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 861 and to stand beside the members of our armed services who have gallantly fought and died for our freedom.

Early in the morning on September 11, 2001, our Nation was at peace. Then at mid-morning a group of terrorists attacked us. What had we done to deserve such an attack? We saved the world from fascism in the 1940s; then rather than punish our enemies, we helped them rebuild their war-torn countries. We saved the world from communism and helped those who were trapped in darkness behind the Iron Curtain see the light of freedom. We are the world's first responders to every emergency, but because a group of murderous cowards hate our way of life, our liberty, and our compassion and values, they attacked us.

Last September, I traveled to Iraq and had the privilege of seeing firsthand our troops' brave actions in combating terrorism. I spent a great deal of time listening to them and learning their perspectives. And these perspectives are contrary to what the American people hear from the media.

Their morale is extremely high and they are proud to serve their country. They believe that we are winning the fight against terrorism and that perseverance and patience will ensure our long-term victory. The most moving part of my trip came when I visited the Air Force Theater Hospital in Balad, Iraq. I was not surprised, but deeply touched, to see that all those I spoke with who were wounded in combat were eager to return to their units.

Mr. Speaker, I respect every Member's opinion on this extremely important subject. However, I submit that we cannot say we support our troops and also continue this overheated political rhetoric about Iraq being a mistake or an ''un-winnable war.'' This undermines the efforts of our troops and jeopardizes our mission—just as was done during the Vietnam war. Having served on active duty for 4 years in the early 50s, I understand that.

Our brave men and women are winning this fight for us in the streets of Baghdad so we don't have to face terrorists on the streets of America. As long as I am in this body, I will continue to fight for our troops and veterans and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res 861, the global war on terrorism resolution. I am opposed to the resolution because it is terribly flawed, nonbinding, and does not provide a viable plan that protects our soldiers or serves our country.

The general assumption is that the debate on the global war on terrorism, GWOT, will be a full and honest debate. In fact, the process we are engaged in represents nothing more than an exercise in rhetoric. H. Res. 861 is flawed because it does not reflect bipartisanship. Democrats were not allowed to offer our substitute or amend the Republican resolution. Further, I strenuously disagree with the language contained in the resolution.

I want to strongly emphasize that the failed Republican policy in Iraq includes poor planninq that left troops without critical equipment, and provided no plan for success. The war in Iraq exemplifies gross mismanaqement, as evidenced by $9 billion that is either lost or stolen and cannot be accounted for. There has been no oversiqht of spending to date. The Republican controlled Congress has refused to oversee military conduct and the policy that contributed to the war. There has been a complete lack of accountability regarding this war. No investigating committee has ensured taxpayer dollars were legally and well spent. This administration is guilty of entering into no-bid contracts, totaling $17 billion to Halliburton alone.

Let me be clear, Democrats want and demand a new direction in Iraq. We want a responsible redeployment of U.S. troops to take place immediately. We must redeploy and be ready.

I disagree with the resolution premise that the U.S. will prevail in the Global War on Terrorism due to the fact that the ''terrorist adversary'' cannot be identified or quantified. The misguided perpetrators of terrorism consist of disparate and loosely confederated groups, some of whom are religious zealots that justify their terrorist actions based on their Islamic beliefs; others are mercenaries seeking to retaliate against the U.S. for our invasion of Iraq. The terrorists identified as members of Al Qaeda led by Osama bin Laden do not adhere to a traditional command and control military structure, thereby making it impossible for our military forces to engage in traditional battlefield strategies.

H. Res. 861 presents the proposition that Saddam Hussein's regime supported terrorists and posed a threat to global peace. There is no documentation to support this premise. These allegations have been wholly disproved, yet supporters of the war and the architects of the resolution continue to propagate these mistruths. This is why today I reaffirm my steadfast opposition to another in a long list of resolutions that seek to delude Americans into believing that we are debating legislation that provides a clear direction to winning the so-called global war on terrorism. This resolution does not.

I oppose this resolution because it does not address the fact that to date we have spent in excess of $368 billion, mainly in the form of supplemental spending bills that are off-budget and contribute mightily to the Federal deficit. The resolution does not address that our President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Agency, NSA, all provided the American public with undeniably wrong information and allegations contrived to seduce them and Members of Congress to support an act of aggression against Saddam Hussein. We engaged in a war without broad international support. America, through its actions in Iraq, reinforced the perception throughout the Middle East that the global war on terrorism is an attack on the religion of Islam, and in some measure that the interests of the U.S. related more to controlling oil in Iraq than promoting democracy. This war has united our enemies and divided our friends.

I reject this resolution because it does not acknowledge that we hastily entered this war and unnecessarily placed our soldiers in harm's way, resulting in 2,500 deaths.

My ongoing assessments of the situation in Iraq have caused me to conclude that it is critical for the House and our nation to develop a strategy that will ensure the redeployment of our forces from Iraq and return them home. I support my colleague Represenative MURTHA and his calls for a reevaluation of our military strategy and a return of our troops as soon as practicable. As our troops redeploy, they will be ready to respond to whatever challenges our Nation may be forced to confront.

Finally, I oppose H. Res. 861 because it will not deliver any tangible solutions to the quagmire that engulfs our soldiers and places them in perpetual danger. H. Res. 861 provides the appearance of substantive and honest debate. In reality, it is merely an exercise designed to appease the emotional and intellectual appetite of Americans seeking to justify what they believe and have been told is a real global war on terrorism. It is not.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H. Res. 861.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 861, expressing our continued dedication to the global war on terror and the brave men and women serving on the front lines in that war. Alongside their counterparts from across the world, they have worked on our behalf to confront terrorist elements and foster freedom in the name of peace and stability.

I want to focus my remarks on the extraordinary efforts of the Bush administration to improve our Nation's intelligence-gathering capabilities and prevent future terrorist attacks. Armed with the new tools Congress provided in the Use of Force Resolution, the USA PATRIOT Act, and other intelligence laws, our military, law enforcement, and intelligence communities have scored many successes in the last 4 years. Their efforts to track terrorist networks and decipher their plans have broken up sinister plots here at home and around

the world. An FBI supervisor has confirmed that the PATRIOT Act led to the breakup of an al Qaeda cell in suburban Buffalo, NY. And just a few days ago, months of painstaking information gathering by U.S., Iraqi, Jordanian, and other sources resulted in the killing of the terrorist mastermind Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

For all the well-earned kudos that have been heaped upon the military and intelligence communities for their successful mission against Zarqawi, most of their successes aren't widely known and can't be publicly broadcast. The intelligence community can't take credit for them for fear of giving away secrets about their modes and methods of gathering this valuable information.

Which is why the revelation in the media last year of the National Security Agency's terrorist surveillance program was an outrageous breach of national security.

This leak—timed to coincide with Congress's debate on reauthorizing the USA PATRIOT Act—let al Qaeda and other terrorist groups know that the NSA had been intercepting the international communications of individuals with links to their groups.

Then-CIA Director Porter Goss confirmed before the Senate Intelligence Committee that the damage caused by the leak has been ''very severe,'' leading to the loss or disruption of some sources and methods—not to mention the damage caused to our relationships with our intelligence counterparts in other countries.

This program has provided valuable intelligence on terrorist activities. CIA Director Michael Hayden, who oversaw this program at the NSA, stated ''unequivocally'' that we have obtained information through the terrorist surveillance program that would not otherwise have been available.

It's also consistent with Congress's direction that the President use ''all necessary and appropriate force'' against nations, groups, and individuals found to be responsible for the 9/11 attacks. We have tracked and intercepted calls in cases where we have reason to believe that at least one party in the conversation is a member of al Qaeda.

The program is also fully compliant with existing law, and has been reviewed by the Justice Department and White House counsel roughly every 45 days. Congress has been briefed regularly on its provisions, consistent with the National Security Act of 1947. Chairman PETE HOEKSTRA has confirmed that congressional leadership, along with the leaders of the two intelligence committees, had numerous opportunities to express concerns about the program.

Sadly, rather than giving the administration credit for working to gather intelligence and ''connect the dots,'' the outrage of some in this Congress has been directed not at those who leaked information about the program, but at the NSA and the White House. Unbelievably, four of our colleagues in the other body even introduced a resolution to censure the President over this program—a program that, had it been in place before 9/11, could have led the NSA to locate and identify two of the 9/11 hijackers who settled in San Diego in 2000.

It's simply irresponsible to claim that this program is outside the administration's authority, since leaders of both parties have had every opportunity to express misgivings over the last 4½ years. Frankly, it smacks of political grandstanding that criticisms were raised only after the program's existence was leaked to the New York Times.

Some have tried to minimize the significance of this leak, saying that terrorists obviously know that we're spying on them. But the truth is that terrorist cells need to communicate, and they'll keep using methods of communication that they know to work—and stop using methods that have been compromised. You can guarantee they'll move on to other modes of communication, now that details of the terrorist surveillance program have been publicized.

It also defies logic to suggest that the privacy of communications with known terrorists is constitutionally protected. Just like in every military conflict our Nation has fought, the interception of enemy communications has been a fundamental part of the war on terror. The day after Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Roosevelt authorized the interception of all communications into and out of the United States. That act was necessary and lawful—as is this more focused interception of al Qaeda communications, given the nature of the enemy we face.

Future al Qaeda attacks on our homeland are likely to be conducted by operatives who are already here. Identifying and tracking them is a sizable challenge, and it's preposterous to suggest that our intelligence professionals will cast such a wide net that they threaten the privacy of ordinary American citizens in doing this work. They don't want useless information that takes them off the trail of criminals and terrorists; they have neither the time nor the resources to waste. They're constantly working against the clock to counter terrorists and terrorist sympathizers who are preparing to attack when and where they can.

As a special agent of the FBI, I conducted wiretaps. They're wrapped in layers of legal protections and never done without probable cause. The NSA's actions simply give intelligence services the same wiretap authorities that have been available to those fighting organized crime and drug lords. Americans not in contact with al Qaeda can be assured that their rights have not been violated.

Even as we debate this legislation, terrorist groups are plotting to kill Americans. If the NSA tracks a call from a known terrorist in Afghanistan to a phone number somewhere in the U.S., it's in our best interest to know who's on the other end of that call and what they're talking about.

This is no time to let our guard down or publicize details of our clandestine intelligence work. The fact that we have not had a major terrorist attack in this Nation since 9/11 is no accident. The focused efforts of our intelligence officials have helped detect and prevent attacks, and we as a nation are safer as a result. They deserve our gratitude, as do all of our service men and women serving on our behalf on all fronts in the global war on terror.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the rationale for the Bush administration's going to war in Iraq has been one of shifting sands.

The first reason given for the action in Iraq was that it was necessary because Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, which turned out to be wrong. Then the rationale was the threat of nuclear weapons from Iraq's alleged purchase of uranium from Africa, which also was not true and was seriously questioned within the Bush administration before the military action.

Then it was said that there was a linkage between the Iraqi regime and the perpetrators of 9/11, a claim that has never been found to be true. The evidence is that al Qaeda did not have a presence in Iraq until after the President ordered military action in Iraq.

The Republicans try to paint Democratic opposition to the administration's Iraq policies as a reflection of refusal to use force. That is absolutely not true. It is a question of under what conditions and circumstances. That was at the heart of the debate over Iraq before the action was taken.

In 2002, a majority of Democrats voted for an alternative resolution allowing the President to undertake military force in Iraq, but only after first attempting a multilateral approach to dealing with Saddam Hussein through the Security Council, just as the first President Bush did in 1991. What Democrats rejected was implementation of an approach emphasizing the use of unilateral, pre-emptive military action by the U.S.

That approach has had a number of consequences: terminating inspections before the inspectors could fully disclose that there were no WMD; the twisting of truth about the lack of an Iraqi program of developing nuclear weapons and the lack of a connection between the Iraqi Government and 9/11; a belief that military action would not only be easy to begin with, but would lead to rapid development of a democracy in Iraq; inadequate equipment to safeguard our troops from the dire consequences of guerilla and radical insurgent attacks; and a vast and deep distrust of our Nation among peoples of the Middle East, Europe and elsewhere.

The situation in Iraq is not getting better. It's getting worse. As of today, 2,500 American soldiers have been killed in Iraq. Nearly 18,000 of our soldiers have been wounded. Tens of thousands of Iraqis have died. Iraq is teetering on the brink of a full-fledged civil war. Sectarian killings have risen rapidly.

This resolution represents a seal of approval of the Bush administration's approach to Iraq. I oppose it. It is essential that we change the course, not simply stay the course, and adopt policies that heighten the pressure to bring about that change and accelerate the reduction of American military involvement in Iraq.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with respect to this resolution, H. Res. 861.

Mr. Speaker, I pride myself on being unapologetically supportive of a robust military. I do believe that President Wilson was correct when he said the United States can help make the world safe for democracy. I believe that we must stand decisively against totalitarianism in whatever form it takes—and today, it takes the form of a twisted misinterpretation of Islam that is radical, extremist, and murderous. And nothing is more important to me, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, than supporting and honoring our troops.

Sadly and cynically, Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us has not been drafted to unify the American people around these principles. It has been drafted to divide the American people based on politics.

This resolution—a nonbinding sense of the House—is not a policy statement. It is a political strategy. It is designed not to win the war in Iraq, but to win elections at home.

First, Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about the legislative intent of this resolution.

It is a sign of this Republican leadership that they would introduce a resolution on an issue as critical as the war in Iraq; then refuse to include in that resolution a single idea, a single solution, a single policy that would actually win the war in Iraq; then refuse to allow sufficient debate or even consideration of alternative resolutions that would demonstrate our national resolve as well as our constructive ideas on how to prevail.

Who can be against the resolution's operative statement: "Declaring that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary"?

Who can be against the clause in the resolution that states that we "Honor the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces" . . . that we "call upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security"?

But the Republican leadership, in their callous attempt to politicize the war in Iraq has inserted other language that is troubling.

A clause I find questionable, Mr. Speaker, is this: "Whereas Iraqi security forces are taking over from United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight to secure Iraq";

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are reports that Iraqi Security Forces are not significantly leading independent operations. Proportionately, Iraqi security forces are performing fewer combat operations than just 6 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Majority should have worked on a bipartisan basis to write a plan to find Osama Bin Laden, and catch or kill him.

If the Republican Majority wanted near unanimity, they would have removed these clauses, or at least refined them. They would have allowed us to offer alternative language. They would have offered to hold bipartisan consultations to find language that would unite Congress and the American people.

Instead, they put partisanship ahead of bipartisanship on an issue that demands cooperation from both sides of the aisle: the war on terror, the war in Iraq, the well-being of our troops, the honor of their sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, let me make two final points.

First, about the importance of honoring our troops. I passionately agree with the resolution's call for honoring our troops. In fact, while the House debated this resolution on the floor yesterday, I secured a public commitment from the Army at an Armed Services Committee hearing that they would end the shortages of life-saving coagulant products that help our soldiers from bleeding to death. Every day for the past 2 weeks I have been working on this issue.

It is proper that we pass a non-binding resolution honoring our troops. But I have secured a commitment from the Army to bind their wounds. So I will not take second place to anyone in this body on the issue of supporting and honoring our troops. And I am insulted that some of the very same people who rail about not degrading the morale of our troops will use the vote on this resolution to degrade the morale of our troops.

Second, Mr. Speaker, instead of passing non-binding resolutions that are political documents, let us pass a binding policy to win the war on terror. The resolution we should be voting on today would require the President to certify to Congress that number of Iraqi forces that have reached combat proficiency, and redeploy an equivalent number of U.S. forces. It would commit some of those forces to containing the growing resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan and finding, once and for all, the murderer who escaped our grasp and started the real war on terror—Osama Bin Laden. It would commit ourselves to properly funding our troops so that no American citizen has to dig into their own pockets and mail life-saving coagulants to our troops because they were not properly equipped.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if those who wrote this resolution spent more time unifying us around those principles and less time dividing us on political rhetoric, we might be out of Iraq by now, and relentlessly finding, capturing and killing those who masterminded the attacks on our country in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 868, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 153, answered "present" 5, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—256

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—153

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Skelton
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Boyd
Jones (NC)
McCotter
Miller (NC)
Sherman

NOT VOTING—19

Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Carter
Cleaver
Dingell
Evans
Gutierrez
Johnson, Sam
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lewis (CA)

Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Reichert	Sessions	Wilson (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1117

Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 16, 2006, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 861, the resolution on the War in Iraq.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 288, for H. Res. 861, I would have voted "nay" on this non-binding and toothless sham of a resolution, that was not a meaningful legislative document.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2006, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 287 due to a family emergency.

On rollcall vote No. 287, if present, I would have voted "aye."

On June 16, 2006, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 288 due to the same family emergency.

On rollcall vote No. 288, if present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall vote 288, final passage of 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. Had I been able to be here I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 288.

We are in a world war against terrorism, a world war, and Iraq is a major battlefield of that war right now. The reason we are not being attacked in large part here in the United States, in my opinion, is because our your men and women in uniform serving in Iraq are making sacrifices over there, in the middle of the storm, where terrorism has its genesis, where Iran and Syria and other countries are supporting terrorism. The terrorists and their state-sponsors do not want democracy to flourish over there, because they know their days will be numbered if democracy succeeds. The killing of Al Qaeda leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi shows that our young men and women fighting over there are making the terrorist days numbered, in my opinion.

I would like to just make one quote from Sir Winston Churchill, when I think about my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and they start talking about how we have to get out of there right now. Sir Winston Churchill, who was one of the greatest leaders of the 20th century, he said in a speech that he made entitled "We Shall Fight on the Beaches," which is very famous, he says: "Wars are not won by evacuations." You do not win by retreating.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4157

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 4157, the Health Information Technology Promotion Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the calendar.

I yield to my friend Mr. BOEHNER, the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the whip for yielding.

Next week we will convene on Monday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 o'clock for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A list of those will be sent out by the end of today. Any votes called on these will be rolled until 5 p.m. on Monday. I want to repeat that: 5 p.m. we will vote on Monday.

For the balance of the week, the House will consider on Tuesday, the Department of Defense appropriation bill; Wednesday, the Voting Rights Act, the reauthorization and several amendments; and on Thursday, we will do the legislative line item veto.

I will remind Members there are no votes next Friday.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for his information.

The leader and I had a brief conversation, as you recall, with reference to the time when we would vote on Monday. I know that you have considered that, but I would again reiterate, as you know, one of the problems is in order for a Member on the west coast to get here, they need at least until 5:30 to be assured of being available for a vote. I know you must have considered this.

Mr. BOEHNER. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. We have discussed it. It is somewhat problematic, but I think what I would say to my colleague is let me keep working with you to see if we can't come to some agreement. I think 6 o'clock would be too late but 5:30 may work. We will continue to work with you on that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to working with him on this to accommodate those Members on the west coast in particular.

There is a change in the announced schedule with regard to first votes, as we have discussed, and I appreciate your responding to that.

With respect to the Labor-Health bill, it was our expectation that the Labor-Health-Education appropriations bill, which was reported out of committee this week, would be on the floor this coming week. As you know, that included within it a bipartisan-approved increase in the minimum wage, by $2.10, to $7.25 over the next 30 months. I notice that that bill is not on the schedule for next week. Can you tell me the status of the Health and Human Services appropriations bill?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. We are continuing to work with the appropriators, trying to resolve some issues in order to find a way to bring it to the floor, but we do not expect to consider it next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

If I might follow it up, we would very much hope that the amendment that was adopted, and we believe is supported by over 80 percent of the American public, would be protected under the rule. We obviously understand that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and would require a waiver, as many have been given in the past. I would respectfully request that you look at that and, in light of the fact of the bipartisan support in the committee, seriously consider and hopefully give a waiver so that that matter may be considered on the floor with a vote by the membership.

If you have any comment, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BOEHNER. I understand your interest.

Mr. HOYER. It will be continuing. I thank you.

We understood next week was supposed to be health care week. Yet no health care legislation is listed. For example, the Health IT or the bill authored by Mr. SHADEGG are not on your announcement. When do you anticipate we may see either of these pieces of legislation on the floor?

Mr. BOEHNER. We were hoping to do that Health IT bill next week. We have got some scoring issues and some what we believe are problems with CBO that we are trying to iron out. So I would expect hopefully those will be ironed out next week and possibly bring that bill up for the following week.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you.

The last question I would ask you, Mr. Leader, you and I have had a discussion. You have been in the leadership of the consideration of the pension reform legislation. Obviously, we all know it is critical to employees, critical to companies. It has been now pending in conference for many, many months. I am wondering whether or not you might give us some thought as to its status and its prospects.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. As the gentleman knows, I do several media events every week where members of the press routinely ask me every Tuesday and every Thursday the same question, and as you know, this is a very difficult issue. Protecting Americans' pensions and the commitments that have been made

to them by their employers is very important, and trying to strengthen the funding rules over these plans is critically important.

I can tell you that there are some issues that we are hung up on. We have had a lot of conversations. We are continuing to have conversations. I am a little more optimistic today than I was yesterday, but we are not there yet. There are Democrat Members who have been involved in at least informal conversations on both sides of the Capitol with regard to how we would proceed, but no timeline yet.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

As you recall when we discussed this matter, it is still my understanding that the Democratic conferees have yet to be really engaged in the conference proceedings. You and I had a discussion on that, and I would hope that that might happen.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Most of the Republican conferees have yet to sit down at the table as well. The principals have been involved and the leadership on both sides have been involved, and as I said, there have been a lot of informal conversations with Democrat Members on both sides of the Capitol.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, you indicate that the leadership on both sides of the aisle have been involved.

Mr. BOEHNER. I said Democrat Members have been involved on both sides of the Capitol.

Mr. HOYER. I mean the leadership of the committees is what I was talking about.

Mr. BOEHNER. The leadership on the Senate side and the House side have been engaged in this as well.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the comments and would hope that is the case, and we will talk to our leaders on that so that we can both, working together, move this bill forward.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006 AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVING MEMBER FROM COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 872) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 872

Resolved, That Mr. Jefferson is hereby removed from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1130

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION BOARD OF ADVISORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 214(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15344), and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors for a term of 2 years.

Mr. Thomas A. Fuentes, Lake Forest, California.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

IRAQ

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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 their mission accomplished, they are still there, still fighting a guerrilla war for which they weren't properly trained or equipped, still paying for the tragic blunders of their civilian superiors, and still risking life and limb because of a security threat that never even existed.

If American troops are still in Iraq at year's end, and, unfortunately, it appears they might be, we will have been in Iraq longer than these soldiers' grandfathers fought in World War II. The difference is that that was a much different war, with a clearer objective, a national consensus, a moral core, and a just cause.

Not only has Iraq not made us safer; it has actually harmed our national security, making the United States an international pariah, provoking the range of anti-American jihadists around the Muslim world, and stoking the fires of an insurgency that gets stronger every day, every day that we are in Iraq.

And that doesn't even take into account the staggering human cost, the 2,500th American soldier killed just yesterday, more than 1,800 soldiers gravely wounded, thousands of others mentally and physically traumatized by their combat experience, not to mention the countless tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians who died for the cause of their own so-called liberation.

Mr. Speaker, the sham resolution that the Republicans in Congress brought to the floor yesterday and that we voted on just a few minutes ago is yet another partisan divisive attempt to stay the course and to link support for this war to support for our troops.

We could have debated particulars of a military disengagement. We could have a substantive discussion that results in an actual change in the Nation's Iraq policy. Instead, we did nothing more than a little Kabuki dance that at the end of the day won't change a single thing except to prove that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to distort the facts and use the war and our troops for politics.

There is nothing inconsistent about having the deepest contempt for the war, but the utmost admiration for the soldiers on the front lines. Last fall, I traveled to Iraq and visited with our troops. My conversations with them only confirmed what I already knew, that these are uniquely loyal, intelligent, and courageous Americans. They represent the very finest our country has to offer, and they deserve our unyielding gratitude every hour of every day.

If only they had civilian leaders who were worthy of their service and their sacrifice. If only the people who are running this war had half the honor, half the integrity of the men and women who are fighting it. It is because I support the troops that I have advocated so passionately for their return home. And we can do that, and we can do it without abandoning Iraq.

We must establish a multilateral security force to keep the peace in Iraq

while shifting the U.S. role from military occupier to reconstruction partner. This is what the American people want, Mr. Speaker. They want to help Iraq rebuild and become a free democratic society, but they want it done without another drop of American bloodshed. They want their sons and daughters, they want their mothers and fathers, their brothers and sisters, their friends and neighbors back home where they belong.

What we need now is action from Washington, not platitudes and photo opportunities, not inconsequential resolutions that require lawmakers to risk absolutely nothing. The American people are looking to Washington. They are begging for leadership. It is time this Congress and the President of the United States provided some.

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

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

WAR ON TERROR

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, international terrorism is an issue of life and death, not just for each of us individually but for our Nation and our way of life.

We did not want this fight. We didn't invite this fight. We did not wish to engage in this battle. However, once our enemy crossed over the line and confirmed for us and the world that they were unwilling to respect international law, respect individual liberty, and respect the sovereignty of nations, and that they were willing and desirous of engaging in mortal battle, no other option was left to us or to the civilized world.

Abu Musab al Zarqawi, on January 23, 2005, said this: ''We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology.'' So this discussion over the past few days comes down to a fundamental question: What is the appropriate strategy and tactic to adopt to win the war on terror? Will we withdraw and simply defend a policy of isolation and containment, or will we aggressively combat terrorism and take the battle to our enemy?

Now, this war is unlike any other in history. Our enemy has no single home. It recruits and trains its army from nations around the world. The only unifying element is hate, hate for democracy and hate for liberty. Thankfully, we have stayed the course. Thankfully, we have persevered in both Iraq and Afghanistan, because the greatest threat to terrorism is freedom and liberty and democracy in the Middle East and beyond.

And great progress is being made. Last week, the U.S. and Iraqi forces eliminated al Qaeda's top terrorist, Zarqawi. This was accomplished with excellent intelligence, and that information came from Iraqi citizens themselves. A very positive sign. And while Zarqawi was eliminated, finding him brought a wealth of information, allowing U.S. and Iraqi forces to dismantle many more pieces of al Qaeda's puzzle. And Iraq just this past week selected three more officials, cabinet ministers, to serve in its standing government. These are very positive accomplishments.

But it is also important for us to remember what led up to this war, and just a short look at a couple of the incidents over the last 30 years will bring it into focus and vividly demonstrate the death, destruction, and terror brought to Americans by our enemy.

The Iran hostage crisis in 1979, where our hostages were held for 444 days;

1983 suicide bomb attacks in Beirut, Lebanon, killing 242 Americans;

1985, the *Achille Lauro* hijacking, where an invalid American was murdered in his wheelchair;

1988, Pan Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 259 people on board;

February 26, 1993, the first World Trade Center bombing;

1996, Khobar Towers bombing, U.S. Air Force barracks in Saudi Arabia, killing 19 U.S. military personnel;

1998, U.S. Embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, killing over 300;

The year 2000, the USS *Cole* bombing, killing 17 U.S. sailors;

And then, September 11th.

Now, treating these incidents as crimes and not as acts of war, providing reactionary measures rather than moving proactively will not work. And how do we know? Because that is precisely what we did for decades, and the consequence was 9/11.

The campaign against the United States and its allies is ambitious, simple, and clear. Terrorists will stop at nothing to achieve their distorted sense of reality. We could have stayed out of this conflict. However, giving terrorists free rein would not make us any safer, and history has proven that. The price would be more innocent lives lost, more bombings, and not an ounce of peace. We must not be held hostage by terrorism. That is not living in liberty and freedom.

There are defining moments for every generation. And for this generation that defining moment is how we engage in this war on terror, highlighted by a very different post-9/11 world. When we came to that defining moment, to that tragic day, we, as a Nation, with our allies around the world, decided we would not allow terrorists to win.

Mr. Speaker, freedom isn't free. The choice is clear, our resolve is clear: we must and we will prevail.

REPORT ON H.R. 5631, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–504) on the bill (H.R. 5631) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

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

IRAQ

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President of the United States to present a plan to Congress to start bringing our troops home from Iraq.

It has been almost 4 years since the President came to Congress and sought the use of force in Iraq. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I voted against giving the President the use of force. It was not a popular vote in my congressional district, but it was the right vote. I was proud of my vote 4 years ago, and I am proud of my vote today.

□ 1145

I have remained an outspoken critic of the President's policies in Iraq. There was no connection between Iraq and the attack on our country on September 11. There was no evidence of any weapons of mass destruction or nuclear weapons, and other weapons information was distorted. There was no direct threat against the United States.

We have paid a heavy price for the war in Iraq. Over 2,400 soldiers have died, 18,000 have been injured, and we have spent $300 billion-plus of taxpayer money.

Our international standing has suffered. In December 2004, I visited the troops in Iraq. I wanted to see firsthand what was happening in Baghdad. My experiences I will not soon forget. I thanked our soldiers for their service to our country. They deserve to come home to their families and a grateful Nation.

A lot has changed in Iraq. It has been 3 years since the Saddam Hussein regime fell. It has been 2 years since an interim government was formed and the sovereignty of Iraq was transferred to that interim government. It has been 15 months since the first elections in Iraq. Iraq has a new constitution. They have elected a permanent government.

In December of 2005 we went on record in the defense authorization bill that 2006 should be a year of transition in which the Iraqi security forces take control of their own security. That has not happened.

It is time to change the policies in Iraq, and yet the President still says let's stay the course. We need a new direction in Iraq. That direction should include the drawdown of American troops. We have 130,000 soldiers serving in Iraq. 20 percent are from our National Guard and Reservists. Military experts have recommended a drawdown of 10,000 troops a month.

Although we should not announce a specific time schedule, it is reasonable to expect that one-half of our combat troops could be home by the end of 2006, and all of our combat troops home by the end of 2007. It should start with our National Guard. They were never intended to be the primary coverage for a military operation. We need them home to meet local needs.

This would allow us to achieve certain necessary objectives, bringing our troops home to their families and not in the middle of a civil war. It is an important message to the Iraqi government that they cannot assume that American soldiers will be there indefinitely to take care of their own security needs. It would remove propaganda for al Qaeda in which they look at the United States as being an occupation force, and it allows us to stage outside of Iraq to work with our allies and international community to fight international terrorism. We have lost our focus in the war against terror. It would help us preserve an all-volunteer military.

We also need to organize an international conference, including the Iraqi government and our friends internationally. The United States is the only superpower. We need to mend our diplomatic fences. We need to engage the international community. It is in their interest to help us in Iraq, to create a ceasefire for the Iraqi government and its militia, train the security forces, and coordinate humanitarian aid and infrastructure assistance.

We need to honor our commitment to our military veteran families and strengthen troop recruitment. The voluntary military is in danger because of excessive deployments. Morale is down because of long tours of duty and our failure to live up to our commitments on veterans' benefits.

The recruitment goal in 2005 was missed by 6,000, and our National Guard and Reservists have only hit 80 percent of their goal. The answer is the proper deployment of our military and honoring our veterans, commitments on benefits, including health benefits, so that the 18,000 who are returning injured from Iraq and the 50,000 who we anticipate will have battle fatigue related issues are dealt with as we have promised.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President to change course in Iraq in order to further U.S. interests.

FISCAL RESTRAINT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing joke here in Washington that the Democrats have no agenda. It is a joke, Mr. Speaker, and it would be very funny if it were not so true. There are ongoing press reports, just this week there is a press report that the Democrats planned to roll out their agenda this week. Well, it is funny because they decided not to. Well, it is also funny because this is a press report that goes back since November of last year. They keep having these press reports that say we are going to roll out our agenda next week. The next week comes and goes, and no Democrat agenda.

It is an amazing thing that such a formerly great party with such high ideals and strong agenda can't even get together an election-year agenda. It is an amazing thing to me as a conservative who has an agenda, who is a member of a party who has an agenda. It is a wonderful thing that the party leadership won't come together. The party leadership won't come together and issue an agenda.

Now I know there are some on the other side of the aisle that have high ideals and have an agenda, but the Democratic leadership in Washington won't come together and issue an agenda. I am hopeful they will because I think what their agenda will show, when they do issue their agenda, it will show two things: Waving the white flag on the war against Islamic extremists and raising taxes. It is a two-part agenda, and I am going to boil it down to those two things.

They are going to wave the white flag and say this war is not worth fighting, let's bring all of our servicemen home. Let's just work with terrorist attacks on our home soil rather than taking the fight to the enemy wherever they are.

The second part of that is big government. How do you have big government, Mr. Speaker? You have big government by having big taxes, by taking more out of the economy and bring it here to Washington, D.C., by taxing people more wherever they are in this Nation, Mr. Speaker, by taxing them more, and bringing that money here to Washington and running programs out of Washington.

Big government liberalism is still at the heart of the Democratic Party, and that is something that is very out of step with what the American people want.

Let's talk about what the Republicans have done and what our conservative leadership here in Washington has done. Just in the last 33 months, we have had wonderful job growth across this Nation. Within the last 3 years, we have had 5.3 million new jobs. Why? Because we have restrained spending in Washington. Well, not as much as I would like as a conservative, but we have been able to restrain spending here in Washington, and excessive growth of government. And we have been able to pass tax cuts that let Americans keep more of what they earn.

Those two things have led to this wonderful job creation, and that is why this House continued to pass tax cuts every year since we have taken the majority as Republicans. Every year we have passed tax cuts since 1995. And those results that we have shown the American people have led to the economy expanding.

Moreover, when the economy expands and people have jobs through these lower taxes, through conservative fiscal policy, you know what happens? As they make more money, they pay more taxes. The Federal Government gets more revenue when people are working, Mr. Speaker.

These things work, and the American people know it and they are benefiting from the prosperity that through conservative fiscal policy, we have helped lead the Nation in this right direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a very severe contrast between the two ideologies that underpin the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. They are two disparate views of the world and how we defend our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we should have this great debate, not just on the war, which we have had for the last 10 hours on the House floor, but we should also have a debate about fiscal policy.

As a conservative, I don't believe we have done enough in terms of fiscal policy, but we are making progress and that progress is getting real results. That is a wonderful agenda for a conservative party to stand for. Now we look forward to our opposition on the other side of the aisle to one day to come up with an agenda.

REDEPLOY OUR TROOPS

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, we were promised another chance to debate our policies with respect to the war in Iraq. Yesterday and today we had that debate. But those who listened to that debate need to understand that it was mere theater.

We had before us today a resolution that could only be voted up or down,

yea or nay. If I wished to offer an amendment giving voice to my desire and that of the majority of my constituents to redeploy our troops from Iraq, I could not. You heard me correctly, the rules of this debate that we had today precluded me from taking any substantive action.

I believe that one of the fundamental functions of the Congress is to act as a check and a balance to the executive branch. Yet here we are in the people's House, the people's House, unable to do the people's will.

Mr. Speaker, America is the lone superpower in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world. Along with that awesome and unprecedented power comes responsibilities to humankind and the planet itself.

America's reasons for maintaining her superpower status must be to export the best of our democratic system of governance and the hope of the American dream to the rest of the world. But these cherished ideals cannot be exported through force. We must teach and lead by example. Leading by example means modeling the behaviors that we want others to emulate. We must respect the rule of law. We must respect civil rights and liberties. We must stand firmly for human rights, renouncing in all circumstances the use of torture, assassinations, kidnappings as political tools, illegal detention, and cruel and unusual punishment.

Mr. Speaker, we must renounce the preemption doctrine. President Kennedy had this to say about the use of America's military force: ''The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want war. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert and try to stop it, but we shall always do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just.''

Mr. Speaker, I voted against authorizing use of force in Iraq. I believed then, as I do today, that Iraq posed no threat to America's security. I agree with the 9/11 Commission members that there was no credible link between Iraq and the 9/11 terrorists. I feared that war in Iraq would divert our attention from anti-terrorism efforts and serve to make us less safe and secure.

I called upon the President to tell Congress and the American people what circumstances would be required in order to bring home our troops from Iraq. My letter demanding articulable milestones and an exit strategy was sent to the President before the war even started, and to this day that letter remains unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, since that time I have participated in fearful troop sendoffs and joyous homecomings. I have nothing but respect for our brave soldiers. During the past 4 years, I have embraced and stood and prayed with Wisconsin families as they said their last good-byes to brave sons, fathers and brothers.

As of yesterday over 2,500 young men and women of our military have given their lives in Iraq. During the past 4 years, I have also heard from parents who clearly see that it is their children and grandchildren who will pay the $320 billion that this war has cost to date.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus and a proud cosponsor of Mr. MURTHA's resolution, H.J. Res. 73, to redeploy our troops. I only wish it was that resolution that we had debated over the past 2 days.

□ 1200

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). 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 WAR IN IRAQ

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to speak out of order and assume the time of Mr. BURTON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I requested this Special Order to read a statement that I earlier placed in the RECORD during the debate on the Iraq war resolution.

I did not request time during the debate because it was obvious that the chairmen controlling the time, all good friends of mine, wanted only speakers who support the war, and I did not want to place them in an uncomfortable position.

I did not request time from the Democrats because many of my colleagues in the minority were using this debate in a bitterly partisan way. Surely, war should be the last thing that should become partisan.

Yet 80 percent of the House Republicans, including me, voted against the bombings in Bosnia and Kosovo when President Clinton was in the White House. I believe 80 percent of Republicans would have opposed the war in Iraq if it had been started by President Clinton or Gore, and probably almost all the Democrats would have then been supporting it, as they did the bombings in Bosnia and Kosovo.

Much of the resolution that was just passed by this House contains language that everyone supports, especially the praise for our troops. Our troops do a great job everywhere they are sent. And it is certainly no criticism of them to criticize this war.

In August of 2002, 2 months before Congress voted for the war in Iraq, Dick Armey, then our Republican majority leader, in a speech in Iowa said, ''I don't believe America will justifiably make an unprovoked attack on another nation. It would not be consistent with what we have been as a Nation.''

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 the evidence he had seen, there was 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 tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride.''

The very popular conservative columnist, Charley Reese, wrote that this 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, it was not to save America from any danger, imminent or otherwise.''

Many years ago, Senator Robert Taft expressed a 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 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 1 percent of ours.

We are not going to be able to pay all our military pensions, civil service pensions, Social Security, Medicare and all the other 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 on 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, a few days ago I found out that a rating service called voteview.com which studies all of our votes from the last Congress, 472 votes I think it was, from last year, in this Congress, rated me as the sixth most conservative Member of this body. And yet I am steadfastly opposed to this war and I have been since the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, we need to start putting our own people first once again and bring our troops home, the sooner the better. And when somebody says we can't cut and run, I surely hope they don't mean that we should stay there forever.

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

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask to address the House out of order.

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, I follow the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I thank him for his honesty, and I thank him for his eloquence. And I too, Mr. DUNCAN, wish that we could do this in a nonpartisan manner, and I would have hoped that we would have had every voice to have been able to be heard on this question. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue about the forces in Iraq, the freedom of this Nation, the right to defend our Nation, the right to tell the American people the truth that Saddam Hussein had nothing to do with the tragedy, the horrific, heinous act of 9/11.

If you looked at the 19 terrorists, you might think that we need to be engaged in war with Saudi Arabia. But we are not. That is why this debate had such insignificance because all of us believe in our troops. More importantly, we believe in the families and the wounded that have come home.

But I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, as someone who has just returned from Iraq, been to Iraq three times and Afghanistan; been to the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan where we truly believe Osama bin Laden hides. Do we remember that name? Someone that we allegedly have been in pursuit of for a number of years, a pursuit that has been stymied by the intrusion of the Iraq war. Rather than the global war on terror, we have misdirected and misconstrued the truth.

I am reminded of the somber presentation that Secretary Powell made before the United Nations; all the world was in awe, all the world's eyes were turned to America, America with the high moral compass. Yes, if America said it, it must be true. And now we can't get more than one or two countries to follow our lead. It cries out for a change in direction.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I hold up for the world to see and for America to see that these are the ones that we should be concerned about, those who have lost their lives in battle, 2,500 and growing, and the 19,000 casualties that are facing America. Are these the soldiers that we are going to say are cutting and running because we want a new direction that makes sense?

Well, I believe in the Declaration of Independence when brave patriots said we all are created equal, with certain unalienable rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And our soldiers deserve the right to pursue happiness. And America deserves the right of the right investment of its tax dollars. The global war on terror is where we should be confronting the evilness of the Osama bin Ladens and the others who are mounting efforts around the world to fight against us.

The insurgency in Iraq, the foreign terrorists are a mere 10 percent or less. It is a civil war in Iraq between Sunnis and Shiia. And Mr. MURTHA is right: there is no mission. The mission is complete. Our soldiers are victorious. Saddam Hussein is gone. We are not broom sweepers. We don't go around cleaning up IEDs. That is what their mission is. That is not a mission of freedom.

And so Democrats today joined with more than one-third of this Congress to ask for a new direction. And I would venture to say that we would have more if there had not been the hard hand of the Republicans to scare their Members into not going against the tide.

The war in Iraq has increased the burden on taxpayers. We are paying $300 million a day, a day, for this war. And yet we do not have monies for our enlisted personnel. Our soldiers' families are on food stamps, and veterans health care has been cut when soldiers are coming with catastrophic injuries, brain injuries that they have yet not diagnosed of how long they will be impacted by what we call closed-brain injuries.

We asked the administration to tell the truth. We asked them to recognize the young soldiers that were kind enough to sign this scarf. Yes, they are true and the brave, and this is not a question of challenging the soldiers' bravery and duty. This is a burden on the policymakers like Secretary McNamara, who indicated that he was wrong in the Vietnam War. But, oh, what a price we paid: 50,000 dead in Vietnam and broken hearts and broken families and yet someone 20-some years later was willing to admit they were wrong.

Well, I voted against this resolution and I voted because I never want it to be said that any war to which we send young soldiers into battle, the military into battle does not have the truth and the strength to withhold the understanding that America's freedom is at risk.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying when I went to Iraq and visited many bases, one sailor took this off of his chest. It is a badge of honor I wear.

We are not cutting and running. We are holding up the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. We want our soldiers to be able to pursue happiness, and we want a sovereign Iraq to protect its own nation.

NEWS FROM THE FRONT

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, news from the front: the war on the border continues. More disturbing news, this time from the forgotten front.

We have just voted to finish successfully the war on the first front, Iraq and Afghanistan. Our second front is the fight against armed illegals, human smugglers, drug runners and possible terrorists not just wanting to penetrate our homeland border with Mexico and Canada, but the forgotten front, Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, here I have a map of the Caribbean islands. Puerto Rico is a part of the United States, the location: in the Caribbean islands next to the Dominican Republic, southeast of Cuba, east of Jamaica. It has earned a reputation among border patrol agents as America's biggest threat.

This is not a photo, the second one here, of Americans storming the beach at Iwo Jima or Normandy. Mr. Speaker, this is a photograph of 100 illegal immigrants with landing craft storming the American beaches in a yola, a homemade wooden boat. The boat is from the Caribbean islands. Its cargo, Dominicans, Middle Easterners and others from the islands. The Border Patrol says when people storm the American beaches here in Puerto Rico, they capture maybe one out of 10. And here we have a Blackhawk helicopter, at this particular time, having to view this firsthand.

One U.S. Border Patrol agent says he interviews the survivors of these ill fated trips, and they say they are coming to America for that free amnesty. Once they get to Puerto Rico, they can go anywhere in the United States with only a birth certificate or an easily forgeable photographic ID, if the one Border Patrol agent at the San Juan airport happens to ask for that identification.

We must remember that one of the 9/11 hijackers made his way into the United States through the Virgin Islands. Then he took flight lessons at San Juan, Puerto Rico. More than 2,600 illegals have been found entering the country just this way in Puerto Rico the past year. How many more weren't caught at all? And just where are they going and what are they taking with them?

Most of them, we must remember, are not from south of the border or north of the border; but they come from all over the world. Since we don't require passports to legally enter the United States from Mexico, Canada or the Caribbean islands, people can easily get to Puerto Rico pretending to be

from these countries. Even people illegally getting into Puerto Rico then board a plane anywhere in the United States with some fake document that is mistaken for a valid American identification.

We have 22 border patrol agents in Puerto Rico, but only four of them are on duty at any one given time. They are doing the best they can, but they need help.

The border war must be won. We do it by first requiring all people in the Western Hemisphere to have a passport to get into the United States legally. Our 9/11 Commission recommends it. It is a national security issue of the United States. And then we give the resources to our border agents to make sure they can keep people from landing on our beaches and invading our country. It is a border security issue. We must win the war on this second front and prevent the unlawful invasion into America. Keep these landing craft from invading our beaches.

Mr. Speaker, lawlessness on our border breeds more lawlessness in the heartland of America.

Mr. Speaker, that is today's news from the front.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, over 3 years our Nation has invested in Iraq. In human and political costs it has been a heavy toll. We have lost thousands of American and Iraqi lives, spent billions of dollars, and squandered the greatest outpouring of international support in decades. And through it all, we have misplaced our focus on the threat of Islamic terrorism.

It is time for us to prepare to redeploy our forces from Iraq by the end of the year. Mr. MURTHA is right: redeploy but be ready. Some successes have occurred.

□ 1215

The recent killing of Islamic extremist al Zarqawi by coalition forces offers an opportunity to stem the steady tide of internal terrorist attacks in Iraq, while the welcome news that several important cabinet ministers have been appointed demonstrates that progress is being made. Nevertheless, these glimpses of optimism cannot mask the overwhelming recognition that this was a war of choice. The administration invaded Iraq without the necessary international support and without plans for stability, reconstruction, and governance.

Earlier this year I visited Iraq and saw firsthand the reality of our investment. While our troops bravely fight, there were few areas of security or safety. Sectarian violence and civil strife have eclipsed the progress of free elections. Unemployment continues unabated. Radical clerics promote hate, and anti-American sentiment has spread with fervor. At the same time the President is urging that we stay the course, we are approaching 2,500 American troops killed, and more and more we are learning the costs back home, families losing loved ones and soldiers physically and mentally scarred by war.

We have helped sow the seeds of democracy, but now the people of Iraq must take charge and bring about their own destiny. We cannot force our way of life or our ideals upon another nation, nor should that ever be our mission. Rather, we must encourage them to bring about their own change and promise that as long as democracy and liberty is their desire, we will be their ally and be devoted to their success. To prolong this transition will only deepen their dependence on our resources, will further radicalize those who use our presence as an enticement for hate, and will distract us away from where our focus must lie.

It was only a few years ago that this Congress, with bipartisanship and unity, supported the President in embarking against the terrorist threat by ousting the Taliban from Afghanistan. All of our allies and some of our enemies recognized the strength of our convictions in defeating those who promote radicalism and extremism, and we were joined by the largest coalition in history. But then we detoured and launched an ill-advised military operation in Iraq. The results have been damaging, and instead of achieving success globally, we have reached and sowed frustration and recalcitrance.

I believe we are seeing ever increasing signs that our resources in Iraq must now be shifted to finish the job in Afghanistan and work with our allies to defeat the terrorist threat around the world. Not because we have failed or succeeded but because the process of democracy is never ending. And it is time for the Iraqi people to stand up and lead the way toward their future. Through redeployment and reallocation, we can provide regional support to those areas most susceptible to terrorism. We can refocus our attention to eradicating the leaders of hate who use global networks to promote radicalism. And we can strengthen our ability to develop multilateral approaches, reinvesting in the idea that key alliances is the best way in which to bring about democracy and stability throughout the world.

There are some who will argue that patriotism and criticism are mutually exclusive. This is utterly false. Our strength of promoting democracy, liberty, and freedom must be coupled with the wisdom of recognizing our fallibility. The difference between those who believe we must stay the course in Iraq and those who believe we must change course lies not in degrees of patriotism but rather in truthful disagreement over policy. Confusing the two leads only to division and partisanship, and we must avoid at all costs to allow an issue of such importance to be clouded with such rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I was against our Nation going to war in Iraq, but at every step of the way I have supported our men and women in uniform in their mission. I have objected to the heavy-handed foreign policy of this administration but have desired to see hope and progress for the Iraqi people. And now I call for our troops in Iraq to be redeployed by the end of the year.

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

(Mr. STUPAK 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 Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROSS 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 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia 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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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 Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again, the 30-something Working Group. I would like to thank the Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, and also Mr. STENY HOYER, who is our whip; Mr. JAMES CLYBURN, our chairman; and also Mr. LARSON, who is our vice chairman.

And I think that it is very appropriate at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the great comeback by the Miami Heat in the series of the NBA finals. And I can say on behalf of Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and those of us from the south Florida delegation and from the Florida delegation that we are very, very pleased of the outstanding play by the Heat. We want to continue to support them in every way possible. We know that they will be victorious. We have been wrestling with our friends in the back in the Speaker's lobby from Dallas and the surrounding area, letting them know that the final outcome will be a great parade in downtown Miami with the new NBA champions. As you know, as we look at it from a religious standpoint, you have to claim it. And we are excited.

There are some extraordinary things that are happening now. Dwyane Wade. If Shaquille O'Neal falls on a Chevy truck, he would hurt it. But Dwyane Wade has been able to overcome the injury, and also several of the Heat players and the Heat fans have persevered. So we look forward to Father's Day. I know that Shaquille O'Neal and Alonzo Mourning and Dwyane Wade are all fathers, and we know on Father's Day they will deliver a gift to themselves and to me and to other folks.

So I just want to say since we have the hour, Mr. Speaker, there are Members, I am pretty sure, from Texas, from Dallas who would love to come to the floor, whom we will not yield to at this time, to give their side of the story.

We are happy we have this hour. We honor the Heat and we are glad that there is a great series going on. And while we are at it, before I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to make comments on this, I want to thank the NBA for all the work that they have done not only in Dallas but in Miami, in their charities, and giving to the Heat center. At Little River Middle School, they have actually put some computers in, and they have been there over the years, but they have made a new commitment to that center and they have named it after the late wife of the Heat trainer. So we want to encourage the NBA to keep doing what they are doing.

I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you to my good friend from Florida, Mr. MEEK.

We are proud to wear the colors today, Mr. Speaker, and we have got the beads on. And because we could not be with the Heat in south Florida during their triumphant victory last night and the other night, we decided to stir up some spirit here and send some good karma home to them. And I can tell you that I have a little gastronomic wager with our good friend Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Dallas. I am looking forward to enjoying some lunch, courtesy of her and her staff after the Heat grabbed the championship. And hopefully, we will be able to be down there with them on Sunday and take home some of the spirit that we have been able to generate up here.

Thanks to your good leadership and firing up the Heat troops up here. I have worn these beads all over the place the last couple of days and yesterday in the mall, walking with my husband and my kids, got stopped by a tourist up here saying, ''Go Heat.'' So we can feel it all the way up here.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just as a point of information, as we start working in a bipartisan way towards the spirit of the Miami Heat, and it is bipartisan, we have Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, also ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, also JEFF MILLER from the Panhandle of Florida that have joined in in this Heat spirit. On our side we have Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, myself, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, and also Mr. ROBERT WEXLER. So I mean it is kind of balanced off as it relates to who has the beads in support of the Miami Heat. We rallied them when they were down by 0–2, and we will continue to rally around them now that it is even.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we would like to go into what we usually do when we come to the floor as it relates to the 30-something Working Group, talking about the issues that we have been meeting on, wanting to bring to the floor and share with the American people and also share with the Members of the House.

We talk about the agenda that was released, ''A New Direction for America'' by the Democratic Caucus, and not talk about what we may do when we take the majority if the American people find it fit for us to take the majority, but what we will do, and I think it is important to say ''will.'' And I always say we have the will and desire to lead. We have the will and desire to pass legislation. We also have the will and desire, Mr. Speaker, to take the rubber stamp out of the Republican majority's hands and put it in the garbage because that is not what this Congress should be all about. It should be oversight. It should be evaluation of policies that we would like to pass, need it be health care, need it be Iraq policy, need it be economic development. And in our plan, it is important to understand that we want to make health care more affordable for Americans, make sure that we have a fair share as it relates to prescription drugs on behalf of the American people, making sure that we can move into the area of investing in stem cell research for medical research for some of the cure that we can do now. Also work toward alternative fuels, making this country independent of the Middle East and invest in the Midwest as it relates to E–85, alternative fuels, making sure that we pass legislation to bring about flex vehicles.

Also helping working families. It is not a question of if we will. It is we will raise the minimum wage. And that is what we are saying on this side of the aisle. There is no question about it. The minimum wage will be raised, and that is a promise. Cutting also and reversing many of the Republican majority increases on student tuition. This is a very important point and we are going to talk a little further about it because we have legislation that is filed now to reverse that, make sure that families have tax credits and make sure students don't have to pay through the nose and come out of college in debt more than they are today.

Also ensuring that seniors and individuals receive Social Security benefits, need it be survivor benefits or need it be the disabled or just simple retirement, not privatizing Social Security. The ''security'' part is to make sure that when all else fails that there is some level of income for those individuals who have worked their entire lives. And requiring fiscal responsibility. This is the most important, if not the point, of the Democratic agenda of making sure if we say we are going to spend it, we had better show how we are going to pay for it. Not like we are doing now, spending and borrowing from foreign nations, making this country more indebted to foreign countries than at any other time in the history of the republic.

So we will talk a little further about that and define this a little bit more as we go along.

I would like to yield to my colleague, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and we will focus more on these issues as we go through the points again.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. MEEK. It is a pleasure again to be here with you and spend some time talking about the priorities of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I know when you were in the Chamber this afternoon you talked about what you would like the American people and the Republican Caucus, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, would like the American people to believe. And I know it sounds good to continue to say that the Democrats do not have an agenda. Well, sadly for you, Mr. Speaker and our Republican colleagues, that is not true. Fortunately, for the American people we do have an agenda. We have had one for quite a long time. It is right here.

Many times it is easier to graphically depict things as opposed to just using words, and we can take you through, as Mr. MEEK just did, our agenda so that, Mr. Speaker, when you are finding yourself standing in front of a chair behind the podium on this floor, you can keep this in mind when you would like to say that we don't have an agenda because that is absolutely inaccurate. The Democrats' New Direction for America, as Mr. MEEK said, pledges that we will make health care more affordable, unlike the rising health care costs that continue to skyrocket out of control in this country led by the Republicans for the last 14 years that they have controlled this Congress.

□ 1230

We will make a commitment to lowering gas prices and spend—yes, spend—the American taxpayers' dollars on exploring alternative energy sources instead of just having things like President Bush putting words in the State of the Union where he said out loud, America has an addiction to foreign oil and then proceeded to do nothing about it. No meaningful policy on the part of the Republicans in this body. No meaningful change in the energy policy. No reduction in gas prices.

I want to digress from this chart for a minute. First of all, let's just demonstrate the difference between what a new direction for America would be versus the same old Republican policies that have failed the American people and don't work.

Under Republicans for the last 14 years, Mr. Speaker, you have college tuition that has increased 40 percent. You have gas prices that have increased 47 percent. You have health care costs that have increased 55 percent. And median household income, Mr. Speaker, that has decreased by 4 percent. If that is the direction that Republicans would like the country to continue to go, then, you are right, the American voters in November should vote for the Republicans and continue more of the same. But if they want a new direction, if they want to make sure that we can have a leadership in this Congress and in this country that is committed to making sure that college and higher education is more affordable, not less, if they want to make sure that we can expand access to health care and instead of adding more people to the rolls that do not have health care and that go uninsured and that have to wait till their family members are so sick that they have to take them to the emergency room before they can get them some health care treatment, then they should continue to vote for more of the same and elect Republicans. If they want to make sure that they can move this country in the direction that most Americans would like to go in, then they will choose Democrats in the fall and we will make a commitment to expanding alternative energy sources, expanding our commitment to making sure that we don't have a continued addiction to foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, I find personally that sometimes graphic depictions, sometimes three-dimensional demonstrations are really incredibly helpful.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this is a gas pump. Apparently our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them don't appear to have seen one of these since they looked like this. The gas pumps from what I understand looked like this, oh, in about the 1950s. It appears as though many of our Republican colleagues haven't put gas in their own car since they looked like this, because if they had then they would realize that in most places in this country, gas is now more than $3 a gallon, that it costs a mom or a dad that drives their kids around in a minivan or in an SUV more than $50 to fill up their tank, and I feel quite certain that if our Republican colleagues were actually pumping their own gas, were actually having to observe the counter on the gas pump that shows, Mr. Speaker, just so you know, those gas pumps actually show you how much you are spending per gallon while you are pumping the gas into your car, maybe we could just pass this around on the floor and our colleagues could see what a gas pump looks like so that they could remember the pain that Americans go through when they have to spend that much on a gallon of gas. Then maybe we would have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle not continue to vote like the rubber stamps that my colleague Mr. MEEK always talks about. Maybe they would get some courage. Maybe they would realize that they shouldn't be voting for an energy policy that actually gives money away to the oil industry, to an oil industry that has made record profits, Mr. MEEK, more money than any corporation in American history in the last quarter of last year. It is just unbelievable.

I am hopeful that by my three-dimensional depiction, by my bringing an actual model of a gas pump to the floor, Mr. Speaker, then maybe some of our colleagues will keep in mind the actual difficulty that most Americans are going through when they actually have to fill up their gas tank by using one of these. I just wanted to provide a public service to some of my colleagues.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am glad that you brought a visual aid down because I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we break this down for the Members because we want to make sure that Members don't go back home in November and giving political speeches saying that, oh, well, I didn't know we were doing that. Or I didn't know that we were breaking a record in borrowing from foreign nations. We want to make sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects that those of us on this side of the aisle actually brought it to the floor in a form that a middle school or a fifth grader can understand. And it is important that we break it down to this point so that no one can say that they misunderstood, they didn't quite know what they were voting for, I made a mistake or whatever the case may be because now, in this day, in this Congress, we are making history in all the wrong places and in all the wrong ways.

I think it is important that we point this out. I want to make sure that I get that Washington Post article that talked about a special meeting at the White House. The innovation agenda, I want to make sure that the Members go on housedemocrats.gov and get a copy of the innovation agenda so that hopefully folks can be enlightened on what we have been talking about and promoting, not just yesterday, not just last month, this has been around, and the only reason why it is not implemented now is that the Republican majority will not allow legislation to come to the floor outside of the original thoughts of President Bush or the Republican leaders.

I think it is important that we understand an innovation agenda. We talk about education and creating the workforce for the future, making sure that there is math and science education, that we work on that and we provide the necessary dollars for it.

Invest in research and also development that promotes public-private partnerships, where many CEOs you will see on housedemocrats.gov have already become a part of what we are talking about and encouraging that to happen.

Affordable, guaranteed broadband access throughout the country. Need it be if you are in the heartland of America, you are on the east coast, you are on the west coast, you are down south, you are up north, you should be able to have an opportunity at this broadband initiative that we have for all Americans.

Achieving energy independence. We talked about that, within 10 years. Not maybe one day, not counting on the oil companies to do it but the Congress setting the stage, this House setting the stage for that to happen.

Providing small businesses with the tools that they need to be able to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am just going to take about 10 minutes here breaking this thing down, if not shorter, of talking about how we are making history in all the wrong ways. The Republican majority, I must say, has done an outstanding job on behalf of President Bush. You have got to hand it to them. If there was an Oscar, an Emmy or a Grammy to give out, the Republican majority would get it as it relates to rubber-stamping everything the administration hands down.

I hold here, Mr. Speaker, and this is no secret to many of the Members and it should not be a secret to the staff

that works here in the House of Representatives, this chart, this chart of the fact that in just 4 years, President Bush and the Republican majority has borrowed $1.05 trillion from foreign nations. We have the Republican Congress right under the President's picture because he couldn't do it by himself.

Forty-two United States Presidents, 224 years, were only able to borrow $1.01 trillion from foreign nations. How could that be? One may say, how can you do this in 4 years? $1.05 trillion from foreign nations. In 224 years, 200 years shy of what the President has been able to do, $1.01 trillion.

Let me tell you, that is staggering. That is not something that it happened in the forties or it happened in the thirties once upon a time. Calculate it. Forty-two Presidents, 224 years. Mr. Speaker, we are not just here as the 30 Something Working Group and dreaming up something. Those numbers are from the U.S. Department of Treasury.

Who do we owe? Who has their hands in the pockets of the American taxpayer? I don't care if you are a Republican, independent, you don't vote yet, or whatever the case may be, a Democrat, you have to have a problem with these nations owning a piece of the American apple pie.

Japan. Like it or not, I know it is painful for some of the Members to hear this, but this is the reality under a Republican majority. Japan, $682.8 billion that they own of the American apple pie thanks to the Republican majority rubber-stamping the Bush policies.

China, $249.8 billion of the American apple pie that they own right now, not because of the American people lack of making the right fiscal decisions but it is because the Republican majority has allowed it to happen with the American taxpayer dollar.

The U.K., $223.2 billion

Caribbean nations, $115.3 billion.

Taiwan, $71.3 billion.

OPEC nations. Oh, my goodness, OPEC nations. We can't do enough for them, but they are buying our debt, $67.8 billion.

Germany, $65.7 billion.

Korea, $66.5 billion.

And Canada, $53.8 billion.

The reason why, Mr. Speaker, you see the American flag in silhouette as it relates to the United States of America, excluding Alaska and Hawaii and Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories, but just to show this silhouette of the mainland of the United States of America, the reason why we have that, if you want to do away with the debt, elect a Democratic majority because we have done it.

The Republican majority, they are saying, well, we're going to cut it in half. It is almost like if there is a cliff, Mr. Speaker, and you are in a vehicle and you have to stop the vehicle before it goes over the cliff. We are saying stop. You are saying go at half speed. You go at half speed, you are going over the cliff regardless. We have stopped the deficit from continuing to continue on when we balanced it, without one Republican vote. And so it is important if the American people, if they are looking at the resume, they will elect Democrats to be able to lead.

What are we doing right now, Mr. Speaker? I think it is important for us to outline this. We are saying pay-as-you-go. If you are going to spend a hundred dollars, you better talk about how you are going to pay for it. What the Republican majority is doing now, they are spending a hundred dollars and they are saying put it on a foreign credit card so we would owe foreign countries money and leave it for future generations and this generation, which is unfair to our young people. Before they even get a chance at life, they are already going to owe folks that they don't even know because of the wrong decisions that have been made here in the Republican majority and that they have been rubber-stamping.

Substitute amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 95 in the 2006 budget resolution. Mr. SPRATT, who is our ranking member on the Budget Committee, put forth an amendment for pay-as-you-go like I just outlined. Not one Republican voted for it. To say that we are going to have fiscal discipline, not one Republican voted for it. 228 Republicans voted against it.

Again in 2005, a substitute amendment to the budget, saying pay-as-you-go. Not one Republican voted for it, Mr. Speaker. 224 Republicans voted against it.

I am coming in for a close. I just want to share this with you. I mentioned the issue about energy. Oh, well, the Republican answer, the Republican majority here in this House because I do know some Republicans who do feel that the Congress should not be rubber-stamping everything that the administration puts forth, and let me just read my article real quick to bring this into focus. I thank my colleague for bearing with me.

November 16, 2005 front page of the Washington Post: White House documents show that executives from big oil companies met with Vice President DICK CHENEY's energy task force in 2001, something long expected by environmentalists but denied as recently as November 2005, last week by industry officials testifying before Congress. The document obtained this week by the Washington Post shows that officials from ExxonMobil, also Shell Oil Company, BP of America met in the White House complex with Cheney aides who were developing a national energy policy, parts of which became law, parts of which are still being debated.

I wanted to just read that to show you that when we talk about alternative fuel and we talk about flex vehicles, I don't think the oil companies are with us on this.

This is actually a picture of an ExxonMobil pump where it shows regular, special, super. That is keeping us, like the President says, addicted to oil. And that is an interesting statement, too, by him.

E85 is an alternative fuel. ExxonMobil has said you cannot use your Mobil credit card to purchase this product. I can take a Mobil credit card when I go there to put gas in the tank, I can go in there and buy a bag of chips.

□ 1245

I am not a cigarette smoker, but somebody can go in and buy a carton of cigarettes with their Mobil card. Someone can go in there, probably end up in some States, buy a Lotto ticket with their Mobil card. But they can't buy an alternative fuel that is made here in America by American farmers and should be supported by the American people.

They are trying to make it even harder. They are putting the block in front of them, because they want to keep this thing going. Now I am not a Member of the House with a conspiracy theory; but, Mr. Speaker, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about record profits.

Here are the facts. This is not fiction; this is fact. In 2001, a meeting took place in the White House. Then all of a sudden we started being handed down legislation, Republican majority by the Bush administration. Oil profits went up $34 billion in 2001. I think that was a meeting worth scheduling.

In 2003, oil profits went up $59 million, billion, goodness gracious. I am getting confused by saying a million, a billion dollars. In 2004, $84 billion in profits; and 2005, $113 billion.

What I can't help, Mr. Speaker, is to say that it will be over $113 billion in oil profits in 2006 even before the year has ended, because when you have the Republican majority passing subsidies, and you don't have to spend your own money for quote, unquote, innovation, you can have those kinds of profits and have the American people paying through the nose.

Last point on the relationship, just one more chart here. I could care less about the former CEO of ExxonMobil as a person. You know, I am not going after him as a person. I am just saying that the Republican majority has allowed this to happen. He has $398 million of a retirement package, and on top of the Republican majority's tax policy, he gets a $2 million tax break.

You want to talk about the winners and losers in America, this is a perfect example; and this is allowed to happen here in this House and here in this democracy because the special interest has a special relationship. Here is the King and the President, talk about relationships.

We are on the side of the American people; it is just that simple. ''Energizing America,'' HouseDemocrats.gov, you get a copy of it, and you will see whose side we are on. If you are a Republican, you got to have a problem

with the way this House has rubber-stamped what the President has handed down.

If you are an Independent, you have to have a problem with the K Street Project that was alive and well to allow the special interests to do a pay and you play as it relates to getting policy passed on to the House. If you are Independent and if you are a Democratic, you have to have a problem that there is no input as it relates to bipartisan approach to policymaking.

Because if there were, and we did have a bipartisan approach, I wouldn't be able to stand here with a straight face, Mr. Speaker, and share with the Members and American people what has happened here in this House with the facts backed by third-party validators by the U.S. Department of Treasury and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I just want to make sure that we break out many visual aids because some Members of the House seem to be a little confused about what is happening and what is not happening.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are absolutely right. No apology necessary. It is really important that we have this time on the floor, and that is why we appreciate Leader PELOSI giving us this opportunity to make some substantive arguments that actually demonstrate how we are going in the wrong direction and also to lay out the Democrats' plan for taking us in a new one.

What has really boggled my mind since I arrived in the Congress, at the beginning of last year, is that our friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have no qualms about just ceding their decisionmaking authority here to the executive branch. Why show up for work? Why run for Congress? This is not an easy job. This is a job that requires a lot of responsibility, it requires thoughtful decisionmaking, it requires time away from our family and all of which, at least each of us on our side, and I know many of our Republican colleagues feel this way, that this is an awesome responsibility that we are given when we are elected to the United States Congress.

The Founding Fathers did not separate the United States Government into three branches in order for the Congress to just be a rubber stamp of the executive. They feared tyranny. They feared an executive that was too strong, and they wanted to make sure that there was a system of checks and balances, so that when questions that come from the executive come before the Congress, that we aren't just a rubber stamp, that we aren't here just to say, yes, Mr. President, absolutely, can I get your hat, can I hold your coat, Mr. President.

Our role here is to ask questions, to exercise oversight, to put forth initiatives and to actually represent our constituents, like you said, in the people's House. That is why I was very surprised, but pleasantly, to see the former leader of this Chamber under the Republican revolution, Mr. Gingrich, the former House Speaker, when he cited in the Knight Ridder newspapers, third-party validator that we like to bring out on this House floor, so that that way people understand it is not just what KENDRICK MEEK says or DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ or TIM RYAN or BILL DELAHUNT. Mr. Gingrich cited a series of blunders under the Republican rule from failures in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina to the mismanagement of the war in Iraq. He said the government has squandered billions of dollars in Iraq.

You know, we just had 10 hours of debate yesterday, which if you listen to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, according to them, what President Bush is doing, everything is wonderful. Everything is coming up roses.

Now, I think we could all acknowledge in this entire Chamber that we are, although I certainly am never pleased about any one individual's demise, because, obviously, we value life, but there were not too many Americans shedding tears about Mr. al Zarqawi's demise and the American contribution to it. The world, such as when we removed Saddam Hussein, is a more peaceful place without him being in it.

But you cannot, based on one individual's demise, in the cesspool that has been created by this President's policies in Iraq, you cannot say, now, you know, everything is great, this is the beginning of the end, this is the turning point.

Listening to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In the last 10 hours, one would think that this bombing of the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq was the be-all and end-all, and that is the thing that Americans were looking for to end this. Nothing could be further from the truth. That is why 42 people were killed in Iraq today, 42.

I mean, it is not like much has changed on the ground in that country. Our real security agenda that would take this country in a new direction, if we were able to win the majority back in November, Americans would see the direction that Democrats would take this country.

We would make a commitment to our troops. We would make sure that we had a real commitment to our troops, that we changed the military into a 21st-century one of military strength, and we would honor them. We would rebuild a state-of-the-art military by making the needed investments in equipment and manpower so that we can make sure we can handle the diverse needs and the diverse activity that we have going on across the globe.

What happened to Afghanistan, Mr. MEEK? I mean, when we first were attacked after 9/11, and we went into Afghanistan, and the Americans were united in that effort, we actually removed the Taliban. We were able to bring that country into the 21st century, restoring quality for women, and making sure that we had a democracy, democratic seedlings planted there.

Now, you fast forward to 2006, because we virtually pulled out of Afghanistan, save for about 17,000 troops that are still left on the ground. Now you have the rise of the Taliban again. You have Afghani women who are saying that they have been subjected to the same inequality and the same requirements of wearing the burqa and not being able to get an education.

We have abandoned Afghanistan; and, instead, we have added our resources in our effort to making Iraq more of a cesspool than it already was. If we are able to implement our real security agenda, we will make sure that our troops are well equipped, that we are funding the appropriate activity and making sure that we actually go after Osama bin Laden. We will make sure that the war on terror is waged both here in the United States and across the globe and that we strike a balance, so that Americans don't have to worry about being attacked in the United States.

We will make sure that we make a commitment to moving the country in a new direction militarily instead of continuing to fund an endless war in Iraq, that no matter what has been said in a 10-hour debate that occurred on this floor, still has no end in sight, still has more than 2,500 troops dead, and we know more to come every day.

Mr. MEEK, you are a member of the Homeland Security Committee and Armed Services Committee, so you are certainly more expert in this area than I am. But I literally heard in the last day and a half a policy of denial on the part of our Republican colleagues. It would be nice if they put both hands on the ground and yanked their heads out of it so that we could all come together and have a real debate, a real debate.

Yes, bring out that rubber stamp, because that is exactly what happened on this vote this morning. If we were allowed to have a real debate, if we were allowed to put forward our alternative, if we were allowed to file amendments, I would have been willing to consider to be able to vote for something and would have been appreciative for the opportunity to vote for something other than what the majority tried to cram down.

They certainly did cram it down their colleagues' throats. We refused to allow it to be crammed down ours. You know what, I don't check my brain at the door of the Chamber when I walk in the door. I represent my constituents.

You know, not everyone will agree with me back home in the 20th district of Florida. That is okay, because I wasn't elected to be a rubber stamp. I was elected to be a Representative, a United States Representative, someone who stands up for what I believe in and stands up for what my constituents believes in. I was not elected to rubber-stamp anyone's policy, not NANCY PELOSI's, not Mr. BOEHNER's, not the President. I was elected as an individual.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they do check their brains at the door. They bring in that big old rubber stamp, and they just pound it on whatever is put in front of them by the Republican leadership and say, yes, Mr. Leader, yes, Mr. President, I am glad to do your bidding and the heck with the checks and balances of the Constitution and our role here as a Member of the United States Congress.

At the end of the day, why be here, why run, why make the sacrifice, why leave your family behind? We only need one of their Members. We only need Mr. BOEHNER or Mr. HASTERT here. They are the only ones that bother showing up to work because these other guys on the other side of the aisle, they just do what they are told to do anyway. Really, they could go spend quite a bit of other time doing something useful and certainly could make sure that the country could begin to see what is really going on in this Chamber.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am glad you pointed out the fact that a lot of rubber-stamping is going on. The reason I voted against the Iraq resolution today, Mr. Speaker, is I will not dishonor the memory of those individuals that have died and those individuals who have been forever maimed or lost a leg or limb or that mother or that father that will never see their son or daughter, or that child that will never see their father, aunt, uncle or niece again.

The reason why I did that is that many men and women in uniform are fighting on behalf of, what, a democracy or something like it. You have a resolution that says, Democrats, we are not even going to allow you to put anything on the floor, we are not going to allow you to amend the resolution.

The rules are set on the third floor up here, Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee that says we won't even allow an alternative resolution. They say we won't even allow. Yes, welcome to the floor, and you will talk. But you know something? Talk is cheap. Action means everything.

So as a member of the Armed Services Committee along with my ranking member and along with a lot of other members of the Armed Services Committee, we voted against the resolution today, not because we believe in something else; we do believe this democracy. But we do believe in a fair debate in oversight and policy.

That is why it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we move in a way that will have our Constitution honored at the same time, and we move in a way as it relates to fairness for every Member of this House.

One thing that Leader PELOSI, if the Democrats take control will be the Speaker, had said we will work in a bipartisan way. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about the whole rubber-stamping issue. This rubber stamp has been used far too many times for the Republican majority. How did we get in the deficits, the deficits as far as the eye can see? Because of the rubber stamp?

□ 1300

Defense contractors and contractors in Hurricane Katrina were able to steal money from the American taxpayer through a lack of oversight because of the rubber stamp.

States are suing the Federal Government under Leave No Child Behind because we are only funding it to the low 30 percent and allowing States and local governments to be able to have what they need to have to carry out the mission of educating our children.

The trouble is because the Republican majority has rubber stamped everything that the Bush White House has handed down, and when we look at tax policies, how does a billionaire here, Mr. Speaker, have a $398 million retirement package with a cherry on top, $2 million tax break, of the policies of the Republican majority? Still we have individuals going to work for $5 and some change on minimum wage.

So I think it is important that we look at this whole issue rubber stamping, and we look at this issue of following Article 1, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution and making sure that we do what we are supposed to do here at the House.

I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your leadership so much and really the opportunity to be here with you almost every night. I am going to have to catch back up to the two of you guys, and I have some family in town this week. I look forward to continuing to talk about the new direction that the Democratic Caucus will take this country when we are given the opportunity in November.

I look forward to continuing this debate and this discussion on our commitment to making sure that we do not privatize Social Security and that we enact responsible legislation that truly shores it and does not use scare tactics against our seniors, implying that there is some sort of crisis that does not exist when Social Security will remain solvent for at least the next 47 years; that we make sure we enact a truly effective energy policy, invest in alternative energy resources and make sure that we actually generate the ability to become insulated from foreign oil, instead of giving away the store to the big oil company; that we make sure that we really expand access to health care, that we reduce the number of uninsured Americans and that when a child is sick, when an American is sick, that they can afford to go to the doctor and that cost is not the obstacle to basic health care.

Those are the things that we remain committed to. That is an agenda that we have put forward and that we look forward to talking about as the months progress through to the November election. I look forward to sharing the podium with you and talking about that for the next several months.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to thank Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for coming down to the floor today, as you always do, and we continue to work on these issues that are facing Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that since we are all kind of draped up in the flag this week and talking about who is a patriot and who is not, and I will not stand judgment even on my Republican colleagues, many of whom that have cast dye on some of the Members of the Democratic aisle of saying who is with the troops or who is not with the troops.

I just want to say that fact, not fiction, always prevails in history and also in the future.

We want to make sure, in the Republican budget, that we point out the fact that there will be a copayment for veterans. There will be a copayment of some $250 for veterans because that is what is in the Republican budget package. That is a fact. Their prescription drug costs will go up. That is a fact. So, if we want to get all draped up and teary-eyed and saying I have a tattoo, saying I support the troops more than you do. My car that I got is painted that I support the troops. It is not what you say or hear on this floor. It is about how you vote and where your dollars are as it relates to respecting the men and women that laid down their life, many of whom and those individuals that have that will never walk again to allow us to salute one flag here today.

I think it is important, and I take issue with the fact because I will not let their memory be dishonored. I take issue with the fact that individuals are coming to the floor saying one thing and doing another with their vote as it relates to those individuals.

When our men and women come home, they are going to have issues. They are going to have issues because they are not going to be able to deal with the effects of the IEDs that are going off, their friends being maimed, and still there is no policy as it relates to how we are going to deal with the issue of Iraq, how we are going to take the training wheels off the Iraqi government.

The only resolutions that have been put forward to deal with those issues are on the Democratic side of the aisle, and because the President does not want to talk about it, the Republican majority does not want to talk about it.

What is so frustrating is the fact that we have plans on this side to have discourse and dialogue in a bipartisan way so that those individuals that are there now in some areas in the Western parts of Iraq, eating meals Ready to Eat, okay, MREs, for those individuals and those individuals that are talking to their children by long distance, saying I am coming home soon and they really cannot answer the question because I have a 9-year-old son and I have an 11-year-old daughter.

I have been to Iraq twice, but you know something, when a Member of

Congress goes to Iraq we are coming back in two or three days on a Federal plane, being served food and drink. We are coming home. We are going to land at Andrews Air Force Base, and the air force people, God bless them and I love them, they are going to give us a ride back here to the Capitol. We are going to get out and we are going to go home, not like those individuals who volunteered, not drafted, volunteered to serve this country.

If they agree or not, they deserve a policy on Iraq, not just a cheerleading resolution saying, well, we are going to do a lot of wordy stuff; then we are going to mail this over to the troops and say we are with you. They know that they are with us. There is not a Member of this House, there is not a person I have received a phone call from, that says I do not support the troops and I do not think you should support the troops.

That is not what this debate is about. The debate should be about how we are going to deal with the Iraqi government, how we are going to continue to pull coalition forces in.

Guess what, you would assume under the resolution that passed today and with the speeches that the President is giving, that we have coalition partners that are running in saying how can we help. There is something wrong, Mr. Speaker, when the coalition is getting smaller of nations that are involved in this effort with the United States of America.

I think if I start giving a speech, and I am home giving a political speech, a campaign speech and folks started leaving the room, that means I am saying something that they disagree with, that they do not believe in.

So I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we pay very close attention and tell my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle that we pay very close attention. This is not a Republican executive committee. This is not a Democratic executive committee. This is not the Reform Party. This is not the Green Party. This is the U.S. House of Representatives, and I want the record to reflect in this time that we are making history in all the wrong places. We are allowing foreign countries to own a piece of the American apple pie who have never owned, at these numbers in the last 4 years, a piece of the American apple pie. The Republican majority is allowing it to happen, and it is unpatriotic for us to even think about being unpatriotic at a time such as this.

We should be coming together as Republicans and the one Independent in this House and Democrats, and figuring out how do we work our way out of this. It will take a generation fiscally for us to work ourselves out of the deficit that has been put forth here today and has been led on by the Republican majority because it has been handed down by the Bush White House.

Now, the President can invite as many Members of the House and the Senate to the White House for tea and coffee and cookies, but guess what, that is not going to cut it. That is not going to cut it. What is going to cut it is a Republican majority saying, you know something, enough is enough, let us put politics aside; let us make sure that Democrats are a part of a conference committee in a real discussion on a strategy of dealing with Iraq, dealing with education, dealing with how we are going to treat our veterans when they come home.

They are going to be at the dining room table with their families, and we cannot be stuttering when they get back as it relates to our commitment to those individuals that has sand in their teeth and are away from their families 12 months, in some cases being extended beyond that another 6 months, to say that, oh, well, we had to up on your copayment because we promised that we will provide health care to you because we want to make sure we guarantee these tax cuts for these billionaires.

Now, I think it is important and I think that we should get passionate and we should get emotional about what we should be doing versus talking back and forth at one another. We have to see it in black and white in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and legislation and resolutions that are passed here on this floor that are going to benefit those individuals in harm's way.

If that is going to be the topic of the day, then let it be the topic of the day. Let us see resolutions that come to the floor from the Democratic side of the aisle about how do we deal with Iraq, with Republican input. Let us see if there is some sort of resolution outside of a bunch of words saying, well, you know, we feel that the war on terror, and you know, the President and people are doing good work, and you know, the indicators show what the indicators show.

That is not policy. That is a speech for someone to go home and say you see, I voted for this because it said a lot of good things, but it did nothing. To say that we are passing this to send a message, well, guess what, that message is not penetrating the reality of this war, and it is important that we deal with it in a way that the American people and the troops know that we have their back 110 percent or reassure Americans that we have their back 110 percent by not shunting our policy responsibility. Right now we are punting. The Republican majority is punting because the White House does not want to do anything. Yet the White House, the White House says we listen to our military commanders.

Can we bring our military commanders out. We have eight generals that are retired that have said that they do not agree with how the way things are going now, eight of them, eight generals, eight generals that are saying they do not know what is happening. They have questions on what is happening, eight generals. So many generals are saying I was there, these policies are not right, but no one wants to listen. I guess they are not patriots now. I guess these generals, they have a cowardly way about them because they disagree with the President and they disagree with the Republican majority.

The thing about it is, in America someone should be able to say what they want to say, and there should not be any repercussions. I think, too, it is fighting in Iraq to try to bring some sort of democracy to Iraq. We are so much in the front seat, the Iraqi government cannot even get in the front seat because we have a policy that no one can figure out on the Republican side.

So I guess we are not going to figure it out. Forget about what those Democrats are saying in the House and Senate, about how can we do it in a comprehensive way and pull it together.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, other coalition forces and other countries may come in and say now how are you going to deal with Iraq and have the Iraqi government take over security operations in Iraq, maybe we want to be part of it because we do not want to continue to go on with the plan of just saying let us just go on.

I will use this analogy by saying this as I close, Mr. Speaker. To pass a resolution without true instruction on how we are going to deal with the issue in Iraq is almost like taking a carton of milk out of the refrigerator and opening it, saying, oh, it is sour, let me put it back in, it will be fresh tomorrow. It may be okay when the issue is a carton of milk, but it is not okay when we are dealing with the lives of the American troops that are in Iraq and in harm's way at this time.

It is not the right policy, and it is not the right thing to do when we have got kids coming home from school saying is Daddy or Mama home yet. It is not the right policy as it relates to those individuals that are our generals and our commanders in Iraq that are looking for some policy direction from the Congress on what we feel because we are the representatives of the American people. It is not the right way to do things.

So I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, we want to talk about what we are going to do. We know we have a new direction for America. We know we have a security policy on this side of the aisle. We know that we have a policy as it relates to innovation. We know that we have a policy as it relates to the fact that the minimum wage will be raised. It is not a question of we are not. It is going to be raised if we are in the majority.

We have a promise to the American people of sending in a new direction on this side of the aisle, that if we get the control of this House of Representatives, that we will institute pay-as-we-go policies to make sure that we work towards balancing the budget, and you have a commitment on this side of the

aisle, Mr. Speaker, from the Democratic side of the aisle that if we become the majority, that this country will be working towards energy independence within 10 years, using alternative fuels and passing policy that will have motor companies building flex vehicles so that we no longer have to be dependent on the Middle East and that we can fund and support the Midwest as it relates to corn, as it relates to sugar cane, as it relates to other energy-related issues to make E–85 here in the United States of America.

Maybe, just maybe, we will not be having the debate up here and resolutions of the House, spending a day and a half with speeches on a resolution that was written, handwritten by the Republican majority without not one word, not even an ''and,'' ''not,'' a ''but,'' not a comma, not a dot, by the Democratic side of the aisle and expect for us to come to the floor in a democracy and just say, okay, I will vote for it?

□ 1315

You wrote it, so I will vote for it, even though there was no input. My only input is to come in here and press the red or green button. Because the way you wrote it is the way you want it. And I think the American people are going to stand up against that kind of policy.

With that, I say for the Members to go on, if they want to get a copy of anything we talked about here today, to housedemocrats.gov/30something, that is housedemocrats.gov/30something. You can get everything, every chart that I showed here, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the Democratic leader for allowing us to have this hour, and I want to thank my colleagues in the 30-something Working Group for all of their assistance and time that they have spent, and I would like to thank the staff. It was an honor addressing the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CLEAVER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the funeral of a dear friend and constituent.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending his son's graduation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARDIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BALDWIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and June 23.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, June 19, 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on June 15, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4939. Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 19, 2006, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Melissa L. Bean, Bob Beauprez, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Michael Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, Sherwood Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Allen Boyd, Jeb Bradley, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Sherrod Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ginny Brown-Waite, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Benjamin L. Cardin, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Julia Carson, John R. Carter, Ed Case, Michael N. Castle, Steve Chabot, Ben Chandler, Chris Chocola, Donna M. Christensen, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Christopher Cox, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham, Artur Davis, Geoff Davis, Jim Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Lincoln Davis, Tom Davis, Susan A. Davis, Danny K. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Tom DeLay, Charles W. Dent, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, Thelma D. Drake, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Rahm Emanuel, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Lane Evans, Terry Everett, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Tom Feeney, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Mark Foley, J. Randy Forbes, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Jeff Fortenberry, Luis G. Fortuño, Vito Fossella, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Jim Gibbons, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Paul E. Gillmor, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Mark Green, Raul M. Grijalva, Luis V. Gutierrez, Gil Gutknecht, Ralph M. Hall, Jane Harman, Katherine Harris, Melissa A. Hart, J. Dennis Hastert, Doc Hastings, Alcee L. Hastings, Robin Hayes, J. D. Hayworth, Joel Hefley, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth, Brian Higgins, Maurice D. Hinchey, Ruben Hinojosa, David L. Hobson, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, John N. Hostettler, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Henry J. Hyde, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, William L. Jenkins, Bobby Jindal, Sam Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Nancy L. Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Sue W. Kelly, Patrick J. Kennedy, Mark R. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Steve King, Peter T. King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, John Kline, Joe Knollenberg, Jim Kolbe, John R. ''Randy'' Kuhl, Jr., Ray LaHood, James R. Langevin, Tom Lantos, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, James A. Leach, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus

G. McCotter, Jim McCrery, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, Cynthia McKinney, Cathy McMorris, Michael R. McNulty, Martin T. Meehan, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, Robert Menendez, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Brad Miller, Jeff Miller, Gary G. Miller, Candice S. Miller, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, Jerry Moran, James P. Moran, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Robert W. Ney, Anne M. Northup, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Devin Nunes, Jim Nussle, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Solomon P. Ortiz, Tom Osborne, C. L. ''Butch'' Otter, Major R. Owens, Michael G. Oxley, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Charles W. ''Chip'' Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Richard W. Pombo, Earl Pomeroy, Jon C. Porter, Rob Portman, Tom Price, David E. Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall, II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Rick Renzi, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Jim Ryun, Martin Olav Sabo, John T. Salazar, Loretta Sanchez, Linda T. Sánchez, Bernard Sanders, Jim Saxton, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Allyson Y. Schwartz, John J. H. ''Joe'' Schwarz, David Scott, Robert C. Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, John B. Shadegg, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Christopher Shays, Brad Sherman, Don Sherwood, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Rob Simmons, Michael K. Simpson, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar S. Smith, Vic Snyder, Michael E. Sodrel, Hilda L. Solis, Mark E. Souder, John M. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Ted Strickland, Bart Stupak, John Sullivan, John E. Sweeney, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, Gene Taylor, Charles H. Taylor, Lee Terry, William M. Thomas, Mike Thompson, Bennie G. Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Edolphus Towns, Michael R. Turner, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Diane E. Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Curt Weldon, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Heather Wilson, Joe Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, Albert Russell Wynn, Don Young, C. W. Bill Young.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8110. A letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending Orders [Docket No. AO-14-A75, et al.; DA-06-06] received May 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8111. A letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and in Umatilla County, OR; Suspension of Handling Regulations, Establishment of Reporting Requirements, and Suspension of the Fresh Prune Import Regulation [Docket No. FV06-924-1 IFR] received May 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8112. A letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Adjust Representation on the Hass Avocado Board [Doc. No. FV-06-701-IFR] received May 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8113. A letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Change in Certain Provisions/Procedures Under the Handling Regulations for Tart Cherries [Docket No. FV06-930-1 IFR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8114. A letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2006-2007 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV06-985-1 FR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8115. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Add Kazakhstan, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine To List of Regions In Which Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Subtype H5N1 is Considered in Exist [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0010] received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8116. A letter from the Director, Program Accountability Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Stamp Program; Civil Rights Data Collection (RIN: 0584-AC75) received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8117. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2005 Section 32 Hurricane Disaster Programs (RIN: 0560-AH45) received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8118. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zoxamide; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0088; FRL-8060-5] received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8119. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Termination of Abandoned Individual Account Plans (RIN: 1210-AA97) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8120. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for the Printing and Publishing Industry [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0441; FRL-8174-5] (RIN: 2060-AI66) received May 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8121. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Redesignation of the Boyd County SO_2 Nonattainment Area [R04-OAR-2005-KY-0002-200531(a); FRL-8174-1] received May 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8122. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0002; FRL-8166-9] received May 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8123. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Wisconsin Construction Permit Permanency SIP Revision; Correction [EPA-R05-2005-0563; FRL-8171-1] received May 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8124. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Monitoring Requirements [A-91-07; FRL-8176-8] (RIN: 2060-AG22) received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8125. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-MI-0001; FRL-8176-6] received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8126. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Alternative Public Participation Process [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0012; FRL-8178-6] received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8127. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio; Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan Updates; Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0052; FRL-8177-8] received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8128. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Air Pollution From Motor Vehicles and Nonroad Diesel Engines: Alternative Low-Sulfur Diesel Fuel Transition Program for Alaska [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0229; FRL-8178-3] (RIN: 2060-AJ72) received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8129. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — EPAAR Prescription and

Clause — Simplified Acquisition Procedures Financing [FRL-8179-6] received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8130. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(l), Delegation of Authority to the Washington State Department of Health [EPA-R10-OAR-2006-0001; FRL-8177-2] received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8131. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — PM2.5 De Minimis Emission Levels for General Conformity Applicability [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0491; FRL-8176-3] (RIN: 2060-AN60) received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8132. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuel and Fuel Additives; Refiner and Importer Quality Assurance Requirements for Downstream Oxygenate Blending and Requirements for Pipeline Interface [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0216; EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0149; FRL-8178-5] (RIN: 2060-AM27) (RIN: 2060-AM88) received May 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8133. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-391, ''Rent Control Reform Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8134. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grains and Similarly Handled Commodities-Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments for the 2006 Through 2007 Crop Years; Cotton (RIN: 0560-AH38) received May 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8135. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Coordinated Communications [Notice 2006-10] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

8136. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the designations of Daniel Pearson as Chairman and Shara L. Aranoff as Vice Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, effective June 17, 2006, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1330(c)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5631. A bill, making appropriations for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act 2007, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. (Rept. 109–504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NUSSLE: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 4890. A bill to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority; with an amendment (Rept. 109–505 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 5632. A bill to amend Chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to establish a national tire fuel efficiency consumer information program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 5633. A bill to establish a program of demonstration and commercial application of advanced energy efficiency technologies and systems for buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 5634. A bill to authorize research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities for advanced energy technologies; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 5635. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to prohibit the import, export, and sale of goods made with sweatshop labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Government Reform, Rules, Energy and Commerce, and 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 Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. HARRIS):

H.R. 5636. A bill to reduce the risk of identity theft by limiting the use of social security account numbers on certain Government-issued identification cards and Government documents; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution requiring the President to notify Congress if the President makes a determination to ignore a duly enacted provision of law, establishing expedited procedures for the consideration of legislation in the House of Representatives in response to such a determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. CLYBURN:

H. Res. 872. A resolution removing a Member from the Committee on Ways and Means; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 873. A resolution recognizing the continued importance of the transatlantic partnership between the United States and the European Union by expressing support for the success of the forthcoming US-EU Summit in Vienna, Austria, on June 21, 2006; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CASE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. GUTKNECHT):

H. Res. 874. A resolution recognizing and honoring America's Seniors; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GINGREY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 875. A resolution congratulating Spelman College on the occasion of its 125th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H. Res. 876. A resolution expressing that the House of Representatives recognizes the rising cost of health care and encourages greater patient empowerment, choice, and responsibility in health care decisions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 284: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 583: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 602: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1405: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 1429: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1441: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1545: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1634: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 1663: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1849: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2238: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 2808: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. SODREL.
H.R. 3192: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3267: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 3479: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3559: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. BASS.
H.R. 4158: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 4236: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4341: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 4450: Mr. CHOCOLA.
H.R. 4725: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 4746: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4761: Mr. FORD and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4772: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 4838: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 4896: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4960: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 4962: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 4976: Mr. LEACH and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5005: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 5011: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 5013: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HALL, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 5060: Mr. KUHL of New York and Ms. HART.
H.R. 5150: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 5188: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5201: Mr. NEY and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 5206: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 5229: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5234: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 5246: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 5257: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5275: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. NEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 5314: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 5346: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 5348: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 5351: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5356: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5358: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5371: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 5390: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 5444: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 5474: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5478: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 5491: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5519: Mr. PORTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5555: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 5588: Mr. STARK, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 5604: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. SHAYS and Ms. ESHOO.
H. Con. Res. 428: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H. Res. 323: Mr. MELANCON.
H. Res. 350: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H. Res. 373: Mr. STARK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 518: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 723: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. SANDERS.
H. Res. 841: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CASE, and Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 846: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STARK, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 852: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H. Res. 858: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 870: Mr. KANJORSKI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4157: Ms. ESHOO.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2006 No. 78

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord, our God and King, You have promised that those who trust You will not miss out on anything good.

Give to our Senators the wonder of Your grace. Impart to them the wisdom to use their talents for Your purpose and glory. Today, surround them with the shield of Your favor and use them as instruments of Your will. May their thoughts and actions please You, for You are the one Who fills our lives with gladness.

Remind us all that when our lives please You, You enable us to live in peace even with our enemies.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

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 MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today, at 10:45, the Senate will resume consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill. The bill's two managers, Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN, will be here to continue to work on this important bill. Although there will be no votes during today's session, Senators are encouraged to come today and speak on the bill. Senators who are intending to offer amendments should be consulting with the managers on getting their amendments in the queue.

Senators are reminded there is a scheduled vote for 5:30 on Monday on a U.S. circuit judge nomination. We could possibly have additional votes on Monday evening on amendments to the Defense bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, just very briefly, I want to comment on the supplemental appropriations bill we passed yesterday morning.

I commend Senator COCHRAN and really both of the managers, and all of our colleagues, as well as the House, and especially Congressman LEWIS, for their leadership in crafting a package that reflects our commitment to economic growth, that keeps America moving forward, that is fiscally responsible.

As the majority says time and time again, the Federal budget is not the Government's money. It is the taxpayers' money. Americans work hard to get what they earn. And it is our responsibility to spend that money wisely, appropriately.

That is why we are working hard to crack down on excessive Washington spending. And I think the way that supplemental bill was handled from the beginning, and especially at the end, reflects that fiscal responsibility. As we all know, that bill did reflect a lot of priorities of this body, but it grew and grew and grew. Once that bill was taken to conference, under the leadership of Chairman COCHRAN and Congressman LEWIS, it was scaled back down to meet the specific guidelines and request of the President of the United States. I think we exercised fiscal restraint and responsibility, but still there is a lot more we do need to do in terms of demonstrating that fiscal restraint and that responsibility.

One of our big challenges is the fact that much of our spending is on autopilot. We see that in our entitlement programs. Also, our budgetary process—the way it is conducted—leaves little time for oversight as to the spending.

I mention that because I want to express my strong support for the efforts of our budget chairman, Senator GREGG, for an act that is called the SOS Act, called the Stop Overspending Act, that will be marked up by his committee, addressed in his committee next week. What it is—and he introduced it to many of us this week—is a broad package on the budgetary process. It is a package of reforms that will tamp down on and give us the tools and ways to control excessive spending.

It adopts the President's proposal to establish a legislative line-item veto. It would reestablish spending caps which have been used effectively in the past. It initiates across-the-board reductions in entitlement spending if the Federal deficit fails to meet specific established targets.

It includes a proposal I have been very supportive of and introduced actually when I first arrived in the Senate to put the budget on a 2-year budget cycle, thereby giving us time for appropriate oversight.

I realize enacting this entire bold package—comprehensive in many ways, this SOS package—would be a huge challenge, particularly in Washington where the forces of spending from below, from within, remain so strong. But achieving even one of the reforms or, hopefully, several of the reforms of this package would be a major

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

victory in the battle to control spending. It is my goal to accomplish just that before I leave the Senate.

So just like every family has to make tough tradeoffs and live within their means, Congress should, too.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our valiant troops are now serving in their fourth year in Iraq. Day after day, they have demonstrated courage, skill, and bravery. They do not ask for much. But all of us owe them a lot.

At the top of the list of things we owe them is an honest debate about what is going on in Iraq.

Yesterday, Democrats offered an amendment to express the sense of the Senate that Iraq not grant amnesty to terrorists who kill our troops as part of their reconciliation plan. The amendment came in response to reports that the Iraqi Prime Minister was in favor of such a proposal.

But instead of joining us in a debate about this amendment, the majority, the Republicans, decided to play a political game and quickly claimed the Iraqi Prime Minister had been ''misquoted'' and offered some procedural gimmicks to stop a vote from taking place on this amendment.

But, just this morning, there is more news that the Prime Minister has talked about and does favor amnesty to those Iraqis who kill American troops. It is all over the country in the news. For example, it is on page 22 of the Washington Post. The aide who first leaked the story has now resigned, but he stands by what he said. Today, he is quoted as saying:

> The prime minister himself has said that he is ready to give amnesty to the so-called resistance, provided they have not been involved in killing Iraqis.

What that says is just what we said yesterday: Amnesty will be granted to those who kill Americans, but not to those who hurt Iraqis.

I think this sounds like it deserves the Senate's attention. Doesn't it seem like we should weigh in on this, and tell the Iraqis there will be no ''get out of jail free'' cards for those who kill our troops?

We should have had that debate yesterday. But instead of having the debate, the Republicans cut and run from the debate. In effect, they are filibustering their own Defense authorization bill, not allowing the matter to move forward—stopped in midday. It does not make sense. Until we know exactly where the Iraqis stand, President Bush must come forward and tell the Iraqis to stand down.

Terrorists who kill our troops should not be set free. Our soldiers have given too much in the name of Iraqi freedom.

Mr. President, there is something else we owe our troops: an acknowledgment of their tremendous sacrifice.

Yesterday, as we know, we had a moment of silence in this Chamber because we lost our 2,500th troop in Iraq.

Mr. President, 2,500 of our finest have been killed in Iraq. The reason we had a moment of silence is because it was a solemn milestone, which we should acknowledge.

But over at the White House, I guess they have a different feeling. They apparently view this sad occasion differently. With all the news around the country today, there is a quote from Tony Snow, the President's Press Secretary, who said, in response to the news: ''It's a number.'' ''It's a number.'' ''It's a number.''

I say to Tony Snow, and others at the White House, it is more than a number. It is somebody's son or daughter. It is someone's father or mother, a neighbor, an uncle, or an aunt.

Nevada has lost 39 soldiers in Iraq—39. Every one of them is more than a number. I wonder how—and they are now my friends—two Nevadans, who came to visit me before Memorial Day—and they came to the Memorial Day ceremonies we had at the Boulder City Veterans Home, where last year we buried more than 2,000 veterans—I wonder how John Lukac's and William Salazar's parents feel about their sons being just numbers.

They are not numbers. They are no more numbers than the people who have been wounded. They are not numbers. They are people, in many instances, who have lost arms or legs or eyes or are paralyzed. They are not just numbers.

I think maybe we should discuss briefly what a Republican Congressman said yesterday. I know this man. I know him well. I have been going to the House gym for a lot of years. He is a man by the name of WAYNE GILCHREST. He is my friend. He is a Republican Congressman from Maryland.

We were standing in the House gym. I have known him for many, many years. And because of our knowing one another—he was shaving actually, with his shirt off. And on his back he had—I noticed it for years—a real scar.

I said: WAYNE, what is that scar?

He said: I was shot.

I said: Tell me about it.

He was in Vietnam. He was a sergeant. He raised his arm to fire, and as he did that, somebody shot him through the chest. The bullet came out of the back. He has a big scar in the back. The words he remembers are: ''Sarge's been shot. I hope he's not dead.''

He survived, but after many months in hospitals. He was a school teacher. He came back from Vietnam and taught kids. Now he is a Member of Congress, and has been for some time.

Here is what he said in yesterday's Washington Post:

> I can't help but feel through eyes of a combat-wounded Marine in Vietnam, if someone was shot, you tried to save his life . . . While you were in combat, you had a sense of urgency to end the slaughter, and around here we don't have that sense of urgency.

That is a direct quote. He went on to say:

> To me, the administration does not act like there's a war going on. The Congress certainly doesn't act like there's a war going on. If you're raising money to keep the majority, if you're thinking about gay marriage, if you're doing all this other peripheral stuff, what does that say to the guy who's about ready to drive over a land mine?

Republican Congressman WAYNE GILCHREST.

John Lukac is just a number? William Salazar is just a number?

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ISAKSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with Senators able to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that we are to end morning business and go on to the bill at 10:45. The hour of 10:45 has arrived, and I note that the chairman and ranking member are not here. I believe they are at a briefing. They are expected to be here shortly. But what I would like to do is ask consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes. When the chairman of the committee and the ranking member arrive, I will ask them for permission to continue, if necessary, but if they have other business, I will understand that. I think the priority is the Defense authorization bill.

So I ask unanimous consent to continue in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk about the Indian Health Care Improvement Act and some frustration—I should say enormous frustration—that I and Senator MCCAIN have about what is happening with a piece of legislation that is so very important.

In this country, we have responsibility for health care for two groups of people: Federal prisoners who are incarcerated in prison—we are responsible for their health care. If they get

sick, they go to an infirmary, they go to a hospital, we are responsible. We provide health care for Federal prisoners. We also have trust responsibility for providing health care for American Indians. That is our trust responsibility.

It is interesting and enormously disappointing to me that we spend twice as much per person on health care for Federal prisoners as we do in providing health care, as is our obligation, for American Indians.

I want to talk a little about that because we have written a piece of legislation called the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, which builds on a piece of legislation that was passed some while ago. I want to talk about what American Indians are facing out in the country with respect to health care.

Let me describe it first with respect to a story. This is a very typical story about a member of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation, which is called the Three Affiliated Tribes in North Dakota. It is a story about a fellow who had diabetes. By the way, I held a hearing some years ago on that reservation. On that reservation, the rate of diabetes is not double, triple, or quadruple the rate of diabetes elsewhere. At that reservation, at that point, it was 12 times the rate of diabetes that existed elsewhere.

The person I am speaking about on the Three Affiliated Tribes or Fort Berthold Reservation is Laidmen Fox, Sr. He was a Native American who had struggled, as other members of his family had, with diabetes. He had his feet amputated. Later he had his knees amputated. Finally, his entire legs were amputated. He was on dialysis. And, finally, the doctors told him he would have to have his hands amputated. At that point, Mr. Fox said he wanted to be taken off of the dialysis machine and to be taken home to die. He died 2 years ago. He went home to be with family and friends, having lost his feet, his knees, then his legs, and then told he would lose his hands. He died, was taken off dialysis.

Just this last February, his daughter—who was 41 years old, and blind from diabetes, and also on dialysis—chose do have herself taken off the machine and went home to die in a similar manner.

We now have in this country something nobody wants to talk about. We ration health care for American Indians. Yes, there is health care rationing. There is something called contract health services. That means that when American Indians show up at a clinic or a hospital and, through the Indian Health Service, seek treatment for their problems, the only treatment they will get and the only reimbursement they will get for that medical condition is if it means ''life or limb,'' threatening ''life or limb.'' Otherwise, in most cases, under the contract health provisions, there is no health care available.

Let me talk about some other examples, if I might.

A member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in my State was suffering from cancer. He went through chemotherapy, and went through chemotherapy again for a number of years through referral from the Indian Health Service to the University of Minnesota. All of a sudden the Indian Health Service said to him: We don't have any more funding. And they refused to pay for any additional treatment, even after he had a number of relapses.

This is not unusual for American Indians to face this sort of thing.

Another American Indian fell as a result of insulin shock at his home. He hit his hip, and hurt his hip badly in the fall. He was taken to a hospital by ambulance, given a shot for the pain and told he was to be released. His father objected because he said: My son can't walk. You can't release him. And the father said: I can't carry him. He can't walk. He must stay here.

The doctor said he could stay in the hospital for one night's observation. The next day, when the pain did not subside, they gave him an x-ray, found out his hip was broken, and referred him to another facility. And because so much time had elapsed since the accident, he had to have a full hip replacement.

Another tribal member was a Vietnam veteran and should have had the services of both the Indian Health Service and the VA available to him. He died after the Indian Health Service denied his request for a referral for him to be seen by a lung specialist at the Mayo Clinic. The IHS told him they had no money to send him to a specialist, and this Vietnam veteran died as a result.

In Montana, an Indian man went to the Indian Health Service clinic seeking assistance for gallstones. He was told it was not a ''life or limb'' situation, which would get him referred to a health provider off the reservation under the contract health provisions I have just described. Subsequent to that, his duct ruptured and he became infected. He had to have part of his pancreas removed, and now he is on dialysis.

Several months ago, a 24-year-old man at the Spirit Lake Nation went to the IHS clinic complaining he had abdominal pain. He was given some medicine and was sent home because he was not considered a ''priority'' patient. He ended up in the emergency room in a nearby hospital, off the reservation, and then transported to a larger medical center 125 miles away. His appendix had raptured. That was 3 months ago, and he is still in the hospital 3 months later, as they attempt to try to control his body temperature and other related matters.

He was determined not to have a ''life or limb'' emergency medical need, and so his actual condition was overlooked, with the results of several months now of acute care in a hospital.

Mr. President, I have spoken a number of times on the floor of the Senate about a young girl named Avis Little Wind. I brought her picture to the floor of the Senate. I did that with the permission of her relatives. She was 14 years old, and she hung herself. She killed herself 2 years after her sister had killed herself.

I went to the reservation because we have had a cluster of suicides of young teenagers on Indian reservations. I talked to this young girl's teachers, school administrators, people in the mental health area, tribal council folks, to try to understand what is wrong here.

What I discovered is this little 14-year-old girl, named Avis Little Wind, laid in a bed for 90 days in a fetal position. Clearly, something was seriously wrong with this young woman. Yet, it did not send a signal to anybody. Her father killed himself. Her mother was dysfunctional, a substance abuser. This young girl somehow just slipped through the system, and she got up one day out of that bed and took her own life.

Avis Little Wind is one person, but a person whose future was stolen from her because she felt hopeless or helpless. And the fact is, on that Indian reservation—as is the case for most Indian reservations—there is no mental health treatment available. There are not enough people available just for the diagnosis of serious problems. You would think someone who misses 90 days of school at age 14 would send alarm bells all over, but it did not. There is not enough money in the Indian Health System to deal with it.

Senator MCCAIN and I have passed some legislation recently dealing with the issue of Indian teen suicide and trying to begin to address that issue. But there is a serious lack of attention to the health care needs of Native Americans and, yes, teenagers like Avis Little Wind and the tragedy that resulted in her death.

It is not uncommon to see 75 people stand in line waiting to have a prescription filled. It is not uncommon for them to stand in line only to find out they can't get the prescription filled because the medicine is not available there.

I have been to a health care facility where one dentist is working in a small trailer house serving 5,000 people. Is that fair? Is that the right thing to do? We can do better than that as a country. Yet, somehow, this issue of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act is not a priority. The administration has dragged its feet, and dragged its feet for months and months. Senator MCCAIN and I have just written the administration a letter saying: How about some help here? How about some cooperation? Let's find a way to solve this and fix it.

While we talk and while we dither and while the administration decides to delay, we have people losing their lives, and we have people going to

health care facilities with very serious problems being told: We don't have the money to refer you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. The tribal chairman for the Three Affiliated Tribes in North Dakota says: Everybody up there on the reservation understands, don't get sick after June. Just don't get sick after June because the money has run out on contract health services. If you get sick after June, there is no money. They are not going to send you to a hospital. Or if you go to the hospital, the hospital will charge back to you because they won't get the money from the Indian Health Service. It will ruin your credit, and you will have to file for bankruptcy. But don't get sick after June because the money won't be there.

What kind of message is that to the American people, especially the most vulnerable in our society? These reservations are where there is substantial poverty, great difficulty.

I have not mentioned methamphetamine. We have had hearings about that. It is unbelievable what is happening with respect to these reservations and health care, and yet somehow there is no urgency here.

Senator MCCAIN and I are asking for a little cooperation from the administration and some cooperation here in the Senate to move this bill.

We had a witness just the other day at a hearing about methamphetamine on reservations. Methamphetamine is a scourge all across this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. One of the witnesses at that hearing on methamphetamine on reservations, who is the chairperson of an Indian tribe, lives on a rural reservation with 13,000 Native Americans who live on that reservation. She told us that one-half of the babies who have been born to tribal members on that reservation—one-half of the babies—have tested positive for alcohol or drugs, including methamphetamine. Think of that.

I was in a hospital one day when they showed me a young baby that was born with a .12 blood alcohol content lying in the nursery. This baby was born with a .12 blood alcohol content, and the mother was down the hall and refused to see the baby because she did not want the baby. She checked into the hospital dead drunk.

The fact is, we have serious problems with methamphetamine and substance abuse and teenage suicide, and all of these issues, and we have a health care system on Indian reservations that is a rationing system. When the chairman of the tribe in my State says, ''All the Indians know: don't get sick after June because the money is not there under contract health to help you,'' that is a serious problem.

All I am asking for and all Senator MCCAIN is asking for is a little help and a little cooperation from the administration and, yes, from our colleagues to move this legislation called the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. It is the right thing for this country to do. Mr. President, I see the chairman of the committee is here, and I will, at this point, yield the floor.

I do have an amendment I wish to offer on the Defense authorization bill today, and I am available to do that when it is convenient. But the chairman and ranking Member are here, so at this point I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was much taken by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota. I have great respect for the Senator from North Dakota. I tell you, you do a lot of homework. You do a lot of independent work. And while I do not have the expertise with regard to the reservations that you have, any of us listening to your comments would immediately come to the conclusion that we better step in to help. And I say to the Senator, you can count on me when the time comes. I think that matter should be addressed as quickly as we can by the Senate.

I thank the Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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:

McCain amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

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.

McConnell amendment No. 4272, to commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my distinguished ranking member, I think at this time it would be appropriate if the Senator wishes to bring up his amendment.

We are in business, I say to my colleagues wherever they are, for purposes of amendments. The Senator from Michigan and I will be here for some period of time in hopes of processing amendments.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He covered such a wide range of issues with such depth and integrity that is really quite extraordinary. We are ready for his amendment. I think he is prepared to proceed with the amendment. We look forward to hearing from him on that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 4292

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4292.

Mr. DORGAN. 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 printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his kind comments. He did not say he welcomed my amendment because he probably knows that this amendment is one which we have dealt with before. But I feel so strongly the need to continue to offer the amendment, if only by voice vote, which says what is going on I think is dreadfully wrong and needs to be corrected. I know the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Michigan are legislators with goodwill and good skills. I hope they will join with me as I once again describe the issues of contracting that exist because we are spending so much money in such a hurry that there is waste, fraud, and abuse which simply cannot be addressed in the regular order.

I believe this amendment is once again a proposal whereby there was a Truman-type committee, the type that existed when Harry Truman served in the Senate, a Democratic Senate then, with a Democrat in the White House. Harry Truman, I am sure, caused some real angst at the White House by saying: I think there needs to be a special bipartisan committee established to take a look at waste, fraud, and abuse in military contracting. He traveled all across this country to military installations to meet with contractors. His committee unearthed a substantial amount of waste.

I offer it again, as I have offered it on previous occasions. I understand I have not been successful, but I offer it again only because I don't think the problem has abated. I think the problem still exists.

Just the other day, in a supplemental emergency appropriations bill, we spent $92 billion. Some of that was for Katrina relief, but the rest of it, by and large, will find its way into the Pentagon accounts—to restore accounts.

The Senator from Illinois just came in, and the Senator from Illinois and I have jointly worked on this issue. Senator HARKIN has asked to be a cosponsor as well. I offer it on behalf of myself and Senators DURBIN and HARKIN. This is something that we have talked about at some length over a period of time.

We have approved emergency supplemental appropriations bills to the tune of tens and tens and tens of billions of dollars. I believe it is now over $340 billion. Think of that: almost a third of $1 trillion approved without being paid for. This adds right on the top of the Federal debt.

This spending is in support of our military. I voted for it because we can't send our troops abroad and not provide them the equipment and things they need.

But when you spend this much money, including $18 billion-plus for reconstruction in Iraq, and then begin to see who gets hold of this money, it is hair raising to hear the stories about what is happening.

I am not suggesting that there would never be any waste as a result of this war. Wartime is a different circumstance. I understand that. But I think it is safe to say that there has been more waste, more fraud, and more abuse of the taxpayers' money in the recently short time, several years, than in the history of this country. I think it is unparalleled. I think we have a responsibility to deal with it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Through the Chair, I am happy to join him in this effort in which we are trying to have some oversight on tax money being spent on this war. The Senator and I have worked on this concept together. We went back to a day when the Senator from Missouri, Harry Truman, decided to ask the same hard questions of the administration during the Second World War, trying to find instances where tax dollars were being wasted and people were profiteering and soldiers were getting equipment that wasn't up to standard.

I ask the Senator from North Dakota: Isn't it curious that Senator Harry Truman, a Democrat from Missouri who created this commission and asked hard questions, when there was a Democratic President named Franklin Roosevelt, was suggesting that when it comes to profiteering, Congress doesn't do the administration nor the people of this country any favors by saying we are going to protect our own party in the White House? Shouldn't we be dealing with a nonpartisan issue of waste at the expense of taxpayers and, more importantly, at the expense of soldiers?

Isn't it true that at the hearings which Senator DORGAN has chaired bringing together whistleblowers who tell us these terrible stories of waste of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, that absent these hearings there has been very little done on Capitol Hill by way of oversight of the giants who are winning these no-bid contracts, multibillion-dollar contracts, and wasting too much of taxpayer dollars?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is the case that whistleblowers from Kuwait, Iraq, and various parts of the United States have come to me and said: What is going on is wrong. We have held some hearings through our policy committee to take a look at it. They have wanted to testify.

Let me give you one example. I talked about Rory before. A man named Rory, an engaging fellow, who was a supervisor at a food service operation in Iraq, he said to us that what was going on was wrong. He worked for Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton.

No. 1, he said we were charging for thousands of meals that we weren't serving.

No. 2, we were feeding the troops food that had expired date stamps on them.

He brought it to the attention of his superiors. They said: It doesn't matter. Feed it to the troops. It doesn't matter.

He said: We had convoys of trucks that were attacked on the road with food in them. He was told: You go into that truck bed and you find out what food has shrapnel in it. If you find good pieces of shrapnel, you give it to your supervisors as souvenirs, but feed the food to the troops.

The other thing that was very interesting, talking about employees of Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton, he said: We were told that when Government auditors come around, don't you dare talk to them. You are forbidden to talk to them. If you do, one of two things will happen. You will either be fired, or you will be sent to a part of Iraq where there is active, hostile shooting going on.

This fellow, in fact, was sent to one of the active areas of Falluja. He had the courage, guts, and temerity, and decided he would talk to Government auditors.

It is unbelievable to me to hear a whistleblower say that a contractor which was being paid with Government funds told the employees: Don't you dare talk to Government auditors. If you do, you will be fired.

That is so fundamentally wrong.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if I may ask one more question, in one of the hearings that I attended, I recall that Senator DORGAN brought in one of these whistleblowers who talked about the monogrammed towels they were charging the Government to be put into certain facilities. The Senator talked about running up the price of gasoline that they were charging to the Government. I hope the Senator will recount those particular instances.

But I would like to ask the Senator, when Members of Congress get up here and say: We love our soldiers and we love our troops and we stand behind them, how can we then cast a blind eye and overlook the obvious? When our soldiers aren't getting the right equipment, when our soldiers aren't getting the goods they deserve, when they are not getting the supplies they need to be safe and successful, how can that reflect any love of our troops? If we are truly committed to these soldiers, wouldn't we be holding oversight hearings, bringing in under oath these whistleblowers and their bosses? Let us bring them in and put them before the cameras and ask them if they are wasting taxpayer dollars and endangering the lives of our troops. Wouldn't that be the true measure of our commitment to these men and women in uniform?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, clearly that is what we ought to do on behalf of soldiers.

I tell the Senator that the most recent allegations have been made by two people who worked for, once again, Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton Corporation, about the water that was provided to the military installations. Let me describe that.

Taking water from the Euphrates River—and some of it goes into a system where it is purified and used as potable water to drink. Some of it is used as nonpotable water. But the way they designed the lines to serve nonpotable water to the base, which is used for showering, shaving, and brushing teeth, and so on, the water that was coming out nonpotable areas was actually more contaminated with E. Coli, bacteria, than the raw water coming out of the Euphrates River from the sewage disposal.

Halliburton said it is not true. The Pentagon said it is not true.

It just wasn't one base. We have a memorandum from the person from KBR, a Halliburton subsidiary in charge of water to all the military installations in Iraq. That memorandum, which has now been made public, was from the person who was in charge on behalf of Halliburton, or KBR, of all the water for all the installations. That memo admits that they have a serious problem, and they have made big mistakes that could have caused serious problems, including death.

After we held hearings, a young woman, an Army captain in Iraq, wrote us a long, unsolicited e-mail. She said: There is something going on on my base. I saw there was some questions about water to our military installations in Iraq. I am here. I am treating people for all kinds of skin problems. And I began to see things that made me suspicious that there was something wrong with the water.

She said: I had my staff track back to the water line.

She said: What I found out was they were providing nonpotable water to the

soldiers on this base that was contaminated.

This is from a doctor who is there today. This isn't conjecture, speculation, or accusation. This is from a doctor who is actually treating people. Yet, once again, the company that we are paying as a contractor to provide water service to these bases, connect and purify the water and provide the water to soldiers, denied publicly that anything was wrong. We have two eye witnesses who have testified, whistleblowers one that worked for the company. We have the internal document from the company that discussed how they had made these mistakes, and we have a doctor, a physician, who works for the Army. This is like the old Western movie: Who are you going to believe, me or your own lying eyes?

The fact is, we know what is happening there, yet no one seems much concerned about it. I write to the Defense Secretary about this and say it is quite clear that unhealthy water is being supplied to troops for showering, brushing their teeth, and shaving. No one seems to get really excited over that. It seems to me the Secretary of Defense ought to say, Wait, what on Earth is going on? Let's put a stop to this.

I will talk in a few minutes about how all of this happens. It happens because we have sole-source, no-bid contracts and very little oversight.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator will yield for one last question, what strikes me is there is not a sense of outrage that American tax dollars are being wasted but, even more important, that American troops are being shortchanged.

What do we ask of these men and women in uniform? Quite simply, we say, take an oath to wear this uniform and risk your life for America—how much more could we ask—and they do it. And then they expect from us support—support when they are in the field and support when they come home.

I don't understand why there isn't a sense of outrage in this Congress on a bipartisan basis, on both sides of the aisle, that we are not only being ripped off as taxpayers by these no-bid contracts but that we are shortchanging these men and women who are risking their lives while we stand in the comfort and safety of this Senate.

I know Halliburton is a big political force in this town. I know in some quarters you are not supposed to question Halliburton. This is some sacred institution politically. I don't buy it. I count the soldiers that are putting their lives on the line to be much more sacred and much more valuable than any big, huge, no-bid corporation.

I say to the Senator from North Dakota, we have done this before, the two of us have joined together, and said let's put together a bipartisan commission that will ask the hard questions, a commission that will bring people in and put them under oath, find out if they are cheating us, find out if they are profiteering during a war, find out if they are shortchanging our soldiers, and let the chips fall where they may. If we find there is a violation of law, even if it reaches all the way to the boardroom, so be it.

How many times have we come to the Senate, I ask the Senator from North Dakota, refresh my memory, how many times have we brought this option to the Senate and said to our colleagues, please, for the sake of the troops, let's have real oversight, let's ask these questions.

How many times have we done this during the course of this 3-year war, I ask the Senator from North Dakota who has been the leader in this effort, and I have been glad to join him, how often have we tried?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have had three recorded votes on this, and we have brought this to the Senate maybe six times now, altogether. I know it is repetitious. I know it probably is not pleasant to hear all of these things again, yet I don't think there is any choice.

If I might, just for the benefit of my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN and I began talking about this some long while ago when we began to see the evidence of waste. We have worked at it since then.

When Senator DURBIN was asking a question, I described the water issue. I want to read a quote from a memorandum that was written May 13, 2005, an internal Halliburton memorandum, written by Will Granger, the man who was paid with taxpayer funds to do this contract for Halliburton for all of the water issues in Iraq. These are the water issues for the U.S. bases in Iraq that directly affect United States soldiers.

Will Granger, the Halliburton employee:

> No disinfection to the non-potable water was occurring [at Camp Ar Ramadi] for water designated for showering purposes. This caused an unknown population to be exposed to potentially harmful water for an undetermined amount of time.
>
> This event should be considered a ''NEAR MISS'' as the consequences of these actions could have been VERY SEVERE resulting in mass sickness or death.
>
> The deficiencies of the camp where the event occurred is not exclusive to that camp; meaning that country-wide, all camps suffer to some extent from some or all of the deficiencies noted.

That is what was covered up. This was not made public until I was able to dig it out. But when a whistleblower said this is happening—and I am not referring to Will Granger, but to a whistleblower who said this is happening in his testimony to our committee—Halliburton said that it is not happening, you are not telling the truth, the Pentagon says there is no evidence of it.

And here is the internal Halliburton report that says it is happening, No. 1; and, No. 2, this camp was a ''near miss'' and:

> . . . the consequence could have been VERY SEVERE resulting in mass sickness or death.

A lot of people are making a lot of money, spent by this Congress, in support of our soldiers who are at war, and we have some contractors who are not playing straight with the soldiers or the American people.

I ask consent to show two items on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. A man whose name was Henry Bunting came to a hearing I held. I believe Senator DURBIN was at that hearing. Henry Bunting worked for Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton in Kuwait. In Kuwait, he was the purchaser of supplies for the U.S. Army. They wanted some hand towels, needed some towels, so a purchase requisition goes to Henry. Henry is going to buy some towels. Except when he put in the order for the towels, his company said, no, no, no, you cannot buy those regular towels that way. Towels have to have our logo embroidered on them.

So this is what he had to buy, at more than double the cost of the regular towels, so that the company logo could be put on the towels, and the taxpayers could be charged twice as much.

I am sure the soldiers didn't care one way or another whether there was that embroidered logo on the towel. But Henry, the purchaser, was told: You buy these. And don't ask any questions.

Henry says, You know, the American taxpayer got charged double and he didn't like it and he want to speak publicly. And not just this, it was a thousand other examples of costs being run up, from $45 for a case of Coca-cola, to $7,500 a month to lease an SUV. Henry said, It is not just the towels, but he brought the towels along to show us what is going on is really wrong. The American people are taking a bath here and it undermines the soldiers, as well.

Thank God there are some whistleblowers who are willing to come forward.

What we need now, of course, is the opportunity to legislate and see if we can't stop this.

I will not go much longer, although I don't see anyone preparing to offer another amendment yet. I do want to make a couple of points I made the other day on the broader amendment that was turned down by the Senate. That amendment dealt with contracting as well, but it was a much broader amendment than this.

I made the point then, and this actually had to do with Bunnatine Greenhouse. I know there are some who do not want to hear about this anymore. But I don't think we have any choice. This was the top civilian contracting official at the Corps of Engineers. She was the one responsible for overseeing the contracts.

Through the Corps of Engineers, Halliburton and KBR got no-bid, sole-

source contracts, giant contracts. Over one half of the contracts in the war theater are Halliburton.

By the way, this has nothing to do with the Vice President. Whenever you mention that term, they say, You are attacking the Vice President. No, he has been gone a long time. It doesn't have anything to do with him. It has to do with a company that got over 50 percent of the contracts in Iraq.

Bunnatine Greenhouse, the top contracting officer at Corps of Engineers who lost her job, now, as a result of telling the truth, says:

> I can unequivocally state that the abuse related to contracts awarded to KBR represents the most blatant and improper contract abuse I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.

For that, she got demoted. Pretty harsh treatment for people who are whistleblowers in this town. She has been replaced, by the way, by someone without experience. When I have asked the general who runs the Corps of Engineers, he said the person that is replacing Bunnatine Greenhouse is now being trained. Not much consolation or confidence, in my judgment, in that for the American people.

One final story. If the issue of water does not motivate someone, let me talk again about Custer Battles. I have plenty of people come to me about Mr. Custer and Mr. Battles. This is an example of what is going on with so much money available.

Mr. Custer and Mr. Battles show up in Iraq without any money, without much experience in contracting, and decide, I will get some of this; I want to get some of this contracting that is available. It was not very long and they got some contracts very quickly. In fact, they ultimately got over $100 million in contracts.

The first contract was to provide security. They set up a little firm to provide security at the Baghdad airport. Now, among other things, whistleblowers from their own company came forward and said, Here are the things they were doing. They are cheating you blind. They took the forklift troop trucks out of the Baghdad airport, took them somewhere else, put them in the warehouse, painted them blue and sent them back and sold them to the Coalition Provisional Authority. They do not belong to them. They repainted them and sold them back to us. They set up subsidiaries in Lebanon and other places to buy and sell to and from themselves, and inflate the price, and, therefore, injure the taxpayer.

Here is what the fellow who runs the security system at the Baghdad airport said. The Baghdad airports director of security in a memo—a guy, also, that was trying to provide some warning—a memo to the Coalition Provisional Authority, and that is us in Iraq; it was set up by Donald Rumsfeld and that was the United States—here is what he said:

> Custer Battles have shown themselves to be unresponsive, uncooperative, incompetent, deceitful, manipulative and war profiteers. Other than that they are swell fellows.

This from the director of security at the Baghdad airport. These guys ended up getting over $100 million in contracts. I will show you a little bit of their money. This is a picture of $2 million in cash, $100 bills wrapped in Saran Wrap. I happen to know this guy; you do not see his head, just his body standing in front of the $2 million. He showed up here. He wanted to talk about this. Here is what he wanted to say.

What he wanted to say was, When I was there, standing in Baghdad, working on these accounts, the word went out to all of the contractors: We pay in cash; bring a bag. He said it was like the Wild West. Bring a sack because we pay in cash.

This $2 million actually went to Custer Battles. They took a picture of it. He said they used to throw these around as footballs, Saran Wrapped $100 bills. They threw them around as footballs in the office. And down below they had billions and billions of dollars, apparently.

Lest there be any question about the misuse of money, let me show $2 million Saran Wrapped just before it went to Custer Battles. How did this happen? Because this guy right here, this fellow right here, told me that our message to everyone was ''bring a bag because we pay in cash.''

Does anyone doubt there is going to be dramatic waste, fraud, and abuse in those circumstances? Does anyone doubt that at all, and after all of these stories? Doubling the price of hand towels; 25 tons, 50,000 pounds of nails laying on the sands of Iraq because they were ordered in the wrong side, dumped in the sand.

I could go on forever from what I learned from whistleblowers. I will not do that, only to say this: The next step for this Congress, I think, is to establish a Truman-type committee. We have done it before and we can do it again. Never has it been more needed than now. There is, I think, plenty of evidence that the most significant waste, fraud, and abuse that has ever been visited on the taxpayers of this country is occurring now and has occurred in the last 3 years.

The remedy for that? It is not to blame anyone here. The remedy for that is for us to fix it, for us to do something. What should we do? Let's put together the type of thing that worked previously. Harry Truman had the guts to do it.

Harry Truman was a Democrat. There was a Democrat in the White House. I am sure they all were gnashing their teeth at what Harry Truman was trying to do, but on a bipartisan basis Harry Truman put together, with the consent of the Senate, the Truman Committee that sunk their teeth into this issue and really did investigate and came up with a massive amount of waste, fraud, and abuse.

That is a minnow compared to the whale that exists at the moment in waste, fraud, and abuse. It is required of us, in my judgment, required of us to pass this legislation.

Having said all of that, let me compliment the chairman and the ranking member, but let me not do it because it is obligatory but because I really do think they do a great job. I hope they decide to strongly support this amendment. Then I will come back and compliment them some more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first let me compliment the Senator from North Dakota. He has been absolutely steadfast on this issue. He has made a major contribution on this issue.

If the Senator will stay for a moment, I want to ask him a question about the Truman Committee which he has made reference to. Perhaps I will make a brief statement and then ask him if he concurs with this history.

When then Senator Truman was appointed to head up the special committee to look into the abuses of contracting during World War II, he did an incredible job for a lot of reasons. One, he took on the abuse, the waste, the fraud that existed. He unearthed it. He brought it out in the daylight. He made a major contribution to our troops and to the taxpayers. It was such an important contribution that his temporary ad hoc special committee then became a Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

So that the origin of our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations which now exists over at the Homeland Security Committee was the special Truman Committee. That is how big an impact that Truman Committee had. And I am wondering whether or not that little bit of history shows us in addition to all of the reasons that were given by the Senator from North Dakota how vitally important these special committees can be, what a contribution they can make to the war effort and to saving taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct, first, about the history and, second, about the importance of this. Harry Truman used to have a sign on his desk saying, ''the buck stops here.'' Well, the buck stops here in the Congress on this issue. We are the ones who have to go find this waste, fraud, and abuse and put a stop to it. If we don't do it, it won't happen.

Harry Truman was a straight talker, a straight thinker. He used to say he would only accept one-armed economists because he didn't want people around him saying ''on the one hand'' and ''on the other hand.'' He decided to sink his teeth into the issue of waste, fraud, and abuse, and he made a big difference at a time when there was substantial waste, fraud, and abuse.

But I would venture to say there has never been a case in our history where

we have pushed hundreds of billions of dollars out the door in a very large hurry and put them in the hands of no-bid, sole-source contracts with big companies and said, ''Have a good time.'' It is unbelievable what is going on, and it is our responsibility to stop it—not tomorrow; it is our responsibility to stop it now.

This is the bill in which we should do it. This amendment fits exactly in this piece of legislation. My hope is that when the dust settles, we will have decided to accept this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. I again thank the Senator from North Dakota for the amendment and I hope that we can get some bipartisan support for it.

There have been reports on abuses. Reports are no substitute for hearings. When you have hearings following a special committee investigation, you have people who are put under oath, who are in the public spotlight so that we can bring a focus on these whistleblower complaints, and that is what has been missing. We have not had a place where the whistleblowers and the people who defend against their charges are brought together, both put under oath in a public forum so that we can then try to end what seems to be so clearly the abuses which have existed.

One of these contracts is a $10 billion contract-plus, basically. It is for indefinite delivery of goods, and it is for an indefinite amount quantitatively. So you have this contract which exists with Hallliburton or the company that they own which allows them to have the total, complete, unilateral sole-source ability to be given a work order—sometimes the money is agreed upon in advance, sometimes the amount of the contract is not agreed to until afterwards—indefinite delivery for indefinite quantities of indefinite goods.

Now, that kind of a contract just automatically lends itself to abuses, which should not happen here. This is something I spoke about yesterday. There should have been at least two and perhaps three contractors who were put in the exclusive contract to provide goods and services in support of the troops.

This is an open-ended contract of undefined scope which then later on billions of dollars of work orders are then put in place. It just lends itself to excess and to abuse. This is something again which I have spoken on a number of times. You need to have competition—not just for who is going to get an open-ended contract but in the implementation of work orders you need some competition. The only way you are going to get it in this circumstance when we are at war is if you have two or three contractors that are awarded these so-called IDIQ contracts so that when it comes to supplying the goods underneath it, they can compete against each other. It is the only hope that you have for a fair price for an amount of goods that is not known at the beginning but which has to be then supplied during the contract.

What these hearings which Senator DORGAN has spearheaded have shown is this kind of a contract and the potential for abuse that it leads to. It has raised all kinds of questions as to whether Halliburton overcharged the Coalition Provisional Authority for several million dollars for oil that was purchased in Kuwait and delivered to Iraq.

It raised the question of whether Halliburton overcharged the Department of Defense for thousands of meals that were not actually served.

It raised the question of whether Halliburton had the estimating subcontracting and financial management systems needed to run two multi-billion-dollar contracts in Iraq.

It raised the question of why did Halliburton receive a follow-on contract for the reconstruction of the Iraqi oil industry at a time when the DCAA, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, had warned that the company's systems were not up to this challenge.

It raised the question, these hearings that were spearhead by Senator DORGAN, as to whether Halliburton knowingly supplied our troops with spoiled food or unsafe drinking water.

It raised the question as to whether Halliburton intentionally withheld information from the Government to avoid raising questions about the quality of its performance.

There have been only two hearings in our subcommittee. I compliment our chairman. Our committee and our subcommittee every year have to deal with a bill, and this bill is in the Chamber. It takes a huge amount of our time as a practical matter. The two subcommittees that have hearings on this issue which Senator DORGAN raises simply have not been able to put in the kind of time that a special Truman Committee can to focus on this kind of issue. And that is why I very much support the appointment by the Senate of a Truman Committee on Iraq contracting.

When you have this many tens of billions of dollars which are being spent and when you have allegations by whistleblowers, people who are in the know, that we have been unable to get into or have not gotten into for one reason or another, they have not been investigated or overseen by the other committee that might do this, this really needs a focus if we are going to have some credibility in the expenditure of these huge amounts of money in the Iraq war. And this should be done on a bipartisan basis. It would be with a Truman Committee. It needs to be done in a way which is free of any kind of political taint or political slant. But it needs to be done. We have to restore credibility and confidence in this contracting system, and the only way we are going to do that I can see is to have a bipartisan Truman-like committee that spends the time, has the staff focus on it, making recommendations which I think will be similar to the ones that were defeated yesterday but they should not be prejudged. In any event, it could make recommendations to this body, and I would hope we would all welcome those kinds of recommendations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could engage my distinguished ranking member in a colloquy, historically this amendment is almost identical in form to what came before the Senate on 14 September last fall, 2005. It was defeated by a vote of 53 to 44. And that was on the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill. Then, with the tenacity of our good friend from North Dakota, he brought the same amendment up again on October 19, 2005. Again, it was defeated by a vote of 54 to 44 on the Transportation appropriations bill.

So the Senate on two occasions has examined this before other committees and defeated it.

Now, let's go back a little bit in history, and this is a part of Senate history that you have greater familiarity with than do I. Your distinguished predecessor, Senator Nunn, when I worked with him—he was chairman, I was the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee—there would be times when he would say, ''John, I simply have to take off a week; I have this special committee.'' He was then on the committee on which you served, I think, throughout your tenure in the Senate; now called Homeland Security, it used to be called Government Operations. And the Senate as a body some time ago decided to take the roots of the Truman Commission, which, indeed, was a successful operation, and repose it, place it into the Government Operations Committee, now the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. I have been on that committee as long as I have been here.

Mr. WARNER. Another 28 years.

Mr. LEVIN. That subcommittee has a major agenda and a whole host of areas that the chairman has identified, frequently with my support, and it has a very full plate. This committee, our committee, has something that that committee does not have, and that is we have the knowledge, we have the information because we are the committee that specializes in the work of Halliburton in the field. We are the people who have the experience in terms of what the troops need and how it is provided to the troops. And so our committee also has the ability to handle these hearings. Neither committee has seen fit, either because it has too full a plate already—and I think our committee from firsthand knowledge is in that situation—has a very full plate, and therefore has not been able or for whatever reason has decided not to look at what are clearly excesses which need to be reviewed.

So it is a matter of finding, identifying Senators who have an interest in this matter who would focus on this

matter because of the attention that it deserves.

Now, it could be an outside commission. If the chairman would prefer that there be an outside commission to do this, perhaps Senator DORGAN would be willing to do it. But this requires a major undertaking with an investigative—you have to identify and set out special staff that will do the investigations on this, and then prepare for hearings. If our committee were able to do this, I would be all for it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, yes, there are instances of fraud and abuse, and work has been done by the Armed Services Committee Readiness Subcommittee. I believe Senator AKAKA is on that committee from your side of the aisle. It is a lot of work. It is not as if somebody is sitting on their hands.

Fraud, waste and abuse within the Federal contracting system, while not pervasive, is a significant problem that we as a Congress must, and are, addressing.

The potential for fraud, waste and abuse is not limited to just Iraq and Afghanistan. Through the use of normal committee legislative tools and processes we have uncovered fraudulent and wasteful cases and are conducting systemic oversight.

The Armed Services Committee has conducted numerous hearings and briefings on acquisition oversight and reform (including oversight of contracting in Iraq) and has initiated investigations by the GAO and the Inspector General on DOD acquisition practices and programs.

Other committees, such as Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Foreign Relations, with jurisdiction over government contracting, have similar oversight records.

The Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction was established to look at Iraqi contracting. The special IG routinely briefs this Committee and others on its findings.

Just yesterday we approved an amendment to expand the special IG's oversight to include a broader range of funds being used to contract for Iraq reconstruction activities.

And, as I noted earlier this week, the special IG submits quarterly and semiannual reports to Congress. The inspector general operates a hotline for reports of possible waste, fraud and abuse and has uncovered criminal activity that has been referred for prosecution.

The special inspector general's efforts have yielded important oversight results and have prompted three specific lessons learned initiatives.

The lessons learned initiatives are: (1) human capital management; (2) contract management; and (3) program management.

The contract management report should be out later this summer.

The committee has also addressed contract and acquisition reform through a series of legislative provisions and initiatives.

I will highlight three recent examples:

No. 1, Section 817 of last year's defense authorization act addressed the need for a joint contingency contracting plan;

No. 2, Section 841 of that same legislation required GAO to review efforts of the Department to identify and assess areas of vulnerability for contracting waste, fraud and abuse. This report should be completed soon;

No. 3, the committee included a provision in this year's bill to build on previous oversight efforts in the contracting area. Section 864 of our bill would require the Department to develop contingency program management plans. This section is part of a series of provisions designed to improve acquisition and contracting outcomes across the department through better overall program management.

I believe our activities, which I have very briefly outlined here, represent the best approach to conducting oversight. We bring in the experts and have them address systemic and specific problems.

We want to avoid an approach that would lead to wasting much of our oversight efforts on anecdotes of individual fraudulent acts which mayor may not show that we have a systemic problem.

We need to prosecute those singular cases and protect against fraud, waste and abuse in a way that can still deliver goods and services to the warfighter as quickly as possible.

So I say to my colleague, I appreciate his concerns and I look forward to working with him to address problems with Federal acquisition.

However, I do not support the establishment of a new special Committee which would duplicate the work of this Committee and would only look at selected Federal expenditures and contracts.

I come back to this creation of the entity that the Senator from North Dakota wants and I again draw attention to the fact that Homeland Security has been given by the Senate the overall responsibility and an investigating committee with special funding, special staff to do investigations. Senator Nunn utilized it frequently when he was chairman of our committee. But there isn't a committee in this body that is not faced from time to time with the subject of fraud, waste, and abuse. And the Senate decided, rather than have each of the committees have their own special investigating team, to put together this subcommittee in the Government Operations Committee to do this work.

So I come back to my friend and just ask, why should we create something additional to what is already present, structured by the Senate to address the fraud, waste, and abuse problems in all the committees that we serve on and it was placed in the Homeland Defense Committee?

Mr. LEVIN. There have been requests—I believe from the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee—to get into this. And if the chairman would be willing to sign a letter with me making another request to that chairman to try to find time in either her committee work or in Senator COLEMAN's committee, I would again be very happy to join in that request.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would certainly entertain that.

Mr. LEVIN. If we are unable do that on our committee, which we have not been able to do anything that needs to be done here—and I understand the time pressures on the committee because of this annual bill we have; I know what is on the plate over at the Governmental Affairs Committee and on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations—

Mr. WARNER. You serve on that committee.

Mr. LEVIN. That is exactly right. I have been there throughout my tenure. I am personally familiar with the work they have undertaken. But if Senator WARNER would be willing to sign a request to Senator COLLINS, I would be delighted to join in that.

Mr. WARNER. What I would suggest we do is have a consultation with Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN and then follow up with a letter, if we deem appropriate.

Mr. LEVIN. That would be fine.

Mr. WARNER. That committee has done a prodigious amount of work. I certainly commend the chairman and ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee. They are workers.

Mr. LEVIN. I am on that committee, as you pointed out. I know the workload they have. Just yesterday, they completed a markup on one bill which took 2 days. I don't know of any people who work harder in the Senate than do Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. WARNER. So we have a procedure on that. For the moment, I suggest we set aside the pending amendment and turn to the matter of trying to clear some amendments on this side. Is that appropriate at this time?

Mr. LEVIN. That would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4254 AND 4295, 4296, AND 4297, EN BLOC

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I send a series of amendments to the desk which have been cleared by myself and the distinguished ranking member. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the amendments en bloc, the amendments be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to any of these individual amendments be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, I just wonder if the Senator would identify the Senator who has sponsored the amendment so that they will hear their amendments have now been cleared.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. The Senators I have indicated here on my sheet are

Senators SESSIONS, OBAMA, ALLARD, SALAZAR, and I judge that scribbling is Senator WARNER of Virginia.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4254

(Purpose: To require the use of competitive procedures for Federal contracts worth over $500,000 related to hurricane recovery, subject to existing limited national security, public interest, and other exceptions)

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING IN HURRICANE RECOVERY.

The exceptions to full and open competition otherwise available under (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 303(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)) and paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 2304(c) 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4295

(Purpose: To require a report on reporting requirements applicable to the Department of Defense)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each report described in paragraph (2) that is required by law to be submitted to the congressional defense committees by the Department of Defense or any department, agency, element, or component under the Department of Defense.

(2) COVERED REPORTS.—Paragraph (1) applies with respect to any report required under a provision of law enacted on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) that requires recurring reports to the committees referred to in that paragraph.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) Each report described by that subsection, including a statement of the provision of law under which such report is required to be submitted to Congress.

(2) For each such report, an assessment by the Secretary of the utility of such report from the perspective of the Department of Defense and a recommendation on the advisability of repealing the requirement for the submittal of such report.

AMENDMENT NO. 4296

(Purpose: To prohibit the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site until the Secretary submits a report analyzing such expansion and provides to the congressional defense committees the extent to which the expansion could be carried out through transactions with willing sellers of the privately held land)

On page 546, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 2828. REPORTS ON ARMY TRAINING RANGES.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not carry out any acquisition of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado until 30 days after the Secretary submits the report required under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT ON PINON CANYON MANEUVER SITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis of any potential expansion of the military training range at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A description of the Army's current and projected military requirements for training at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(B) An analysis of the reasons for any changes in those requirements, including the extent to which they are a result of the increase of military personnel due to the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) A proposed plan for addressing those requirements, including a description of any proposed expansion of the existing training range by acquiring privately held land surrounding the site and an analysis of alternative approaches that do not require expansion of the training range.

(D) If an expansion of the training range is recommended pursuant to subparagraph (C), the following information:

(i) An assessment of the economic impact on local communities of such acquisition.

(ii) An assessment of the environmental impact of expanding the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(iii) An estimate of the costs associated with the potential expansion, including land acquisition, range improvements, installation of utilities, environmental restoration, and other environmental activities in connection with the acquisition.

(iv) An assessment of options for compensating local communities for the loss of property tax revenue as a result of the expansion of Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(v) An assessment of whether the acquisition of additional land at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site can be carried out by the Secretary solely through transactions, including land exchanges and the lease or purchase of easements, with willing sellers of the privately held land.

(c) REPORT ON EXPANSION OF ARMY TRAINING RANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an assessment of the training ranges operated by the Army to support major Army units.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) The size, description, and mission essential training tasks supported by each such Army training range during fiscal year 2003.

(B) A description of the projected changes in training range requirements, including the size, characteristics, and attributes for mission essential training of each range and the extent to which any changes in requirements are a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) The projected deficit or surplus of training land at each such range, and a description of the Army's plan to address that projected deficit or surplus of land as well as the upgrade of range attributes at each existing training range.

(D) A description of the Army's prioritization process and investment strategy to address the potential expansion or upgrade of training ranges.

(E) An analysis of alternatives to the expansion of Army ranges to include an assessment of the joint use of ranges operated by other services.

AMENDMENT NO. 4297

(Purpose: To make technical corrections to provisions related to the National Museums of the Armed Forces)

On page 65, line 16, insert ''facility designated by the Secretary as the'' before ''National''.

On page 65, line 24, insert ''facility designated by the Secretary as the'' before ''National''.

On page 66, line 17, insert ''facility designated by the Secretary as the'' before ''National''.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan and I have been here, together with the leadership of both sides, making it clear we are ready to conduct business on such amendments as may be brought before the Senate on this bill. I believe at this time we have now completed such business as was ready. I anticipate the leadership will advise us with regard to the schedule on Monday, and most certainly we will be back up at some point in time during that day to continue. I hope I will be joined by my distinguished colleague from Michigan urging Senators to come to the floor.

On our side of the aisle, I only know of perhaps two amendments that might be offered—one, as you are quite familiar with, by the Senator from Georgia with regard to certain aircraft programs. That is clear on its face. The other one I will work through. Frankly, I would have to say to my colleagues throughout the Senate, most particularly to my ranking member, I begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel, certainly as regards the amendments that could be forthcoming from this side of the aisle.

Mr. LEVIN. I was hoping the Senator was referring to Iraq, but since he is referring to our bill, I also see that we ought to be able to finish this next week. We will have a good debate on Iraq, I guess probably next Tuesday. Next Monday, I believe we have an amendment lined up.

Mr. WARNER. I know the Senator from Georgia wishes to offer his.

Mr. LEVIN. On your side of the aisle. After Senator DORGAN offered his today, it would then go to your side of the aisle to offer the next amendment, if we want to keep that informal order which has been established.

Mr. WARNER. Correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Then we could perhaps pick up the debate on the Dorgan amendment on Monday after the debate on the judge.

Mr. WARNER. I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts intends to revisit his strong approach to some of the situations in Iraq, particularly regarding troop structure.

Mr. LEVIN. I wouldn't want to speak for the Senator from Massachusetts. I

do believe, though, he is working on an amendment. There will be at least two amendments on this side relative to Iraq.

Mr. WARNER. In addition to the one from the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LEVIN. There is one Senator JACK REED and I are working on, and I think there is one Senator KERRY is working on. I can't speak for others. There may be a number of amendments on this side.

Mr. WARNER. I see the distinguished minority whip here. Maybe he could advise us what his ascertainment might be with regard to the balance of amendments on that side.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment related to the rendition of prisoners which I would like to say a word about before we adjourn today. There may be an indication that there are still a few more amendments to be forthcoming. I will bring my amendment to your attention today, and I hope all Members will do the same so that you can plot the schedule for the upcoming week.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we believe there are a number of amendments which will need debate. It would be useful for all Senators on either Monday or Tuesday morning, if they could, to let us know what amendments they are planning on offering so we could get an estimate—I know you would agree as the floor manager—as to how many amendments are out there.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, Senator FRIST and I have discussed that. I believe he is in conversation with the leadership on your side. I heartily endorse that approach. Perhaps we could formalize it in some way.

Mr. LEVIN. I think we might be better off not formalizing it.

Mr. WARNER. Only in the sense that the two leaders and you and I come to the floor. I am not suggesting cloture or anything of that nature. I would hope this bill could be passed on by the Senate without the benefit of any cloture motion.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask through the Chair, if this would be an appropriate moment, I would like to speak to the amendment which I will offer and a few other remarks not to exceed 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Whatever the distinguished Senator from Illinois wishes, please proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to recognizing the Senator from Illinois for 10 minutes?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, after wars are completed, history stands in judgment of the leaders, not just whether there was a victory or defeat in the war but whether the war was conducted properly. Almost without fail, history has been a brutal, sometimes difficult judge of the conduct of war. Caught up in concern about protection and security, nations do things which don't stand the test of time and reflection. The man I think was our greatest President, Abraham Lincoln, in the course of the Civil War suspended the writ of habeas corpus. By suspending that writ, he held prisoners without charges and without due process for long periods of time. It was controversial. Later on, it was judged that perhaps President Lincoln had gone too far.

In the midst of the First World War, with our concern over espionage, Congress enacted the Sedition Act which unfortunately tarred and condemned innocent Americans, and later on we came to realize that. In World War II, the most notorious conduct by our own Government was against our fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry who were interred in camps, innocent people. I know some of them. I have grown up with some of them. I know they carry scars from that incarceration. Throughout our history, as we reflect, we find there are things we should not have done in the course of a war.

I have said on this floor several times that I believe eventually history will be a very strenuous judge of our conduct in this war on terror when it comes to the use of torture. For decades, the United States had established a clear standard that we would never engage in torture—cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. Then after 9/11, in the shock and fear that followed, this administration ended up trying to rewrite the standards for interrogation and torture. It wasn't a proud chapter in our history. We now know the administration abandoned that effort after some time. We know as well that some of the people who were involved in it have been reluctant to even discuss what they were doing. But there was a good ending when last year Senator JOHN MCCAIN offered an amendment in the Senate to state unequivocally that the United States would not engage in the torture of prisoners, not engage in cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment of prisoners.

The reasons are obvious. Prisoners who are being tortured will say anything. It doesn't have to be true. Secondly, the standard we set in the treatment of our prisoners could one day be used against Americans who are taken as prisoners. So not only does it give you invalid information, it sets a standard that we never want our soldiers to be subjected to.

By a vote of 90 to 9, the Senate enacted JOHN MCCAIN's standard for torture, saying that we were not abandoning our longstanding commitment to it. I was happy to cosponsor that effort. There was a debate where Vice President CHENEY came forward and said we need to make an exception for agents of intelligence agencies in our Government. Thank goodness, the Vice President's recommendation was rejected. The President signed it, and I hope he is living by it. Sadly, most of that is being done behind closed doors, and we won't know for a long time, if ever, whether it is being followed. I trust the word of the President when he says we are not engaging in torture. Now comes the next chapter.

If the President's words are an indication, Guantanamo Bay is likely to be closed. That is a good thing. Guantanamo Bay and the prisoners who are being held there have to be moved to a different situation. If they are in fact a danger to the United States or to any soldiers or any person we value, they should be charged and held or held as enemy combatants. But if they are being held for intelligence purposes, we should be honest. After 3 years, for goodness' sake, what value could they possibly bring to our intelligence?

Several hundred men are being held. Last week, there was the startling discovery that three had committed suicide. It is an indication to me that Guantanamo Bay should be closed, as the President has suggested. I hope it is sooner rather than later.

Then what will happen to the prisoners? The amendment I will offer says that if we are going to be involved in the rendition of these prisoners, the transfer of these prisoners to some other place, some other country, we need to make sure that country abides by the same standards of humane conduct to which the United States ascribes. We cannot be content in sending these prisoners to some other place where they will be subjected to torture if, in fact, we have expressed a value in the United States that we are opposed to torture. That is what the amendment will say, that we make that effort to ascertain and to review regularly those detention facilities to make sure they live by that same standard.

There has been a debate this week in Washington over the war in Iraq. It was also a week when the Department of Defense reported that we have lost 2,500 soldiers. White House spokesperson Tony Snow was asked to comment on this loss of 2,500. I am sure the statement he made doesn't reflect what he really feels in his heart when he said:

It's a number.

I am sure he feels as we all do that it is more than a number. It is more than an aggregate. It is 2,500 precious lives that have been lost by men and women in uniform willing to stand and serve and risk their lives for America.

I have attended some of the funerals. They are heartbreaking. Most of the soldiers are very young. I recall going down to southern Illinois where the funeral service was right outside the farmhouse where this young man grew up, down in Perry County. His mom and dad brought out for us to see, around the tent where the service was taking place, little souvenirs from his life—his fishing rods, his hunting rifle. We were just a few feet away from the tree house he and his dad built. I will never forget that scene as long as I live. It was a reminder that before he was in uniform, he was a son, he was a boy. Their heartbreaking experience will be with them for a long time. There are 2,499 other stories just like

that of grief which will be shared by families for years to come.

We are debating now what should we do in Iraq. The idea that we pull out our troops quickly, precipitously, is unacceptable. It would leave a situation which I am afraid would descend further into chaos and maybe create more instability and more problems to come.

But here is what worries me. When the President of the United States goes to Iraq and says to our enemies in Iraq that we are here to stay, that may be a strong message to our enemies of our resolve, but it is the wrong message to our allies and friends. The Iraqis have to understand we are not going to stay indefinitely. Think of what we have done in this country, not only giving 2,500 of our best and bravest lives, not only having 20,000 of our soldiers come home, half of them with serious permanent injuries, 2,000 of them with head injuries, not only spending $300 billion in behalf of this effort in Iraq, not only sacrificing at home where we can't afford to fund medical research, Amtrak, education, health care, and the programs which Americans value, not only all these things, but we have been successful; we have deposed their dictator, Saddam Hussein; we dug him out of a hole in the ground and put him on trial.

We have given the Iraqis more than ample opportunity to control their fate and future. We offered them free elections. We have given them a chance to form a government. We have given this country so much in the 3 years we have been there. Now we must say to them: The day has come when you must stand and defend your own country. If you value Iraq as a nation, be prepared to stand and fight and maybe even die on behalf of that nation. But if we say to the Iraqis that we are staying there indefinitely, it is the best deal on Earth because it is the best military on Earth that will be there for them serving as a babysitter and a referee in an ongoing civil war for an indeterminate amount of time.

How many more lives will America give to this conflict before the Iraqis stand and defend their own nation? And when the President and many in the Chamber here don't want to speak to any kind of withdrawal date, they are suggesting to the Iraqis we are there to stay. That is the wrong message. We need to tell them that we have fought and offered our best for their future and that they need to accept that responsibility from this point forward.

This week, I stood in silence at my desk on the floor of the Senate with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in reverence to the 2,500 lives that have been lost, saying a prayer for their memory and their families, thinking as well of the veterans who have come home, some broken in body and in spirit, who have done so much for this country. We owe it to them, we owe it to their families to reach a point where we can come home with our mission truly accomplished.

It is more than just a number. Mr. President, 2,500 of our soldiers have given their lives. When this came up initially, I voted against authorization for war. I believed at the time that the administration had misled us as to what was happening there, this threat of weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons and connections with 9/11. It turned out they were all false. None of it was true, and we went to war anyway. We were told as soon as we arrived that the Iraqi Army would turn on Saddam Hussein and join us in the fight, and that didn't happen. We were told the Iraqi people would greet us with open arms, and I know many are appreciative for what we have done, but it is still so unsafe in that country. The average soldier just going down the street in a military vehicle is risking his life every single day, more than 3 years after our invasion.

Having voted against that authorization for war, though, I have voted for every penny this President asked for. I lived through Vietnam. I remember what happened. An unpopular war was taken out on our soldiers, and that is not fair. Our soldiers did what we asked of them in the Vietnam war, as they are doing today. Politicians and elected officials can debate and differ on policy, but the bottom line is our soldiers are serving us and we should stand by them. I voted for every penny because of one basic standard: If it were my son or daughter in uniform, I would want them to have everything they needed to come home safely. That is the way I feel, and that is why I voted this week for the supplemental appropriation. But that won't stop me today and in the coming days from challenging this administration and challenging this Congress to make it clear that the Iraqis have to stand and fight and defend, and the American troops are coming home. It is only when that happens that we can truly say that our mission is accomplished.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to share a few thoughts about the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which I chair, which deals with space, missile defense, satellites, and many of the other high-tech systems on which our Defense Department relies. But I just want to respond to my colleague, Senator DURBIN. I don't think he actually meant to say that our soldiers are coming home broken in body and spirit, but he came close. That is not what I am hearing. Go out to Walter Reed. They may have broken bodies and broken bones, but they are not broken in spirit.

The night before last, I attended a wonderful ceremony of the 231st birthday of the U.S. Army. I was talking with soldiers there. We were talking about the war and the politics of the Capitol. They are aware of what is going on. I told them that I thought the Congress would not vote for any immediate withdrawal, and indeed we voted yesterday 93 to 6 against any kind of withdrawal requirement for this year. That vote, represents a strong bipartisan consensus of the Senate. One of those soldiers said: I will tell you what we want, Senator; ''We want to win.'' We want to win this war. That is what the American people want, that is what the soldiers who have gone there and sacrificed want, and that is what they believe in. The soldiers who have been there believe in what they have done. They have been courageous in performing their mission.

It is difficult for me and for them to understand this idea that we can support the soldiers but not support the mission we sent them on, sent them by a three-fourths vote of this Senate. A majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for this war, and we are going to stay the course, we are going to help our military succeed, and we are going to help them win.

The point I pick up more and more as I talk with these soldiers, what I am hearing from them, is they are afraid we are going to mess it up. They believe they are winning. They believe they are doing their job. They believe they will be successful. And they are really worried that this Congress will be the one that will lose its nerve and not stand with them after they put their lives on the line for this country.

I believe this is a big deal, and that success in Iraq is important for our Nation. I visited that region recently. I talked to the leaders of Turkey, Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. What would it mean for us if we had a disastrous event in Iraq where the terrorists take over that country? What would it mean to their neighbors? What would it mean to the region? All nations of good will know we must succeed.

Iraq is stepping up. There are now 260,000 Iraqi soldiers and security personnel in uniform and reaching higher and higher levels of performance. They are doing a much better job every day. They will soon be at 350,000 by the end of this year. They are being better equipped and better trained, and I believe we are doing a much smarter job of imbedding our soldiers with the Iraqi units so we can call in air support, we can provide mentoring, we can provide advice, we can call on other kinds of support, if they need it, to be effective.

A majority of the raids and actions that are taking place in Iraq are taking place by the Iraqis. Iraqi soldiers are taking more casualties than American soldiers. We are not babysitting them. This image of millions casting their ballots for a freely elected government of Iraq is not a bad image for us to remember. We need to remember that, and it is important for us, let me note first and foremost, that this Nation not allow the terrorists to win in Iraq.

We are going to be successful. But I realize the American people are concerned. They don't like to see violence and continued death. They don't like to see our soldiers at risk. I certainly understand that; neither do I.

I have been an admirer of General Abizaid, CENTCOM commander, and his team of generals because General Abizaid has always resisted the temptation to see how many troops we can put in Iraq. He said that is not the way to win this war. We need the right number of troops, and we need to begin to draw them down as soon as it is appropriate to draw them down and lift up the Iraqi Army. That is what we need to do.

Some want to have the President set forth a detailed plan so they can criticize it, basically. How will some sort of formalized plan help our soldiers be effective in the battle? It just tells your enemy what you are going to be doing. More importantly, a detailed plan is not going to be permanent. It will have to change because the enemy changes. As soon as you shut off one avenue of enemy success, they take another one and you have to respond to that. That is the history of warfare. That is the way wars have always been fought: you constantly adjust and constantly alter your efforts to be successful toward your ultimate goal of victory. That is what our military is doing.

Trying to demand a date from our military to withdraw or trying to demand from them a plan of what they are going to do 5 months from now fails to understand and recognize the nature of this conflict, and this conflict more than most conflicts because we face an asymmetrical enemy, a nontraditional enemy, who knows it cannot stand and fight our military successfully, so it devises devious and sneaky ways to pit one religion against another, to attack American soldiers, to attack the local police, all designed to crumble the Government of Iraq. But it hasn't happened. Iraqis are still signing up and becoming policemen. Iraqis are still signing up and the army is growing. The Government of Iraq has elected, for the first time, their permanent leadership.

Prime Minister Maliki is in office. His whole Cabinet now has been established. The two key Cabinet positions on which they spent extra time, Defense and Interior, have now been established, confirmed and voted by the 275 member Parliament. So they have their government now, fully elected, a permanent government, just like any other nation in the world. There is no interim government now.

I believe they are going to be successful, and I tell you, it is going to be important for the United States that they are. We have invested a lot; our soldiers have invested a lot. They are proud of what they are doing. They are not broken in spirit. They want to be successful and win.

I have some numbers I will share with my colleagues and those around the country who might be listening. In this conflict, the Army has had the largest number of people serving in Iraq, yet their enlistment rate through May of this year was 104.3 percent. They have exceeded their enlistment goals for this year. They have exceeded their reenlistment goals. The Army for a few months did miss their goals, and some critics said it was a broken Army and predicted disaster. The Army said: No, we are not broken, and we are going to meet our goals. For 13 consecutive months, the Army has met its goals. The highest retention reenlistment rates come from the units that have just come back from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Barr, who was at Walter Reed, was injured by an explosive device. He was punctured by as many as 100 different pieces of shrapnel. He was told he would have difficulty walking and would probably never run again. He said he was going to run again, and he was going back to Iraq with the unit that he came with. And he worked at it and he worked at it and he ran. He eventually went back to Iraq and served again. That is the kind of spirit that we have. That is the kind of spirit that you see in our Army.

I was told by an officer who knew that story that every single soldier in his squad reenlisted. This is the spirit that this Congress needs to strive to be worthy of. This is the kind of professional commitment and courage that inspires us, or should inspire us. We should not be whining around here and trying to find some error that was made somewhere where body armor did not get to a soldier. Body armor is out there protecting soldiers. It is not a problem. To say that there has never been a shortage somewhere or somehow a supply failed to get where it was supposed to, I can't say; but it is not a systemic problem. But to go around and suggest to the citizens of our country that this Congress and the military is not committed to providing body armor to our soldiers is bogus and false and undermines what they are doing. It must be most confusing to our soldiers there.

But I think the vote yesterday should give them confidence that most of this talk is simply politics. Most of it is just complaining and second-guessing, like is done on the floor of the Senate every day. We hear it every day on many issues and debate and criticism is passed of the strength of American Government.

But I would urge my colleagues to think differently about soldiers in conflict, soldiers in harm's way. We need to be careful what we are saying here. It may sound good, it may hurt President Bush, to make this allegation or that allegation, but is it perhaps creating in the eyes of our enemies a belief that we are divided, that we won't stay the course, and that if they just kill enough people, civilians, Americans, Iraqis, that somehow, it will all just fail. Is that the possibility that we are creating? That is why I urge my colleagues to be very careful and watch what you say in terms of attacks on the efforts that our military have so courageously undertaken in Iraq. Things happen in war. Bad things happen. But no military has done a better job of striving for perfection than ours has.

I would also like to respond to charges that this Nation is going to be embarrassed historically because we have tortured people that were captured in this war on terrorism. We talked about Lincoln. Lincoln eliminated the writ of habeas corpus. Roosevelt, as Senator DURBIN said, locked people up, Japanese Americans, in a way that was not justified. He basically takes a view, as so many seem to be saying on the left and on the Democratic side, that we have a policy of torture in the United States. That is not so. The President has repeatedly, time and time again, said: We have no policy of torture; we do not torture.

There is a statute in the United States Code passed shortly before I came here that defines and prohibits torture. It does not say you can never put any stress on someone, but it says you can't subject them to torture, and it defines it precisely.

They say, well, what about Abu Ghraib. Let me remind everybody, we learned about Abu Ghraib when the Army general reported what happened in Abu Ghraib. Let me remind people that what happened to those prisoners in Abu Ghraib, so wrong that it was, had nothing to do with interrogation, had nothing to do with any plan of torture. These were not even prisoners who had any intelligence. It was the late graveyard shift and a group of soldiers lost their discipline—lost their discipline under the stress of war—and performed in a way that got them prosecuted and sent to jail by the U.S. military. That was not the policy of the United States of America. We have heard this most complex chain of thoughts and reasoning, this complex chain of reasoning which is almost laughable, and is worthy of the most incredible conspiracy theorists, that somehow President Bush is responsible for what happened in Abu Ghraib.

It is not so. The military responded firmly and aggressively to this terrible wrong. And do you remember the story—I know the Presiding Officer does—of the fine African-American colonel under the stress of attacks on his men in Iraq, he fired a gun near the head of an enemy that had been captured in order to attempt to frighten him and to get intelligence from him. Apparently, he got some intelligence of value that he believed helped protect the lives of his soldiers. But do you know what. He was booted out of the military because we don't tolerate that kind of thing. His actions went beyond what our standards allow, and he was cashiered from the Army. A fine person with a fine career who made a big mistake, and he paid for it because we don't accept that kind of thing.

It is demeaning, it is dishonest, it is wrong to suggest that we have a policy to torture prisoners. With regard to Guantanamo, I know the President said he would like to see it closed. Well, I want to know what he is going to do with those prisoners. I have been there twice. Those soldiers do their jobs under difficult conditions every single day. They are highly professional. They do not allow themselves to be baited into overreacting when these prisoners display the worst kinds of anti-Americanism.

Until just recently, not a single captive had died at Guantanamo. Now we have three suicides. So I suppose that is our fault now, that we had three people commit suicide who were being held down there. These are not bad conditions at all. They are good conditions. They are treated fine. They are given the Koran, given places to worship, given places to exercise, and given all kinds of things that most prisons around the world don't give to the prisoners of their own countries, much less to the people who want to destroy their country.

But what I would say is this: They committed suicide. Those suicides were a political statement. They were their efforts to attack and undermine the United States. Their fervent desire was that Members of this Senate and the House of Representatives would use their deaths to speak on the floor to try to undermine our war against terrorism to make us less successful in the war on terrorism. That is exactly what their goal was. And, I would say this: does anyone in this Chamber doubt that if they had access to a bomb, they would have put that bomb on their body and killed anybody they could have? They would have killed themselves to promote their terrorist agenda. If they had been given the opportunity, wouldn't they have put a bomb on and killed others at the same time?

I say those suicides are an absolute indication that we have in Guantanamo some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world.

Now, I heard an official of our great ally, the United Kingdom, say we ought to close Guantanamo. I wanted to write him and say: Do you want to take these prisoners to the U.K.? Do you want to hold them? And then if you get tired of holding them, are you just going to let them go in London on your subways and on your buses? Then the critics worry that if we turn them back to their home countries and we have a rendition of the prisoners back to their home countries, that we have to guarantee that they are going to be treated wonderfully. So we can't keep them in Guantanamo, we can't—who else wants them? We can't even send them back to their home countries to be held in prison, apparently.

So this reminds me of nuclear waste. Everybody has nuclear waste, but nobody wants to do anything with it, and they use the argument that you can't dispose of nuclear waste to try to block nuclear power. So this is just another attempt to make it more difficult, in my view, for us to be successful in handling these prisoners. They are not being tortured at Guantanamo. It is not the policy of the United States to torture anyone, and they are not being tortured. The few people who violated our high standards have been disciplined and punished.

So let me say this in conclusion, Mr. President. The good news is that we have free debate here, and we get to duke it out and we get to have our say. We just voted yesterday 93 to 6 to declare we have no intention of any precipitous withdrawal from Iraq; that we are going to stand there with our soldiers, and we are going to stand with our allies in Iraq and help them establish a free, decent, democratic government, a government that will be to our national interests to an incredible degree. It will be more valuable than most people can comprehend to us and to the world to have a decent, peaceful Iraq and to defeat the terrorists there who want to take it over and make it their place.

The other good news is that we have had a very successful attack on the CEO of terrorism, Zarqawi, and he has been killed. He clearly was the No. 1 executive officer of terrorism in the world, and that was a big victory.

We also now completed the confirmation of the Defense Minister and the Interior Minister for Iraq, so the entire Cabinet is in place, and an entire government is in place. The Iraqi Army continues to get better, and it continues to grow, and we are beginning to see the possibility that our troops can be withdrawn. If we have to send more troops there, I will listen to the commanders. If they can bring the troops down, that will make me happy. We are going to listen to our commanders and do what it takes and continue this process in a way that leads to—what? Victory. That is what the soldiers we have sent there want, that is what the American people want, and that is what we in this Congress have to do; to figure out how to help our military people go forward and achieve victory. That will be my effort, and I think for the most part that is the bipartisan consensus of this Senate.

Mr. President, again, I finish with a tribute to the professionalism of those in service, to the risk they have incurred; how they have attempted to conduct the violence of war in a way that mitigates civilian casualties and that reflects the highest ideals of the United States of America. I could not be more proud of their service. The conduct of this war on terrorism will be received as the most humane and careful war in history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, let me begin by saying I very much share the view of the Senator from Alabama about our troops. Day in and day out, they bring the utmost professionalism and the utmost courage and valor to the cause of standing up for American values. I very much share his views with respect to the tribute we ought to be paying to those who serve us, who wear the uniform of the United States and who do it with such extraordinary patriotism and service to our country.

(Mr. SESSIONS assumed the Chair.)

What I am here to talk about, though, is the political decisions that are made and how they affect those courageous troops and how they affect the security of the country.

In March of this year, at a press conference, a reporter asked President Bush:

> Will there come a day, and I'm not asking you when, not asking for a timetable—will there come a day when there will be no more American forces in Iraq?

The President responded:

> That, of course, is an objective and that will be decided by future Presidents and future governments of Iraq.
> . . . decided by future Presidents. . . .
> . . . decided by future Presidents. . . .
> . . . decided by future Presidents. . . .

I found that statement troubling for two major reasons. First, staying in Iraq for years and years, in my view, will threaten Americans' preparedness to deal with a host of other threats that ought to concern all of us. Certainly at the top of that list would be Iran and North Korea, but suffice it to say, it is a dangerous world.

I serve on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. I know the distinguished Senator from Alabama has a great interest in military affairs. No Senator who looks at the facts and the world in a realistic way would conclude otherwise. It is a dangerous world. There are real threats to our country. It is my view that to stay and stay and stay in Iraq will threaten the preparedness of our country at a dangerous time.

Second, it seems to me that making this kind of open-ended commitment to stay in Iraq, an open-ended commitment that in effect says we will be there at least until 2009, doesn't send the right message to the Iraqis about getting serious about their most serious challenges. For example, when I was recently in Iraq with my colleague, Senator SNOWE, I was especially troubled by the Iraqis' response to my concerns about corruption in the Iraqi oil sector. We all know that 90 percent of the revenue generated in Iraq comes from oil, and there has been one independent analysis after another documenting widespread corruption in Iraq's oil sector. I brought that to the attention of the officials Senator SNOWE and I met with on our trip. Essentially, the response was one of denial: Well, Senator, it really isn't that bad; well, Senator, we are getting serious about it; well, Senator, we are thinking about trying X, Y, and Z.

But I say to the Senate today that we continue to read these independent

analyses which have documented widespread corruption and malfeasance in the Iraqi oil sector. Yet it is not being dealt with. My view is that to say the future of American forces in Iraq will be decided by future Presidents is yet another signal to the Iraqis that they have plenty of time to deal with serious problems like corruption in the oil sector, which should have been dealt with some time ago.

Again, I share the view of the Senator from Alabama concerning the professionalism of our troops. Our country and the world is better as a result of the death of Mr. Zarqawi. The kind of carnage and the brutal campaign that Mr. Zarqawi conducted is well understood. We are all very hopeful, because we all root for success in Iraq, that this will deal a blow to the insurgency. Our soldiers and all concerned ought to be proud of what they accomplished in taking down Zarqawi. I am proud of them. I know the Senator from Alabama is as well.

But let us think about the implications of overstretching our Armed Forces. That is why I say I am troubled about what is going to happen to American preparedness for a dangerous world if we stay and stay and stay—until at least 2009. Oregon Guard members, for example, of whom we are exceptionally proud, are on their third rotation in the theater. Some Active-Duty Forces are on their fourth rotation. Others are getting ready for their fifth rotation into harm's way. I am sure that is also the case in Alabama. I am sure it is also the case in every part of the United States. I will tell the Senate today that I think the stress our courageous Armed Forces are dealing with now is at the point where, if we can't get the Iraqis to speed up securing their own defense, this is going to undermine America's preparedness to deal with a dangerous world.

Our Armed Forces are maintaining an exceptional level of professionalism under exceptional stress, but at a certain point it is just not possible to continue in that way and be ready for the kinds of crises and the kinds of national security challenges that exist today. So the preparedness of our U.S. military to deal with a host of national security challenges hinges on what happens in Iraq. The more responsibility the Iraqis take for their future, the less the United States must shoulder, and the sooner we can start bringing our troops home.

When our President says that a future American President will decide when to bring U.S. troops home, it seems to me that sends a message to the Iraqis that they have a lot more time. For the sake of preparedness, for the sake of Iraq securing its own future, we have to speed this timetable up. American troops cannot and should not be in Iraq forever.

Shortly, I will introduce a very simple resolution. It is a sense of the Senate on the President's intention to keep U.S. forces in Iraq until at least 2009. The resolution is very simple. I will just read it this afternoon:

That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the members of the Armed Forces deserve the enormous respect and support of the Senate and the American people for the sacrifices that they are making on behalf of our country; and

(2) the President's intention, as stated on March 21, 2006, that ''future Presidents'' will determine whether to keep members of the Armed Forces in Iraq undermines the preparedness of the United States military to respond to other crises and should not be supported.

I will close. Again I pick up on the Chair's statement about the commitment of our troops and their courage and their valor. This is not, today, a debate about whether it was right to go to war. We had that debate. I was on the side that voted against, and other Senators were for it. We are long past that point. What we are dealing with now is how to win the peace. That is something which all Senators should be looking to try to work together on and find some bipartisan common ground.

I commend the Senator from Alabama for his statement about our troops. But I do believe we have to find a way to get beyond some of these artificial choices—like cutting and running or staying the course. Hopefully we can do that. I believe one area for bipartisan cooperation should be to try to speed up Iraq taking over its own future.

I was very troubled by the statement that it was the President's intention that the future of our Armed Forces in Iraq would be dealt with by future Presidents. We have to deal with it now. We have to find a way to win the peace and do it on a bipartisan basis. I intend to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this goal, which is not about whether you are for the war or against the war, it is today about winning the peace, and that is why I will be offering my resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, as chairman of the Budget Committee, I regularly comment on appropriations bills that are brought to the Senate for consideration and present the fiscal comparisons and budgetary data. I believe it is useful to expand that practice, when required, for authorization bills that we consider.

S. 2766, the national Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2007, is, of course, one of the most important bills the Congress brings up on an annual basis. As Senators know, the Budget Committee does not enforce the levels of the authorizations of appropriations contained in the bill, even though they constitute the vast majority of programs and projects addressed. Ultimately, those authorizations of appropriations only spend money once the Appropriations Committee acts on its Defense bill.

But there is another category of spending in the Defense authorization bill which the Budget Committee does enforce because passage of this bill and its signature by the President would create automatic spending. By that, I mean the direct spending or mandatory spending provisions in the bill.

According to a Congressional Budget Office estimate of June 9, 2006, S. 2766 as reported increases budget authority for mandatory spending by $458 million in fiscal year 2007 and $1.508 billion over the next 5 years. Corresponding outlays are $307 million in fiscal year 2007 and $1.416 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table of direct spending for S. 2766 excerpted from CBO's official cost estimate be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED IMPACT OF S. 2766 ON DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING										
Military Housing in Korea:										
Estimated Budget Authority	160	160	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	10	58	109	126	92	48	22	10	5	0
Pilot Projects for Military Housing:										
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	0	4	14	9	2	1	0	0	0
Maximum Term of Leases for Overseas Facilities:										
Estimated Budget Authority	1	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Estimated Outlays	*	1	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
SBP Benefits:										
Estimated Budget Authority	53	57	61	63	66	68	70	72	74	76
Estimated Outlays	53	57	61	63	66	68	70	72	74	76
Paid-Up SBP:										
Estimated Budget Authority	202	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	202	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRICARE Pharmacy Program:										
Estimated Budget Authority	42	61	62	54	46	39	31	22	12	2
Estimated Outlays	42	61	62	54	46	39	31	22	12	2

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED IMPACT OF S. 2766 ON DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES—Continued

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total Changes:										
Estimated Budget Authority	458	493	318	122	117	112	106	99	91	83
Estimated Outlays	307	390	239	262	218	162	129	109	96	83
CHANGES IN REVENUES										
Thrift Savings Plan: Estimated Revenues	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

NOTES.—Numbers in the text may differ from figures shown here because of rounding. SBP = Survivor Benefit Plan. * = between −$500,000 and $500,000.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in evaluating our needs in the Department of Defense authorization bill, key factors will be our relationship with Iran and North Korea as we face two major problems of two nations: one having nuclear weapons and the other appearing to be intent on developing nuclear weapons. I applaud the President's recent move to agree to bilateral negotiations with Iran subject to certain conditions, and I think he was precisely correct in saying that notwithstanding the difficulties with Iran and their apparent intransigence, that all diplomatic efforts ought to be explored before any consideration is given to the use of military force. I think that is a way to approach the international issues. While we deal with some of these tough adversaries, all options should theoretically remain on the table. But to the extent that these problems can be solved through diplomacy, that is obviously the preferable course.

In dealing with countries such as Iran and North Korea, it is difficult when the United States has branded them as the ''axis of evil.'' But President Reagan invited Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev to a dialogue within weeks after labeling the U.S.S.R. as the ''evil empire.'' So it is possible to have some tough dialogue and some tough rhetoric and, at the same time, work toward negotiations, no matter how difficult the adversary or potential adversary may be.

Early in my activities and public service, when I was an assistant district attorney in Philadelphia, I had an occasion to interview inmates at the State prison, Rockview, who were under the death sentence. Joining the district attorney's office, I was low man on the totem pole, and the low man got the job of traveling to the State prison and talking to people under the death penalty, people who wanted to have their death sentences commuted. It was quite an experience. Very, very tough people who had committed heinous crimes, outrageous lives, bad backgrounds, about as tough a gang as you could find off the streets of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other parts of the State who had committed murders so atrocious that they had gotten the death penalty. That taught me a lesson, leading me to the conclusion that if you could talk to people like that, you could talk to anybody. You don't have to agree with people, but there is no reason not to talk. I am aware that it is a significant transfer to apply that kind of an experience to international diplomacy, but I think it has some weight.

There are those who oppose talking to Iran or North Korea on a bilateral basis because we don't want to recognize them, we don't want to give them any status. I think a comprehensive answer was made to that by Richard Armitage, who was Deputy Secretary of State right under Colin Powell during President Bush's first term. This is what Mr. Armitage had to say:

> It appears that the administration thinks that dialogue equates with weakness, that we have called these regimes evil and, therefore, we won't talk to them. Some people say that talking would legitimize the regimes. But we are not trying to change the regimes, and they are already legitimatized in the eyes of the international community. So we ought to have enough confidence in our ability as diplomats to go eye-to-eye with people, even though we disagree in the strongest possible way, and come away without losing anything.

Our relationship with Iran has obviously been extremely difficult since the Shah was deposed in 1979. And Iran is a proud country with a proud history. There is, at least, some part of the motivation to become a nuclear power, nuclear military force to be with the big boys as a matter of international status. I think if we were willing to meet with Iran in a straightforward, diplomatic way as negotiating equals—the United States is never going to be equal with Iran because of the great difference in our power in the international field—but I do believe that our foreign policy would be enhanced if we treated foreign leaders, foreign countries with more dignity and respect. I think it would be a significant step forward if Iran were treated as a diplomatic and negotiating equal, that it might take some of the pressure off their determination to be a nuclear military power or, at a minimum, I think it is worth a try.

I made my first trip to the Mideast back in 1964, and in the intervening 42 years I have made almost 30 trips to the region. I tried to go to Iran shortly after the Iran-Iraq war ended in 1988, and my efforts to go there have never been successful. It is possible to travel to Iran as a tourist, but it is not—they are not receptive to having an official visit.

In the absence of being able to go to Iran, I have contacted and had discussions with two of the Iranian Ambassadors to the United Nations. I made my first contact back in May of the year 2000, a little more than 6 years ago, and I discussed with the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations the possibility of an exchange of parliamentarians; that a group of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives might meet with a group of parliamentarians from the Iranian Parliament. I invited the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations to a dinner in my hideaway, my office here in Washington, attended by a number of Members. I then met with his successor in August of 2003 and had moved toward concrete plans to have a group of Iranian parliamentarians meet with Members of Congress in Switzerland in January of 2004, but unfortunately, those plans fell through because there was a concurrent, harsh exchange of rhetoric, and the Iranians were not willing to meet at that time.

There was a significant development when the Iranian President, on May 8 of this year, sent President Bush an 18-page letter, and the President appropriately responded, showing interest in having negotiations with Iran. We had been pursuing efforts to have diplomatic pressure applied by Iran in concert with our European allies, trying to involve China and trying to involve Russia, and then Secretary of State Rice signified a shift of U.S. policy by indicating our willingness to negotiate directly with Iran by putting conditions on that offer to negotiate. To repeat, I believe that we ought to be willing to negotiate without conditions. We have similarly sought to deal with North Korea in collaboration with other nations, including Japan and South Korea, China, and Russia, and here again, it would be my hope that we would seek and be willing to have those talks without preconditions.

I was part of a CODEL led by Senator BIDEN in August of 2001, at the time when Senator BIDEN was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and we traveled to the Far East and had plans to meet with the North Korean President, and that did not materialize because at that same time, the North Korean President made an unexpected trip to China. In looking toward the future, it is my hope to be able to go to North Korea. I think there is a climate there of receptivity to meeting with Members of Congress, and that is a course which I intend to pursue.

I have found that in the meetings I have had on foreign travels that, at least in my opinion, they have been a bit productive. In the 25 years of my service in the Senate, I have been on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and for 8 years I served on the Intelligence Committee, chairing that committee during the

104th Congress in 1995 and 1996, and those committee assignments and my interests generally in foreign policy have taken me to some 93 countries.

One of the countries I have visited on many occasions is Syria. I have visited Syria on 15 trips. On nine occasions I have had an opportunity to meet with President Hafez al-Assad. I was the only Member of Congress to accompany the Secretary of State to his funeral in the year 2000, and I have since had an opportunity to visit on three occasions with President Bashar al-Assad.

In the course of those meetings I got to know President Hafez al-Assad. The first meeting was in 1988, and it lasted for approximately 4½ hours. I had long heard about President Assad's willingness to engage in extended discussions. We covered a wide variety of subjects. We talked about Syrian relations with Israel. We talked about the Palestinian problems. We talked about the Iran-Iraq war. We talked about U.S.-Soviet relations. On a number of occasions I suggested that I had taken too much of his time. On each occasion he would say: No, I am interested in talking more.

In the course of meeting President Hafez al-Assad on some nine occasions, it developed into a cordial relationship, even, you might call it, a joking relationship. I would urge President Assad to meet with Israeli Prime Ministers and say that our meeting, always attended by the local photographers, would appear on the front page of the Syrian newspaper, the Damascus newspaper, but if President Assad would meet with the Israeli Prime Minister, it would be world news.

I told him when Prime Minister Rabin and Foreign Minister Perez and Palestinian Authority Chairman Arafat got the Nobel Peace Prize, if he would work for peace with Israel, that he would get the Nobel Peace Prize in Stockholm.

He replied: Well, I might be welcome in Stockholm under the arrangement you suggest, but I might not be able to get back to Damascus.

In 1988 I suggested to President Assad that he permit the Jewish women in Syria to leave the country because there were very few Jewish men for them to marry. That was a subject which Congressman Stephen Solarz had undertaken, and I was carrying forward some of what Congressman Solarz had sought to do. President Hafez al-Assad said to me that anyone who came to claim a Syrian Jewish bride would be permitted to take the bride with him out of the country. I relayed that message to the large Syrian community in Brooklyn, NY. Nothing much ever came of it. But in 1992, President Assad permitted all the Jews to immigrate out of Syria. My exhortations might have had some effect—who knows as to what that might have been.

I consistently would urge President Assad to negotiate with Israel, and he would say that he would not do so but entertained the possibility of negotiations with Israel if sponsored by the big 5: sponsored by the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and the China. Israel was unwilling to engage in those negotiations because only the United States would be neutral or perhaps friendly toward Israel. Finally, President Assad did agree to go to Madrid, in 1991, to negotiate with Israel.

I had extensive discussions with a very distinguished Syrian diplomat, Walid al-Moualem. When Benjamin Netanyahu was Prime Minister of Israel, in 1996, upon taking office Prime Minister Netanyahu made a forceful declaration that Israel and he would hold Syria responsible for the actions of Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. That led to a realignment of the Syrian military, and for a time it looked as if that was a tense situation. I was in Israel at that time and was asked by Prime Minister Netanyahu to carry a message to President Assad that Israel wanted peace. I conveyed that message to President Assad, and later, when I met with Walid al-Moualem, the Syrian Ambassador to the United Nations—met with him here in Washington—he told me that the conversations I had and the message I carried from Prime Minister Netanyahu to President Assad had been, as he put it, ''helpful in deescalating the dangerous tensions.''

Ambassador Moualem later told me I had gained the trust and confidence and personal relationship with President Assad because, as he put it, ''they viewed me as being objective'' even though, as he put it, ''nobody could question my support for Israel.''

I am not making any major contentions, or making any claims as to what effect these visits would have had. But every little bit helps. In getting to know Assad and getting to know his son, it does provide an opportunity for a statement as to our values in the United States, what we would like to see happen. I think it is helpful and certainly can do no harm.

In January of 1989, I made my first trip to Iraq and returned a year later with Senator SHELBY.

I will conclude briefly and will supplement my remarks today with more specification at a later time on exact dates, based on trip reports which I make after coming back from each of my travels.

I had referenced the conversation which Senator SHELBY and I had with Saddam Hussein in January of 1990. I do not know if it would have ever have been possible to have dissuaded Saddam Hussein from his practices of aggression, but on that occasion Senator SHELBY and I had a professional conversation with him, and it is my view conversations of that sort have the potential to be helpful.

I have had occasion to visit with Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat on some eight occasions. I have conveyed messages from Prime Minister Netanyahu to Chairman Arafat about the terrorism issue. Whether it had any effect or not I do not know. I have had occasion to visit Cuba on three occasions, meeting with President Fidel Castro on a wide range of conversations, urging him to have respect for human rights. I questioned him about the deployment of Soviet missiles in 1962, asking about possible involvement in the assassination of President Kennedy, which he denied in talking to him about assassination efforts. I believe there is a fruitful basis to have cooperation with Cuba on drug interdiction, and it is something I have pursued and intend to pursue in the future.

I have had occasion to visit China on four visits. I have had discussions with the Chinese leader about their failure to respect human rights, about the detention of a librarian from Dickerson College, who later was freed after a condemnatory resolution was filed in the Senate, and I have taken the lead in urging Temple University to establish a school in Beijing to inform Chinese leaders about the due process of law.

I had an opportunity to meet with President Chavez in Venezuela last August. There was a controversy on drug enforcement. The Venezuelans would not meet with our ambassador, and I asked for a meeting of President Chavez with our ambassador. I met with the Venezuelan Minister of the Interior. I don't have time to summarize it now, but President Chavez was willing to discuss a protocol for drug cooperation.

I believe the talks with people, even our tough adversaries, our toughest adversaries, can be fruitful. As we structure our legislation for the Department of Defense and look later to the Department of Defense appropriations subcommittee, a subcommittee on which I serve, it is my hope that the United States would be vigorous in the pursuit of negotiations with Iran to diffuse the risk there, to try to find a way of recognizing them in respect and dignity, persuading them not to become a nuclear power, and to have bilateral talks with North Korea on the same unconditional basis—again treating them with respect and seeking to find a way to have an international protocol which would contain and control the significant threat posed by North Korea.

As I say, Mr. President, I have generalized. Most of what I have said has come from floor statements which I have made in the past 25 years. And I will document this further at a later time when there is more time for the presentation.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Democratic Leader, Senator REID, for his leadership and the hard work he has done to include an amendment to National Defense Authorization Act which increases protections for the dedicated women and men throughout our judiciary. The recent

shooting of a State judge in Nevada provides another terrible reminder of the vulnerable position of our State and Federal judges. Unfortunately, this is not the only recent reminder. Last May, the Judiciary Committee heard the courageous testimony of Judge Joan Lefkow of Chicago, the federal judge whose mother and husband were murdered in their home. We must protect judges where they work and where they and their families live.

The amendment now incorporated into the bill which I cosponsored with Senator REID, Chairman SPECTER, and Senator DURBIN, would enact provisions from the Court Security Improvement Act of 2005, CSIA, S. 1968, which Chairman SPECTER and I introduced last November. Our bill and this amendment authorize additional resources to improve security for State and local court systems. We also respond to requests by the Federal judiciary for a greater voice in working with the U.S. Marshals Service to determine their security needs. This amendment provides criminal penalties for the misuse of restricted personal information to seriously harm or threaten to seriously harm Federal judges, their families or other individuals performing official duties. It provides criminal penalties for threatening Federal judges and Federal law enforcement officials by the malicious filing of false liens, and provides increased protections for witnesses. It also includes an extension of life insurance benefits to bankruptcy, magistrate and territorial judges, and provides health insurance for surviving spouses and families of Federal judges, both of which are provisions that I suggested be included.

Finally, this amendment contains provisions which have passed the Senate several times extending and expanding to family members the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact certain information from a Federal judge's mandatory financial disclosure. This redaction authority is intended to be used in circumstances in which the release of the information could endanger the filer or the filer's family. I hope that the House of Representatives finally takes up and passes this extension and expansion of redaction authority.

U.S. MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP LEJEUNE WATER CONTAMINATION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the motto of the U.S. Marine Corps is Semper Fidelis. Translated, it means, ''Always Faithful,'' but among members of the Marine Corps the motto holds a deeper meaning. Semper Fidelis represents our Nation's shared commitment to those who dedicate their lives to protect us. As a Navy veteran, I know we must always honor the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families for the sacrifices they make for our Nation everyday.

Lately, I am afraid Congress has not fulfilled its commitment to our men and women in the military, and this is especially evident in the lack of support for our military veterans and their families. Our lack of assistance for those exposed to the highly contaminated drinking water at U.S. Marine Corps base Camp Lejeune in North Carolina is one of the best examples of this body's shortcomings.

Camp Lejeune is the site of one of the largest drinking water catastrophes in our Nation's history. Between 1980 and 1985, Camp Lejeune drinking water samples conducted by the Marine Corps found high levels of volatile organic compounds used by the Marines in solvents for industrial degreasing. The contaminated wells were closed in 1985; however, the contamination itself may date back until the late 1950s. To put the contamination in perspective, the current EPA health standard for these chemicals is 5 parts per billon. The tap water samples taken at homes and the elementary school between 1980 and 1985 reached levels as high as 1,400 parts per billon.

While the health effects of exposure to the contaminates at Camp Lejeune are still being studied, the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances, ATSDR, has documented at least 100 babies exposed in utero to the contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune have birth defects and cancers, including spina bifida, leukemia, and clef palates. This is at least twice the rate found in the general population.

For the last 20 years, the calls for assistance from those affected by this contamination have gone unanswered. The Department of Defense's cooperation has been slow, and the political will in Congress has been lacking. I will offer a modest amendment to answer the call for help.

Senator DOLE's amendment would do two things. First, it would provide veterans' health care benefits to those exposed in utero while at Camp Lejeune. The in utero exposures to Camp Lejeune's contaminated water happened under the Marine Corps watch, and it is our responsibility to assist those who were harmed. Medical assistance is a modest step to help restore faith among our veterans and their family members in the Government's commitment to them.

Second, it requires the Marine Corps to notify those who may have been exposed to the water contamination upon the completion of the ATSDR's study on the human exposures to drinking water. To date, the Marine Corps has issued targeted press releases, but information has not been sent to all who may have been exposed. The ATSDR's modeling of the contaminated water will make it possible to notify exposed segments of the Camp Lejeune population, without creating undue worry among the greater population that resided on base. This amendment will require the Marines to provide notice to those who may have been exposed, to outline the events leading to the exposures, to describe the potential adverse health effects, and to give the affected people resources they can use to obtain more information.

I thank Senator DOLE for her leadership on this issue. Without her, this tragic situation would not have gotten the attention it deserves.

Nevertheless, concerns have been raised about this amendment. The people exposed to the highly contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune have waited for decades for answers. Congress needs to take steps now and not delay for years debating this issue.

For this reason, I have worked with Senator DOLE on a second, compromise Dole-Jeffords amendment. This amendment would require a comprehensive National Academy of Sciences study to be completed within 18 months to evaluate the strength of the link between TCE and PCE exposure and adverse health impacts for prenatal, childhood, and adult exposures at Camp Lejeune.

It also requires the Navy to notify those potentially affected by the water contamination at Camp Lejeune so they can learn what happened, how it may have affected them, and what steps they may want to consider taking now to minimize the potential health impacts. While I am told by the Defense Department that individual notification by letter to each person affected is impractical, under this compromise amendment, the Navy would carry out a media blitz and place a letter on its Web page providing the information that those affected deserve to have.

Again, I thank Senator DOLE for taking a bipartisan approach to this issue and for pushing to make constructive progress. We have a moral responsibility to support our troops and their families, and any failure to do so, is a failure to fulfill our commitment embodied in the Marine's motto Semper Fidelis. I urge my colleagues to approve this compromise amendment.

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.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FATHER'S DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few moments we will be closing for the week. Before we leave, I want to take just a few moments to reflect on a very special holiday coming up this weekend, and that is Father's Day.

On Sunday, families all across America will celebrate their dads with dinners and lunches and gifts and, if my

family is typical, some gentle teasing over the course of the day.

It is a day that we show our gratitude and how important our dads are—and have been and continue to be—in our lives.

In my own case, I cherish my memories of my dad. I think of him each and every day. He was my mentor in medicine, mentor in public service, mentor in humanitarian efforts, and my friend. It was his love and his wisdom and his encouragement that gave me the confidence to work outside of the box, to take risks, and to set high goals.

As I was thinking back a few moments ago as to what I would say, I remembered and recall most vividly, after returning back to Nashville, TN, and working at Vanderbilt—after having been away from Nashville for a long period of time with college and medical school and my internship and residency and training and moving back to Nashville—every day I would drive by my parents' home on the way to work at Vanderbilt Hospital.

As I would go by that house—and, ironically, it is the same house I live in today, but as I would go by that house, I would think, each day, about the values that dad—both parents and really the entire family—instilled in each of us.

I also used it as a marker place in coming home every night. As I drove by that white house, I would call. That number would be dialed as I was driving by. And by the time I got home, we would complete our conversation, on a daily basis—each and every day.

Indeed, he was an extraordinary man in many ways, not in his accomplishments or just being a great physician, a humble physician treating people throughout middle Tennessee, but in his acts of generosity and in his kindness, known throughout the community for his good works.

My father died in 1998. Mother and Dad both died within about 36 hours of each other of totally independent causes. In truth, it was referred at the funeral as a great love story. A lot of people arrived for the funeral of my dad—my mother died about 30 hours later—and there were two caskets there. Thinking about how tragic it was, in truth it was a manifestation of what was a great love story, a marriage of over 65 years.

Dad, not too long before he died, wrote a letter to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren and great-great-grandchildren that he would never know—that is the way he opened the letter to them—passing on in about a two-page letter the insights he had in very simple ways, humble ways. It is a long letter, and I won't read the whole of it but just a few paragraphs.

Again, this is a letter he left to be passed on to future generations. His advice was:

> Be happy in your family life. Your family is the most important thing you can ever have. Love your wife or your husband. Tell your children how great they are. Encourage them in everything they do.
>
> Be happy in your community. Charity is so important. There's so much good to do in the world and so many different ways to do it.

A little bit later in the letter he wrote:

> The world is always changing, and that's a good thing. It's how you carry yourself in the world that doesn't change. Morality, integrity, warmth, and kindness are the same things in 1910, when I was born, or in 2010 or later when you will be reading this. And that's a good thing, too.

Dad is the one who had the high ideals. I have done my best to try to live up to those ideals and to that sterling example he set before us. I have worked hard as a dad to instill those same values and commitments in my own sons.

This weekend, as we celebrate our fathers and the good news that America's fathers are more present in their children's lives than ever, we all realize that they have a huge impact. Children involved with loving fathers are more likely to do well in school, to have healthy self-esteem, to show empathy, to avoid destructive behaviors. Kids do better with their dads around.

For a while, America seemed to forget this. But now we know in our kids what we have always known in our hearts: America's dads deserve our respect and our support, dads on the frontline who risk their lives for our freedom, dads on the home front who work hard to support their families.

Fatherhood is the most important responsibility a man will ever take on. It is also the most rewarding.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, banks of day lilies are celebrating their brief moments of glory as they turn their vibrant orange faces to the sun. The days are warm and mellow, not too hot for working in the garden or in the yard. The evenings linger, fading slowly into velvet nights filled with the trill of crickets, the sparkle of lightning bugs and the soft songs of whippoorwills. These are perfect evenings to spend on a country porch, watching the day slide into night. Late spring, almost summer—it is a lovely time of year.

On Sunday, June 18, the Nation will celebrate Father's Day. Father's Day does not arrive with quite the same fanfare as Mother's Day. To be sure, stores have been busy reminding us to shop for Father's Day, and the racks are full of Father's Day cards, but there doesn't seem to be the same level of intensity as that which surrounds Mother's Day. The long distance lines will not be as busy. Florists will not be swamped with orders. But fathers around the country will be treated to brunch or to some other family gathering. They will open presents of golf shirts, ties, or cologne bought by family members frustrated because dad always just buys what he really wants whenever he wants it. He is forgiven for this fault only because his family is fairly sure that dad is unaware of the approach of any holiday, including Father's Day. Of course, fathers will put their dramatic skills to the test in order to express their gratitude. The comedian Bill Cosby famously once said, ''Fatherhood is pretending the present you love most is 'soap-on-a-rope.' ''

This is not to say that Nation does not appreciate men. Far from it. We observe the birthdays of our Founding Fathers. We celebrate the fathers and other men who brave the terrors of distant battlefields to defend the Nation. We have monuments and parks, schools and mountains named after men who have won battles, made important discoveries, or who have contributed to the growth and prosperity of our Nation. But rarely, if ever, are these memorials dedicated to the important role that men play in their own families. The role that fathers play in the lives of their children, in helping to shape the future of the Nation, certainly merits this one day of recognition. The poet William Wordsworth observed: ''Father!—to God himself we cannot give a holier name.''

Fathers carry a heavy load of duty, responsibility and worry. Every day, and during many sleepless nights, they worry about big things, like the state of the economy or the impact of trade agreements on their jobs. Will they be able to support their families and make their mortgages on time? Will they keep their job or lose it to an overseas competitor? Is their pension secure? Will they have health care—not for themselves, for men are not very good about going to the doctor regularly, but for their families. Fathers also worry about small details, like oil level in the lawn mower or that suspicious drip under the sink. Is the prime interest rate going up or down, and how will that affect their ability to pay the monthly bills? Everything that can affect their families is a concern for fathers, who take their role as providers for their families very seriously, indeed.

By June 18, children are out of school at last. In days past, that would mean long summer days to while away with swimming and in play, and idle hours spent reading a book in the shade. In today's world, however, summer vacation for children out of school is often a headache for families with two working parents. Summer becomes instead a scheduling nightmare of day camps or sitters, or of latchkey kids who must spend the day indoors behind lock and key because there is no adult available to supervise their play. Instead of two working parents meaning a better life, today two working parents may as easily signal a family working hard just to keep up. Many fathers endure long commutes between work and home so that their families can live in a nicer neighborhood than those same fathers did growing up. Fathers are often portrayed as workaholics who live for their jobs and who see families as a minor annoyance, if they notice them at all. In truth, fathers worry about their jobs because they fear that, if they do not concentrate on their work,

they will lose their jobs and not be able to provide for their families. Today's economy is too uncertain, too volatile, and too global to take for granted.

This Father's Day, so many fathers are in harm's way in Afghanistan or in Iraq facing daily dangers that have already taken too many other fathers from their wives and children. To them and to their families, I offer my prayers of thanks and of safekeeping. May God bring them safely home. The families for whom this Father's Day will be a mix of loving remembrance and painful loss, I can offer only the comforting words of sympathy and the acknowledgment of their sad, sad loss. These fathers in heaven, for there they surely are, still have an important place in the family. Like all fathers, they teach by example. In this case, their example is one of bravery and sacrifice, patriotism and service.

Clarence Budington Kelland once wrote of his father: ''He didn't tell me how to live; he lived, and let me watch him do it.'' These fathers in uniform, like good fathers everywhere, teach by the example of their own lives. ''The words that a father speaks to his children in the privacy of home are not heard by the world, but, as in whispering-galleries, they are clearly heard at the end and by posterity.'' Jean Paul Richter made that observation, and that truism captures the essence of a father's importance. Each day they gird themselves for battle, whether that battle be in Iraq or in an office or a factory. They go, and they return. They do not complain, or at least not much, about how much time they must spend away from home. They simply do the best that they can for their families, day after day, year after year. They love their children. They play with them when they can. They monitor schoolwork and behavior. They set standards and measure performance. They mete out discipline. They scrutinize their children's friends. They say ''yes'' as often as they say ''no.'' Good fathers participate in all aspects of their children's lives.

Our families are our Nation's greatest resource and greatest treasure. I am proud each year to take a few minutes to recognize the critical role of mothers and fathers on the days set aside for each of them. It reminds me to think always of how families are affected by the votes I cast here in the Senate. The votes we cast here affect the lives and well being of mothers and fathers and families. We need to make life easier for families, not harder. We should not send fathers into battle without good cause. We should not add to the burden of debt without good cause. Our spending decisions should add to the prosperity and well-being of the Nation and our families, first and foremost.

I close with a favorite poem of mine, one that I often recite for Father's Day. I learned it as young boy, and the words and the lesson have come to mean more to me with each passing year:

THAT DAD OF MINE

He's slowing down, as some folks say,
With the burden of years from day to day;
His brow bears many a furrowed line;
He's growing old—that dad of mine.

His shoulders droop, and his step is slow;
And his hair is white, as white as snow;
But his kind eyes sparkle with a friendly light;
His smile is warm, and his heart is right.

He's old? Oh, yes. But only in years,
For his spirit soars as the sunset nears.
And blest I've been, and wealth I've had,
In knowing a man like my old dad.

And proud I am to stand by him,
As he stood by me when the way was dim;
I've found him worthy and just as fine,
A prince of men—that dad of mine.

REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2006.

Hon. BILL FRIST,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: On June 15, 2006, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably the nomination of Kenneth L. Wainstein to be the Assistant Attorney General for National Security. Pursuant to section 17(b)(1) of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress (as amended by Section 506(d) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, Pub. L. No. 109–177 (Mar. 9, 2006)), I request that the nomination of Mr. Wainstein be referred to the Select Committee on Intelligence for a period not to exceed 20 calendar days.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I today salute a hero for all Americans, a leader for his party, and my friend, Senator Robert Joseph Dole.

This week marks 10 years since Senator Dole retired from this Chamber, a day I remember well. Senator Dole left as the longest-serving Republican leader in Senate history. In fact, the beginning of his leadership tenure coincided with my first term in the Senate, starting in January 1985.

Even then, it was clear that Senator Dole was and is not just another Senator, but a national fixture in American politics. Author Michael Barone, writing in his Almanac of American Politics, has this to say about our friend from Kansas:

> Senator Bob Dole is one of the large political figures of our time, in the middle 1990s towering over everyone else in the political landscape, even the president . . . for Bob Dole is not only one of the most successful politicians of the second half of the 20th Century but also one of the most enduring.

Powerful words about a powerful leader. Many of my colleagues have already recounted Senator Dole's extensive political career, his record of legislative accomplishment, and his leadership of the Republican Party, here in the Senate and as the Republican candidate for both President and Vice-President of the United States. Beginning with his chairmanship of the Republican National Committee in 1971, Senator Dole was a prominent player on the national stage for a quarter-century.

Senator Dole's heroism on the battlefield is well-known and revered by us all as well. In 1945, a young Lieutenant Dole from Russell, KS, found himself on the hills of Italy, fighting the Nazis. Suddenly pain exploded in his back. Paralyzed by his war injury, Bob Dole spent 4 years in hospital wards, relearning how to do simple tasks, like button his shirt. To this day his right arm remains largely paralyzed.

I believe the determination and focus Senator Dole must have had to recover from that injury explains his success in politics, and with the American people. After struggling to regain control of one's body, lining up a vote on a difficult bill might be a little less daunting. I have heard Senator DOLE say before that no honor that has come his way has ever surpassed the pride he felt at wearing his country's uniform.

As a Republican Leader, Bob Dole was about results, not symbolism or showmanship. President George H.W. Bush, for instance, cited him as instrumental in the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. Out of office, he has continued to serve his country, fundraising for worthy causes and raising awareness of the dangers of prostate cancer.

Senator Dole is also famous for his dry, Midwestern wit, which has lifted many of us here in the Senate in times of despair as well as levity. This is a man who, after losing the Republican Presidential nomination in 1988, assured an audience that he ''went home and slept like a baby. Every couple of hours, I'd wake up and cry.''

My colleagues and I continue to be graced every day in this chamber by the presence of another prominent Senator DOLE, the Senator from North Carolina. ELIZABETH, I wish to express how happy we all are Bob has found you, and you have found Bob. You remind us of him every day, and we hope that you will tell him how much we all respect and miss him, and how pleased we are to honor his service.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, last Sunday marked the 10th anniversary of Senator Bob Dole's retirement from the Senate. Bob Dole served the people of Kansas and the people of the United States of America as a Member of Congress for more than three and a half decades. He was outspoken on many issues, but, above all, I will always admire his tireless, passionate advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities.

The first speech that Bob Dole ever made on the floor of the Senate—on April 14, 1969—was about the challenges faced by Americans with disabilities. That date was the 24th anniversary of the day he was gravely wounded in

World War II. In fact, every year that he was in the Senate, on or about April 14, Bob Dole made a statement on the floor about the challenges faced by individuals with disabilities. But Bob Dole did much more than just talk about expanding access and opportunity for people with disabilities. He was an outstanding leader in bringing about change for the good.

Most importantly, I will always be grateful for Senator Bob Dole's leadership in helping to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. Both he and I remember the day that it was signed into law as one of the proudest in our entire legislative careers.

It is hard to believe, but it has been nearly 16 years since we passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. Just as many predicted, ADA has taken its place among the great civil rights laws in our Nation's history. Today, the impacts of ADA are all around us. Drive-through restaurants have visual displays allowing the deaf and hard of hearing to place their orders. Banks have talking ATMs, now, to assist those with visual impairments. Cities have installed curb cuts and ramps to allow wheelchair users easier access. And on and on. Just as important, because of ADA, we have seen an enormous change in attitudes. These changes that we see today, that we feel today, would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of Senator Bob Dole in working cooperatively to help get the ADA passed.

On a bipartisan basis, we miss Bob Dole here in this body. But the good news is that there is still a Senator DOLE in the Senate, and our friend Bob has found a richly satisfying life after the Senate. Today, he continues to serve the American people in a whole range of voluntary capacities, proving President Reagan's dictum that ''you don't have to be on the public payroll to be an outstanding public servant.'' I salute my good friend, Bob Dole, and I wish him all the best.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, of all my colleagues, I suppose that in 1996 I was the one most hoping that Bob Dole would not retire from the Senate. That was because I was doing my best to defeat him in the New Hampshire Presidential primary. If I had, Bob had told several friends he was ''going back to the Senate.'' Well, Pat Buchanan beat both of us by a few percentage points, and Bob beat me. Within a few weeks, I was back in Tennessee at a press conference endorsing Bob Dole and presenting him with one of my red and black plaid shirts. ''I hope it's his last one,'' Bob's friend Howard Baker was heard to mutter, referring to my shirt.

I should have known better. In my first Iowa poll in June of 1995, pollster Whit Ayres said, ''Governor, this is the professional challenge of my career. The poll says, 'Dole 54, Alexander 3, margin of error 4 percentage points.''' The end result in the caucuses 6 months later was a good deal closer, but Bob Dole won because he had earned for himself the unofficial title of ''President of Iowa.'' Iowans liked his spare talk, his good humor, his war record, and his middle-America brand of politics.

So did and does the rest of America. Not everyone comes out of a Presidential race more admired than when he or she went in. But Bob Dole did. He ran three times, the last time securing the Republican nomination. And, I would judge, he is even more admired today than he was 10 years ago when he retired from the Senate.

Bob Dole is an emblem of America's greatest generation. He and our colleague ELIZABETH are together one of our country's most admired couples. When we think of him, and of them, we think of what is best about public service in America and about our country itself.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, today I honor a great American, a man who devoted his life to this nation and to the just principles he believed in. Born in Russell, Ks, Robert J. Dole would serve his country as a war hero, risking his life for a fellow soldier fighting the forces of fascism and Nazism in Italy, as a Senator, a great Majority Leader, my party's candidate for Vice President and President and today as an active private citizen fighting for veterans and the causes in which he believes.

For his bravery in World War II, Bob Dole received two Purple Hearts for his injuries, and the Bronze Star Medal for his attempt to assist a downed radio man. Bob Dole served in the House and Senate representing his home State of Kansas. In 1971, President Nixon asked him to be the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, a post he held for 2 years. Then in 1976, President Ford selected Bob Dole as his running mate for the Republican nomination.

Recognizing his leadership, Bob Dole rose to the pinnacle of our leadership here in the U.S. Senate as the Majority Leader. He was a tireless worker and effective champion of conservative principles, a strong foreign policy and personal freedom and responsibility.

One decade ago, Senator Dole resigned his post to devote himself fully to his 1996 presidential campaign. As my party's nominee he crossed the country running on a platform of lower taxation and smaller, more accountable government. Unfortunately, he didn't win, but he developed a good working relationship with President Clinton and the two leaders have devoted their time and energy to many notable causes over the years. Shortly after the 1996 election, President Clinton bestowed upon Senator Dole the highest civilian award in Government, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

To those who know him, Senator Dole is a regular comedian. One story goes that on the campaign trail in his home state of Kansas, he would spend an hour at each stop telling jokes and only 10 minutes talking about politics. Senator Dole was always able to demonstrate a quick wit, while also showing that he was well grounded in decency.

Senator Dole continues today to serve the many veterans of World War II who fought so valiantly to liberate Europe and defeat the Japanese. Most recently, it was his personal dedication and determination to see a monument honoring the sacrifice of the World War II veterans that led to the construction of the beautiful tribute to selfless service that now graces the National Mall.

I wish Senator Dole and his lovely wife, my colleague, Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, more happy years together and many happy returns to the United States Senate.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I was first elected to the Senate in 1993 in a special election to fill the remainder of Lloyd Bentsen's term. Bob Dole, like my predecessor Lloyd Bentsen, is a member of the ''Greatest Generation'' —the generation of men who never wavered in answering the call to duty, fighting in distant lands to protect the free world, and returning home to build the greatest Nation on Earth. Bob Dole epitomizes the ''Greatest Generation,'' not only for his heroic service in battle, but also for what he did when he came home, ultimately serving in the U.S. Senate.

When I first arrived in Washington, Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas was the only other female Republican Senator. Fortunately, our leader Bob Dole understood the unique and important voice women brought to the Senate. He graciously welcomed me from the first day, and I enjoyed working with him as he ascended from minority leader to majority leader. He was great in both roles, and I appreciate the leadership and support he provided in my early days.

One of my first discussions with Bob was committee assignments. I told him I wanted to serve on the Armed Services Committee, as there are more military members serving in Texas than any other State. I hoped to carry on the great tradition of helping our men and women in uniform like so many Texas Senators before me. He understood why this committee assignment was important to me and realized the unique perspective I would bring to the national discussion. I was the first woman to sit on this committee in over 30 years. Today, there are three women serving on the Armed Services Committee, including Bob's wife, Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, who was elected after Bob retired from her home State of North Carolina.

On the 10th anniversary of Bob Dole's retirement from the Senate, I am proud to honor him for his many accomplishments and tireless service to our country. While we all regretted to see him go, we are grateful for the legacy he left behind, and I hope we can carry it forward for generations to come. He was a giant during his time

in this institution, and when the history of the Senate is written, I am confident that he will be fondly remembered as one of our great leaders.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, it was just about 10 years ago that Bob Dole announced his retirement from the Senate. It was 1996 and the Nation was in the midst of an intense campaign for the Presidency. Bob Dole had decided to resign his Senate seat for the good of his home State of Kansas, his party, and his country. He knew he would have to focus all his energies on his campaign for President if he were to be successful, so he left Washington to answer another call to serve his country and provide a choice to the people of Kansas and the rest of the United States when the election was held in November of that year.

We really shouldn't have been surprised. Answering the call to serve his country was nothing new for Bob Dole and he was proud to be able to do it. Over his life he had been many things, a legislator, a decorated war hero, and a leader both inside and outside of the Senate. Through the years, Bob Dole had always answered the call to serve his country when he was needed, and I have no doubt that he will continue to do so for many years to come.

It's no secret. Bob Dole has made it clear all his life. You want to know and understand him, you must first understand Russell, KS—the people who live there and the values and principles they hold dear. By coming to know the people of Russell, you understand the philosophy that Bob Dole has lived by his entire life. It's a philosophy ard work, and of always giving your best to whatever you choose to do. It is a reflection of his father's view of the world—''stewers versus doers.'' Needless to say, you will always find Bob Dole in the ''doers'' group.

That is why the story of Bob Dole's life is thoroughly intertwined with the story of Russell, KS. For it was when he was growing up in Russell that Bob Dole committed himself to the service of God, Country and family. They came to become his core values as he learned at a young age that there are things worth fighting for and that is what drew him to his service in the military.

Those who have chronicled those difficult years in our history have called him part of our greatest generation. Without any regard for himself, Bob Dole left everything he called dear behind to face a challenge as great as any generation had faced before. Pearl Harbor had been attacked and the whole world had taken up arms in a battle against an unspeakable evil that had been unleashed upon the world. World War II had called him to action and Bob Dole was a young man serving in the U.S. Army. He would never be the same again in mind or body. Given the circumstances, I don't think anyone would have returned home from the battlefields of Europe and the South Pacific and not have been changed forever.

As he bravely fought in the mountains of Italy, he was wounded in action, but still he fought on. Then, he was wounded again, this time far more seriously. The odds were against him, but he somehow made it through those vital first days. He then began what would be a lengthy recovery. He had a long stay in the hospital and despite the efforts of those who attended him, he had lost the use of an arm.

When he was released from the hospital, he returned home, and that special place of Russell, KS, again reached out to him with open arms and provided him with the support he needed to continue to recover from the wounds he had suffered on the battlefield. Once again, the bonds that tied him to the people of Russell and Kansas became stronger. Those bonds helped Bob Dole to regain his strength and begin to plan for the future.

Soon he heard the call to serve again. With the support of the people of his home town, he left to work for the people of Kansas in the State house and then in the U.S. Congress. His leadership skills were quite apparent and he compiled quite a record in the Senate. He progressed through the ranks and served his party as minority and then majority leader. Every day on the Senate floor, he took a leadership role on a wide variety of issues that he knew were important to the people of his home State. Through the years he worked to ensure that our American values we protected and preserved in all the proceedings of Congress. It was a remarkable record of service that continued until that day, ten years ago, when he resigned to pursue the call to carry the Republican banner for President.

Although that final political campaign of his was not successful, Bob Dole will always be remembered for a lifetime of service to the United States. He has received many honors for his service to the United States, and for being a part of a noble cause that the greatest generation took up for which so many fought and died. He never forgot those with whom he served or the needs of our Nation's veterans. In fact, it was those ties from so many years ago that led him to join the effort to construct a memorial for World War II to recognize those with whom he served—especially those who never returned. His leadership in that effort resulted in the dedication of a beautiful memorial that will stand forever in the shadows of the Lincolm Memorial and the Washington Monument on the Mall in our Nation's Capital.

Today, Bob Dole and his wife ELIZABETH continue to be a great team as she serves the people of North Carolina with the same care and attention that Bob Dole has always provided the people of Kansas.

Bob Dole has always said that his goal in life was to defend and serve the America he learned to love in Russell. I think the record shows that he succeeded in that effort and, in so doing, left his mark throughout much of the world as he fought in Europe to free the oppressed, and, in the Senate, for the principles and values he had learned to cherish as a young boy growing up in Russell, KS.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate my friend, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who has achieved the distinction of being the longest serving Senator in the history of the Senate. Even though this is definitely a noteworthy achievement, what has set Senator BYRD apart from all others who have served as Senators is the dedication he has shown to the duties of his office, his respect for the traditions of the Senate, and his leadership of this body during his service in the Senate.

As President pro tempore, majority leader, and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he has succeeded in protecting and enforcing the rules of the Senate, first written by Thomas Jefferson during his service as Vice President and the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and he used his leadership skills to successfully lead the Senate in changing the rules when a consensus for modernizing the rules permitted. His insights into the needs of his constituents and his devotion to their well-being have been admirable.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to our understanding of the Senate was his authorship of the ''Addresses on the History of the United States Senate,'' the most comprehensive account of the role the Senate has played over the years.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia for his illustrious and record-breaking career in the Senate, and I wish for him many more years of service in this body.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr President, I am sorry that I was not present on the floor on Monday when my colleagues paid tribute to my friend, ROBERT C. BYRD, but I would like to add my voice to the chorus speaking on his unsurpassed contributions to the U.S. Senate and to America.

I say without hesitation Senator BYRD is one of the most remarkable men I have ever had the privilege to work with. Although I have been here for 33 years, he is the only Member whom I have looked up to as my senior—my senior in every way.

When my days are finished in this Chamber, my children, my grandchildren, and my great-grandchildren will know that I served with the greatest servant of the U.S. Senate of all who have served.

Once someone said of another West Virginian, Stonewall Jackson, that ''his character and will make him a stonewall and more of a stonewall than any man I've ever known.''

I say the same of ROBERT BYRD. When he walks on the floor, Constitution in

his pocket, and he looks around, raises his voice, points his finger, he is our stonewall. He is the unshakeable rock of this institution. He is our foundation. He is the protector of this body.

I am absolutely certain that the Senator's service, knowledge, and contributions to the Senate will never be surpassed. This country gentleman has no peer. No one has given as much to this institution or loved it as much as the senior Senator from West Virginia.

The Senate is what it is because of ROBERT BYRD. And he is our wise senior, not because of the records but because he is a man of his conviction. He has told the truth on every issue that confronts our country. He is our rock of integrity.

When I was elected at age 29, and 6 weeks later, before I was sworn in, my wife and daughter were killed in a terrible car accident, Senator BYRD came to the funeral home. He waited in a long line to pay his respects. It was an act of kindness that I have never forgotten.

I know how bittersweet this honor is for him, as his lifemate, Erma, would have been 89 years old this week. We all admire the love and devotion the two of them had for each other, in health and in sickness. We know his first love was not in the Chamber; it was at home. We also know how proud she would be of him this week.

One of America's favorite West Virginians, who also set a lot of records in his day, is Mr. Clutch, Jerry West. He once said: ''You can't get much done in life if you only work on the days when you feel good.''

Senator BYRD has worked 17,331 days—days that have been good and bad. In all that time, he has made the most out of every one of them and gotten more done than anyone will ever know. It has been an honor serving with him for 12,209 of those days. I look forward to many more days and years together.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our most distinguished Members, the Senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

As he passes the milestone of becoming the Senate's longest serving Member, I would remind him of a statement by Yogi Berra when they asked him about one of his many records. He said, ''I knew that one would stand until it was broken.'' Perhaps when medical science allows us to live to be 150 years old his record may be broken, but until then, I think he is safe.

Knowing the Senator's affection for the simple truth, I just want to make three points in recognizing this achievement which he embodies to an extraordinary degree.

The first is: Your life is what you make it.

Our former colleague, Senator Dave Durenberger told me the story of a Friday afternoon in the Senate in 1987 when he was standing in for Senator Dole for the procedural ''wrap up'' with Senator BYRD. The Twins were in the World Series at the time and on the Record, Senator Durenberger asked Senator BYRD if he wanted to come to Minnesota to see one of the games.

Senator BYRD said he has not seen a professional baseball game, or football game, or Hollywood movie for more than a decade. But he said he had not been idle. He shared that he had read the Bible cover to cover many times, had read all the plays of Shakespeare, all the Lives of Plutarch and the entire Oxford Unabridged Dictionary.

Many of us wonder what we might accomplish without the many distractions of modern life. We should look to Senator BYRD for the answer.

The second point I would like to make is: People change.

When we look at ROBERT BYRD's upbringing and the person he has become, it underlies a basic truth which has been made clear by all the great hearts and minds of history. Life is not what happens to you: life is what you choose to do with what happens to you.

Change and growth is always possible in people's lives, if they have the courage to change and discipline to grow.

And my third point is: This Senate is unique.

For the sake of the 100 of us who temporarily occupy these seats, Senator BYRD has embodied the truth that the Senate is unique in human history and its value must be preserved.

The genius of our Founders was their understanding of the heights and depths of human endeavor and their ability to translate those thoughts into practical institutions which maximized the heights and minimized the depths.

They knew that the philosophy of democracy must honor both the principle of majority rule and the protection of minority rights. And so in article I of the Constitution they created a House to operate mostly by majority rule and a Senate mostly to protect minority rights. The balance they struck has given a dynamic quality to the Congress that serves our Nation well on every conceivable issue.

I have often gone up to Senator BYRD on this floor and told him that he has given me something I could not get from any other source: a proper appreciation for the living history of the Senate that leads to reverence for this institution.

ROBERT BYRD and his service in the Senate is a great American story. It tells anyone who will listen how a person from humble origin can rise to leadership and then strive his whole life to keep the way open for those who would come up behind him.

We know that great ideas are just a generation from extinction. I am grateful to have had the chance to see many of those great ideas embodied and standing on this floor in the person of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

My tribute to him will be to try to learn and live out the lessons he has lovingly and forcefully tried to teach us all in this Chamber.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a tribute to my colleague Senator ROBERT BYRD. Few men in our Nation's history have had such a large hand in shaping the U.S. Senate and the destiny of our country as ROBERT BYRD. No one in our country's history has served in the Senate longer or with more distinction.

Senator BYRD's Senate career truly is a remarkable American success story. Only in America could a young man from the coal fields of Appalachia use hard work, intelligence, and determination to one day become the longest serving Senator in U.S. history.

He has often been called the Senate's historian. I have often been amazed at Senator BYRD's prolific ability to weave the great authors and poets of the past into modern relevant lessons for today's society. Cicero, Shakespeare, Tacitus, Aquinas, Jefferson, and Washington are not simply names memorized from a textbook for Senator BYRD. They are living characters with indelible truths that we should all spend more time studying and give more time to in quiet reflection. Senator BYRD reminds us all of the importance of the august traditions of the Senate and why this is the world's greatest deliberative body.

You will never find Senator BYRD without his copy of the Constitution. I dare say there are few individuals here in this body with a greater love or commitment to those noble ideas our Founding Fathers fought and died defending.

But above all, I have been most impressed with his love and dedication to his family.

Senator BYRD and his beloved wife, Erma, were an amazing example for what we should all strive for in a loving marriage. For nearly 69 years ROBERT and Erma were together side by side, living and loving together. I would like to share some touching words that Senator BYRD gave in testament to his great wife—his greatest treasure:

> She met with kings and shahs, princes and princesses, Governors and Senators, Presidents. She entertained the high and the mighty, the powerful and the wealthy of this Nation in a foreign land because it was important to her husband who served as the majority leader of this Senate and various other Senatorial offices. She did it all with an innate, inherent graciousness, incredible patience, and a soft, warm smile. She was a remarkable lady of great wisdom, but most of all, great gentleness, yet she could be tough when she saw injustice or unfairness.

I think America could use more devotion like that.

In closing, I congratulate Senator BYRD on his amazing accomplishments and to his 17,329 days in service to his country in the U.S. Senate. When the history books record his deeds and actions, he will truly be remembered in the pantheon of legends that have forever left their mark on our great nation.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, just a few days ago Senator ROBERT C. BYRD set a

very remarkable record. He is now the longest serving Senator in the history of the Senate. The Senate, the legislative body that means so much to him, now honors him for his achievement and for the remarkable record of service that he has given to the United States. I appreciate having the opportunity to be a part of our recognition of our colleague and his commitment to public service and the people of his home State of West Virginia.

For almost 48 years now, ROBERT C. BYRD has carried the title of U.S. Senator. I think it is fair to say that no one has done so with a greater awareness of what it means to be a Senator and of all the institution of the Senate represents. He is truly our institutional memory and he is the master of the Senate's rules and procedures. No one knows better than he the precedents and prerogatives of the Senate, and no one is a better protector, promoter and defender of them than he is.

It is not just for the length of his service that Senator BYRD is being honored, however. It isn't so much the years he has served but the service he has provided to the people of the United States and his State of West Virginia that has earned him the accolades he has received and will continue to receive from his colleagues and his constituents.

Our celebration of this moment and all he has achieved is softened by the loss of his beloved wife Erma, his greatest friend and supporter, his companion through life and almost 69 years of marriage, who passed away recently. I am sure she is looking down on us all, proud and thrilled to see Senator BYRD's continued efforts to address the issues of importance to his beloved friends of West Virginia and to note his recognition for being their champion for so many years.

During my service in the Senate I have appreciated working with Senator BYRD on a variety of issues, most recently the Miner Safety Act. We were both there at the President's side as he took up his pen and signed the bill into law. As he did, he noted Senator BYRD's presence because he knew the bill was the result of Senator BYRD's heartfelt concern for the miners of his State, for their safety, and the security of their families.

I have no doubt that if we were to look up the words ''constituent service'' in any book it would immediately refer us to Senator BYRD's work in the Senate. He has been an active and effective advocate for the people of West Virginia and he has worked tirelessly and diligently to address their needs in the Congress.

Looking back, Senator BYRD's life reads like a Hollywood movie script. He graduated first in his high school class and married his high school sweetheart. He then spent 12 years saving the money he needed to start college.

Through the years that followed, he held a variety of jobs that gave him an understanding of the needs of the working people of his State. He also developed his talent for the fiddle, and soon became known for that as well. Before long he was a member of the State legislature and, not too long thereafter, he came to the Senate.

Here in the Senate, no one has shown a greater understanding of the history and meaning of the U.S. Constitution and the role it plays in shaping our values and our way of life as Americans. We both have a habit of carrying a copy in our pocket to remind us of our job here in the Senate and our responsibility as Senators to adhere to the provisions of the Constitution and all it says and requires us to do.

Whenever I think of Senator BYRD, the first thing that comes to mind is his incredible knowledge and understanding of world history and the American experience. He also has a profound and substantive mastery of the legacy of the written word. Whenever he takes to the floor to present his views on an issue he always has a ready reference to the precedents of the past, or the words of some great author who had written something appropriate to the moment.

Now, Senator BYRD, the great student of the history of our Nation and so much more, is himself a part of the great story of America and the traditions of the Senate. Every day he joins us here to deliberate on the issues before the Senate, he writes another chapter of his own life's story, a story that will be forever told and retold back in his home State, in the mountains and valleys of West Virginia, by the people who live there who will forever remember him and his legacy as their Senator—a legacy that will never be forgotten.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

1ST SERGEANT MICHAEL MATTHEWS
SERGEANT KENNETH KRAUS
STAFF SERGEANT JACOB LONG

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, it is my honor today to pay tribute to three courageous soldiers from the city of Roswell, GA, whose service to country and community merits grateful recognition.

1SG Michael Matthews has served 21 years in the U.S. Army and Army National Guard and is currently a member of Charlie Co., 108th Armored Regiment, 48th Brigade of the Georgia Army National Guard. On August 30, 2005, Sergeant Matthews was seriously wounded when two Iraqis detonated an Improvised Explosive Device next to his convoy 25 miles south of Bagdad. Sergeant Matthews continues to recover from his injuries, and following his recovery, the Roswell Police Department will welcome him back to his position on the force. Sergeant Matthews worked for 17 years as a uniform police officer and SWAT team member and, in 2005, was named the Police Officer of the Year.

SGT Kenneth Kraus served as a U.S. Marine on duty at the U.S. Embassy in Iran during February of 1979. As revolutionaries overpowered the Embassy, Sergeant Kraus successfully negotiated the release of several American civilians before he was wounded and taken hostage himself. Beaten and interrogated repeatedly, he was given a 20 minute trial and sentenced to die the next day. Sergeant Kraus was pulled from his cell in the hours after his sentence while a representative from the U.S. Embassy finally secured his release. He was flown to Germany for medical treatment and then home to the United States. The Roswell Police Department has been fortunate to have Sergeant Kraus work with them as a detective for over 11 years.

SSG Jacob Long serves as Company Master Gunner in Charlie Co., First Battalion, 121st Infantry Regiment, 48th Brigade of the Georgia Army National Guard. On April 22, 2006, Staff Sergeant Long returned from a yearlong deployment in Iraq during which Charlie Co. became responsible for sending Baby Noor, an Iraqi infant with spinal bifida, on a flight to obtain vital treatment in the United States and Baby Noor underwent successful surgery in Atlanta. In addition to his service abroad, Sergeant Jacob has worked with the Roswell Parks and Recreation Department for over 10 years.

These individuals continue to better their community and their Nation with selfless dedication to their careers in public service. I am proud to join the city of Roswell, the State of Georgia, and our Nation in honoring these brave men who have exemplified service to others on the local, national, and international level.

A BLOW TO GUN TRAFFICKING

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, a unique type of gun trafficking sting operation was completed recently. Teams of undercover law enforcement officials wearing hidden cameras traveled to Georgia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia to make purchases which were designed to appear to be what are known as ''straw purchases.'' Straw purchases are transactions that violate Federal law in which one individual submits to the required Federal background check for a gun that is clearly intended to be used by someone else. These purchasers play a crucial role in the illegal trafficking of guns by purchasing with the intention of reselling them to prohibited buyers.

In addition, a lawsuit was filed by the city of New York. The suit, filed in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York in Brooklyn, asks the court to enforce gun laws regarding such sales and require extra training for and supervision of dealers. The lawsuit also seeks punitive and compensatory damages. According to New York City's Web site, its police have

confiscated more than 500 guns that were sold by the 15 dealers named in the lawsuit and subsequently used in crimes there.

In January 2001, a 12-year-old boy in New York City, playing with a semi-automatic handgun from a pawnshop in Summerville, SC, accidentally shot someone in the chest. The gun involved was one of 49 such guns from the store linked to crimes and accidents in New York City. As New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg pointed out, ''Our suit offers clear and compelling evidence that guns sold by these dealers are used in crimes by people ineligible to own a gun far more frequently than guns from other dealers.''

To build its case, the city of New York compiled a list of gun dealers based on data it received from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. Investigators worked in pairs. One looked at the merchandise, talked with the salesman and handled the weapon, while the other wandered the store, seemingly uninterested. When it came time to complete the necessary background check forms, the first operator, often a man, would call over his partner, frequently a woman, who had not been part of the discussion of the weapon. The second investigator would fill out the background paperwork, and the first one would pay for the gun in cash. This procedure was used to clearly illustrate that the second person was making a ''straw purchase'' for the first person.

Gun-control advocates praise the sting operation and the lawsuit. This type of action sends a message to dealers that more government officials are not willing to look the other way. Other cities, including Gary, Indiana, Chicago and Detroit, have taken similar approaches in their own jurisdictions, often using local law enforcement officials. This operation however, marks the first time investigators across the country participated in such a sting involving a number of States.

I would like to commend everyone on both the Federal and local levels who aided in this investigation. This kind of illegal activity can be stopped by vigorously enforcing our existing gun laws, providing law enforcement with more tools to crack down on gun trafficking and corrupt gun dealers, and by passing sensible gun safety legislation.

PRELIMINARY 2005 UNIFORM CRIME REPORT

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a very sobering report just issued by our FBI—its Preliminary 2005 Uniform Crime Report. This is the gold standard of crime reports in our country, taken from statistics by more than 12,000 law enforcement agencies all across our country.

Here is what the report says: Murders are up 4.8 percent. This means that there were 16,900 victims in 2005—16,900 in a single year. This is the most murders since 1998 and the largest percentage increase in 15 years. Violent crime more generally, which also includes forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, rose 2 percent after seeing decreases over the last 3 years.

Some areas of the country were especially hard hit. The Midwest, for example, saw violent crime rise 5.7 percent. Medium-large towns—those with populations between half a million and 1 million—saw an increase in violent crime of 8.3 percent. Murders increased more than 12 percent in towns with populations between 50,000 and 250,000. These troubling increases come after more than a decade of record decreases in crime.

These historic decreases in crime happened for a reason and, I fear, the recent and dramatic increase in murders and violent crime are also happening for a reason.

Let me explain. In 1994, we passed the most sweeping anticrime bill in history. At the time, we faced a national crisis with respect to violent crime. Despite the tough-on-crime rhetoric of the 1980s, the Federal Government until that point had very little impact on crime rates. This is largely because only about 3 percent of all crimes are handled by the Federal Government.

We recognized in 1994 that the only way to seriously address crime in our communities would be to vigorously and consistently support State and local law enforcement. We made a commitment to do just that by creating the Community Oriented Policing Services Program—more commonly known as COPS.

This ambitious new program committed to put more than 100,000 new officers on the streets and to expand the concept of community-oriented policing. Crime rates went down every year for 8 consecutive years. Violent crime was reduced by 26 percent. The murder rate went down by 34 percent.

In just a few short years, Americans went from being afraid to go out on their streets to living in the safest neighborhoods in a generation. By giving State and local law enforcement the support they needed, we were able to improve the lives of millions of Americans.

I recognize there are many factors involved in whether crime rates go up and down and that the COPS Program was not the sole reason for this historic drop in violent crime. At the same time, the legacy of COPS is unmistakable. The Government Accountability Office, GAO, released a report in October 2005 that concluded what many police chiefs and sheriffs have said all along—the COPS Program helps reduce crime. Specifically, the GAO found that ''as a demonstration of whether a federal program can affect crime rates through hiring officers and changing policing practices, the evidence indicates that COPS contributed to declines in crime above the levels of declines that would have been expected without it.'' For every $1 in COPS hiring grant expenditures per capita, there was a reduction of almost 30 index crimes per 100,000 persons.

Former Attorney General John Ashcroft called the COPS Program a ''miraculous success.'' But, unfortunately, I fear that some of us have taken our eyes off the ball. Specifically, the Bush administration has forgotten the lessons we learned from the COPS Program. Despite the dramatic and historic COPS successes, President Bush has systematically eliminated the programs that helped to lay the foundation for our low crime rates.

President Bush has proposed to cut support for State and local law enforcement every year for the past 5 years, proposing a budget in 2007 that cut $2 billion in guaranteed funding for State and local law enforcement from the amount we provided only 5 years ago. President Bush has steadily tried to kill the COPS hiring program, routinely trying to zero out all hiring funding.

And Congress has not held the line. During the 1990s, roughly $1 billion per year was allocated for the COPS Program. In 2002, $385 million was allocated to hire officers. That allocation was steadily reduced until last year when, for the first time, funding to hire officers was completely eliminated. Let me repeat: No Federal COPS funding whatsoever to hire officers. Adding insult to injury, President Bush has also proposed to zero out the Byrnes Justice Assistance Grant Program.

From 1994 to 2003, this wildly popular program provided around $900 million per year to our States to improve their criminal justice systems, providing vital resources to our men and women officers. Since 2003, this number has steadily eroded, with President Bush proposing absolutely no funding in his 2007 budget request. And I fear that we are now seeing the results of this vast defunding of the COPS Program and the Byrne Program—a result that was certainly not unpredictable.

Earlier this year, in response to the President's latest budget request, the President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Mary Ann Viverette, stated: ''these cuts have the potential to cripple the capabilities of law enforcement agencies nationwide and will undoubtedly force many departments to take officers off the streets, leading to more crime and violence in our hometowns and ultimately less security for our homeland.''

Many of us in Congress have also tried to raise the warning flags repeatedly. This February, I released a report entitled, ''Abandoning the Front Line: The Bush Administration's Record of Support for State and Local Law Enforcement'' which warned that we need to keep our eye on the ball, otherwise we risk seeing dramatic increases in crime rates.

Another problem facing our local law enforcement agencies is the fact that the FBI is getting out of the crime business. Since 9/11, the number of FBI agents focusing on crime has gone

down by over 1,000 agents. As a result, drug investigations have dropped by 60 percent and violent crime investigations have been reduced by 40 percent.

This has created a perfect storm for law enforcement, and I hope that these latest dramatic and troubling crime statistics serve as a wake-up call to Congress and the President.

We must build on the successes of the past; we must never become complacent. When I speak to law enforcement groups on the subject of crime, I make the point that keeping crime rates low is like cutting the grass. You mow your lawn and it looks great. You let it grow for a week, and it starts looking ragged. You let it grow for a month and you have a jungle.

The preliminary numbers released yesterday show that we have not been cutting the grass. In Cleveland, from 1994 to 2001, we spent $3.2 million per year for COPS hiring. From 2002 to 2005, we only spent $875,500 per year. A 2004 news article noted that Cleveland lost 250 officers, a reduction of 15 percent in their force. In their latest crime numbers, murder is up 38 percent; violent crime is up 7 percent. In St. Louis, from 1994 to 2001, we spend $770,000 per year for COPS hiring. From 2002 to 2005, that number was zero. A 2003 study found that St. Louis had lost 168 officers, a reduction of 11 percent in their force. In their latest crime numbers murder is up 16 percent, violent crime up 20 percent. The pattern is, unfortunately, clear.

In Philadelphia from 1994 to 2001, we spent $5,250,000 per year for COPS hiring. From 2002 to 2995, that number was again zero, Last year, I asked the Philadelphia police chief about the number of officers they have lost recently. He said since 2003, they were down 600 officers. In Philadelphia's latest crime numbers, murder is up 14.2 percent, violent crime up 3.4 percent.

Now is the time to see the error in our recent ways. It is my hope that the Appropriations, Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee will see fit to fully fund the COPS Program, the Justice assistance grants, and other critical crime control programs when it reports out its appropriations bill later this summer. If they do not, I will be offering an amendment to restore full funding for the COPS Program. I have done this for the past several years.

The Senate has previously not adopted my amendments, however—with opponents arguing that the COPS Program has worked, so we should kill it, or that it is not a Federal responsibility to fund local law enforcement. Critics will also argue that adding funding to the COPS Program will bust the budget.

I believe that the safety of the American citizens is our No. 1 priority, and I cannot accept the argument that we cannot find funding for local law enforcement at the same time we are giving a tax cut to our nation's millionaires. They did not ask for this tax cut, and I know that they would be willing to give that back in order to keep their communities safer.

The COPS Program helps us prevent both crime and terrorism, and I hope my colleagues will support me in restoring funding for this critical program.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE LIFE OF DR. JAMES CAMERON

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, Dr. James Cameron, sadly, passed away on June 11, and with his passing, the Nation has lost one the 20th century's greatest civil rights pioneers.

James Cameron was born in 1914 in La Crosse, WI, but it was during the time that he lived in Marion, IN, that he would have a terrifying experience that would forever change the course of his life.

On August 7, 1930, when he was just 16, he was wrongly accused of and arrested for the murder of a White man and the rape of a White woman. While in jail, a mob broke in and dragged him, and the other two charged with the crime, out into the street. A rope was placed around Cameron's neck, but he was spared when a man in the crowd proclaimed Cameron's innocence. While Cameron survived the beating and attempted lynching, the other two men were lynched and killed.

Cameron was convicted as an accessory to involuntary manslaughter—for which he was later pardoned—but no one was ever accused, charged, or arrested for the lynching and murder of the other two men.

After surviving this horrific experience, Dr. Cameron dedicated his life to raising awareness of racial injustice in America. In the 1940s, he organized several chapters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, in Indiana. As the Indiana State director of civil liberties from 1942 to 1950, Dr. Cameron worked to end segregation. The strong presence of the Ku Klux Klan in Indiana at the time made his job that much more difficult and dangerous. Dr. Cameron faced threats of violence, including threats to his life.

After he moved to Milwaukee, he continued his civil rights work by protesting against segregated housing and police brutality. During the 1960s, he took part in marches in Washington, DC, with civil rights leaders Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King.

Furthering his commitment to civil rights education, Dr. Cameron mortgaged his home in 1982 to publish 5,000 copies of his memoir, ''A Time of Terror.'' The book provides a moving account of his near-death experience in 1930.

After visiting Israel's Holocaust Museum, Dr. Cameron was inspired to construct a similar museum in Wisconsin, dedicated to the history and struggles of African Americans. His dream became a reality in 1988 when he opened the Black Holocaust Museum, which has made an important contribution to Milwaukee and an invaluable contribution to our understanding of American history.

It was particularly fitting that Dr. Cameron was able to watch in person as the U.S. Senate finally passed a resolution apologizing to victims of lynching. His monumental efforts were central to that important and long-overdue moment.

Dr. Cameron dedicated his life to ending racial injustice. Now his strength and resilience must inspire all of us as we carry on that critically important work. James Cameron's incredible story of survival is a part of history. But Dr. Cameron was more than just a part of history—he helped to shape history, with his determined commitment to promoting civil rights. With everything James Cameron did, he served the cause of justice. He led a courageous, remarkable life, and he will be greatly missed.•

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MADISON, WEST VIRGINIA

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is with great honor that I recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of the town of Madison, WV. A celebration will take place this month, and I would like to take this opportunity to speak for a few moments about this wonderful Appalachian community. Madison was incorporated as the county seat of Boone County, which it remains today. It is also the home of a number of exemplary schools and dedicated churches. Madison has long been noted for its rich coal mining heritage, and was named for Colonel William Madison Peyton, pioneer coal operator and leader of the movement that led to the establishment of Boone County.

A significant percentage of Madison residents are employed by coal mining corporations, or related businesses. That makes it fitting that the township is the home of the Bituminous Coal Heritage Foundation Museum and the location of the West Virginia Coal Festival. Each year, thousands of people travel to Madison for this festival to celebrate coal heritage. This year, the festival will include a memorial service to the 18 West Virginians who tragically lost their lives in recent months in mining accidents. In light of these events, along with State and local officials and I have been working to better ensure the safety of all West Virginia coal miners. Another important asset to the City of Madison is Boone Memorial Hospital which serves the community with personalized care and respect for all in need of medical attention.

The town of Madison is the historical site of a crucial Union victory during

the Civil War. The Battle of Boone County Courthouse, the name of the town before it was known as Madison, occurred early in the war on September 1, 1861, at a time when the Union army had suffered many devastating defeats. The original court house in Madison was burned by Union soldiers as a result of the skirmish. Madison's centennial celebration will take place on the grounds of the restored structure.

On the grounds of that courthouse stands a memorial to soldiers who died in service of their Nation. Madison and Boone County, as all of West Virginia, have given more than its share of brave men and women to the service of our Nation. Boone countians are fiercely patriotic and dedicated to their families, their community and their God. They are resilient and determined, having suffered the ups and downs of the coal economy. They are also kind-hearted people. When I first came to West Virginia as a young man in the VISTA program over 40 years ago, it was to a community on the Boone-Kanawha county line. The people of that community taught me so much and forever changed my life. I will forever have a special place in my heart for Boone County, the town of Madison, and their residents. I certainly wish the town and its people the best for the centennial celebration and much success during the next 100 years.

I hope my fellow Senators and fellow West Virginians will join me in celebrating this special occasion, the centennial of Madison, WV.●

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

ST. ALBANS FIRE DEPARTMENT

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the St. Albans Fire Department for 100 years of dedicated service to its community. Their outstanding achievement has not only improved the town of St. Albans, but West Virginia as a whole. I am proud to represent such a courageous and selfless group of individuals, who serve West Virginia well every day. All first responders are enormously important to our well being and to their communities, but the longevity of this department deserves special recognition.

The St. Albans Fire Department was started in 1906 as the St. Albans Salvage Corps. The small group of committed volunteers ventures to preserve property and save lives in this small Kanawha County community. Their goal created a foundation on which the St. Albans Fire Department—SAFD—was built. Today, the SAFD is a 26 person team of 19 full time and seven part time firefighters. Although the operation has grown tremendously, the firefighters still strive to protect every aspect of the community. They respond not only to fires, but also to automobile accidents, water rescue, as well as providing emergency medical service. The firefighters that represent St. Albans are highly trained and capable of handling all types of emergencies.

The SAFD was presented with the Life Safety Achievement Award for the sixth time in 2005. This award is given to the departments that help reduce the number of fire related deaths each year. In 2004, St. Albans did not have any structural fire deaths. The Department was also able to improve their Insurance Safety Office rating from a Class 4 to a Class 3. The better rating will help not only the fire department, but the people they serve as well, by lowering their insurance premiums. This achievement shows the true dedication of the St. Albans Fire Department. Congratulations on such an amazing accomplishment, and let the next 100 years be as strong as the first.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3534. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 16, 2006, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, CO, as the ''William H. Emery Post Office''.

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 Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 3531. A bill to appropriate $430,000,000 for medical care for veterans and $70,000,000 to improve the security for personal data of veterans held by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 3532. A bill to support the goals of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

S. 3533. A bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to carry out certain activities with respect to delivering training in age-appropriate basic life supporting first aid skills to school children, including funding of a program to provide this education to the public; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3534. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 514. A resolution to authorize testimony and legal representation in City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 930

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 930, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to drug safety, and for other purposes.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 2148

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2148, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Chattahoochee Trace National Heritage Corridor in Alabama and Georgia, and for other purposes.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Rosa Parks.

S. 2250

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2250, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug.

S. 2599

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) 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 emergencies.

S. 2990

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2990, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore financial stability to Medicare anesthesiology teaching programs for resident physicians.

S. 3275

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) 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.

S. 3487

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3487, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize and improve the disaster loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 3503

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 3503, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund.

S. CON. RES. 84

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 84, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a free trade agreement between the United States and Taiwan.

S. CON. RES. 96

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 96, a concurrent resolution to commemorate, celebrate, and reaffirm the national motto of the United States on the 50th anniversary of its formal adoption.

S. RES. 507

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor 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.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 508, a resolution designating October 20, 2006 as ''National Mammography Day''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4231

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4231 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4245

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4245 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4246

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4246 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4259

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4259 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3534. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program; read the first time.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the YouthBuild Transfer Act. I am pleased to be joined in this important effort by Senator KENNEDY, the ranking member of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, and Senators DEWINE, KERRY, and MURRAY.

This bill transfers the YouthBuild program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, the Department of Labor, DOL, as an amendment to the Workforce Investment Act, WIA. YouthBuild was enacted in 1992. It provides programs for young adults aged 16 to 24 to build or rehabilitate housing for homeless or low-income individuals in their communities while they study to earn their own high school diploma or GED. These youth gain occupational and technical skills while building their knowledge to help them become and remain productive participants in the workplace.

By transferring YouthBuild to DOL, the program will be more closely aligned with and benefit from collaboration with the larger workforce system at the State and local levels. It will continue to serve those young adults most in need of these services, and enable them to serve their communities by building affordable housing, and assists them in transforming their own lives and roles in society.

YouthBuild assists young adults not currently enrolled in school gain needed education, skills and knowledge. The skill and literacy requirements of today's and tomorrow's workplace cannot be met if we do not provide everyone access to lifelong education, training and retraining.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor and express my strong support for the YouthBuild Transfer Act which will preserve and extend the YouthBuild Program by transferring its operations from Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to the Department of Labor, DOL.

Last year, President Bush's budget request recommended transferring the operations of the YouthBuild Program from HUD to DOL. In November 2005, I introduced the YouthBuild Transfer Act of 2005, S. 1999, to authorize that transfer, and it is very similar to this legislation being introduced today.

I express my appreciation to Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Chairman ENZI and the ranking member, Senator KENNEDY, for their work in developing this consensus legislation. I also thank Senator DEWINE for his efforts in both developing this legislation and for his efforts to obtain funding for YouthBuild for many years. I believe this bill continues the bipartisan spirit which has been the hallmark of the YouthBuild Program.

Poverty, neglect, abuse, and deprivation of all kinds can prevent people

from reaching their true potential. Many of those who have fallen off track, suffered losses, and made mistakes can recover. If given the opportunity, they can learn to cope with obstacles and care effectively about themselves, their families, and their communities. YouthBuild helps young people who have lost their way to turn their lives around.

YouthBuild is a uniquely comprehensive program that offers at-risk youth an immediate productive role rebuilding their communities. While attending basic education classes for 50 percent of program time, students also receive job skills training in the construction field, personal counseling from respected mentors, a supportive peer group with positive values, and experience in civic engagement. They build houses for homeless and low-income people while earning their own GED or high school diploma.

YouthBuild is built on success. During the 1960s, YouthBuild's future founder, Dorothy Stoneman, formed the Youth Action Program to rebuild homes in New York City. The successful renovation of an East Harlem tenement led to a citywide coalition and in 1990, led to YouthBuild USA, an organization created to replicate this program around the Nation.

After visiting a YouthBuild site, I introduced legislation in 1992 authorizing Federal funding for YouthBuild through the Department of Housing and Urban Development which was enacted into law as part of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act. Since then, I have led a coalition of Senators in support of Federal funding for this important program. The $600 million that has been appropriated through HUD since fiscal year 1993 has leveraged over $1.5 billion of additional public and private investment at the local level due to the resourcefulness of local leaders and the high demand for YouthBuild programs.

The results have been dramatic. Since 1994, YouthBuild has helped more than 60,000 disadvantaged youth into productive employment, higher education, and civic engagement across the Nation. At the same time, YouthBuild has helped rebuild low- and moderate-income communities by creating more than 15,000 units of affordable housing. Over 1,000 local organizations, in every State, have applied for HUD funds to bring YouthBuild to their communities.

Research on 900 YouthBuild graduates, several years after they had completed the program showed that more than 75 percent of them were either employed at an average wage of $10 an hour or attending college and were positively contributing to their communities. Of those who had committed felonies, the recidivism rate was a strikingly low 15 percent and all studies to date have shown a recidivism rate below 20 percent strikingly lower than the 60 percent recidivism rate for most prison systems.

Today there are over 226 YouthBuild programs in 43 States engaging 8,000 young adults, and the number of programs could easily be expanded. Last year alone, 260 communities were denied YouthBuild funding. The demand is equally great from young people—in 2003 local programs turned away over 10,000 applicants solely for lack of funds, and in 2004 they turned away 12,000. The 20 percent cut suffered for fiscal year 2006 could cause the closing of 25 local programs; if the funds are restored and expanded, some of these closings can be averted. I am hopeful that the YouthBuild Transfer Act will be enacted into law. However, YouthBuild must continue to receive Federal funds in fiscal year 2007 in order to remain a successful program. President Bush included $50 million for YouthBuild in his fiscal year 2007 budget request to Congress. Senator DEWINE and I have sent a letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of $90 million for the program. I look forward to working with the members of the Appropriations Committee to insure that this critical program receives an increase in Federal funding next year.

Increasing Federal funding for YouthBuild will help address critical national problems that cost society dearly. Over 32 percent of America's youth are dropping out of high school with no prospect of becoming gainfully employed, contributing members of society, taxpayers, and in inner-city communities, that percentage- rises toward 50. States are spending $36,000 per year per person to house 365,000 16 to 24 year olds, 65 percent of whom have dropped out of high school. In addition, the construction industry is short 80,000 workers. Furthermore, in the aftermath of Katrina, the need for construction workers is increasing, and YouthBuild programs are a resource in the gulf, sending trained crews to Mississippi to rebuild homes as part of their service to the Nation.

YouthBuild is also on the cutting edge of education reform for dropouts and effective re-entry for offenders. Forty YouthBuild programs have now been chartered by their States or authorized by their superintendent of schools to provide high school diplomas and to receive public funds as successful public schools reclaiming high school dropouts. In several States, the criminal justice departments are now supplementing HUD funds to expand capacity of YouthBuild programs as successful re-entry programs for ex-offenders. To maximize the investment already made in YouthBuild as a resource for education of dropouts and reentry of ex-offenders, it is imperative to keep the foundation of its Federal funding strong.

I ask all of my colleagues to support the YouthBuild Transfer Act to allow the YouthBuild Program to expand this unique comprehensive program to provide at-risk youth an immediately productive role rebuilding their communities.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 514—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN CITY OF EUGENE V. PETER VINCENT CHABAREK

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 514

Whereas, in the case of City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek, Citation No. 06–05546, pending in Municipal Court for the City of Eugene, testimony has been requested from Juine Chada, an employee in the office of Senator Ron Wyden;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent an employee of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that Juine Chada is authorized to testify in the case of City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Juine Chada in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4292. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) 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.

SA 4293. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4294. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4295. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4296. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4297. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4298. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4299. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S.

2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4300. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4301. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4302. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4303. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4304. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4305. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4306. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4307. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4308. Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4309. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4292. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) 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 division A, add the following:

TITLE XV—SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF SENATE ON WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING

SEC. 1501. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have exerted very large demands on the Treasury of the United States and required tremendous sacrifice by the members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(2) Congress has a constitutional responsibility to ensure comprehensive oversight of the expenditure of United States Government funds.

(3) Waste and corporate abuse of United States Government resources are particularly unacceptable and reprehensible during times of war.

(4) The magnitude of the funds involved in the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq and the war on terrorism, together with the speed with which these funds have been committed, presents a challenge to the effective performance of the traditional oversight function of Congress and the auditing functions of the executive branch.

(5) The Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, popularly know as the Truman Committee, which was established during World War II, offers a constructive precedent for bipartisan oversight of wartime contracting that can also be extended to wartime and postwar reconstruction activities.

(6) The Truman Committee is credited with an extremely successful investigative effort, performance of a significant public education role, and achievement of fiscal savings measured in the billions of dollars.

(7) The public has a right to expect that taxpayer resources will be carefully disbursed and honestly spent.

SEC. 1502. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING.

There is established a special committee of the Senate to be known as the Special Committee on War and Reconstruction Contracting (hereafter in this title referred to as the ''Special Committee'').

SEC. 1503. PURPOSE AND DUTIES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Special Committee is to investigate the awarding and performance of contracts to conduct military, security, and reconstruction activities in Afghanistan and Iraq and to support the prosecution of the war on terrorism.

(b) DUTIES.—The Special Committee shall examine the contracting actions described in subsection (a) and report on such actions, in accordance with this section, regarding—

(1) bidding, contracting, accounting, and auditing standards for Federal Government contracts;

(2) methods of contracting, including sole-source contracts and limited competition or noncompetitive contracts;

(3) subcontracting under large, comprehensive contracts;

(4) oversight procedures;

(5) consequences of cost-plus and fixed price contracting;

(6) allegations of wasteful and fraudulent practices;

(7) accountability of contractors and Government officials involved in procurement and contracting;

(8) penalties for violations of law and abuses in the awarding and performance of Government contracts; and

(9) lessons learned from the contracting process used in Iraq and Afghanistan and in connection with the war on terrorism with respect to the structure, coordination, management policies, and procedures of the Federal Government.

(c) INVESTIGATION OF WASTEFUL AND FRAUDULENT PRACTICES.—The investigation by the Special Committee of allegations of wasteful and fraudulent practices under subsection (b)(6) shall include investigation of allegations regarding any contract or spending entered into, supervised by, or otherwise involving the Coalition Provisional Authority, regardless of whether or not such contract or spending involved appropriated funds of the United States.

(d) EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.—In carrying out its duties, the Special Committee shall ascertain and evaluate the evidence developed by all relevant governmental agencies regarding the facts and circumstances relevant to contracts described in subsection (a) and any contract or spending covered by subsection (c).

SEC. 1504. COMPOSITION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Special Committee shall consist of 7 members of the Senate of whom—

(A) 4 members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the majority leader of the Senate; and

(B) 3 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Special Committee shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Special Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) SERVICE.—Service of a Senator as a member, chairman, or ranking member of the Special Committee shall not be taken into account for the purposes of paragraph (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(d) CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER.—The chairman of the Special Committee shall be designated by the majority leader of the Senate, and the ranking member of the Special Committee shall be designated by the minority leader of the Senate.

(e) QUORUM.—

(1) REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—A majority of the members of the Special Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of reporting a matter or recommendation to the Senate.

(2) TESTIMONY.—One member of the Special Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

(3) OTHER BUSINESS.—A majority of the members of the Special Committee, or ⅓ of the members of the Special Committee if at least one member of the minority party is present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting any other business of the Special Committee.

SEC. 1505. RULES AND PROCEDURES.

(a) GOVERNANCE UNDER STANDING RULES OF SENATE.—Except as otherwise specifically provided in this resolution, the investigation, study, and hearings conducted by the Special Committee shall be governed by the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) ADDITIONAL RULES AND PROCEDURES.—The Special Committee may adopt additional rules or procedures if the chairman and ranking member agree that such additional rules or procedures are necessary to enable the Special Committee to conduct the investigation, study, and hearings authorized by this resolution. Any such additional rules and procedures—

(1) shall not be inconsistent with this resolution or the Standing Rules of the Senate; and

(2) shall become effective upon publication in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 1506. AUTHORITY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Special Committee may exercise all of the powers and responsibilities of a committee under rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) HEARINGS.—The Special Committee or, at its direction, any subcommittee or member of the Special Committee, may, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Special Committee or such subcommittee or member considers advisable; and

(2) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, tapes, and materials as the Special Committee considers advisable.

(c) ISSUANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF SUBPOENAS.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—Subpoenas issued under subsection (b) shall bear the signature of the Chairman of the Special Committee and shall be served by any person or class of persons designated by the Chairman for that purpose.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under subsection (a), the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Special Committee may sit and act at any time or place during sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate.

SEC. 1507. REPORTS.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—The Special Committee shall submit to the Senate a report on the investigation conducted pursuant to section 1503 not later than 270 days after the appointment of the Special Committee members.

(b) UPDATED REPORT.—The Special Committee shall submit an updated report on such investigation not later than 180 days after the submission of the report under subsection (a).

(c) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—The Special Committee may submit any additional report or reports that the Special Committee considers appropriate.

(d) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The reports under this section shall include findings and recommendations of the Special Committee regarding the matters considered under section 1503.

(e) DISPOSITION OF REPORTS.—Any report made by the Special Committee when the Senate is not in session shall be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate. Any report made by the Special Committee shall be referred to the committee or committees that have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the report.

SEC. 1508. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Special Committee may employ in accordance with paragraph (2) a staff composed of such clerical, investigatory, legal, technical, and other personnel as the Special Committee, or the chairman or the ranking member, considers necessary or appropriate.

(2) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Special Committee shall appoint a staff for the majority, a staff for the minority, and a nondesignated staff.

(B) MAJORITY STAFF.—The majority staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the chairman and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the chairman.

(C) MINORITY STAFF.—The minority staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking member of the Special Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(D) NONDESIGNATED STAFF.—Nondesignated staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, jointly by the chairman and the ranking member, and shall work under the joint general supervision and direction of the chairman and ranking member.

(b) COMPENSATION.—

(1) MAJORITY STAFF.—The chairman shall fix the compensation of all personnel of the majority staff of the Special Committee.

(2) MINORITY STAFF.—The ranking member shall fix the compensation of all personnel of the minority staff of the Special Committee.

(3) NONDESIGNATED STAFF.—The chairman and ranking member shall jointly fix the compensation of all nondesignated staff of the Special Committee, within the budget approved for such purposes for the Special Committee.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—The Special Committee may reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by such staff members in the performance of their functions for the Special Committee.

(d) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—There shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Special Committee. Such payments shall be made on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Special Committee and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. Amounts made available under this subsection shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

SEC. 1509. TERMINATION.

The Special Committee shall terminate on July 1, 2008.

SEC. 1510. SENSE OF SENATE ON CERTAIN CLAIMS REGARDING THE COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY.

It is the sense of the Senate that any claim of fraud, waste, or abuse under the False Claims Act that involves any contract or spending by the Coalition Provisional Authority should be considered a claim against the United States Government.

SA 4293. Mr. DURBIN 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 III, add the following:

SEC. 375. WIND ENERGY FACILITIES AND RADAR FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of the other military departments, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Labor, the chief executive officers of the several States, representatives of the wind energy industry, and other appropriate individuals from the public and private sector, lead in the development of strategies to prevent, reduce, or mitigate interference by wind turbines with the operation of radars in the United States.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report setting forth recommendations for legislative or administrative action to—

(1) facilitate the coexistence of military missions and wind energy facilities, to the greatest extent possible, including mechanisms to apply mitigation strategies on a case-by-case basis to the location and operation of any particular wind energy facility; and

(2) create a centralized process within the Department of Defense for the evaluation of the potential impact on military radars of the operation of a proposed wind energy facility in the United States, including a process to assure the early evaluation of such impact by the Department and for the right of appeal from a decision of the Department following such an evaluation.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—The lack of submittal of the report required by section 358 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3208) should not be construed as a reason or justification for the delay of the construction or completion of any wind energy or windmill project.

SA 4294. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) 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 B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3121. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FORMER NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS IN SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT UNDER ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) INCLUSION IN SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT.—Section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384l(14)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) The employee was so employed at the Bethlehem Steel plant located in Lackawanna, New York, for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days—

''(i) which were during the period beginning on January 1, 1949, and ending on December 31, 1952; and

''(ii) during which the employee had direct exposure to material (including residual material) that emitted radiation.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR NIOSH DETERMINATION.—The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health of the Department of Health and Human Services shall make the determination required by clause (i) of subparagraph (D) of section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, as added by subsection (a), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4295. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. SESSIONS) 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 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each report described in paragraph (2) that is required by law to be submitted to the congressional defense committees by the Department of Defense or any department, agency, element, or component under the Department of Defense.

(2) COVERED REPORTS.—Paragraph (1) applies with respect to any report required under a provision of law enacted on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) that requires recurring reports to the committees referred to in that paragraph.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) Each report described by that subsection, including a statement of the provision of law under which such report is required to be submitted to Congress.

(2) For each such report, an assessment by the Secretary of the utility of such report from the perspective of the Department of Defense and a recommendation on the advisability of repealing the requirement for the submittal of such report.

SA 4296. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. ALLARD (for himself 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 546, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 2828. REPORTS ON ARMY TRAINING RANGES.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not carry out any acquisition of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado until 30 days after the Secretary submits the report required under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT ON PINON CANYON MANEUVER SITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis of any potential expansion of the military training range at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A description of the Army's current and projected military requirements for training at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(B) An analysis of the reasons for any changes in those requirements, including the extent to which they are a result of the increase of military personnel due to the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) A proposed plan for addressing those requirements, including a description of any proposed expansion of the existing training range by acquiring privately held land surrounding the site and an analysis of alternative approaches that do not require expansion of the training range.

(D) If an expansion of the training range is recommended pursuant to subparagraph (C), the following information:

(i) An assessment of the economic impact on local communities of such acquisition.

(ii) An assessment of the environmental impact of expanding the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(iii) An estimate of the costs associated with the potential expansion, including land acquisition, range improvements, installation of utilities, environmental restoration, and other environmental activities in connection with the acquisition.

(iv) An assessment of options for compensating local communities for the loss of property tax revenue as a result of the expansion of Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(v) An assessment of whether the acquisition of additional land at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site can be carried out by the Secretary solely through transactions, including land exchanges and the lease or purchase of easements, with willing sellers of the privately held land.

(c) REPORT ON EXPANSION OF ARMY TRAINING RANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an assessment of the training ranges operated by the Army to support major Army units.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) The size, description, and mission essential training tasks supported by each such Army training range during fiscal year 2003.

(B) A description of the projected changes in training range requirements, including the size, characteristics, and attributes for mission essential training of each range and the extent to which any changes in requirements are a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) The projected deficit or surplus of training land at each such range, and a description of the Army's plan to address that projected deficit or surplus of land as well as the upgrade of range attributes at each existing training range.

(D) A description of the Army's prioritization process and investment strategy to address the potential expansion or upgrade of training ranges.

(E) An analysis of alternatives to the expansion of Army ranges to include an assessment of the joint use of ranges operated by other services.

SA 4297. 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:

On page 65, line 16, insert ''facility designated by the Secretary as the'' before ''National''.

On page 65, line 24, insert ''facility designated by the Secretary as the'' before ''National''.

On page 66, line 17, insert ''facility designated by the Secretary as the'' before ''National''.

SA 4298. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. DOLE) 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. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) ARMY SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—

(1) 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 $10,000,000.

(2) 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 paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103A for University Research Initiatives.

(b) NAVY SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103N for University Research Initiatives.

(c) AIR FORCE SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—

(1) 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 $10,000,000.

(2) 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 paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103F for University Research Initiatives.

(d) COMPUTER SCIENCE AND CYBERSECURITY.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601101E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency University Research Program in Computer Science and Cybersecurity.

(e) SMART NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by $5,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by paragraph (1), $5,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601120D8Z for the SMART National Defense Education Program.

(f) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that it should be a goal of the Department of Defense to invest not less than an amount equal to 15 percent of the science and technology budget of the Department of Defense in basic research programs.

(g) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities is hereby reduced by $45,000,000.

SA 4299. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) 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 XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3121. EDUCATION OF FUTURE NUCLEAR ENGINEERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense and the United States depend on the specialized expertise of nuclear engineers who support the development and sustainment of technologies including naval reactors, strategic weapons, and nuclear power plants.

(2) Experts estimate that over 25 percent of the approximately 58,000 workers in the nuclear power industry in the United States will be eligible to retire within 5 years, representing both a huge loss of institutional memory and a potential national security crisis.

(3) This shortfall of workers is exacerbated by reductions to the University Reactor Infrastructure and Education Assistance program, which trains civilian nuclear scientists and engineers. The defense and civilian nuclear industries are interdependent on a limited number of educational institutions to produce their workforce. A reduction in nuclear scientists and engineers trained in the civilian sector may result in a further loss of qualified personnel for defense-related research and engineering.

(4) The Department of Defense's successful Science, Math and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship-for-service program serves as a good model for a targeted scholarship or fellowship program designed to educate future scientists at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

(b) REPORT ON EDUCATION OF FUTURE NUCLEAR ENGINEERS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Energy shall study the feasibility and merit of establishing a targeted scholarship or fellowship program to educate future nuclear engineers at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—The President shall submit to the congressional defense committees, together with the budget request submitted for fiscal year 2008, a report on the study conducted by the Secretary of Energy under paragraph (1).

SA 4300. Mr. KENNEDY 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 D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 147. MULTI-SPECTRAL IMAGING CAPABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The budget of the President for fiscal year 2007, as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and the current Future-Years Defense Program adopts an Air Force plan to retire the remaining fleet of U–2 aircraft by 2011.

(2) This retirement would eliminate the multi-spectral capability provided by the electro-optical/infrared (EO/IR) Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System (SYERS-2) high-altitude imaging system.

(3) The system referred to in paragraph (2) provides high-resolution, long-range, day-and-night image intelligence.

(4) The infrared capabilities of the system referred to in paragraph (2) can defeat enemy efforts to use camouflage or concealment, as well as provide images through poor visibility and smoke.

(5) Although the Air Force has previously recognized the military value of Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System sensors, the Air Force has no plans to migrate this capability to any platform remaining in the fleet.

(6) The Air Force could integrate such capabilities onto the Global Hawk platform to retain this capability for combatant commanders.

(7) The Nation risks a loss of an important intelligence gathering capability if this capability is not transferred to another platform.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Air Force should investigate ways to retain the multi-spectral imaging capabilities provided by the Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System high-altitude imaging system after the retirement of the U–2 aircraft fleet.

(c) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees, at the same time the budget of the President for fiscal year 2008 is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a plan for migrating the capabilities provided by the Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System high-altitude imaging system from the U–2 aircraft to the Global Hawk platform before the retirement of the U–2 aircraft fleet in 2011.

SA 4301. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) 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 I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR INDIVIDUALS EXPOSED IN UTERO TO CONTAMINATED WATER AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide each individual described in subsection (b) with such health care as the Secretary determines is needed by such individual for any health problem, condition, or disability that is associated with the exposure of such individual as described in that subsection.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—An individual described in this subsection is any individual, as determined by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Agency for Toxic Substances, who was exposed in utero to water contaminated with toxic chemicals at United States Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

(c) AUTHORITY FOR CARE TO BE PROVIDED DIRECTLY OR BY CONTRACT.—The Secretary may provide health care under this section directly or by contract or other arrangement with a health care provider.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the rights or obligations of any person or entity, including the Federal Government, under any other law.

(e) NOTICE ON EXPOSURE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall, upon completion of the report by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry on human exposure to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune, take appropriate actions to notify each person who may have been exposed to such drinking water of such exposure.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The notice provided under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the events resulting in exposure to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(B) A description of the duration and extent of the contamination of drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(C) The known and suspected health effects of exposure to the contaminants in the contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(D) A description of sources of additional information on—

(i) the contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune; and

(ii) the known and suspected health effects of exposure to the contaminants in such drinking water.

(f) HEALTH CARE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''health care'' has the meaning given that term in section 1803(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

SA 4302. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) 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 D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY ON HUMAN EXPOSURE TO CONTAMINATED DRINKING WATER AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Navy shall enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of the available scientific and medical evidence regarding associations between pre-natal, child, and adult exposure to drinking water contaminated with trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetrachloroethylene (PCE) at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, as well as other pre-natal, child, and adult exposures to levels of trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene similar to those experienced at Camp Lejeune, and birth defects or diseases and any other adverse health effects.

(2) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the review and evaluation, the Academy shall review and summarize the scientific and medical evidence and assess the strength of that evidence in establishing a link or association between exposure to trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene and each birth defect or disease suspected to be associated with such

exposure. For each birth defect or disease reviewed, the Academy shall determine, to the extent practicable with available scientific and medical data, whether—

(A) a statistical association with such contaminant exposures exists; and

(B) there exist plausible biological mechanisms or other evidence of a causal relationship between contaminant exposures and the birth defect or disease.

(3) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In conducting the review and evaluation, the Academy shall include a review and evaluation of—

(A) the toxicologic and epidemiologic literature on adverse health effects of trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene, including epidemiologic and risk assessment reports from government agencies;

(B) recent literature reviews by the National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, and other groups;

(C) the completed and on-going Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry (ATSDR) studies on potential trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene exposure at Camp Lejeune; and

(D) published meta-analyses.

(4) PEER REVIEW.—The Academy shall obtain the peer review of the report prepared as a result of the review and evaluation under applicable Academy procedures.

(5) SUBMITTAL.—The Academy shall submit the report prepared as a result of the review and evaluation to the Secretary and Congress not later than 18 months after entering into the agreement for the review and evaluation under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE ON EXPOSURE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Upon completion of the current epidemiological study by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, known as the Exposure to Volatile Organic Compounds in Drinking Water and Specific Birth Defects and Childhood Cancers, United States Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall take appropriate actions, including the use of national media such as newspapers, television, and the Internet, to notify former Camp Lejeune residents and employees who may have been exposed to drinking water impacted by trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene of the results of the study.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The information provided by the Commandant of the Marine Corps under paragraph (1) shall be prepared in conjunction with the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry and shall include a description of sources of additional information relating to such exposure, including, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) A description of the events resulting in exposure to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(B) A description of the duration and extent of the contamination of drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(C) The known and suspected health effects of exposure to the drinking water impacted by trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene at Camp Lejeune.

SA 4303. Mr. CHAMBLISS 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 III, add the following:

SEC. 375. RECOVERY AND AVAILABILITY TO CORPORATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND FIREARMS SAFETY OF CERTAIN FIREARMS, AMMUNITION, AND PARTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 407 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 40728 the following new section:

"§ 40728A. Recovery and availability of excess firearms, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries

''(a) RECOVERY.—The Secretary of the Army may recover from any country to which a grant of rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or other supplies described in section 40731(a) of this title is made under section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314) any such rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies that are excess to the needs of such country.

''(b) COST OF RECOVERY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the cost of recovery of any rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies under subsection (a) shall be treated as incremental direct costs incurred in providing logistical support to the corporation for which reimbursement shall be required as provided in section 40727(a) of this title.

''(2) The Secretary may require the corporation to pay costs of recovery described in paragraph (1) in advance of incurring such costs. Amounts so paid shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, but shall be administered in accordance with the last sentence of section 40727(a) of this title.

''(c) AVAILABILITY.—Any rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies recovered under subsection (a) shall be available for transfer to the corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 40728 of this title under such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 407 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 40728 the following new item:

''40728A. Recovery and availability of excess firearms, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries.''.

SA 4304. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) 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:

On page 26, line 19, add after the period the following: ''The prohibition in the preceding sentence shall not apply to any C–130E/H tactical airlift aircraft that are declared by the Air Force to be grounded and are determined by the Secretary of the Air Force to be unsafe for exceeding structural design limits or to have structural cracks in excess of an economic ability to repair, but only if the Secretary submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a notice on such determination before retiring such aircraft.''

SA 4305. Mr. HAGEL 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 D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 568. EXEMPTION FROM PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER MONTGOMERY GI BILL OF INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE AS ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13235.

(a) ACTIVE DUTY PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding section 3011(b) of title 38, United States Code, no reduction in basic pay otherwise required by such section shall be made in the case of a covered member of the Armed Forces.

(b) SELECTED RESERVE PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding section 3012(c) of such title, no reduction in basic pay otherwise required by such section shall be made in the case of a covered member of the Armed Forces.

(c) TERMINATION OF ON-GOING REDUCTIONS IN BASIC PAY.—In the case of a covered member of the Armed Forces who first became a member of the Armed Forces or first entered on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces before the date of the enactment of this Act and whose basic pay would, but for subsection (a) or (b) of this section, be subject to reduction under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of such title for any month beginning on or after that date, the reduction of basic pay of such covered member of the Armed Forces under such section 3011(b) or 3012(c), as applicable, shall cease commencing with the first month beginning on or after that date.

(d) REFUND OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—(1) In the case of any covered member of the Armed Forces whose basic pay was reduced under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of such title for any month beginning before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall pay to such covered member of the Armed Forces an amount equal to the aggregate amount of reductions of basic pay of such member of the Armed Forces under such section 3011(b) or 3012(c), as applicable, as of that date.

(2) Any amount paid to a covered member of the Armed Forces under paragraph (1) shall not be included in gross income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) Amounts for payments made by a Secretary concerned under paragraph (1) during fiscal year 2005 shall be derived from amounts made available for such fiscal year in an Act making supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq.

(4) In this subsection, the term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of the Army, with respect to matters concerning the Army;

(B) the Secretary of the Navy, with respect to matters concerning the Navy or the Marine Corps;

(C) the Secretary of the Air Force, with respect to matters concerning the Air Force; and

(D) the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

(e) COVERED MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered member of the Armed Forces'' means any individual who serves on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces during the period—

(1) beginning on November 16, 2001, the date of Executive Order 13235, relating to National Emergency Construction Authority; and

(2) ending on the termination date of the Executive order referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 569. OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE AS ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13235 TO WITHDRAW ELECTION NOT TO ENROLL IN MONTGOMERY GI BILL.

Section 3018 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsection (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, an individual who—

''(A) serves on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces during the period beginning on November 16, 2001, and ending on the termination date of Executive Order 13235, relating to National Emergency Construction Authority; and

''(B) has served continuously on active duty without a break in service following the date the individual first becomes a member or first enters on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces,

shall have the opportunity, on such form as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, to withdraw an election under section 3011(c)(1) or 3012(d)(1) of this title not to receive education assistance under this chapter.

''(2) An individual described paragraph (1) who made an election under section 3011(c)(1) or 3012(d)(1) of this title and who—

''(A) while serving on active duty during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection makes a withdrawal of such election;

''(B) continues to serve the period of service which such individual was obligated to serve;

''(C) serves the obligated period of service described in subparagraph (B) or before completing such obligated period of service is described by subsection (b)(3)(B); and

''(D) meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b),

is entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter.''; and

(3) in subsection (e), as so redesignated, by inserting ''or (c)(2)(A)'' after ''(b)(1)''.

SA 4306. Mr. HAGEL 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 D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 648. COMMENCEMENT OF RECEIPT OF NONREGULAR SERVICE RETIRED PAY BY RESERVES WHO SERVED ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR SIGNIFICANT PERIODS DURING THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) REDUCED ELIGIBILITY AGE.—Section 12731 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) has attained the eligibility age applicable under subsection (f) to that person;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the eligibility age for the purposes of subsection (a)(1) is 60 years of age.

''(2)(A) In the case of a person who, as a member of a reserve component of an armed force, served on active duty during a global war on terrorism service year under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of this title, the eligibility age for the purposes of subsection (a)(1) is reduced below 60 years of age by one year for each global war on terrorism service year during which such person so served on active duty for at least 90 consecutive days, subject to subparagraph (B).

''(B) The eligibility age may not be reduced below 55 years of age for any person under subparagraph (A).

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'global war on terrorism service year' means—

''(i) the one-year period beginning on November 16, 2001, and ending on November 15, 2002; and

''(ii) each successive one-year period beginning on November 16 of a year.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF RELATED PROVISIONS OF LAW OR POLICY.—With respect to any provision of law, or of any policy, regulation, or directive of the executive branch, that refers to a member or former member of the uniformed services as being eligible for, or entitled to, retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, but for the fact that the member or former member is under 60 years of age, such provision shall be carried out with respect to that member or former member by substituting for the reference to being 60 years of age a reference to having attained the eligibility age applicable under subsection (f) of section 12731 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), to such member or former member for qualification for such retired pay under subsection (a) of such section.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of November 16, 2001, and shall apply with respect to applications for retired pay that are submitted under section 12731(a) of title 10, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4307. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LEVIN) 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 XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. NORTH KOREA.

(a) COORDINATOR OF POLICY ON NORTH KOREA.—

(1) APPOINTMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint a senior presidential envoy to act as coordinator of United States policy on North Korea.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The individual appointed under paragraph (1) may be known as the ''North Korea Policy Coordinator'' (in this subsection referred to as the ''Coordinator)''.

(3) DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall—

(A) conduct a full and complete interagency review of United States policy toward North Korea;

(B) provide policy direction for negotiations with North Korea relating to nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and other security matters; and

(C) provide leadership for United States participation in Six Party Talks on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the appointment of an individual as Coordinator under paragraph (1), the Coordinator shall submit to the President and Congress an unclassified report, with a classified annex if necessary, on the actions undertaken under paragraph (3). The report shall set forth—

(A) the results of the review under paragraph (3)(A); and

(B) any other matters on North Korea that the individual considers appropriate.

(b) REPORT ON NUCLEAR AND MISSILE PROGRAMS OF NORTH KOREA.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress an unclassified report, with a classified annex as appropriate, on the nuclear program and the missile program of North Korea.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The most current national intelligence estimate on the nuclear program and the missile program of North Korea, and, consistent with the protection of intelligence sources and methods, an unclassified summary of the key judgments in the estimate.

(B) The most current unclassified United States Government assessment, stated as a range if necessary, of (i) the number of nuclear weapons possessed by North Korea and (ii) the amount of nuclear material suitable for weapons use produced by North Korea by plutonium reprocessing and uranium enrichment for each period as follows:

(I) Before October 1994.

(II) Between October 1994 and October 2002.

(III) Between October 2002 and the date of the submittal of the initial report under paragraph (1).

(IV) Each 12-month period after the submittal of the initial report under paragraph (1).

(C) Any other matter relating to the nuclear program or missile program of North Korea that the President considers appropriate.

SA 4308. Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and 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 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 III, add the following:

SEC. ___ EXPANSION OF JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall take appropriate actions to increase the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is organized under chapter 102 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) EXPANSION TARGETS.—In increasing under subsection (a) the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Crops is organized, the Secretaries of the military departments shall seek to organize unites at an additional number of institutions as follows:

(1) In the case of Army units, 15 institutions.

(2) In the case of Navy units, 10 institutions.

(3) In the case of Marine Corps units, 15 institutions.

(4) In the case of Air Force units, 10 institutions.

SA 4309. Mr. SCHUMER 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 I, add the following:

SEC. 105. AMOUNT FOR PROCUREMENT OF HEMOSTATIC AGENTS FOR USE IN THE FIELD.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that every member of the Armed Forces should carry life saving resources on them, including hemostatic agents.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized under section 104 for Defense-wide procurement, $20,000,000 may be made available for the procurement of a sufficient quantity of hemostatic agents, including blood-clotting bandages, for use by members of the Armed Forces in the field so that each soldier serving in Iraq and Afghanistan is issued at least one hemostatic agent and accompanying medical personnel have a sufficient inventory of hemostatic agents.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the distribution of hemostatic agents to members of the Armed Forces serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, including a description of any distribution problems and attempts to resolve such problems.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that MAJ Shannon Sentell, an Army congressional fellow serving in my office, be granted the privileges of the floor for the remainder of the debate on S. 2766.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 514, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 514) to authorize testimony and legal representation in City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony and representation in a criminal trespass action in Municipal Court in Eugene, OR. In this action, an antiwar protestor has been charged with criminally trespassing on the building housing Senator RON WYDEN's Eugene, OR, office on March 20, 2006, for refusing repeated requests by building management to leave the premises. A trial on the charge of trespass is scheduled to commence on June 20, 2006. The defendant has subpoenaed a member of the Senator's staff who had conversations with the defendant and other protestors before and during the charged events. The enclosed resolution would authorize that staff member to testify in connection with this action, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 514) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 514

Whereas, in the case of City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek, Citation No. 06–05546, pending in Municipal Court for the City of Eugene, testimony has been requested from Juine Chada, an employee in the office of Senator Ron Wyden;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent an employee of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Juine Chada is authorized to testify in the case of City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

Sec. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Juine Chada in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3534

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3534) to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild Program.

Mr. FRIST. I now ask for its second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 2 P.M. TODAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open until 2 p.m. today for submission of statements only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 19. 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 resume consideration of S. 2766, the Defense authorization bill; further, that the previous order for executive session be changed so that at 4 p.m. on Monday, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Sandra Ikuta; I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided as provided earlier, with the vote now occurring at 5 p.m., and that the remaining provisions of the order stay in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the first vote of the week will occur on Monday afternoon at 5:00. The vote is on a U.S. circuit judge nomination previously scheduled for 5:30. We have moved that up 30 minutes to 5 o'clock. We will extend the length of that vote slightly to allow for Members' arrival based on the previously ordered time.

Next week, we will continue to work through the amendments to the Defense authorization bill. Votes will be scheduled each day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006, AT 2 p.m.

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 1:47 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 19, 2006, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive Nominations Received by the Senate June 16, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NANCY MONTANEZ-JOHNER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES, VICE ERIC M. BOST.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

MICHAEL V. DUNN, OF IOWA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 19, 2011. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NANCY MONTANEZ-JOHNER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, VICE ERIC M. BOST.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

GEOFFREY S. BACINO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 27, 2013, VICE FRANZ S. LEICHTER, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS C. FOLEY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO IRELAND.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

MANFREDI PICCOLOMINI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE ANDREW LADIS, TERM EXPIRED.

KENNETH R. WEINSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE DAVID HERTZ, TERM EXPIRED.

JAY WINIK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE NATHAN O. HATCH, TERM EXPIRED.

JOSIAH BUNTING III, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE WRIGHT L. LASSITER, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

WILFRED M. MCCLAY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. (REAPPOINTMENT)

ROBERT S. MARTIN, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE JEFFREY D. WALLIN, TERM EXPIRED.

MARY HAYBECK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE JAMES R. STONER, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

KARL HESS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2008, VICE DELORES M. ETTER, RESIGNED.

THOMAS N. TAYLOR, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE DANIEL SIMBERLOFF, TERM EXPIRED.

RICHARD F. THOMPSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE MARK S. WRIGHTON, TERM EXPIRED.

MARK R. ABBOTT, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE JANE LUBCHENCO, TERM EXPIRED.

CAMILLA PERSSON BENBOW, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE WARREN M. WASHINGTON, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHN T. BRUER, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE JOHN A. WHITE, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

PATRICIA D. GALLOWAY, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE DIANA S. NATALICIO, TERM EXPIRED.

JOSE-MARIE GRIFFITHS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012, VICE NINA V. FEDOROFF, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JAMES C. CHARLIFUE, OF COLORADO
CATHERINE M. TRUJILLO, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

KAREN LEE ANDERSON, OF MARYLAND
NOEL B. ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN EDWARD CALLAHAN, OF NEW YORK
JON M. CHASSON, OF FLORIDA
IDRIS M. DIAZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW MARC HERSCOWITZ, OF CALIFORNIA
MAI L. HUANG, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL HUTCHINSON, OF WASHINGTON
F. CATHERINE JOHNSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
WILLIAM F. PENOYAR, OF VIRGINIA
ANNE MARIE YASTISHOCK, OF PENNSYLVANIA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BARBARA J. MARTIN, OF MARYLAND

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ROLF RICHARD ANDERSON, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL BLACKMAN, OF FLORIDA
ALEXANDER V. BOND, OF TEXAS
STEPHEN M. BRAGER, OF MARYLAND
CAROLINE B. BREARLEY, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN L. CARNEY, OF FLORIDA
COURTNEY L. CHUBB, OF FLORIDA
DAVID JAMES CONSIGNY, OF WISCONSIN
CHRISTOPHER M. CUSHING, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ROBERT E. DAVIDSON, OF NEW YORK
REGINA R. DENNIS, OF MISSOURI
BARBARA J. DICKERSON, OF MARYLAND
ANNE MARGARET DIX, OF MARYLAND
LAWRENCE W. DOLAN, OF NEW JERSEY
JOHN LAURENCE DUNLOP, OF NEW JERSEY
RAMONA MARTINA MULLER EL HAMZAOUI, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
MARGARET ELIZABETH ENIS, OF OKLAHOMA
MERVYN ANTHONY FARROE, OF FLORIDA
JEANNIE FRIEDMANN, OF CALIFORNIA
LUIS FERNANDO GARCIA, OF FLORIDA
NANCY GODFREY, OF FLORIDA
ANN HIRSCHEY, OF NEW YORK
MELINDA HOBBS, OF MISSOURI
GWENETH HUGHES, OF GEORGIA
PAUL R. KOLSTAD, OF VIRGINIA
YVES KORE, OF MISSISSIPPI
JEFFREY LEHRER, OF NEW JERSEY
ANDREW LEVIN, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY R. LEVINE, OF VIRGINIA
DALE D. LEWIS, OF FLORIDA
JENNIFER M. LINK, OF ILLINOIS
KURT P. LOW, OF TEXAS
MANUEL MARROQUIN, OF FLORIDA
JOSEPH T. MCGEE, OF FLORIDA
J. MICHAEL NEHRBASS, OF WASHINGTON
VAN N. NGUYEN, OF TEXAS
CRISTINA AUSTRIA OLIVE, OF FLORIDA
KATHRYN J. PANTHER, OF VIRGINIA
LYNE PAQUETTE, OF FLORIDA
JOHN A. PENNELL, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW K. POSACKI, OF FLORIDA
MARGARET KATE SANCHO-MORRIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN MORRIS STAMM, OF OHIO
LOREN O. STODDARD, OF UTAH
TANYA SUZANNA URQUIETA, OF TEXAS
LYNN NORTHCUTT VEGA, OF TEXAS
VIRGINIA KAY WADDELL, OF TEXAS
SAIMING T. WAN, OF CALIFORNIA
LISA Y. WHITLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMES S. WRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DARION K. AKINS, OF TEXAS
JOHN C. KELLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED: CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SARAH C. ELLERMAN, OF KANSAS
ROBIN KESSLER, OF OHIO
JAMES E. SITTON, OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMES M. ACUNA, OF MARYLAND
MONA LAKHAL AINSWORTH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUSAN MARIE ALEXANDER, OF VIRGINIA
ANA M. AMANS, OF VIRGINIA
GILLIAN R. APFEL, OF WASHINGTON
TARO BERNARD ARAI, OF MARYLAND
AMBER AURA, OF CALIFORNIA
LILA BLAKELY BANDY, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMY K. BARNUM, OF UTAH
DAVIDA A. BAXTER, OF VIRGINIA
AMITABHA BHOUMIK, OF VIRGINIA
BRENT LYLE BIGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY M. BISHOP, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINA LYNCH BOBROW, OF MARYLAND
MONICA ALEXANDRA BODUSZYNSKI, OF CALIFORNIA
MATT BONAIUTO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MANOELA GUIDORIZZI BORGES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTEN M. BRADLEY, OF TEXAS
RANDALL BROWN, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW WESLEY BROWNE, OF VIRGINIA
MARK W. BURT, OF VIRGINIA
JAMIE J. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA
HOWARD MATTHEW CAMERON, OF VIRGINIA
DOLORES CANAVAN, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE W. CARLETON, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA CHAMBERLIN, OF NEW MEXICO
LAUREN C.W. CHARWAT, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH A. COCHRANE, OF VIRGINIA
NILES COLE, OF NEW YORK
STACY L. COMP, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DAVID J. CONK, OF VIRGINIA
JERWAYNE DENNARD COOK, OF VIRGINIA
LESLIE KAY DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA
CYNTHIA DAY, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER FINNEY DUGMORE, OF VIRGINIA
SONJA W. EALEY, OF VIRGINIA
DANEAN F. EGAN, OF VIRGINIA
LULZIME ELMAZI, OF VIRGINIA
JASON DANIEL EVANS, OF VIRGINIA
RON FIE'EIKI, OF VIRGINIA
TERRY T. FINNECY, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW BRENDAN FLACK, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. FLAHERTY, OF MARYLAND
DAVID E. FLIEG, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTI L. FLIS, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT EMMETT FORD, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES T. GALLAGHER, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN A. GARTMAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JESSICA GAYLOR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PAUL W. GEARY, OF VIRGINIA
BETH W. GOLDBERG, OF MARYLAND
MEGAN ALANNA GOODFELLOW, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES R. GOODMAN III, OF FLORIDA
JESSICA ELAINE GUPTA, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA J. HAGER, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW CURTIS HALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BENJAMIN C. HARRIS, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW MICHAEL HARTSOG, OF FLORIDA
AARON B. HAWKINS, OF MARYLAND
KAREN E. HEIMSOTH, OF ILLINOIS
LISE JEAN HERBERT, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA JOY HESTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIC HEYDEN, OF TENNESSEE
THOMAS C. HILLEARY, OF VIRGINIA
DARCIE A. HOFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
NAWANA S. HOLT, OF GEORGIA
MICHAEL D. HORTON, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN FRANK INGRAM, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID ALLAN JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
GAIL R. JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
DOUGLAS E. JOHNSTON, OF MASSACHUSETTS
NATHAN A. JONES, OF UTAH
JOHN C. KASTNING, OF NEBRASKA
JOHN G. KERSHAW, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BENJAMIN L. KESSLER, OF VIRGINIA
SOFIA MARIAM KHILJI, OF VIRGINIA
JIYOON KIM, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN JAMES KLOETZEL, OF VIRGINIA
MICHELLE K. KOOP, OF VIRGINIA
ROBYN KIM LABBE, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. LACOMBE, OF VIRGINIA
R. NICHOLAS LARSEN, OF UTAH
CHRISTINE E. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
TI-YING LEE, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY MICHAEL LEHMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HEIDI R. LIN, OF FLORIDA
ELIZABETH C. LINDER, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS K. LIPPMANN, OF VIRGINIA
TISHA R. LOEPER-VITI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARY JO A. LONG, OF VIRGINIA
AMY L. LORENZEN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DARIO N. LORENZETTI, OF VIRGINIA
HERBERT GORDON MACKAY, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT ALAN MAKENS, OF MICHIGAN
JOSEPH R. MARTELLO, OF VIRGINIA
ABRAMO MASTROIANNI, OF VIRGINIA
DOUGLAS J. MATHEWS, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY RYAN MILES, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CATHERINE CONNELL MCSHERRY, OF FLORIDA
JAMES F. MONTGOMERY, OF VIRGINIA
DEWEY E. MOORE, JR., OF VIRGINIA
DENISE MICHELE MORAGA, OF VIRGINIA
ROBIN K. MOSER, OF VIRGINIA
SUPRANORM MULVEY, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA LOUISE NEAL, OF MARYLAND
DATHANH T. NGUYEN, OF VIRGINIA
MBALLE M. NKEMBE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIRIAM NOVIK, OF MARYLAND
ANDREW MICHAEL NOZNESKY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAUREEN A. O'NEILL, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW LANG OSBORNE, OF VIRGINIA
ALICE N. PATERAS, OF FLORIDA
JOAN D. PATTERSON, OF UTAH
EMILY S. PETERS, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG T. PIKE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER G. PIXLEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LORI B. PORTER, OF MARYLAND
NADA N. PROUTY, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL P. RAHILL, OF VIRGINIA
LISA BETH RAYMOND, OF MARYLAND
GREGORY L. ROBERTS, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD MILLER ROBERTS, OF TEXAS
THERON P. ROBISON, OF VIRGINIA
HEATHER MARIE ROGERS, OF MINNESOTA
ZACHARIAH L. ROLLINS, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY VICTORIA RONEK, OF NEW YORK
WAYNE M. ROSEN, OF VIRGINIA
MARK T. RYNIAK, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN J. SALVERSON, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS MICHAEL SCHMIDT, OF MISSOURI
WAYNE D. SCHMIDT, OF IDAHO
LEO A. SERVELLO, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY M. SHAFFER, OF VIRGINIA
TRACY L. SHOLES, OF MARYLAND
MIMI L. SMITH, OF FLORIDA
TRISTAN M. SPICELAND, OF WASHINGTON
KIMBERLY L. STERGULZ, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID J. STRASHNOY, OF CALIFORNIA

TODD STRUMKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREA R. TALLEY, OF TEXAS
MAURA L. TIERNEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WILLIAM R. UDELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KURT WESTON UPDEGRAFF, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN J. WEISS, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER A. WHITE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARINA S. WHITE, OF MARYLAND
CAROL F. WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER LEIGH WILLIAMS, OF TEXAS
PETER M. WILLIS, OF VIRGINIA
BROCK DANIEL WILSON, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN ELIZABETH WILSON, OF ILLINOIS
PETER YOON, OF VIRGINIA

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

HEATHER ANN SCHILDGE, OF VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BARBARA MATTHEWS, OF VIRGINIA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MAURICE L. MCFANN, JR., 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL J. SILVA, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL STYLES, FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVANT AND DESERT CIVIC LEADER

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant for both the Federal government and the desert communities in my district—Michael B. Styles, the longtime national president of the Federal Managers Association and one of the guiding lights of Copper Mountain Community College.

My good friend Mike Styles has been a dedicated member of the Federal Manager Association's General Executive Board since 1986. He served as national vice president, zone president, and chapter president. As national president for some 15 years until this past March, his efforts are a testament to the highest level of commitment an individual can demonstrate on the behalf of federal workers.

His leadership among federal managers was recognized when the President appointed him in 1995 to the National Partnership Council, which advises the President on federal labor-management issues and relations. His six years on the council helped open up communication between the management industry and the Administration and Congress.

In his long career in Tactical Data Systems management with the Department of the Navy and United State Marine Corps, Mike helped make significant improvements in systems acquisition and logistics support. The Fleet Marine Force, one of his main projects, has been improved considerably by his efforts.

He spent 30 years as a lecturer, facilitator and consultant, specializing in education theory and practice. Since 1986, Mike has taught graduate and undergraduate courses as adjunct professor at the National University School of Management and Technology. He is a tremendous asset as President of the Federal Management Institute, the association's education division, having received a master's degree in education from the University of Redlands. He was also a fellow at Syracuse University's Maxwell Center for Advanced Public Management.

The citizens of Joshua Tree, a desert city in my congressional district, are particularly grateful for Mike Styles' contributions to the Copper Mountain Community College District. Mike was the original founder of the Friends of Copper Mountain College, established in 1983. This charitable organization provides students with educational support and introduces them to community service. He has served on the college's board of directors since 1996, and has been president of the College Foundation for the past two years. This college is especially important to our federal workforce, since it serves Marines and their dependents who are stationed at the nearby Air-Ground Combat Center at Twentynine Palms.

The Morongo Basin has also benefited greatly from Mike's community service. He serves on the United Way's Board of Directors, is a member of the Knight of Columbus, and plays an active role in the chamber of commerce. Having worked with Mike over the years, I can attest to his dedication in bettering the Inland Empire region of California.

Mr. Speaker, Mike Styles has been an exemplary public servant and civic leader, and thousands of our federal employees and students have benefited from his expertise and dedication to education excellence. In addition to ending his long service as FMA president this spring, Mike is stepping down as president of the college foundation. Please join me in thanking him for his dedication, and wishing him well in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSE ANESTHETISTS (AANA) ON THEIR 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BEN CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to an outstanding group of representatives from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA) on their 75th anniversary of their founding, as well as the Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) for their dedication to quality anesthesia care and patient safety. CRNAs are advanced practice nurses who are the hands-on providers of approximately 65 percent of all anesthesia given in the United States each year.

Nurses were the first professional group to provide anesthesia services in the United States. Established in the late 1800s, nurse anesthesia has since become recognized as the first clinical nursing specialty. On June 17, 1931, pioneer nurse anesthetist Agatha Hodgins founded the National Association of Nurse Anesthetists (NANA) in Cleveland, Ohio. Eight years later, NANA officially changed its name to the present AANA. The oldest national organization of anesthesia providers in the country, the AANA is the professional association for more than 35,000 CRNAs and student nurse anesthetists.

CRNAs administer every type of anesthetic and provide care for every type of surgery or procedure, from open heart to cataract to pain management. CRNAs practice in every setting in which anesthesia is delivered: traditional hospital surgical suites and obstetrical delivery rooms; critical access hospitals; ambulatory surgical centers; the offices of dentists, podiatrists, ophthalmologists, plastic surgeons, and pain management specialists; and U.S. Military, Public Health Services, and Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare facilities.

CRNAs are the sole anesthesia providers in approximately two thirds of all rural hospitals in the United States, enabling these healthcare facilities to offer obstetrical, surgical, and trauma stabilization services. In some states, CRNAs are the sole providers in nearly 100 percent of the rural hospitals.

Since World War I, nurse anesthetists have been the principal anesthesia providers in combat areas of every war in which the United States has been engaged. During the Panama action, only nurse anesthetists were sent with the fighting forces. Nurse anesthetists have been held as prisoners of war, suffered combat wounds during wartime service, and have lost their lives serving their country. The names of two CRNAs killed in the Vietnam War are engraved on the Vietnam Memorial Wall in Washington, DC. Military nurse anesthetists have been honored and decorated by the United States and foreign governments for outstanding achievements, dedication to duty, and competence in treating the seriously wounded. In the 21st Century, CRNAs continue to care for servicemen and women, their dependents, and veterans—whether on the frontlines of Iraq and Afghanistan, or in military hospitals and VA facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA and their 35,000 Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) as they celebrate 75 years of invaluable service to their patients and to our country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CORAL REEF LEGACY ACT OF 2006

HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Coral Reef Conservation Legacy Act of 2006, an important environmental conservation bill, during Congressional Oceans Week.

This legislation builds on the foundation of bills introduced earlier this Congress by Senator INOUYE and Congressman FALEOMAVAEGA. Both of those bills sparked a discussion on coral reef conservation. I appreciate the leadership of these two gentlemen on this issue and I look forward to working with them as the legislation moves through Congress.

The development of the Coral Reef Conservation Legacy Act is a result of a collaborative effort to incorporate comments from a number of coral reef experts within the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Coral Reef Task Force, and nongovernmental organizations. All of these groups made suggestions on ways to improve the earlier legislation and this bill incorporates a number of their suggestions.

I believe the Coral Reef Conservation Legacy Act will benefit coral reef conservation and will strengthen the roles of the states and territories through community-based planning

grants and through the Local Action Strategies. The bill supports the continued use of these successful conservation management tools. To be successful in the long-term it is imperative to have the local and regional entities involved in the conservation of coral reef resources from the start.

This legislation also recognizes the important role the Department of the Interior has played in coral reef conservation and would authorize much needed funding for their activities. This bill, however, does not change the fundamental jurisdictions and roles of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce, but recognizes that the Department of the Interior has a role in this endeavor. In addition the bill continues to support and recognize the accomplishments and conservation efforts of the Department of Commerce. Both agencies have participated in coral reef conservation activities and this bill encourages their continued cooperation and coordination.

While the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000 has been very successful in restoring and protecting coral reefs, it has had limitations in its grant program. The Coral Reef Conservation Legacy Act would allow for multi-year cooperative agreements between the Federal Government and other agencies, states, territories, academic institutions, and non-governmental organizations. This multi-year authority will allow more stability in funding for important projects that might now be finalized in or limited to one year.

This legislation also codifies the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force. The Task Force has been an important voice for coral reef activities and has coordinated the activities in support of coral reef conservation. This codification recognizes the important work of the Task Force and the indispensable role they have played in the conservation of coral reefs.

The Coral Reef Conservation Legacy Act will continue the ongoing efforts to protect and restore coral reefs. I look forward to working with my colleagues as this bill moves through the legislative process.

STATEMENT HONORING ROGER ANDAL

HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to honor the life of Roger Andal, Vietnam veteran and former South Dakota Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, who died on Tuesday, June 13, 2006, at the age of 57 from complications after surgery in his battle against Crohn's disease.

I am deeply saddened by the news that my good friend Roger Andal has passed away. Roger lived a life of service to his fellow Americans. He was drafted in July 1969 and was sent to Vietnam that December where he served as a platoon medic with the Army's 4th Infantry Division. Roger served the next five months in the jungle around Pleiku in the central highlands of Vietnam before being hit with shrapnel from a rocket propelled grenade. He spent the following five months in military hospitals before being honorably discharged on April 13, 1971.

Following his tour of duty in Vietnam, Roger became one of the most tenacious and most effective advocates for veterans that South Dakota, or the nation, has ever seen. Roger's cause was righteous and his will was unyielding. But even in those tough and passionate battles on issues he cared about, he also brought a caring spirit, a hearty laugh, and a ready hug that touched all who knew him. Roger relished a good battle, but he was as kindhearted as he was dogged in his pursuit of ensuring that the federal government keep its promises to our nation's veterans. As State Commander of the South Dakota Disabled American Veterans, he was a true leader, who fought the tough fights and led by example. He quietly suffered the effects of his own injuries while working so hard to ease the pain of others, including the physical and mental pain experienced by his fellow combat veterans years after their service to the country.

Today, we remember and honor the noble service and the undeterred commitment of Roger Andal to the United States of America. I join with all South Dakotans in expressing my sympathies to his family. Roger's commitment to and sacrifice for our nation will never be forgotten. The lives of countless veterans and their families, including my own, were touched and helped by Roger's work, and we all have a heavy burden to carry in his absence. My thoughts and prayers are with Roger's wife Peggy, his children and all his family in this time of sorrow and I look forward to continuing to fight for those things Roger cared about so deeply.

COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5252) to promote the deployment of broadband networks and services:

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I also want to add that Mr. MCCRERY wanted to cosponsor H.R. 5252, but was unable to do so because the bill already had been reported by the House Energy and Commerce Committee. I certainly appreciate his interest in cosponsoring the bill nonetheless.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PATRICK JENNINGS

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patrick Jennings, who has diligently served the Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce and Agency Organization, of which I am the Chairman, for the past several months.

Prior to Patrick beginning his service with the Subcommittee, he served as the retirement policy expert on law enforcement and firefighter issues for the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). In this role, he took the lead for retirement-related input to the Congressionally-mandated OPM report entitled Federal Law Enforcement Pay and Benefits (July 2004). Patrick served as primary expert for advising the Center for Retirement and Insurance Services on competing survivor claims, state laws on inheritance and marriage, and foreign marriages. He also acted as agency representative in administrative litigation before the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, thereby promoting OPM's position in a variety of retirement areas.

Patrick began his service with the Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce and Agency Organization in January 2005, as a detailee from the OPM. Over the course of the past year and a half, Patrick has proven himself time and again as a man of exemplary professionalism. As Senior Counsel, Patrick's service was of an extraordinary caliber, where he made recommendations on a variety of issues and legislation before the Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Patrick Jennings. The dedication he has shown to the work of the Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce and Agency Organization is greatly appreciated, and he will be surely missed. I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF WYNNE ANTONIO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Mrs. Wynne Antonio, upon her retirement after 35 years of dedicated service in the Cleveland Municipal School District.

For 35 years, Mrs. Wynne Antonio has loved, nurtured and taught Cleveland's school children with all her heart. She has worked collaboratively with parents to involve them in both decision-making as well as supportive roles. Mrs. Antonio went beyond the call of duty to expose her students to the arts, culture and government of Ohio to prove that a child's education goes beyond the classroom.

In addition to her dedication to her students, Mrs. Antonio has been an active leader in the Cleveland Teachers Union as a building chair, a member of many internal committees, and the chair of Community Relations for the Cleveland Teachers Union Executive Board. On a political level, Mrs. Antonio has been active in local, state and national political campaigns. It is also not uncommon to find this distinguished educator at street rallies for peace, human rights and economic justice. Just this past spring, my office had the privilege of giving her and the students of Carl F. Shuler Middle School a tour of the Capitol building during their visit to Washington DC.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor, recognition and gratitude of Mrs. Wynne Antonio for commitment to education in Northeast Ohio. Mrs. Antonio's dedication to her work serves as a model to her colleagues and an inspiration to us all. I wish Mrs. Antonio many blessed years of happiness and am sure that while her professional career has

come to an end, she will continue to have an affect on us all.

HONORING JAMES A. WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR, US–VISIT PROGRAM AT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of James (Jim) Williams, Director of the Department of Homeland Security's US–VISIT program. After a strong tenure heading up US–VISIT, Jim has agreed to take on new challenges as Commissioner of the Federal Acquisition Service in the General Services Administration.

Jim is a selfless public servant, and has been an effective leader at the Department of Homeland Security. US–VISIT is a continuum of security measures that keep America's doors open and our Nation secure. US–VISIT begins overseas, at the U.S. consular offices issuing visas, where visitors' biometrics are collected and checked against a database of known criminals and suspected terrorists. When the visitor arrives at the port of entry, US–VISIT use the same biometrics to verify the person at the port is the same person who received the visa.

Jim understands that strong security measures, when done right, keep the Nation secure and open to legitimate travelers and tourists. He has had the vision and follow-through to oversee the installation of biometric entry procedures at 154 land border ports of entry and at airports and seaports with international arrivals. In turn, US–VISIT has processed nearly 60 million visitors to date, and denied entry to more than 1,100 criminals and immigration violators. At the same time, US–VISIT has not affected wait times at the border and in some instances has actually reduced inspection times. These accomplishments have been appropriately recognized by the ten members of the 9/11 Commission, who gave US–VISIT the highest grade on their final report card.

Thanks in large part to Jim and the team he has assembled, we now have 21st century tools to address our emerging security challenges. These tools are allowing the U.S. to deal more effectively with threats of terrorism, while keeping us competitive in the global economy. I know that Jim will be missed at US–VISIT. I have enjoyed working with him over the past 2 years, and would like to wish him well as he takes on new challenges at the General Services Administration.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ARIEL COHEN

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ariel Cohen for her remarkable recovery from pediatric stroke and the inspiration she has provided to other pediatric patients at the National Rehabilitation Hospital (NRH).

Ariel's life was profoundly changed on November 30, 2005 when she was struck with a very rare, often initially misdiagnosed, and almost always seriously debilitating condition—pediatric stroke. Having initially experienced complete paralysis on the left side of her body, Ariel was truly fighting for her life. After eight days in Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Ariel entered NRH. Upon her arrival Ariel quickly progressed in the Pediatric Unit at NRH to the point of being able to sit unassisted, and was soon capable of limited weight bearing on her left side.

The first two weeks at NRH saw a striking turn in Ariel's recovery as the strength and control in Ariel's leg, trunk and face progressed rapidly. The Cohen's credit NRH, and specifically the National Center for Children's Rehabilitation, for offering Ariel a well balanced approach to recovery, one that utilized the many disciplines of physical rehabilitation, counseling and aquatic therapy, the most technologically advanced equipment and processes, as well as the incorporation of peer support and an incredible amount of positive reinforcement. Within the first week, Ariel learned to really like and trust her therapists. She looked forward to her sessions, and she was always made to feel successful—no matter how small the gain.

For all that Ariel has received; she has given back—cooking her famous chocolate chip pancakes for the NRH team members who assisted in her rehab, using her own room decorations, surprising a fellow teen at NRH with a room makeover in a well-timed "sneak attack." She was an inspiration for all the pediatric patients at NRH—working incredibly hard with a spirit and determination to recover that has never waned. And while it is true that no 13-year-old girl wants to stand out, Ariel has taken in stride that by standing out, she offers much to other victims of pediatric stroke. From that day in November and Ariel's subsequent ongoing recovery springs a wealth of knowledge on the part of the medical community and, as Ariel hopes, educational resources for other families coping with the effects of pediatric stroke. Every day, Ariel pushes herself to recover more fully, always keenly aware of the gifts she received as a patient at NRH—the keys to own her recovery, mentally, emotionally and physically. As the signs and symptoms of her stroke fade by the day, a complete recovery of use and function now appears probable.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Ariel Cohen. Her recovery from pediatric stroke is truly an inspiration and her efforts to assist in the recovery of her fellow patients are commendable. When I met Ariel, I couldn't help but be inspired by her determination and passion, which is why I am recognizing her today. She is truly a remarkable young woman, and I wish her the best in her continuing recovery.

INTRODUCTION ON THE IRAQ CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. BARDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Iraq Congressional Oversight Enhancement Act. I serve on the Committee on Armed Services in the House and have traveled to Iraq 8 times. These trips have allowed me to see Iraq first-hand, to meet with our fighting men and women and civilians serving there, and to learn from them the facts on the ground in that country. This legislation recognizes the complexity of the mission in Iraq and the need for enhanced Congressional oversight based upon comprehensive reporting from the administration.

This legislation is intended to enhance Congressional oversight of our operations in Iraq. This bill would not set a timetable to dictate the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. This bill would require that the President transmit periodically to Congress a consolidated, comprehensive report on the implementation of the National Strategy for Victory in Iraq. This bill would also provide the Congress the vital measures or other benchmarks for Iraq's political, security, and economic development and metrics by which progress towards these benchmarks can be more effectively measured and assessed.

This legislation would affirm Congress's support of our troops and civilian personnel in Iraq, and expresses its concern regarding the continued, deadly insurgent attacks against them. This legislation also would affirm Congress's support for the formation of a democratic, pluralistic, federal, and united Iraq, while urging elected Iraqi leaders to maintain and preserve a national unity government for the Iraqi people. Moreover, this bill recognizes the complex and interdependent nature of the challenges associated with the political, security, infrastructure, and economic development of Iraq, including governance capacity building at and between the various levels of government in Iraq.

The National Strategy for Victory in Iraq, presented by the President on November 30, 2005, is an informative document. The Strategy represents progress toward defining the terms for victory in Iraq. I believe, however, more progress on defining the current mission in Iraq and the benchmarks for achieving victory are necessary. This legislation would require the President to transmit to Congress a report to back-up the Strategy by identifying benchmarks and by using metrics.

It is true that two recent legislative initiatives have required reports along these lines. They are the section entitled "Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq" of House Conference Report 109–72 accompanying H.R. 1268, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005, Public Law 109–13, and the U.S. Policy in Iraq Act, Section 1227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, Public Law 109–163.

These reports, provided to Congress by the Secretary of Defense, contain useful information. But, when taken together, the reports are not sufficient for Congress to fully exercise its oversight responsibilities pertaining to this war. These reports also do not provide the American people a clear and full picture of what the United States seeks to achieve in Iraq, what the United States Armed Forces and civilian personnel are doing to achieve those objectives, and where we are in the process of achieving them—at the various levels of government within Iraq.

Our service in this body is never more consequential than it is when our troops are in harm's way. Debate regarding issues of war and peace deserves sober reflection, reasoned thinking, critical focus, and balanced

perspective. This is an institutional responsibility for the House of Representatives. But it is also a personal responsibility for each of us as representatives of our constituents. The sacrifices made by our military and civilian personnel serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, those made by Coalition personnel, and those made by Iraqis themselves only further reinforce the need to elevate our discussion on the merits of and challenges associated with what remains of the mission in Iraq.

I believe an honest and open exchange of views on the substance of what our country and our allies seek to achieve in Iraq is needed. This legislation would provide us the information we need to make better informed decisions on policy with regard to Iraq.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF CHESTER AND IRENE BROZEK

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to pay tribute to Chester and Irene Brozek of Three Rivers, Massachusetts, upon the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

It was June 16, 1956, that Chester and Irene wed at Saints Peter and Paul Church in Three Rivers, Massachusetts. They have lived their lives together in that small town, attended the same schools—in the same class—and raised four sons and a daughter; Steven, Jim, David, Carolyn and Michael.

Chester, or Zab, worked at the Monsanto Company in Indian Orchard for more than 30 years. Irene worked for the Town of Palmer in the Tax Collector's Office, becoming the tax collector and retiring from that position.

On Saturday, June 24th Chester and Irene will return to Saints Peter and Paul Church to celebrate with their children, their 12 grandchildren, relatives and friends this momentous occasion. I congratulate them and wish them health, best wishes and happiness in their years to come.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GIBRAN BAYDOUN

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gibran Baydoun for winning the 2006 National Endowment for the Arts Nevada Poetry Out Loud State Championship.

Gibran Baydoun attends Green Valley High School in Henderson, Nevada and recently won the Nevada State Finals for the National Endowment for the Arts Poetry Out Loud Contest held in Carson City. Created by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Poetry Foundation, this program encourages high school students to memorize and perform great poems. Poetry Out Loud invites the dynamic aspects of slam poetry, spoken word, and theater into the English class. This exciting new program helps students master public speaking skills, build self-confidence, and learn about their literary heritage.

Mr. Speaker, having met and listened to Gibran Baydoun, I am proud to honor him for his success at the Nevada Poetry Out Loud State Championship. Gibran's successful memorization and performance of great poems at the Nevada State Finals is a note worthy achievement.

ANSWERED PRAYERS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the costs of Hurricane Katrina and Rita are far more than dollar amounts. For days, thousands of people fought for survival among the rising flood waters, lack of food and water, and outlaws victimizing the weak and helpless. In an attempt to lead the smallest victims of the hurricanes to safety, desperate, yet well-meaning parents sent their children with family and evacuation workers fleeing for safety. Their hope was to reunite after the storm; however, full panic soon engulfed Louisiana and Texas. Many parents found it impossible to locate these children once the storms had passed. Terrified parents made heart wrenching pleas to anyone who would listen. They spent countless hours praying for news of their kids.

Mr. Speaker, one organization heard their prayers and responded with the will and manpower to find these children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children would undertake the tremendous task of locating 5,172 missing children. Mr. Speaker, after the winds stopped and the flood waters receded, all 5,172 children were found. It was only through the unwavering and relentless dedication that these children were found, and returned to the safe arms of their parents. I now pay tribute to those tireless children crusaders.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, was established in 1984 by John and Reve Walsh in response to the kidnapping and disappearance of their son, Adam, in 1981. The center makes it their mission to locate, and successfully bring home, missing children across the United States. When Hurricanes Katrina and Rita hit Louisiana and Texas, the U.S. Department of Justice requested NCMEC's help in locating the displaced children of the hurricanes' victims. NCMEC responded with lightning speed, establishing a Katrina Missing Persons Hotline, with 30 telephones and 160 highly trained Project ALERT and Project ADAM volunteers to man the hotlines. Over the next few days, they would report thousands of missing child sightings.

These child crusaders spent long days and nights looking throughout America for these missing children. Photographs were used to help identify these children. The center tracked down leads, handled phone calls, and in the end, reunited families. They did not perform these tasks all on their own, however. The U.S. Postal Inspection Service, USPIS, American Airlines, and thousands of nameless, silent volunteers aided the NCMEC in the successful recovery of all 5,172 missing children.

The U.S. Postal Inspection Service responded to the prayers for help much like the NCMEC. These highly dedicated lawmen and women used the U.S. Postal Service's change of address information system to reunite these families. Safety precautions were taken by the USPIS to ensure no misuse of the information system occurred. Members of the highly trained Project ALERT and Project ADAM teams, as well as the NCMEC case analysts, worked in cooperation with the special Hurricanes Katrina and Rita change of address operation in Tennessee, reunited children with parents. American Airlines became the angels in the sky for the NCMEC, donating numerous airline tickets, which successfully led to 89 children being brought home safe.

I was present when First Lady Laura Bush held a reception on Monday, June 12, at the White House to show appreciation to all those wonderful people. She invited these heroes to join her, along with six Members of Congress, and several of the reunited families. Everyone extended heart-felt gratitude for the tireless efforts achieved by these individuals. Rebecca Gonzales, wife of Attorney General Alberto Gonzales and John and Reve Walsh were present as well. The First Lady praised the collaborative efforts of these organizations and individuals, expressing her gratitude for the heroes who relentlessly crusaded for the most helpless victims of the hurricanes—the children.

It is my honor to pay tribute to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, as well as the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, American Airlines, and thousands of volunteers for answering the prayers of the despondent hurricane parents. Today, 5,172 children have been led back to their families, another example of Americans helping Americans when the tidewaters of trouble have risen.

WE THE PEOPLE ALABAMA CLASS PLACES FOURTH AT NATIONAL COMPETITION ON THE CONSTITUTION

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, from April 29–May 1, 2006, approximately 1,200 students from across the country participated in the national finals competition of We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution, the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. I am pleased to announce that Vestavia Hills High School from Birmingham, Alabama placed fourth in the competition. The We the People program is administered by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education by act of Congress.

The We the People national finals is a three-day academic competition that simulates a congressional hearing in which the students "testify" before a panel of judges on constitutional topics. Students demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles as they evaluate, take, and defend positions on relevant historical and contemporary issues. Among the questions students

responded to in the competition includes, ''Is judicial review essential for the functioning of our American constitutional democracy? Explain and justify your position.''

Mr. Speaker, the names of these outstanding students from Vestavia Hills High School are as follows:

Grace Anthony, George Bolshinskiy, Barrett Bowdre, Courtney Bragg, Jeannettee Dooley, Daniel Driscoll, Claire Foster, Sarah Graffeo, Lauren Howard, Sarah McKibben, Patrick Mulligan, John Nicholson, Tiffany Parrish, Hanna Perry, Julie Phillips, Joseph Siegelman, Kendal Spires, Wes Stevenson, Emily Unnasch, Amy Watson, Ryan Woodford, and Ansley Zarra.

I also wish to commend the teacher of the class, Amy Maddox, who was responsible for preparing the student class for the national finals competition. Also worthy of special recognition are Janice Cowin and Kerri Williamson, the state coordinators and Jeff Northrup, the district coordinator, who are among those responsible for implementing the We the People program in my district.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues in the House, please join me in congratulating these young constitutional experts for their outstanding achievement.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO FRANCES WILSON

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frances Wilson, a wonderful woman whom I have known and admired all of my life. My Aunt Frances will be celebrating her 80th birthday on June 17th in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Born on July 1st, 1926, Frances was the youngest of four, with three older brothers: Don, Russ, and my Dad Ron. She spent her childhood years in Humbolt, Iowa. On January 19, 1947 Frances married the late Daryl ''Buck'' Wilson and had two children, Sandra and Brian. She also has two grandchildren: Joshua, who married Renee, and Jacob. She also has two great-grandchildren, Sidney and Sawyer.

In 1955 she began work as a telephone operator and was one of the first working mothers in her family. As a very hard-working independent woman, Aunt Frances finished a long employment career in the gift shop of the Gold Strike Hotel and Casino in Boulder City, Nevada, which is now known as the Hacienda Hotel and Casino, retiring at age 77. She currently resides in Denver, Colorado where she is close to her daughter and often visits her son and his wife Carleen in Minnesota.

She is proud of her family and has openly admitted that her greatest joy comes from spending time with her great-grandchildren, who adore their great-grandmother tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize my aunt, Frances Wilson on the floor of the House. I commend her for her contributions to me, the rest of my family, and for her commitment to the community.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION HONORING OUR NATION'S SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a House resolution recognizing and honoring America's senior citizens. Such a resolution is important because our seniors have made countless sacrifices and contributions that have helped make this country great. This resolution is an opportunity for Congress to officially recognize the impact of this influential segment of our society.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Representative WALTER JONES, for his fervent support of this resolution. His efforts reflect his value for senior citizens and the role they play in our society and our national conscience.

Undoubtedly, senior citizens have played an important role in the development of this nation. They have fought in significant military conflicts such as World War I, World War II, and the Korean War. I have full confidence that Americans throughout the ages will remember and honor such monumental sacrifices.

During their lifetimes, senior citizens have also experienced a myriad of profound social and cultural changes that have made this country what it is today. I believe that nothing is more important to our ability to effectively address our present than understanding the lessons learned from those who have come before us. This resolution encourages children and students to take the time to learn from senior citizens. The knowledge and experience that older Americans have acquired over their lifetimes serve as a window to our collective past. It is imperative that we as a society facilitate the sharing of this information between generations.

As we recognize the contributions of seniors, it is important that we understand their needs. So much of what we do in Congress directly impacts the lives of elderly men and women. The decisions that we make on Capitol Hill have tangible effects on the health, pocketbooks, and livelihood of each and every senior citizen. It is essential that we remember the individuals that our actions will impact as we consider issues such as Medicare, Social Security, veterans' benefits, housing, and healthcare.

After a lifetime of working, raising families, and contributing to the success of this nation in countless other ways, senior citizens deserve to retire with dignity. This resolution is a step in honoring the service of our seniors. However, I encourage all Americans to express their appreciation for and respect toward senior citizens in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to pass this resolution in the coming weeks. My esteemed colleagues in Congress should give deserved recognition to America's senior citizens for the contributions they have made, and continue to make, to this great nation.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER MEYERHOF, PH.D.

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Walter Meyerhof who died on May 27, 2006, at the age of 84 of complications from Parkinson's disease.

Walter E. Meyerhof was Professor Emeritus of Physics at Stanford University. He was born in Kiel, Germany, in 1922, the same year that his father, Otto Meyerhof, won a Nobel Prize in Medicine. His mother, Hedwig Schallenberg, was a painter.

Dr. Meyerhof's parents were Jewish but raised their three children as Lutherans in an attempt to protect them from burgeoning Nazism. Despite this ruse, the family suffered from anti-Semitism and was ultimately helped to flee Vichy France by ''the American Schindler'', Varian Fry. Fry, a non-Jew who went to France to operate a rescue network, saved at least 2,000 people. In 1992, Meyerhof established and directed a foundation to honor the memory of Varian Fry. His film about Fry was narrated by Meryl Streep and distributed to more than 35,000 schools.

Dr. Meyerhof earned his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. At age 24 he married Miriam Rubin, who had worked at a child-care center directed by Anna Freud. In 1949 he began his distinguished 43-year career as a Professor of Physics at Stanford University.

Dr. Meyerhof was instrumental in the construction of the Stanford Linear Accelerator. He was awarded the Lloyd Dinkelspiel Teaching Award, the Tenured Faculty Development Award and was given an Honorary Doctorate by the University of Frankfort in 1980. He was named U.S. Senior Scientist by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in 1980–1981.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Meyerhof and the entire Meyerhof family. Dr. Walter Meyerhof was a national treasure, who loved his community and his country and served them exceedingly well. He will always be missed and never forgotten.

INTRODUCTION OF FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Family and Medical Leave Enhancement Act. This legislation is identical to legislation introduced by Senator DODD of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, since enactment in 1993, more than 50 million employees have taken leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act. The Act guarantees eligible employees working for covered employers access to up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave within any 12-month period to care for their health or the health of their families without putting their jobs or health insurance at risk. About 11 percent of private sector businesses are covered

under FMLA; 77 percent of employees work in these covered businesses (although about 62 percent of employees are eligible for FMLA).

According to data from a 2001 Department of Labor study, 52 percent of leave-takers have taken time off to care for their own serious illness; 26 percent have taken time off to care for a new child or for maternity disability reasons; 13 percent have taken time off to care for a seriously ill parent; 12 percent have taken time off to care for a seriously ill child; and 6 percent have taken time off to care for a seriously ill spouse. About 42 percent of leave takers are men; about 58 percent of leave-takers are women. The median length of leave is 10 days; 80 percent of leaves are for 40 days or fewer. About 73 percent of leave-takers earn $30,000 or more.

While the Family and Medical Leave Act has proven invaluable to many Americans, too many are still not covered by the law and others cannot afford to take leave under the Act because leave is unpaid. Many women and men are unable to take time off to care for their families, whether due to the arrival of a new child or when a medical crisis strikes. More than three in four (78 percent) employees who have needed but who have not taken leave report that they simply could not afford it.

The Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act would expand the scope and coverage of FMLA to ensure that even more American workers do not have to choose between job and family. Too many eligible individuals simply cannot afford unpaid leave. Many forgo leave or take the shortest amount of time possible because the current FMLA law requires only unpaid leave. The Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act would:

Establish a pilot program to allocate grants to states to provide paid leave for at least 6 weeks to eligible employees responding to caregiving needs resulting from the birth or adoption of a child or family illness. States may provide for wage replacement directly or through an insurance program, such as a state temporary disability program or a state unemployment compensation program, or other mechanism. Such paid leave shall count toward an eligible employee's 12 weeks of leave under FMLA.

Expand the number of individuals eligible for FMLA by covering employers with 25 or more employees (to enable 13 million more Americans to take FMLA).

Expand the reasons for leave to include eligible employees addressing domestic violence and its effects, which make the employee unable to perform the functions of the position of such employee or, to care for the son, daughter, or parent of the employee, if such individual is addressing domestic violence and its effects.

Establish a pilot program within the federal government for the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to administer a partial or full wage replacement for at least 6 weeks to eligible employees responding to caregiving needs resulting from the birth or adoption of a child or other family caregiving needs. Such paid leave shall count toward an eligible employee's 12 weeks of leave under FMLA.

Allows employees to use a total of 24 hours during any 12-month period to participate in a school activity of a son or daughter, such as a parent-teacher conference, or to participate in literacy training under a family literacy program.

COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5252) to promote the deployment of broadband. networks and services:

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, last week, the House passed by a very large margin H.R. 5252, the Communications Opportunity, Promotion, and Enhancement Act of 2006. As a strong supporter of this legislation, I want to congratulate Chairmen BARTON and UPTON for authoring a bill that will accelerate the development of next-generation video and broadband competition to all Americans.

I also wish to elaborate on one aspect of this bill dealing with the definition of cable systems and its effect on private cable operations. The Committee Report "emphasizes that none of the changes to the cable definitions made under Section 102 are intended to affect the application of any of the definitions, including Section 602(7)(B) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 522(7)(B)), which exempts from the 'cable system' definition facilities that serve subscribers without using public rights-of-way."

This means that an entity that constructs facilities for the distribution of video programming entirely on private rights-of-way is not a cable operator, even if the video programming signal is delivered over a telecommunications provider's facility that does use public rights-of-way, if the entity using private rights-of-way neither owns nor controls the facility that transmits its programming over the public rights-of-way. That is the case because Section 602(5) (47 U.S.C. 522(5)) defines a cable operator as a person who provides cable service over a cable system they own or control, and a facility that does not use public rights-of-way is not a cable system under section 602(7)(B).

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL HISTORY DAY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National History Day program. A basic knowledge of history is essential for our Nation's children to become informed participants in our democracy, and National History Day is promoting history education in Minnesota and throughout the Nation. National History Day empowers teachers to improve history education so that every student will have historical knowledge and skills to contribute to the public good of our Nation.

As Representative to the citizens of the 4th Congressional District of Minnesota, it brings me great pleasure to pay special tribute to Emily Brown, on this date, June 15, 2006, as she is recognized for her scholastic achievements in National History Day.

Emily Brown, a student at Sunrise Park Middle School in White Bear Lake, was one of twelve students chosen out of hundreds of thousands across America, to display and present her project at the White House. Emily will be presenting her project on Alice Paul. Alice Paul took a stand against a president to secure women's right to vote: she was the first to picket outside the White House. She later had to take a stand against other women leaders and against the American public who told her to stop picketing during WWI. The National History Day program allows students to create exhibits, documentaries and performances, by using their critical thinking and research skills in the subject of history.

I congratulate Emily and commend her for her dedication and commitment. I join with Emily's family, friends and teachers in wishing Emily well in all her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JACQUELINE A. YOUNG—"DR. JACQUELINE A. YOUNG EDUCATIONAL CENTER"

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to offer my heartfelt congratulations to Jacqueline A. Young, PhD, as the Dr. Jacqueline A. Young Education Center is dedicated on June 15, 2006, in Fairfield, New Jersey. It should come as no surprise to anyone who knows Dr. Young, who received her Doctorate of Education from Rutgers University, Graduate School of Education, that such an honor would be bestowed upon her for her many years of dedicated service to the Essex County Educational Services Commission.

An educator since 1974, Dr. Young has been involved with many aspects of this noble profession. She has been a teacher, a Basic Skills Consultant, a Coordinator, a Supervisor, a Director and has held her current post as Superintendent of the Essex County Educational Services Commission since July, 1992. Prior to being named Superintendent, Dr. Young served the commission as Director beginning in 1986. During this period, Dr. Young has been responsible for many new programs and initiatives which have resulted in sustainable growth and institutional stability. Under her guidance, both staff and students have been exposed to professionalism at its finest as Dr. Young is the epitome of excellence in leadership.

With facilities such as the Essex County Juvenile Detention Center under her control, Dr. Young is certainly challenged on a daily basis to provide educational opportunities to students that are coping with a variety of other distracting issues. In order for students to retain a semblance of their high school experience and to allow them to embark on their new life journey with a clean slate, Youth House graduates earn diplomas from their respective high schools. In part, this results in some students retaining their interest in education. Dr. Young manages to get their attention and to remain a woman of "grace under pressure."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Young does an admirable job in serving her community well and the

Essex County Educational Services Commission is thriving under her leadership. I know my fellow House Members join me in wishing Dr. Young continued success in her career with the Essex County Educational Services Commission. To have a building named after her is a well deserved honor and a fitting tribute to Dr. Jacqueline A. Young, Educator Extraordinaire.

HONORING PRESTON A. ENGLERT AFTER 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATIONAL KIDNEY FOUNDATION OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Preston A. Englert for twenty-five years of service to the National Kidney Foundation of the National Capital Area.

Mr. Englert, President and CEO of the National Kidney Foundation of the National Capital Area, has served at the Foundation since 1981.

Mr. Englert graduated from Louisiana State University in 1970 and attended graduate school at the University of Tulsa and George Washington University. A native of Memphis, Tennessee, Mr. Englert served as the Executive Director of the American Heart Association branches in Tulsa, Oklahoma and Atlanta, Georgia before joining the National Kidney Foundation in 1981. In July of 1986, Mr. Englert became the Vice President of the Foundation and he was named President and Chief Executive Officer in 1999.

The National Kidney Foundation has grown substantially under Mr. Englert's leadership. He is responsible for outreach programs, increased funding, early detection screenings and the expansion of both patient services and public awareness. Mr. Englert is extremely invested in the community, indicated by the numerous accolades he has accumulated over the years. He was named the Active Member of the Year by the Greater Washington Society of Association Executives in 1989. Mr. Englert's passion for helping humanity transcends the boundaries of this community, as he received the ''Partnership Award'' in 2005 from the National Kidney Foundation, Inc. for work with dialysis patients displaced or affected by hurricane Katrina.

Mr. Englert is a shining example of one man's ability to affect change. His creativity and innovation has turned the National Kidney Foundation into one of the most successful affiliations nationwide. He has dedicated his life to giving a voice to kidney disease patients around the country and he has made a lasting impact over the past twenty-five years. I look forward to Mr. Englert's continued service in the years to come.

I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Preston A. Englert and congratulating him on this distinguished achievement.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JOEL M. CARP ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF METROPOLITAN CHICAGO

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Joel M. Carp on the occasion of his retirement from the Jewish Federation of Chicago. For more than 30 years, Joel has devoted his life and considerable talents to helping the disadvantaged in our community and across the country.

As the Senior Vice President for Community Services and Governmental Relations of the Federation, Joel was the voice of the Federation, both in the community and in the halls of the capitals in Springfield and Washington, D.C. Many were the times that he was a source of guidance and advice for me and my colleagues there, and for that I am grateful.

Joel's contributions to the social service network in Chicago have been enormous. His work with the poor, the sick and the homeless ensured that countless members of our community had access to health and human services in their hour of need.

As a public policy advocate and a writer, Joel has helped to steer local, State, and Federal Governments toward greater social responsibility. He has served on numerous task forces to address the needs of both the homeless and underprivileged children. In addition, he has supervised the Illinois State refugee and immigrant programs. Finally, through his writing and teaching, he has advanced the study and practice of social work.

Mr. Speaker, Joel Carp is truly an outstanding individual whose lifetime of work will continue to benefit communities throughout the Chicago area for generations to come. So, once again, I thank Joel Carp for his service, his humor and his humanity, and I congratulate him on a well-earned retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO KUM-OK KIM

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Kum-Ok Kim, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, NY business and civic communities. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Mr. Kum-Ok Kim was born in Bo-Ryong City, ChungChung Province, Korea. He came to the United States in1981, and started a fruits and vegetables business at Nostrand Avenue in Brooklyn in 1989. Mr. Kim, a Korean-American citizen, was ordained in 1996.

A member of several community organizations, Mr. Kim held many leadership positions such as: chairman of the board of the ChungChung Province Association of Eastern U.S.A. in 1997; vice president of the Korean Sports Association of New York; chairman of the Supporting Committee for Governor George E. Pataki, and director of the Korean-American Youth Foundation from 1995 to 2005.

Mr. Kim served 4 years, two terms, as president of the Korean-American Brooklyn Association, New York, Inc., a not for profit (501–c3) community-based organization, which was first established in April 1984, in order to reflect its wider civic role in providing outreach services to families and individuals. As president of the Korean-American Brooklyn Association, New York, Inc., Mr. Kim has been instrumental in assisting not only within the Korean community of Brooklyn, but other communities at large to contribute to the further developing relationships of an enlightened, healthy Korean-American community and culture, and to promote better understanding, friendship and cooperation with other ethnic groups in the greater New York area.

Mr. Kim planned and organized a free citizenship assistance and basic English program for Korean-American Brooklyn residents, developed an assistance program for the Korean-American Teacher Association, created seminars for small business owners that were sponsored by the New York State Attorney General, and developed a relief fund for flood victims in Korea. Every year on Thanksgiving day, under the supervision of the Brooklyn Borough President, Mr. Kim, along with several religious organizations and at least 28 community groups, participates in feeding the homeless at a help center and in the Brooklyn Toy Drive for Brooklyn Borough President's children's Christmas party.

Mr. Kim has been the recipient of numerous awards for his contributions to his community including citations from the Brooklyn Borough President and a State Senator Commemoration Award, and the Korean-American Community Service Awards.

Mr. Kim is a dedicated, loving husband and father. He resides with his wife Monica, sons Daniel and Joseph and daughters Tailer and Do-Kyung.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Kum-Ok Kim as he offers his talents and philanthropic services for the betterment of our community.

Mr. Speaker, Kum-Ok Kim's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

IN HONOR OF LT. PATRICK K. DOWDELL

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Patrick K. Dowdell, upon his graduation from West Point as a second lieutenant.

Patrick K. Dowdell is a resident of Breezy Point, Queens, who has been a volunteer with the Point Breeze Volunteer Fire Department, Habitat for Humanity and Meals on Wheels. Along with his father Kevin Dowdell, a lieutenant at Rescue Company 4 of the New York City Fire Department, Patrick contacted my office in 2000 to request a nomination to West Point's Class of 2005. Despite my nomination, and a valiant effort by Lt. Kevin Dowdell to

hand deliver the required documents for his son's application to West Point admissions officials, Patrick was waitlisted and instead attended Iona College.

Patrick K. Dowdell proved to be both resilient and determined, and sought admission to West Point the following year while he excelled at Iona and was elected as Freshman Class Representative in the student government. Supported by teachers, neighbors and friends offering praise and letters of support, Patrick again asked for my nomination, with his father leading the charge.

When the dust of September 11, 2001 settled, Patrick Dowdell and his family learned that Lt. Kevin Dowdell was last seen entering the burning towers to help his fellow citizens and had been lost. Patrick Dowdell, as determined as ever to serve his country and make his dad proud, volunteered in the clean up efforts and continued to pursue his dream of attending West Point.

Patrick K. Dowdell was designated as my principle nominee in 2001 and was a member of the 2006 West Point graduating class. In President Bush's commencement speech last month to the first class to enter the academy after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, Patrick had the honor of being the only cadet singled out for praise by the President. In the words of the President, "We live in freedom because young Americans like Patrick and all the cadets here today have stepped forward to serve."

Patrick is now looking forward to serving his country and continuing to honor his father's memory. He also serves as a source of encouragement to his younger brother James Dowdell, who has followed in their father's footsteps by joining the New York City Fire Department, serving in Ladder 174 and providing support to his proud mother, Rose Ellen Dowdell.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I congratulate Patrick K. Dowdell upon the completion of his studies at West Point and upon his commission as a second lieutenant.

A TRIBUTE TO MARTHA RODRIGUEZ-TORRES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Martha Rodriguez-Torres, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, NY, community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Martha Rodriguez-Torres was born and raised in Brownsville, Brooklyn and is one of five children born to the late Carmen Rodriguez. In spite of being raised in a one-parent household, her mother made certain that education and community involvement were a priority in her home. Martha has her bachelor of science from Boston College, a master of science and a professional diploma from Long Island University and was a member of the Harvard University Principal's Institute.

After working in several school districts throughout the city, Martha became the principal of PS 156, the Waverly School of the Arts where she accepted the challenge of leading a low performing school with only 17 percent of the children reading at or above grade level. Today, the school is one that stands as a model for others. The school has become a nurturing environment for both students and teachers and the reading scores at the school have more than tripled.

Martha is respected by both her superiors and peers and has served as a mentor principal and was a member of the Chancellor's Distinguished Faculty, where she trained new principals. Martha worked with Hunter College in the design and implementation of a new program for the training of future administrators.

It is through Martha's dedication, tenacity and courage that she has been able to make a positive impact on her school community and it is because of these very qualities that she now serves as a local instructional superintendent in Region 5 as well as the community superintendent for Community School District 19.

Martha is to be applauded for refusing to let her humble beginnings be an impediment for success, not forgetting from where she came and for continuing to serve those with challenging circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Martha Rodriguez-Torres as she offers her talents and philanthropic services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Martha Rodriguez-Torres's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

TRIBUTE TO THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FILIPINO MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the more than three million Filipino-Americans and Filipino immigrants across the United States on the occasion of the 100th Anniversary of Filipino Migration to the United States. This is a significant milestone in the storied tradition of Filipinos in our Nation ever since the first fifteen farm workers, called sakadas, were recruited by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, arriving in Hawaii on December 20, 1906. They were to become the precursors to millions of other contract workers, who soon came to build America in the succeeding years.

It was in 1919 that Filipino leader Pablo Manlapit organized the first labor union to demand higher wages and better working conditions for the farm workers of Hawaii. He was to be joined by other Asian farm workers, especially those coming from Japan. Though in 1920, some 12,000 farm workers from the sugar plantations were cruelly evicted and thrown out of work; their rugged determination and gritty character typified their conviction that America must live by its creed of equal opportunity and simple justice for all.

The downtrodden and the disenfranchised—these defined the miserable conditions to which those first immigrants were mercilessly subjected. What better way to memorialize those hardy spirits than to invoke their courage under fire during this Centennial of their epic journey to self-hood and recognition. They came to forge a better life and contribute to the building of America in Hawaii's sugar cane and pineapple fields, in the canneries of Alaska, and throughout the verdant farm lands of California and other west coast States.

In his stirring novel, America is in the Heart, Carlos Bulosan, the Filipino writer par excellence, described the first Filipino immigrants' abject exclusion from American society when he wrote: "I know deep in my heart that I am an exile in America . . . I feel like a criminal running away from a crime I did not commit. And this crime is that I am a Filipino in America." Despite this inglorious past, their pioneering efforts and resilient spirit were drawn by their genuine belief in America's spirit of idealism as the land of opportunity and promise.

I am confident that under the aegis of this Centennial, America will join Filipino-Americans in recognizing the untold sacrifices of the early Filipino migrants whose faith in God and whose work ethic sustained them in their ordeal. In converging this celebration with the indomitable spirit of those pioneers, we hope to be enlightened and enriched by the messages they wrote through their silent struggles to be recognized and appreciated. It is on this historic occasion that I congratulate the National Federation of Filipino American Associations (NaFFAA), the Philippine-American Federation of South Florida (PhilAmFed) and other bonafide groups for their steadfast efforts in sensitizing us to the contributions that Filipino immigrants gave and continue to give to buttressing America's stature as the envy of world today.

Filipino-Americans in my District, and millions of others across this great Nation, may take heart in Mr. Bulosan's prophetic words: "America is not a land of one race or one class of men. We are all Americans that have toiled and suffered and known oppression and defeat . . . America is not merely a land or an institution. America is in the hearts of men that died for freedom; it is also in the eyes of men that are building a new world. America is a warning to those who would try to falsify the ideals of free men. All of us, from the first Adams to the last Filipino, native born or alien, educated or illiterate—We are America!"

Indeed, this Centennial is a proud reminder of the nobility and quiet dignity of Filipino Americans whose predecessors migrated to America 100 years ago, paving the way for countless others.

A TRIBUTE TO MIGUEL A FELICIANO

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Miguel A. Feliciano, a distinguished member of the business and civic communities. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope by colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

A young successful entrepreneur and avid community activist, Miguel Feliciano has resided in Brooklyn, New York since moving from Puerto Rico in 1956.

Mr. Feliciano is known for his friendly, energetic and dynamic style. Servicing our community for over 25 years, Mr. Feliciano has left his mark on the real estate and banking fields. He is the president of Feliciano Properties Inc., and executive vice president of Equitable Funding, a licensed mortgage bank with offices in the neighborhood of City Line, Brooklyn.

Mr. Feliciano's honors include: Chairman of the Board of Managers of North Brooklyn YMCA, Recipient of the coveted YMCA of Greater New York Volunteer of the Year Award, Founder of the Brooklyn East Sports Federation, servicing our youth since 1987, Commissioner of the Pedrin Zorilla Baseball League, Member of New York City Community Planning Board #5, Treasurer of the East New York Urban Youth Corp, Former President of the Liberty Avenue Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Feliciano demonstrated his leadership skills early on when he helped organized the youth at Our Lady of Presentation, a Catholic Church in Ocean Hill Brownsville the community where he was raised. He is a staunch supporter of his Hispanic heritage as shown by his participation and support in the annual celebration of the Feast of the Epiphany (three Kings Day) held on January 6th at the Twelve Towns YMCA.

Mr. Feliciano attended Thomas Jefferson High School in East New York Brooklyn and later graduated from Bernard Baruch College in 1977 with a Bachelor of Business Administration Degree with a major in Accounting. After obtaining his degree, he went into the banking and financial services business. Mr. Feliciano later applied his business acumen as District Business Manager for the Board of Education in District 12 in the borough of the Bronx before embarking on his own.

Mr. Feliciano is a dedicated loving husband and father who strives to be a role model for all his children and the children of his community.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Miguel Feliciano as he offers his talents and philanthropic services for the betterment of our local community.

Mr. Speaker, Miguel Feliciano's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

CAROLINE SPARROW HART MAKES HER MARK ON THE WORLD

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Webb Hart and Virginia Sparrow Hart on the birth of their first child, Caroline Sparrow Hart. Caroline was born on Friday, June 9, 2006 and weighed 7 pounds and 5 ounces. Faye joins me in wishing John and Virginia Sparrow Hart great happiness during this very special time in their lives.

As a father and grandfather, I know the joy, pride, and excitement that parents experience upon the entrance of their child into the world. Representing hope, goodness, and innocence, a newborn allows those around her to see the world through her eyes . . . as a new, fresh place with unending possibilities for the future. Through a child, one is able to recognize and appreciate the full potential of the human race. I know the Harts look forward to the changes and challenges, that their new daughter will bring to their lives while taking pleasure in the many rewards they are sure to receive as they watch her grow.

I welcome young Caroline into the world and wish John and Virginia all the best as they raise her.

A TRIBUTE TO PASTOR TYRONE STEVENSON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Pastor Tyrone Stevenson, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Pastor Tyrone Stevenson is blessed by the unique privilege to serve the Lord in the community where he was born and raised. As his purpose in life manifests itself, he has the distinct honor to be the Senior Pastor of Hope Christian Center in Brooklyn, New York.

Pastor Stevenson is fueled by his God-given mission to disciple those whom we touch that they may in turn disciple those they touch for generations to come. As such, his preaching and teaching is geared towards transforming his congregates into equipped disciples.

Pastor Stevenson has been married to the love of his life, Terrie Lane Stevenson, and from their union, God has blessed them with two beautiful daughters, Emoni and Hannah.

After graduating from Forest Hills High School, Pastor Stevenson enlisted in the United States Navy and was discharged with honors after eight years of service. After which, he was a successful mortgage banker, writing millions of dollars in residential loans.

In 1994, Pastor Stevenson and his wife joined the First Baptist Church of Glenarden, in Landover, Maryland, under the leadership of Pastor John K. Jenkins, Sr. It was there, in 1995 that Pastor Stevenson yielded his life and responded to the call of ministry. As he grew in the Lord, Pastor Stevenson faithfully served his spiritual father, Pastor Jenkins, and witnessed the hand of God move in his life as the Lord propelled him forward in fulfilling His mandate. Pastor Stevenson has traveled tirelessly teaching and proclaiming the Word of God. On August 26, 2001, Pastor Stevenson answered the call of God to pastor. Shortly after that an opportunity arose for Pastor Stevenson to revitalize his home church in Brooklyn, New York.

Pastor Stevenson is now celebrating another milestone in his working legacy of dedicated and faithful service to the Lord. Because he dares to believe in God, his life and lifestyle serves as an example to those he leads.

Pastor Stevenson is a much sought after preacher. God uses him in a tremendous way to minister directly to the hurts, issues and challenges of people with whom he comes in contact. God's effectiveness is manifested through the response of the unsaved to the preached Word.

Pastor Stevenson gives thanks to the Lord who has enabled him because God has counted him faithful by placing him in the ministry.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Pastor Tyrone Stevenson, as he offers his talents and services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Pastor Tyrone Stevenson's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE BEATRICE REEVES

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform my colleagues about the passing of a great lady of Miami and an anchor of one of Miami's great families: the late Beatrice ''Bee'' Reeves. Her sudden passing last Saturday, June 10, 2006 has truly left a deep void in our midst.

Mrs. Reeves represented the best and the noblest of our community. In her quiet but dignified way, she dedicated a major portion of her life to service in groups like the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, the Links, and the MRS Club, where she served as a past president. Her mission in life girded her belief that understanding of and compassion for the less fortunate defined her life-vocation as a gifted Christian and as a community leader who never sought the limelight.

She also loved to play bridge, and she was a member of the Tuesday and Saturday bridge clubs. From the stories I have heard about her enthusiasm and skill, you definitely wanted to have Mrs. Reeves playing on your side.

She was a multi-talented servant of the people, a civic activist, and an indefatigable community-builder, always thinking of others in her endeavors. The genuineness of her stewardship on behalf of our community was buttressed by her utmost consecration to her vocation as God's faithful servant, bringing hope and optimism to countless ordinary folks whose lives she touched so deeply, never holding anyone at arm's length.

This remarkable lady was our community's friend and confidante. I am deeply saddened by her passing. She will indeed be an indelible reminder of the noble commitment and quiet power of friendship she extended to anyone who came to her for help and advice. Her faith was deep and genuine, and her love for our community evoked her dynamic friendship and thorough understanding of the struggles and travails we have had to endure throughout all the years. No one who knew her—and was struck by her sunny disposition and optimism—went away not acknowledging the presence of a caring and compassionate community leader.

This Friday, June 16, 2006 a funeral mass will be celebrated at Miami's Episcopal Church

of the Incarnation officiated by the Rev. Kenneth Major, her pastor and spiritual adviser. I want to extend my deepest sympathies to her husband, Mr. Garth Reeves, the publisher emeritus of The Miami Times; her sister Dorothy Burrows Baker; and her stepdaughters Rachel Reeves and Lynnette Richardson.

I join the Miami-Dade community in celebrating her life and her friendship. She will carry on through the example she set and the wonderful thoughts and memories we all have of her. This is the wonderful legacy the late Beatrice ''Bee'' Reeves left behind.

A TRIBUTE TO VIVIAN YVETTE BRIGHT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Vivian Yvette Bright, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Ms. Bright represents an esteemed and respected instrument that is superbly tuned to the needs of others and who performs with beauty, depth and understanding in the orchestra of life.

Academically, her credentials include an M.S. in Human Resources Management from the New School for Social Research; graduate of the first class of the Pratt Institute Community Economic Development program; and a Bachelor of Science in Accounting. She has received numerous honors and is listed in ''Who's Who of American Women''.

Vivian Y. Bright wears numerous hats. She is committed to the never-ending fight for her community and the development of our youth. She believes that it is important to try and do as much as you can for as many as you can for as long as you can. This is illustrated by her exhaustive list of associations. Vivian is a life member of the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. and past President of the Delta Alpha Zeta Chapter; life member of the National Council of Negro Women; former Chairperson of the Board of Directors Cypress Community Day Care Center; Trustee of the Addiction Research & Treatment Center/Urban Research Institute; member and former member of the Board of Directors of the Brooklyn NAACP; member of Community Board No. 5 and former Vice President and Chair of the Land Use Committee; President of the Women's Caucus for Congressman EDOLPHUS 'ED' TOWNS; President of the Leadership Council of Open Communities of Brooklyn, Inc.; Business Manager-Concerned Women of Brooklyn; and member of Stuy Park Lions—among many other affiliations. In addition to all of the above and more she has been a member of the historic Berean Baptist Church of Brooklyn, New York for over 55 years and has served as the church's Business Administrator since 1989.

Vivian has received many awards among which are: Brooklyn Navy Yard Community Leadership; The Lucille Rose Humanitarian Award-NAACP; Gov. Carey International Year of the Child Award; New Horizons Village Homeowners Leadership award; Community Service Awards from Assemblyman William Boyland, Assemblyman Darryl Towns and Senator Marty Markowitz; a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Award from Congressman EDOLPHUS TOWNS; a citation from New York City Mayor David Dinkins; and the Robert J. Epslinger Distinguished Service Award from Lions Inc.

Vivian is a proud wife and mother receiving constant support from her husband of 47 years, Lonnie M. Bright and their children Gary, Teresa, Marvin, Jamal and Tiffany. Her involvement in community affairs in the East New York section of Brooklyn, where she has lived for over 40 years, has won her wide support and admiration from the residents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Vivian Yvette Bright as she offers her talents and services for the betterment of our community.

Mr. Speaker, Vivian Yvette Bright's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

IN HONOR OF MIKE FREEZE, ARKANSAS GAME AND FISH COMMISSION

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today on behalf,of Congressmen JOHN BOOZMAN, MIKE ROSS, VIC SNYDER, and myself, to pay tribute to one of my good friends, Mike Freeze of England, Arkansas, who has served the last seven years on the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. We are grateful to have such a leader in Arkansas committed to improving conservation and recreation across our state.

Freeze was appointed to the Commission for a seven year term on July 1, 1999, serving the last year as Chairman. He has brought a wealth of experience to the position, serving as the Commission's first former employee to return as Chairman, the Commission's first fish farmer, and the first ever member from Lonoke County. Freeze operates Keo Fish Farms, is the previous owner of Arkansas Aquatics Inc., and was the state fisheries research coordinator for the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission from 1978–1983.

Freeze graduated from Little Rock Hall High School in 1971, received a bachelor's degree in fisheries and wildlife management from Arkansas Tech University at Russellville in 1975, and a master's degree in biology from Murray State University in Kentucky in 1977. He has served many leadership roles over the years including President of the National Aquaculture Association, the American Fish Farmers Federation, the Striped Bass Growers Association, and State Chapter President of the American Fisheries Society.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to work with Mike Freeze for many years. I hope my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join the Arkansas delegation in thanking Mike for his service and wishing him the best in his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO YOUNG-CHON MIN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Young-Chon Min, a distinguished member of the business and civic communities. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Mr. Min was born in South Korea and immigrated to U.S. in 1988. He graduated Sunrin Business High School, but he started working as a musician right after his graduation in spite of his parents' objection to his career choice. He became a member of the MBC-TV Orchestra and he worked in various places such as the U.S. Army Base in South Korea.

After his immigration to the United States, Mr. Min became involved with the Korean American Entertainers Association of New York. In April 2001, he became chairman of the organization and later became the president in 2003. Coinciding with his chairmanship of the organization, Mr. Min also volunteered to provide entertainment for the elderly residents of the various nursing homes in the New York area, such as The Schulman Institute of Brookdale University Hospital, the Flushing Manor Nursing Home, the Union Plaza Nursing Home, the Queens Korean Catholic Church, and the Yonkers Nursing Home.

Mr. Min is also a faithful member and serves as a treasurer of the Church of Little Grain and the New York Association of The Swedenborgian Church. He has a lovely wife, Jung Hwa, a son, Sung-Sik, and a daughter Nicole who is married to Jung Min Kim. The couple has two children, Dean and Sean.

Mr. Min received numerous awards and appreciation plaques from various organizations such as CCM, Flushing Manor Nursing Home and the Brooklyn Roman Catholic Church Diocese.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Young-Chon Min, as he offers his talents for the betterment of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, Young-Chon Min's service to our communities makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHEATHAM COUNTY, TN

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today I commemorate the sesquicentennial anniversary of Cheatham County, Tennessee.

May 5, 2006 marked the official 150th anniversary of the county, and this week, with Ashland City Summerfest and Redd Stewart Homecoming Days, Cheatham County residents will take part in the culmination of a year's sesquicentennial celebrations.

Cheatham County was founded on February 28, 1856 when the Tennessee General Assembly designated the 50 acres of land to the

west of Nashville and north of the Cumberland River as Cheatham County. It was named after Speaker of the State Senate, Edward Saunders Cheatham. Ashland City was established as the county seat. After the sale of the first town lots, the county was able to build its first courthouse and jail on the public square, where they stand today.

Cheatham County is the third fastest growing county in the State; today more than 38,000 people call it home. It is also a center of commercial and industrial growth with A.O. Smith Water Products, Triton Boats and Trinity Marine as the county's top three industrial employers. While agricultural production has declined in recent times, many Cheatham County farmers remain major contributors in the beef and tobacco sectors. Despite all the growth and industry, Cheatham County's beautiful rolling green hills are preserved in the Cheatham Wildlife Management Area, a 21,000 acre game reserve for hunting and fishing.

One of Cheatham County's most notable citizens was the late Redd Stewart, a singer and songwriter who wrote our state song, the ''Tennessee Waltz.'' This week, the events of Redd Stewart Homecoming Days will pay tribute to the musician with two days of free bluegrass concerts. In addition, Cheatham County residents will commemorate the sesquicentennial anniversary at Summerfest in Ashland City. We'll get together at Riverbluff Park on the Cumberland River to share good times as our Cheatham County founders did: eating home-cooked food, playing games and dancing to old time bluegrass music.

I am proud to honor all the generations of Cheatham County families who have contributed so much to this special place. I join with everyone in Tennessee's Fifth District in commemorating Cheatham County's 150th anniversary, and I commend County Mayor Bill Orange and today's residents for ensuring that Cheatham County remains a community where folks can live, work and raise future generations of great Tennesseans.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. EDA HARRIS-HASTICK

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Eda Harris-Hastick, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community.

Dr. Eda Harris-Hastick is a tenured Associate Professor of Social Work at Medgar Evers College of the City University of New York. A trained clinical social worker with over 30 years experience in alcoholism and substance abuse services and administration, she has also served as Assistant Chief of Alcoholism Services at Harlem Hospital Center and is a former Administrator at New York City Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services.

Dr. Harris-Hastick began her career at Medgar in 1984 in the dual capacity of Director of College Counseling Services and Chairperson of Special Programs. Since that time, she has initiated several innovative programs to assist students including an Emergency Financial Assistance Fund to aid students in financial crisis (1984), the Rose Ross Scholarship Fund for students interested in social work and/or social welfare, in memory of a former social work colleague (1998), and has served as the MEC Coordinator for the CUNY-wide Substance Abuse Information and Referral Services Unit. As director of the MEC Academic Success Center, Dr. Harris-Hastick supervised academic advisors and counselors, and in collaboration with the OAA, initiated creative strategies to implement counselor training, centralize and streamline the college's academic advisement and counseling services programs that were later expanded into a separate unit to serve students in a more comprehensive manner. A recipient of numerous research grants and academic awards, she has been engaged in several community initiatives and international health and mental health missions to the Caribbean, where she has utilized her expertise as educator, researcher and social worker to balance teaching and academic research with community service. Dr. Harris-Hastick has studied Korean and Caribbean immigrant cultures in Brooklyn and in the Caribbean and has involved students in collaborative research projects to teach research/problem solving skills in local/international community contexts. Her publications and her research continue to reflect her interest/commitment to understanding cultural differences, women's issues and public health concerns.

Dr. Harris-Hastick has completed the initial stages of the development of a Bachelor of Social Work degree. In addition, she has continued to serve as faculty advisor for the MEC Student Black Social Work Club, which she assisted in initiating in 1995. As an elected member of the City University Faculty Senate (UFS), she also serves as an elected member of the Executive Committee of the UFS. A founding member of the Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CACCI), she currently serves as board member of CACCI's Educational Foundation, Caribbean Research Center's Editorial Board, SUNY Downstate Medical Center Community Advisory Board, Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions Editorial Board, NYC Chapter of NASW Leadership Team, and NYS OASAS (Substance Abuse) Workforce Development.

Dr. Harris-Hastick was born on the Caribbean island of St. Kitts and has traveled extensively throughout the Caribbean where she has conducted research on substance abuse, organized training seminars and collaborated with faculty and administration at the University of the West Indies, and with social workers, health clinicians and others practitioners engaged in chemical dependency and HIV/AIDS studies, treatment and administration. Dr. Harris-Hastick's published work consists of several journal articles and a book chapter that include: Managing Stress in Challenging Times; Susus: New Life for a Caribbean Grassroots Approach to Savings; Voices of Korean American Women; Substance Abuse Treatment Among English Speaking People of Caribbean Ancestry; The Importance of Culture in HIV/AIDS Prevention in Grenada (with Dr. Clarice Modeste-Curwen, Minister of Health and the Environment, Grenada, W.I.), and a forthcoming article ''Substance Abuse and AIDS: Intertwined Epidemics in the Caribbean region'' is nearing completion.

Dr. Harris-Hastick has received numerous awards and citations for leadership and community service. A sought after speaker, Dr. Harris-Hastick has made numerous presentations to student groups as well as local, national and international groups including business, academic, social work, civic and community organizations such as the National Conferences of NASW and NABSW, National Association of Meeting Planners, Asian American Studies Conference, Congressional Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference, CACCI, and the Addiction Studies Institute. Dr. Harris-Hastick received a BA in Sociology/Anthropology from Queens College, a Masters in Social Work from Smith College, School for Social Work, and a Doctorate in Education from Columbia University.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. Eda Harris-Hastick as she offers her talents and services for the betterment of our local and global communities.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eda Harris-Hastick's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

FREEDOM FOR RICARDO PUPO SIERRA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Ricardo Pupo Sierra, political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Pupo Sierra is a member of the Cuban Human Rights Party and a pro-democracy activist. Mr. Pupo Sierra has been a constant advocate for human rights for those currently toiling under the nightmare of repression called the Castro regime. He has bravely denounced the cruel policies of the tyrant and demanded that the people of Cuba be allowed their inalienable rights.

Mr. Pupo Sierra was arrested by the dictatorship and, after a sham trial, thrown into the totalitarian gulag. According to Prima News, in August 2005, Mr. Pupo conducted a hunger strike to protest the abhorrent treatment of prisoners in the grotesque gulag. According to Directorio, he began a hunger strike on June 9, 2006, to demand access to religious services.

Mr. Pupo Sierra also sent this message to the Cuban people saying: ''Do not be afraid of the regime. Do not allow yourself to continue being deceived: dissent. Speak the truth without fear. Do not be discouraged. We are reaching the final point of the ruling system in Cuba. We will soon have a free, democratic Cuba with the rule of law.''

Mr. Pupo Sierra is a brilliant example of the heroism of the Cuban people. His message exemplifies the Cuban desire to live in liberty, free of the tyrannical repression imposed on them by the murderous despot. Mr. Pupo Sierra knows the violence, abuse, and repression that will be used to try to break him. Yet he stands strong in the strength of his conviction: ''We will soon have a free, democratic Cuba with the rule of law.'' Mr. Pupo Sierra is an apostle of freedom for Cuba.

Despite incessant repression, harassment, incarceration and abuse, he remains committed to the conviction that liberty and human

rights are the birthright of the Cuban people. It is a crime against humanity that Castro's totalitarian gulags are full of men and women, like Mr. Pupo Sierra, who represent the best of the Cuban nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear, Mr. Pupo Sierra is languishing in the grotesque squalor of the gulag because he desires freedom for all Cubans. My Colleagues, read his message often. We must demand the immediate and unconditional release of Ricardo Pupo Sierra and every political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ROY A. HASTICK, SR.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Roy A. Hastick, Sr., a distinguished member of the Brooklyn business and civic communities. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Dr. Roy A. Hastick has served as President/CEO/Founder of the Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Inc. (CACCI) for almost 20 years. Under his leadership, CACCI has promoted economic development on behalf of Caribbean American, African American, women and other minority small business owners and has become an internationally recognized business organization with a membership of over 1,700 in the United States and the Caribbean. Prior to starting CACCI, Dr. Hastick published the West Indian Tribune, a tabloid newspaper which served as a launching pad for the development of the Chamber, and which became the voice for the Caribbean American Community, and a business networking vehicle.

A tireless advocate for economic and community empowerment, Dr. Hastick helped to form several immigrant organizations and served for over 16 years in various capacities including 1st Vice Chairman of his local Community Board in Crown Heights Brooklyn. He currently serves on several small business advisory boards including: the New York State Governor's and New York City Mayor's Small Business Advisory Boards which advocates on behalf of minority and women owned business; JP Morgan Chase Bank, and the board of directors of the Brooklyn Navy Yard Development Corporation, Brooklyn Economic Development Corporation, New York Congregational Community Services, SUNY Jobs for Youth, and American Red Cross of Brooklyn. For six years, he has served as a delegate to the United Nations.

Dr. Hastick has been an ardent supporter of Two-Way trade between the United States and the Caribbean region. As an elected delegate to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business, he campaigned to get Two-Way trade with the region into the final recommendations submitted to the United States Congress. Under his leadership, CACCI has undertaken several extraordinary and challenging initiatives including: conducting over 600 business seminars, providing weekly business clinics for start-ups and emerging businesses to access financing, contracting and procurement opportunities; promoting trade and investment opportunities between the Caribbean and the United States, and undertaking energetic and rapid responses to hurricane disasters in the Caribbean region. For the past 3 years, CACCI has managed, Flatbush Caton Merchants Mart, a city-owned Brooklyn-based micro enterprise incubator which houses 61 vendors and occupies 9,000 sq. ft. of space. CACCI's Educational Foundation supports micro-entrepreneurship, hurricane disaster relief efforts and provides scholarships for disadvantaged young people.

Dr. Hastick has led several trade missions to the Caribbean region, hosted numerous Caribbean Head of State on their visits to the United States and made presentations at Caribbean Heads of Government meetings. Under his leadership, the development of the first ever Caribbean Trade Center, a one stop capital shop for two-way trade that will occupy 20,000 sq. ft in a major commercial corridor in Central Brooklyn, is in its 2nd phase of development and has received financial support and commitments from the New York State Governor, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, New York City Council, New York City Mayor, and has been endorsed by local, national and international business entities, including CARICOM. Expected completion date is Fall 2006.

Dr. Hastick has partnered with numerous economic development entities, academic and medical institutions, national and local community groups including the United States Small Business Administration (SBA) United States Department of Commerce MBDA, NYS Empire Development Corporation, NYC Small Business Services (NYC SBS), SCORE, City University of New York (CUNY), SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Caribbean Women's Health Association, African American Chamber of Commerce of Westchester and Rockland Counties, and the Korean American Small Business Service Center.

He has received numerous awards including: the United States Department of Commerce and the New York State Small Business Advocate of the Year Awards; Korean American Small Business Service Center "Harmony and Unity Award"; Dr. Martin Luther King Humanitarian Award from the Shirley Chisholm Institute; Ron Brown Business Advocate Award; "Chamber of the Year Award" from the NYS Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; honored by President William Jefferson Clinton at "New York Day" in Washington, DC; "CEO of the Year 2000" from the Brooklyn Branch of the NAACP, the New York State Hispanic Legislative Task Force 2002, and the New York State Black and Puerto Rican State Senators Award. Dr. Hastick was also honored with an Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, Honoris Causa by Medgar Evers College, CUNY at its 2001 Annual Convocation Ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. Roy A. Hastick, as he offers his talents and services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hastick's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic, dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

A TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. CLARENCE KEATON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today in appreciation and admiration of Reverend Dr. Clarence Keaton for his continued commitment, serving as Pastor and founder of the True Worship Church Worldwide Ministries, as a spiritual leader to his congregants, peers, friends, family, and the entire community of Brooklyn, New York.

Ordained as a minister in 1983, Reverend Dr. Keaton is affectionately referred to as P.O.P. [Pastor of Pastors] by his faithful congregants because of the guidance and genuine support he offers to them through the words of God. He has specifically sought out young members, in need of a spiritual teacher, and has inspired them to fully embrace God's love while following his direction to lead an honest, devout life. In the eyes of his peers, he is known as the "preachers teacher," passionately devoted to spreading the biblical truths of the gospel. This man of god is a beacon of light for his congregation, a buttress of strength, and a source of wisdom for anyone so blessed to be in his presence and hear his voice.

Pastor Keaton was dignified with an honorary doctorate of divinity degree in 1992 by the acclaimed Jesus Saves Bible Institute. His ministry work is highlighted by his magnetic personality and encouraging speech. Pastor Keaton's inspirational teachings are broadcasted on the radio, to proclaim the guiding words of God to a greater audience. This led to his numerous commendations and awards of excellence in radio, because he is able to reach out to thousands of souls of men and women through WWRL radio station. In addition to his outstanding work in ministry, he has been honored for his extraordinary community work, specifically with the senior citizens of the Brownsville Recreation Center.

It gives me great pleasure to honor the many achievements of Reverend Dr. Clarence Keaton and offer my utmost respect for the honest work that he does out of the kindness of his heart. We pray for God's continued grace on his ministry.

SIKH, CATHOLIC LEADERS MEET

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of Sikh leaders met in New York with Catholic leaders in an all-day event hosted by an Interfaith organization. Sikh leaders in attendance included Dr. Manohar Singh, Dr. Tarunjit Singh Butalia, and Dr. Anahat Kaur Sandhu. Monsignor Felix Machado, an official at the Vatican, also attended the meeting.

It is good to see this kind of pluralistic cooperation and I thank Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, for bringing it to my attention.

Contrast this to the situation in India, where Sikhs, Christian, Muslims, and other minorities

are subject to brutal and ongoing repression from the government. Perhaps "the world's largest democracy" could learn a thing or two from the meeting in New York.

We should stop our aid to India and we should demand self-determination for all the people of South Asia so that they can live in peace, freedom, harmony, and prosperity, as they do here in America and other Western democracies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the article from India-West into the RECORD.

[From India-West, June 2, 2006]

SIKH, CATHOLIC LEADERS MEET IN NEW YORK

(By a Staff Reporter)

Representatives of the World Sikh Council-America Region met with Catholic leaders in New York in an all-day event hosted by the Religions for Peace-USA. the Sikh group has said.

Dr. Manohar Singh, the group's chairperson, and Dr. Tarunjit Singh, chair of the group's Interfaith Committee, led the Sikhs.

The U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops' delegation was headed by Rev. James Massa, executive director of its Secretariat for Ecumenical and Interfaith Affairs.

Monsignor Felix Machado, undersecretary of the Pontifical Council for Inter-religious Dialogue at the Vatican in Rome, was a special guest and adviser.

Two observers of ReIigions for Peace attended the May 20 meeting.

"The universal message of Sikhism respects pluralism and we welcome our Catholic friends with open arms," Manohar Singh said. "This dialogue is an opportunity for our communities to begin a conversation at the highest level on how we may be able to work with each other in trust and friendship to make this world a more peaceful and just place for all."

Machado responded by saying the Catholic Church appreciates this dialogue with the Sikh community. "Sikhs respect us, not suspect us," he said.

Sikh and Catholic leaders expressed shared concerns over the challenges faced by immigrant communities in the U.S., the curtailment of religious freedom and human rights in South Asia, and the challenges of secularism to both religious communities.

The participants said they would meet again this year with a focus on "Divinity, Humanity and Creation." They also pledged to continue to meet at least once a year through a working committee.

After the meeting, the Catholic and Sikh participants visited the Mata Sahib Kaur Gurdwara Sahib in Glen Cove, N.Y., joined the evening service and partook of langar meal.

A TRIBUTE TO STANLEY HENRY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Stanley Henry, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us today to honor a man who has exhibited the will to succeed, and the insatiable drive to bring his goals into fruition.

Stanley Henry is a man that went from working menial night jobs and attending high school during the day, to owning his own hardware distribution store and contracting firm and being one of the most respected men in Brooklyn.

Mr. Henry was born in British Guyana, South America in 1945. While he attended the Mackenzie Government and Technical High School during the day, he worked nights, a feat especially commendable for a teenager. After graduating in 1965, Mr. Henry worked as a construction apprentice with the Canadian Bauxite Company. In 1967, he migrated to Brooklyn. Not needing much time to adapt to a new culture, Mr. Henry graduated from The Delhanty Institute of Structural Design within 2 years. He then secured a position with Ewell W. Finley Engineer PC and for the next 10 years, Mr. Henry stayed with this company. While still employed with the company, Mr. Henry continued his education. He graduated from both the Institute of Design Construction adding to his structural engineering experience and from NYC Technical College to enhance his administrative skills.

Mr. Henry later moved on to establish Annie Henry General Hardware, his own building materials supply business named after his beloved mother. The name was later changed to Henry Wholesale & Resale Distributors, LLC. He is also the proud owner of Henry Builders Inc., a contracting firm that not only knows the people that it serves, but the people it serves knows and loves him. Mr. Henry's businesses have been a fixture on Broadway for over 35 years and he is affectionately known as the "Mayor of Broadway" and "The Master Builder."

Mr. Henry embodies the entrepreneurial spirit that is essential to any small business.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Stanley Henry as he offers his talents and services for the betterment of our community.

Mr. Speaker, Stanley Henry's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication and today we should recognize this man and pay homage to a life truly worth celebrating.

TRIBUTE TO THE GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL & TRANSGENDER COMMUNITY CENTER OF COLORADO

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the exceptional leadership and invaluable contributions of the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Center of Colorado, "The Center," on the occasion of its 30th anniversary. It is fitting that we recognize The Center for its record of extraordinary service in providing support and advocacy for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender, GLBT, communities in the 1st Congressional District and throughout Colorado.

The Center has been on the front lines of progress since its inception and has proven to be a powerful force in transforming the landscape of our State. Founded in Denver in 1976, The Center is a statewide, nonprofit community center and is one of the oldest organizations serving GLBT communities in the country. It is a powerful advocate on a broad range of issues that affect GLBT people in our State and is a catalyst for community organizing and providing needed support services.

Health and wellness is a key focus of The Center. Its Healthy Living Program offers extensive health care services including free HIV testing in conjunction with Denver Health, low-cost hepatitis vaccinations, free mammograms for uninsured women, health care provider referrals and access to mental health services. It also devotes sizable effort to community health education as well as disease prevention. The Lesbian Cancer Support Service strives to increase early detection and a higher rate of cancer survival in lesbian and bisexual women. The Center also maintains Rainbow Alley, a drop-in center designed for GLBT youth that provides heath care services, counseling and referral. Youth have access to a medical clinic, computer lab, kitchen and the Terry Mangan Library, all of which are drug, alcohol, tobacco and hate free.

The Center's advocacy and legal initiatives have done much to advance the cause of civil liberty and provide necessary assistance to those who experience discrimination, harassment and unequal treatment. The Legal Initiatives Project, CLIP, was founded in 1992 to challenge a discriminatory amendment to the Colorado Constitution. Amendment II would have precluded any action by the State or local governments designed to protect GLBT people. Amendment II passed by a slim margin, but due to CLIP's leadership, a lawsuit was filed and injunctive relief was granted to prevent the measure from taking effect. The decision was appealed to the United States Supreme Court and a national coalition of civil rights groups joined CLIP to uphold the lower court ruling. In a historic decision—*Romer* v. *Evans*, 517 U.S. 620 (1996)—the Supreme Court held that Amendment II was unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. In 2000, CLIP merged with The Center and became its legal services program. It accomplishes its mission through the CLIP Legal Hotline, civil rights litigation and mediation, media work and public education. CLIP focuses on cases and issues that move the civil rights agenda forward serve the most oppressed and disadvantaged in the GLBT communities.

We are indeed fortunate to have The Center in our community. It is an invaluable resource and I am deeply appreciative of the good work The Center does in addressing systemic inequalities and providing continuity and stability in the efforts to secure greater equality, justice and participation in our democracy. The Center has helped provide a place at the table for GLBT people. It has provided needed health and community services. In summary, The Center's leadership and engagement has made a real difference in peoples lives and thereby in the communities it serves.

Please join me in commending the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Center of Colorado. It is the strong leadership and meaningful service it provides on a daily basis that continually enhances our lives and builds a better future for all of our people.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA TESTIMONY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention Part II of the testimony of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) when they testified before the Human Resources Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee on May 23, 2006.

The purpose of the testimony given was to share with the Subcommittee important measures to improve our nation's child protective services. It is my hope that my colleagues will find this information useful as well as informative as we focus on legislation that addresses the needs and care of our children.

CWLA POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Reauthorization of Promoting Safe and Stable Families—Of most immediate importance for this Committee is the reauthorization of the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program (PSSF) beyond FY 2006, PSSF supports four vital services that address four different types of families in need: those in need of basic support services to strengthen the family and keep them whole, families being reunified, families we are trying to preserve, and adoptive families in need of support. As you review some of the key needs included in this testimony, the Subcommittee can see how the issues of prevention, aftercare, permanency and stability and maintaining families are all addressed by these categories,

CWLA believes these services and families should continue to be the target for PSSF in a reauthorization bill:

Family Support Services (FSS) were developed to respond to the concerns, interests, and needs of families within a community. Family Support Services are targeted to families with difficulties and concerns related to the proper functioning of the family and care of the children. The focus of the program is on prevention. The services address the need to improve the well-being of a child, family functioning, and the parent's ability to provide for the family, before they are in crisis. In order to reach families in need of assistance, family support programs work with outside community organizations such as schools and child welfare agencies. The aim is to provide temporary relief to families and to teach them how to better nurture their children. Involvement in these services is voluntary. Types of services include parent education, child care relief, and selfhelp groups.

Reunification is the first permanency option states consider for children entering care. Yet, in many ways, it is the most challenging option to achieve in a plan-based, permanent way. We know that forty-eight percent of, or 246,650, children in care on September 30, 2003 had a case plan goal of reunification with their parents or other principal caretaker. At the same time, 151,770 children, or 55 percent of those children who left care in 2003, were returned to their parent's or caretaker's home.

Successful permanency through reunification requires many things, including skilled workers, readily available supportive and treatment resources, clear expectations and service plans, and excellent collaboration across involved agencies. Reunification also requires culturally appropriate support and treatment services for families and the critical need for after care or postpermanency services to ensure that safety and permanency are maintained following reunification.

Family Preservation Services (FPS) are comprehensive, short-term, intensive services for families delivered primarily in the home and designed to prevent the unnecessary out-of-home placement of children or to promote family reunification. The services are intended to protect a child in a home where allegations of child abuse or neglect have occurred, prevent subsequent abuse or neglect, prevent placement of a child, or reduce the stay for a child in out-of-home care. Families in need of family preservation services are usually referred by public welfare agencies. Services are provided within 24 hours of referral and the family's involvement is voluntary. These services respond to families on a 24–hour basis, including services such as family therapy, budgeting, nutrition, and parenting skills.

Adoption support is an important need as the number of adoptions have increased. There is still more work to be done. Services may include information and referral, case management services, support groups and a range of other services. Of the 523,085 children in foster care in 2003, approximately 119,000 were waiting to be adopted, with 68,000 of these children being free for adoption (parental rights had been terminated). Of the children waiting, 40 percent were black non-Hispanic, 37 percent were white non-Hispanic, 14 percent were Hispanic, and 4 percent were of undetermined ethnicity.In 2003, the median age of children waiting to be adopted was 8.7 years; 3 percent of the children waiting to be adopted were younger than 1 year; 32 percent were ages 1 to 5; 28 percent were ages 6 to 10; 30 percent were 11 to 15; and 6 percent were 16 to 18.

Use Of $40 Million PSSF Increase—CWLA supports the extension of the $40 million in mandatory funding that was included in the Deficit Reduction Act and we want to work with the Subcommittee and members of Congress to see that PSSF is at a minimum fully funded at the level of $505 million as adopted by this Subcommittee in 2001. We feel there a need for more. As indicated earlier in our testimony, forty percent of children substantiated as abused or neglected do not receive follow up services. We also feel it bears repeating that there is need for more reunification, adoption and other support services than PSSF attempts to address. To truly reach the goal of safe and stable families this country needs to go much further in its funding and priority of the entire child welfare system.

CWLA recognizes that the Subcommittee and members of Congress see the $40 million in mandatory funding as an opportunity to address some additional issues in the child welfare field. If that is the decision of the Congress we strongly urge you to make this the first step in a comprehensive strategy over the next few years to more fully address the needs of these children.

The draft legislation includes a workforce element tied to caseworker visits. CWLA supports regular and on-going visits to children in care. In the child welfare field visitation is not an isolated service or stand-alone intervention. Rather it is part of a larger case planning process. To reach this visitation goal we need a comprehensive strategy to strengthen the child welfare workforce.

We would not want a system of care where too few workers with very high caseloads are simply meeting an outcome measure of numbers. Rather each state should be assisted in implementing a long term workforce strategy that sets goals around reduced workforce turnover, higher education levels, adequate case loads, initial training and on-going training, adequate supervision and the proper partnerships with educational institutions and other partners in workforce development.

For each state this will be different so we would urge the Subcommittee to craft legislation around such a flexible allocation of funding and planning that will work with states to develop outcomes and provide related data that can demonstrate progress toward a comprehensive workforce strategy or goals. Again, this is a long-term strategy that requires federal, state and local partnerships. It should also be recognized that $40 million for fifty states may limit the kind of progress we all seek in advancing this goal. In addition, it will be difficult to determine how this designation of $40 million will supplement and not supplant current state efforts since it will overlap with Title IV–E Administrative funding used for these critical purposes but we do highlight that additional resources are needed.

Possible Improvements—Access For Tribal Communities—In your reauthorization, CWLA suggests that the Subcommittee include the recommendations being proposed by the National Indian Child Welfare Association, National Congress of American Indians and the Association of American Indian Affairs. Their joint proposal would set the reserved amounts of funding for tribal governments at 3 percent in both the mandatory and discretionary funding. A consortium of tribal governments could also apply for the funding and we endorse an authorization of a tribal court improvement program.

Better Data—As part of the application process, states submit information on how they intend to allocate their PSSF funding. This information should be collected and included in an annual report by HHS. We also urge the Subcommittee to include legislative language that would direct HHS to work with states to determine how to compile an annual report that would provide information on how funds are actually spent and would include information on families and children served. The annual reports by HHS on the Social Services Block Grant have only been issued since 1998, yet they have provided a stronger picture of why that funding is important to so many human service programs.

Mentoring of Children of Prisoners—We commend the Committee for including the reauthorization of the Mentoring Children of Prisoners program in this legislation. Mentoring for this population is an effective way to engage at-risk children and youth, provides connections to caring adults, and perhaps most importantly, builds relations among family members during and after incarceration. We know there are many areas in the country today where children of prisoners are not able to access this mentoring service due to lack of availability. Expansion is necessary and the Committee is to be commended for focusing on this. We urge the committee to carefully consider the following issues as this new initiative is implemented.

Currently there are 218 federally funded sites around the country where this mentoring is taking place, involving thousands of children. It would be tragic for these children to have their mentoring disrupted or ended prematurely. We urge the Committee to include provisions to allow these efforts to continue.

Researchers and mentoring experts have concluded that children facing multiple developmental risks benefit more from mentoring than other children; however, they require a higher quality of mentoring program and are more likely to be adversely affected by poor quality mentoring. We urge the Committee to examine carefully the expertise and background of all potential national

entities specific to mentoring children of prisoners. New trainings, techniques and curricula, have recently been developed. Whatever entity is chosen will need to be fully knowledgeable of these tools and prepared to make them available.

IV–B Part 1 Child Welfare Services—CWLA appreciates the Subcommittee's efforts to better align the IV–B Part 1, Child Welfare Services program with that of PSSF. This can add clarity to the understanding of funding sources although it is unclear to what extent IV–B 1 funds are spent on adoption, foster care and child care on an annual basis. In practical terms, since federal Title IV–E funds cover half or less than half of the children in foster care, it is also unclear that this change in statute will result in any increase in funding for services covered under IV–B part 1 or PSSF. Inevitably states must pick up the cost of foster care for children ineligible for IV–E by relying on other federal funds, state funds, local funds or a combination of all three.

CWLA also appreciates the Subcommittee's efforts at updating the state plan requirements. In addition we suggest the requirement to include a description of efforts to address the overrepresentation of children of color in the child welfare system. These children represent African American/Black, Latino/Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or two or more races.

Conclusion—CWLA appreciates the opportunity to offer our testimony and comments to the Subcommittee in regard to this reauthorization of Promoting Safe and Stable Families. As this legislation moves forward we look forward to a continued dialogue with the Subcommittee and Members of Congress. We also hope that this reauthorization serves as a building block for future efforts that will create a comprehensive reform that results in reduced numbers of children being abused and neglected and safer and permanent families for those children who do come into contact with the child welfare system.

IN MEMORIAM TO DAVID HANSBERGER, FOR HIS CIVIC LEADERSHIP IN YUCAIPA CALIFORNIA

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to express my sadness at the passing of a friend, David Hansberger of Yucaipa, whose civic leadership helped guide this growing community to cityhood and set it on a course to become a highly-desired destination city in my California district. Mr. Hansberger passed away this week, and all of his friends will feel the loss.

David Hansberger is a native of Redlands, my hometown, and received all of his education in our area. As he grew up, the Inland Empire also grew, from a semi-rural group of small cities to a population powerhouse—one of the largest urban growth areas in the United States. That we have been able to remain a fabulous place to live is a credit to local leaders like David Hansberger and his brother, Dennis, who is now a San Bernardino County Supervisor.

His public service career actually began in the Coast Guard, where he served 8 years and became a First Class Petty Officer and received the Honor Man Award. When he returned to San Bernardino County, he became a leader in a number of our local industries: Owner-operator of Snow-Line Orchards for 13 years; manager of Tri-City Concrete and Perris Ready-Mix; Realtor for Hansberger-Teeters and Emerich and Company, and finally the District Manager of the Inland Empire Resource Conservation District, protecting the natural assets of the growing area.

David applied this intimate knowledge of how San Bernardino County ticked to his civic activities. He served on hospital and charity boards, and was very active in the Jaycees, ultimately becoming a District Governor for that group. He was very popular as a caller at auction events for charities, and was given credit for dozens of extremely successful fundraisers for groups over the years.

Perhaps David Hansberger's largest contribution, however, was in helping guide the citizens of Yucaipa into cityhood. This booming area in the foothills on the east side of San Bernardino Valley had made four attempts at incorporation by the mid-1980s, and the lack of success had caused deep divisions in the community.

Mr. Hansberger took over as president of the Yucaipa City Incorporation Committee, and is widely credited with smoothing the rivalries and disagreements. Yucaipa voters finally voted to incorporate in 1989, and the city has grown to a population of 47,000. David Hansberger became a charter member of the city planning commission, and helped set a tone of top-quality home development that has made the city a beautiful place.

The friends of David Hansberger are legion—indeed, most people who knew him would say he never let anyone be a stranger for long. His genuine concern and compassion drew people to him, and he welcomed them as friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in expressing condolences to Mr. Hansberger's wife of 41 years, Sheila, and his children, grandchildren, parents and siblings. I ask you to join me as well in celebrating his wonderful contributions to making his community, and our world, a friendlier and more livable place.

HONORING ARTHUR GLIDDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF THE WOLFEBORO CENTRE COMMUNITY CHURCH

HON. JEB BRADLEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Arthur Glidden for his hard work and dedication to the continuation and protection of the Wolfeboro Centre Community Church for over 43 years. Arthur Glidden is 83-years-old and has been a resident of my hometown of Wolfeboro for his entire life. Arthur's wife, Dotty, is also a lifelong resident of the community and a supporter of the church.

In 1841, a group of Wolfeboro citizens purchased one third of an acre for $17 to build a non-denominational worship center for the Christian members in the area. This traditional New England church was started and it continued in operation with the generous help of the congregation. In 1964, Arthur Glidden became President of the Church Board and began what has now become his long-standing devotion to the parishioners and the care and preservation of the building.

Arthur has taken the traditions of when the meetinghouse was first built and he has raised them to a higher level. For almost 25 percent of the life of the Wolfeboro Centre Community Church, he has been its greatest protector and benefactor. At times, almost single-handedly, Arthur lifted the church up to save it from declining attendance and carried it forward on his shoulders until it was safe and secure again.

Arthur Glidden is to be commended for his steadfast dedication to the Wolfeboro Centre Community Church, and all of his efforts to improve the community in which he lives.

H.R. 5252: THE COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, Federal telecommunications law was last reformed in 1996. Many new technologies have been developed since then that have changed how Americans receive and seek information. This reform legislation is long overdue. I support reforming telecommunications law that will encourage investment, innovation, and competition in both telecommunications software and hardware. The delivery of telecommunications services to consumers, such as universal service, community access, and public safety must be protected. And, most importantly, any changes to telecommunication law intended to enhance competition must ensure consumer protections.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today does little to meet those goals and instead the consumer protections and community access we have come to expect could be in jeopardy. In addition, this bill forces unfunded mandates onto State and local governments and does little to prevent businesses from discriminating against consumers in order to enhance profit margins.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that intergovernmental mandates on State and local governments would increase over time—adding up to $100 to $350 million by 2011. This cost will ultimately be passed along to the families who use these services. And, while the bill maintains the rights of cities to manage rights-of-ways requirements, such as where telecommunications infrastructure can be laid and what city streets can be disrupted, this legislation prevents State and local consumer protection laws from applying to national franchise holders.

While the bill includes some ''anti-discrimination'' requirements intended to prevent providers from servicing areas based on income levels, these provisions are weak because the bill does not require companies to offer service to all communities within a specific area within a certain period of time. Weak anti-discrimination policies undermine the universal service principles that have been the pillars of

fair access to U.S. telecommunications. I am concerned that the anti-discrimination policy contained in the bill does not go far enough in ensuring fair access to service and in allowing fair access to group claims and protections in the event that consumers feel that they and their neighbors have been discriminated against.

I also continue to remain concerned that this bill does not contain a stronger network neutrality provision—which would prevent Internet providers from discriminating against Internet content—whether through pricing or speed of delivery. The Internet has been a communication medium that has flourished due to the fact that content has moved freely and equally without interference from network providers. Financial incentives to move some content through the Internet faster than other content would undermine the innovation that has spurred competitive Internet content and services. It is my opinion that the network providers should not be the ones in charge of favoring one application over another—consumers should be in charge of that.

A broad coalition of groups opposes this bill for a variety of reasons, including the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Telecommunications Offices and Advisors, and the National Governors' Association. Other groups share in the concern about the need for strong network neutrality provisions, including a broad coalition representing AARP, the American Library Association, colleges and universities across the country, and many others. I share in their concerns and that is why I rise today to oppose passage of this bill.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006—CONFERENCE

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2006

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, the Bush Administration's policy on Iraq has been based on distortions and misjudgments. Prior to the invasion, I fought to prevent this war. I parted with most members of Congress and cast a vote against the resolution authorizing the use of military force in Iraq. The President misled the American people into believing there was a link between Iraq and the terrorist attacks of September 11.

I understand the frustration and heartbreak that have led many Americans to conclude that it is now time for us to remove ourselves from this misguided quagmire and bring our troops home. That is why I have called on the President to change course. America simply cannot continue indefinitely to pay the high costs in both lives and dollars to stay on the same failed course in Iraq.

In December 2005, I voted for H.R. 1815, the FY 2006 Defense Authorization bill, which the President signed into law in January 2006. Section 1227 of that bill, United States Policy on Iraq, states that it is the sense of Congress that "calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraq 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."

It is time for the President to implement this policy. We should not have American troops in the middle of a civil war. President Bush is wrong to say that we should stay the course in Iraq. We need a new direction in Iraq.

The President must present a strategy to Congress to draw down American troops from Iraq and return them home to their families. This strategy must ensure that our National Guard troops are the first to come home, as they were never intended as our primary force for overseas military missions. We need our National Guard troops to be home and available for our local needs.

Military experts have recommended a drawdown of 10,000 troops per month. Although we should not announce a specific timeline for troop withdrawal, it is reasonable to expect that we should have half of our combat troops home by the end of 2006, and all of our combat troops home by the end of 2007. Even with such a drawdown of American troops in Iraq, this supplemental appropriations is necessary in order to insure the proper funding of our military operations during such a drawdown.

Bringing our troops home allows us to achieve certain necessary objectives. First, we will bring our troops home safely to their families and remove them from being in the middle of a civil war. Second, we should send an important message to the Iraqi government to take responsibility for their government—after they ratified a new constitution, held elections, and installed a new government—because American troops cannot and should not remain in Iraq indefinitely. Third, we would remove a powerful propaganda and recruitment tool for Al Qaeda that the United States is an occupation force. Fourth, we would be able to stage our troops outside of Iraq to work with our allies and the international community to fight the war against international terrorism. The repositioning of our troops would help us to regain our focus on the war on terror. Finally, bringing our troops home would help us preserve the strength of our all-volunteer military by improving troop morale and boosting our efforts to improve recruitment of new soldiers.

I have repeatedly called for a change in America's policies so that we can bring our troops home as soon as possible. In December 2004, I visited our troops in Iraq. I thanked them for their service and listened to their stories. It was a moving experience for me. I honor the sacrifices they and their families are making each day.

The men and women of our armed forces are demonstrating tremendous dedication to our nation through their performance in Iraq. These brave soldiers have put their lives in harm's way for our country, and we are forever grateful for their service.

This bill also contains crucial provisions, which I support, that would provide nearly $20 billion for Hurricane Katrina relief, including funds for housing, community planning and development, flood control, and small business loans. In addition, the House should take up H.R. 4197, a comprehensive Hurricane Katrina recovery bill introduced by the Congressional Black Caucus.

I am encouraged that the bill provides nearly $500 million to address the ongoing genocide in southern Sudan and Darfur. These funds are critical to meeting the immediate needs of victims of the Darfur crisis, such as shelter, health care, and access to water and sanitation. Sudanese government-backed Arab militias have slaughtered hundreds of thousands of villagers, and they have burned entire villages. Up to two million refugees have fled this genocide to neighboring countries, but the small, poorly-equipped, and underfunded African Union (AU) force cannot offer them adequate protection. This bill provides needed funding to help transition the AU peacekeeping operation to a United Nations mission. It is also encouraging that in April the House passed H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, which I co-sponsored, and which I urge the Senate to take up without delay.

Mr. Speaker, this emergency supplemental is a necessary measure that will provide essential support for our troops in their arduous mission in Iraq, vital funding for the global war on terror, and desperately needed assistance for our own Gulf region and the many Americans who have been uprooted by Hurricane Katrina.

MINE IMPROVEMENT AND NEW EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACT OF 2006 (S. 2803)

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedies of the Sago and Aracoma Alma mine disasters have been a difficult lesson in the efforts to improve mine safety regulations effectively and permanently. I rise today in strong support of long overdue coal miner safety legislation. Unfortunately, the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006, S. 2803, while an improvement over current law, neglects to address three simple, much-needed reforms that could save lives.

I cannot support the bill before us today because I support stronger improvements to miner safety—which have been supported by miners, miner families, and industry. This legislation would be made stronger with three additional requirements: Provision of no less than a 2-day supply of breathable air for trapped miners; Assurance that within 15 months, communications and tracking devices will be available to find and communicate with trapped miners; regular inspections of miners' individual oxygen packs, known as self-contained self-rescuers, by the federal Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Congress can do better for working men and women by adopting these three provisions. In fact, since this bill passed the Senate, reports have indicated that these reforms could be easily implemented at very little cost. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership would not allow these simple and agreeable provisions to be offered as amendments to the bill.

The Bush administration has failed to make miner safety a priority and instead has proposed budget cuts and deregulation. Despite

six U.S. mine tragedies and more than 30 miners' deaths this year already, the President did not request funding for additional safety enforcement personnel in his Fiscal Year 2007 budget. This proposal is after years of budget cuts to the Department of Labor's Mine Safety and Health Administration, MSHA, resulting in a decline of 170 full-time employees at MSHA and a decline of 217 employees in coal enforcement. In addition, President Bush has appointed former mining executives to the top political positions at the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

I will continue to support efforts to implement stronger miner safety laws. I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues in joining with me to fight for stronger regulations that will save lives and to fight for our working men and women.

A TRIBUTE TO WALTER T. MOSLEY III

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Walter T. Mosley III, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments. Walter T. Mosley III serves as Chief of Staff and Counsel to New York State Assemblyman William F. Boyland, Jr. Prior to his current assignment, Mr. Mosley served as Legal Counsel to the Deputy Speaker of the Assembly, Hon. Clarence Norman, Jr. from 2001 to 2005. In this capacity, he served as advisor to the Deputy Speaker on legislative and public policy issues related to statewide and borough-wide initiatives.

Mr. Mosley's current responsibilities include proposing and recommending legislative items and statewide sponsorship requests, serving as the assemblyman's consultant to social programs and economic development projects within central Brooklyn. He also serves as his re-election consultant, and manager of his staff, both in Brooklyn and Albany, New York.

Prior to accepting his current position with the New York State Assembly, Mr. Mosley served as a political consultant on several local and countywide campaigns, and in 2004, was assigned by the Democratic National Committee to work on behalf of Senator JOHN KERRY's presidential campaign. From 1998 to 2001, Mr. Mosley was a Legislative and Oversight Analyst and Investigator for the New York City Council's Office of Oversight and Investigations. In that capacity, Mr. Mosley issued a number of citywide reports and studies on several public policy issues for the City Council.

Mr. Mosley is involved with many community activities, which include his personal work with literacy programs, youth and civic organizations that have made him keenly aware of the importance of helping others while providing opportunities for individuals to reach their full potential. Presently, Mr. Mosley serves as Chairman and Volunteer Mentor to "Future Giant," a non-profit Harlem/South Bronx community based organization formed to support and mentor adolescents and young adults; Board Member, Bedford YMCA; Chairman of the Economic Development & Job Creation Committee for Community Board 2; Board Member, Cush Campus Schools in Brooklyn, NY; Mentor, Penn State Fast Start Program for incoming freshmen from New York City; and an active member of the Brooklyn Branch of the NAACP.

Recently, Mr. Mosley co-founded and is a managing partner for the consulting firm, Advent Consulting Group, LLC where he helps to advise and organize not-for-profit groups in New York City.

In his spare time, Mr. Mosley serves as a volunteer youth coach with the Brooklyn Skyhawks Football Club and as a participating coach with the National Football League's Junior Players Development Program. Mr. Mosley is a member of the oldest African-American fraternal organization in America—Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Incorporated.

In addition to his volunteer work, Mr. Mosley actively fundraises for the internationally acclaimed HIV/AIDS advocacy group, The "Balm in Gilead," where he participates yearly in their annual marathon. Mr. Mosley sincerely hopes the level of his commitment not only helps to generate funding and awareness in the fight against HIV/AIDS, but will encourage other young adults to join in his efforts to raise money and awareness towards the fight against this horrible disease. This year, Mr. Mosley intends to run in the New York City Marathon to raise funds for the Bedford YMCA. As a result of his tireless work and efforts, Mr. Mosley is the recipient of numerous community awards and recognitions.

CONCERNING THE THREE SUICIDES AT GUANTANAMO BAY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker there has been no organization, no strategy and no plan for the handling of the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay. They have been in prison for years and years, with no hope of being formally charged. They are given none of the rights afforded prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention nor are they given the rights of criminal suspects in the U.S. justice system. In fact, out of the roughly 500 detainees at Guantanamo Bay, only four have been charged with war crimes. And, since these detainees are classified as enemy combatants, they can be held until the Iraq war is over. Since no one can accurately determine when the war will end, the prisoners could be detained for an indefinite amount of time.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Guantanamo Bay in 2003. I saw firsthand the conditions of the prisoners and the facilities in which they were being held. These prisoners were being held in small cells for over a year without any hope of having their day in court—or even being formally charged with a war crime. With this desperate atmosphere, it is not surprising that there have been at least 41 unsuccessful suicide attempts by 25 detainees since the United States began taking prisoners to the base in January 2002.

I find it inexcusable that my own country has not demonstrated more concern for the basic Constitutional rights of these prisoners. If there is legitimate evidence of crime, these prisoners deserve a speedy trial.

Mr. Speaker, we must be a positive example to the world. We must prove to all those who would challenge our way of life that a worthy Democracy that upholds the rule of law even in the time of conflict, can exist. If we are to convince the world that terrorism is wrong and freedom is right and just, then as the most powerful voice of liberty, the United States of America must start acting as a leader and as an example.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency I was not in attendance in the House between June 12th and June 14th, and during that time I missed a number of roll call votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes 250 through 262, 270, 273, 283, 286 and 287, and I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 263 through 269, 271, 272, 274 through 282, 284 and 285.

I ask unanimous consent that this be entered into the RECORD in the appropriate place.

TRIBUTE TO MARK ABBOTT

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mark Abbott, Dean of the College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences at Oregon State University, on his nomination to the National Science Board. Oregon has long benefited from Dean Abbott's impressive scientific knowledge and I am delighted that he will now have the opportunity to share this insight with the rest of the country.

We in Congress have already benefited from Dean Abbott's scientific expertise. In July, 2002, he testified before the House Committee on Science's Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards about satellite data management at NOAA from the perspective of the Earth science community.

During his time at Oregon State, Dean Abbott's research has been focused on the interaction of biological and physical processes in the upper ocean. He has been a pioneer in the use of satellite ocean color data to study coupled physical/biological processes and he has also advised the Office of Naval Research and the National Science Foundation on ocean information infrastructure. Dean Abbott was also recently appointed a co-chair of the State of Oregon's Climate Change Integration Group. This panel, appointed by Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski, has been charged with tracking the State's progress on greenhouse gas emission reductions and looking at future economic and societal implications of climate change.

The National Science Board is the governing body of the National Science Foundation, an independent federal agency established to promote the progress of science, advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and secure the national defense. The National Science Board has the duel responsibilities of serving as the national science policy advisor to the President and the Congress and serving as the governing board of the National Science Foundation.

Today, the Nation and the world are confronted with many questions about the possible impacts that human behavior is having on the environment. We need to make sure that our policy decisions are based on science and not the other way around. With Mark Abbott and others like him serving on the National Science Board, I know that this will continue to be the case.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM D. PINKETT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of William D. Pinkett, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

William D. Pinkett was born in New Haven, Connecticut to the late William Sheridan and Hattie Pinkett. He is the fifth of five brothers, all of whom have preceded him in death.

William (Bill as he is affectionately called by most) came to Brooklyn as an infant, when his parents came to New York seeking a better life.

Bill was educated in the New York public school system, attending PS 41, Junior High School 210 and Boys High School. He received his Bachelor of Arts Degree and Masters in Sociology from Brooklyn College. He also received a Masters of Science Degree in Educational Supervision from Pace University. In 1950, the US Army drafted Bill and he served in the infantry in Korea. In 1953, Bill received an honorable discharge and was immediately hired by the US Postal System. While working as a clerk at night, Bill attended graduate school and taught in the NYC Public Schools on a per diem basis during the day.

After 10 years of postal employment, he assumed a fulltime career as classroom teacher for 22 years. He later served as an educational administrator at the Board of Education headquarters for the next 10 years. Bill's tenure at the New York City Board of Education lasted 33 years. He retired in 1991, as a licensed Senior Educational Administrator of Curriculum and Staff Development.

Wherever Bill worked, he also served as a union representative in those titles. Upon retirement at the Board it was to be expected that he would become an elected officer in the Retired School Supervisors Chapter of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators (CSA). In his capacity as a Trustee of the CSA Retiree Welfare fund, Bill continues to serve as a champion for the rights and benefits for retirees of his former union.

Given Bill's leadership abilities, it was not a surprise that he was elected Chairman of the City-Wide Council of Municipal Retiree Organizations (COMRO), which is comprised of retirees from over 40 New York City unions, representing in excess of 150,000 retirees. Bill is completing his second term as Chairman of this distinguished organization of uniformed and civilian retirees, which seeks to maintain and improve the health benefits of all municipal retirees as well as keeping a watchful eye on legislation that impact upon New York City's five pension systems.

Bill will be quick to tell you that whatever skills in public relations with workers and retirees he might have, came about because he learned so much from his master teacher (and late wife), New York City Councilwoman Mary Glover Pinkett.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of William D. Pinkett as he offers his talents and services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, William Pinkett's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

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, 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:

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5576, the Transportation-Treasury-Housing and Urban Development-Judiciary-DC Appropriations Act of 2007.

This bill will provide over $139 billion in budgetary resources, including direct appropriations and funds from the transportation trust fund. Our highways and infrastructure system built this Nation, and we need to maintain them. This legislation brings the funding level to the amount required in the recently passed transportation bill, provides over $1 billion for Amtrak and other rail service, as well as the funds needed to maintain our Community Development Block Grant and elderly housing programs.

But I believe that this could have been a better bill. The proposed cuts to the HUD programs such as Hope VI and Section 8 housing for the elderly should have been rejected.

I support H.R. 5576 as amended, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS P. CANALI ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Francis (Frank) P. Canali on the occasion of his retirement from the Worcester, Massachusetts Public Schools. The end of this school year marks the end of Frank's distinguished thirty-four year career as a teacher and administrator at Worcester Vocational High School. During his long tenure, Frank has gained a well-deserved reputation as a talented professional educator who is widely respected and admired for his unfailing devotion to Worcester Voke.

The longevity of Frank Canali's career is not only impressive, it is also inspiring. In an age when loyalty is becoming an increasingly rare quality, Frank's steadfast commitment to the students, faculty and staff of Worcester Yoke reminds us all what one man can accomplish when he dedicates his life's work to the betterment of a single institution. When Frank walks out the doors of Worcester Voke for the last time, he will leave the school an infinitely better place than he found it.

Frank began teaching at Worcester Vocational High School in 1972 as a graphic arts instructor in the evening program. He later taught offset lithography, both in the Career Educational Training Program and at Worcester Vocational High School, before becoming head of the graphic communications department in 1980. Along the way Frank furthered his own education by earning a bachelor's of science degree in education and a master's degree in administration of occupational education. He was subsequently appointed assistant principal in 2000 and ultimately principal in 2003. As Frank now prepares to end his career as principal, he leaves Worcester Vocational High School as one of the highest-performing public schools in the City of Worcester and with a new state-of-the-art facility that is the envy of every community in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Both remarkable achievements are due in no small part to the immeasurable and lasting contributions Frank has made during his career. His positive influence has benefited an untold number of young men and women, and his legacy will be that he tirelessly demanded that vocational education receive the attention, emphasis and investment it rightly deserves and that our nation so desperately needs.

Mr. Speaker, as the brother of two Worcester public school teachers, I know well the great challenges and demands our educators face on a daily basis. For thirty-four years, Frank Canali has met and mastered those daily challenges. He enters retirement with the quiet pride and satisfaction of knowing that he has truly made a difference. I wish to offer my heartfelt appreciation for Frank's public service to the families of Worcester, Massachusetts, and I wish him and his wife Pattie, their children and grandchildren a happy and healthy retirement. He has earned it.

CONGRATULATING THE LEWIS CASS ''LADY KINGS'' SOFTBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE CLASS 2A INDIANA STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CHRIS CHOCOLA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 2006 Class 2A State Champion Lewis Cass Softball team.

Led by coach Brent Blinn and assistant coaches Scott Rouch, Greg Comoglio, and Mike Stow these 17 talented girls beat Frankton High School 3–0 to clinch the championship.

The Championship game, all five and a half hours of it, capped off an incredible 28–2 season where the Lady Kings faced and defeated the best competition Indiana has to offer. These talented young ladies are a great example of how teamwork, commitment, discipline, and confidence will lead to success.

The team includes: Krista Weber, Kayla Blinn, Misty Collins, Rachel Comoglio, Brittany LoCoco, Jennifer Berlet, Emily Watkinds, Taylor DeHaven, Alexandra Rouch, Ollmay Wilson, Molly Naphew, Anna Tweed, Samantha Roller, Morgan Baker, Danya Long, Ashley Snider and Haley Tolle.

I am truly fortunate to have the opportunity to recognize these incredible women. It is my wish that their story of triumph will encourage both men and women of all walks of life, whether they play sports or not, to follow their dreams, believe in their friends, and not give up until they can hoist the trophy of victory above their heads like the Lady Kings of Lewis Cass.

THE IMPORTANCE OF U.S. FOREIGN AID

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD, an article by Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Nicholas D. Kristof discussing the merits of U.S. foreign aid. In the article, titled Foreign Aid Has Flaws. So What?, published in the June 13, 2006 edition of the New York Times, Mr. Kristof demands a dialogue to increase the effectiveness of our foreign aid. It is good to see the subject of foreign aid being addressed in the New York Times editorial pages because there needs to be public education about the benefits of foreign aid for the poor and also for the United States.

Eradicating global poverty is the first objective of the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals. With that in mind we must recognize the need for increasing the effectiveness of the money that is provided through foreign assistance programs every year. Mr. Kristof initiates his point by acknowledging the central reality that ''helping people can be much harder than it looks.'' For example, food assistance lowers prices in the markets of the recipient countries and continues the impact by discouraging local farmers from planting the next season.

Economists have argued that aid can have adverse effects on a country's economic system. It pushes up the local exchange rates, discouraging local manufacturing; it breeds foreign assistance dependency by cutting down room for internal development of industries and opportunities. At the same time our aid saves lives. ''For pennies [we] can vaccinate a child and save his/her life. For only $5, [we] can buy a mosquito net and save several people from malaria.'' In Darfur we haven't done nearly enough to establish permanent peace and stability, but our aid has kept thousands of people alive.

Keeping these facts in mind, my dear colleagues, I ask you all to join me in taking constructive steps to increase both the amount of U.S. foreign aid and the efficiency in distributing it to nations that are in dire need of assistance. We, as representatives of the most powerful nation of the world, must lead the way and work with international organizations that can share this burden with us.

[From The New York Times, June 13, 2006]

FOREIGN AID HAS FLAWS. SO WHAT?

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

Don't tell anyone, but a dirty little secret within the foreign aid world is that aid often doesn't work very well.

Now that truth has been aired (and sometimes exaggerated) in a provocative new book by William Easterly, ''The White Man's Burden.'' Mr. Easterly, a former World Bank official who is now an economics professor at New York University, has tossed a hand grenade at the world's bleeding hearts—and, worst of all, he makes some valid points.

Let me say right off that stingy Republicans should not read this book. It might inflame their worst suspicions.

But the rest of us should read it, because there is a growing constituency for fighting global poverty, and we need to figure out how to make that money more effective.

I disagree with many of Professor Easterly's arguments, but he's right about one central reality: helping people can be much harder than it looks. When people are chronically hungry, for example, shipping in food can actually make things worse, because the imported food lowers prices and thus discourages farmers from planting in the next season. (That's why the United Nations, when spending aid money, tries to buy food in the region rather than import it.)

On one of my last trips to Darfur, I had dinner at a restaurant in Nyala called K2. Out back were 18 big white S.U.V.'s belonging to the U.N. and aid groups; that amounted to nearly $1 million worth of vehicles, in a country where people are starving.

The aid workers are struggling heroically in a dangerous and difficult place, and I don't begrudge them reliable vehicles. But something seems wrong when international agencies are more successful at maintaining S.U.V.'s than clinics. (One reason is that budgeting is often done annually, and one of the ways to spend a grant in a single year is to buy a vehicle.)

It's well-known that the countries that have succeeded best in lifting people out of poverty (China, Singapore, Malaysia) have received minimal aid, while many that have been flooded with aid (Niger, Togo, Zambia) have ended up poorer. Thus many economists accept that aid doesn't generally help poor countries grow, but argue that it does stimulate growth in poor countries with good governance. That was the conclusion of a study in 2000 by Craig Burnside and David Dollar. Professor Easterly repeated that study, using a larger pool of data, and—alas—found no improvement even in countries with good governance.

Saddest of all, Raghuram Rajan and Arvind Subramanian of the International Monetary Fund have found that ''aid inflows have systematic adverse effects on a country's competitiveness.'' One problem is that aid pushes up the local exchange rate, discouraging local manufacturing. Mr. Subramanian also argues that aid income can create the same kinds of problems as oil income—that famous ''oil curse''—by breeding dependency and undermining local institutions.

All these findings can be pretty shattering to a bleeding-heart American. But cheer up.

Some other studies indicate that aid does improve growth (economists don't agree about this any more than they agree about anything else). And whatever the impact on economic growth rates, aid definitely does something far more important: it saves lives.

For pennies, you can vaccinate a child and save his or her life. For $5 you can buy a family a large mosquito net and save several people from malaria. For $250, you can repair a teenage girl's fistula, a common childbirth injury, and give her a life again.

The Center for Global Development, a Washington think tank, has published a terrific book, ''Millions Saved,'' demonstrating how health projects have saved lives. Eradicating smallpox and reducing river blindness have improved the lives of more people for less money than almost any investment imaginable. In Darfur, we haven't done nearly enough. But our aid shipments have kept alive hundreds of thousands of people.

For my whole adult life, I've sponsored children through Plan USA, and in visiting my ''adopted'' child in places like the Philippines and Sudan, I've seen how the kids' lives are transformed by American sponsors. Aid is no panacea, but it is a lifesaver.

So let's not shy away from a conversation about the effectiveness of aid. The problems are real, but so are the millions of people alive today who wouldn't be if not for aid. In the end, if we have tough conversations about foreign aid, then I believe Americans will acknowledge the challenges—and then, clear-eyed, agree to dig more deeply than ever, for that is simply the best way we have of asserting our own humanity.

HENRY GLOVER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Henry Glover, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Mr. Glover was born and raised in South Carolina and moved to Brooklyn, New York after graduating from high school.

He's married to his high school sweetheart Mabel and is the proud father of four children and one adopted son. Mr. Glover graduated as an auto mechanic from Berk Trade School. He also attended LaGuardia Community College and earned his certification in Management. After many years of loyal and dedicated service, Mr. Glover retired from Eagle Electric Company.

Noting a need for change, Mr. Glover started volunteering in the community in the late seventies with the East New York Democratic Club. He later was appointed President of the

Tenant Association of Marcus Garvey Houses, where he started the development's first free lunch program and youth jobs program.

Mr. Glover later moved to Bedford Stuyvesant and became very active with the Unity Democratic Club, where he serves as Chairperson of the Membership Committee and Office Manager. In his spare time, he loves to watch sports and two of his most beloved teams are the NY Yankees and the NY Football Giants.

Everyone who knows Mr. Glover knows that if you can't catch him during the week, you will be sure to find him on Sunday at Mt. Carmel Baptist Church where he serves as a faithful Deacon. He is also a member of the Association of Deacons.

Mr. Glover's motto is "If I Can't Help Somebody Along the Way, Then My Living Would Have Been in Vain," and his life is a living testament.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Henry Glover, a man who offers his talents and services for the betterment of our community.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Glover's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH HENRY WASHINGTON

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as Chair of the Congressional Black Caucas, to pay tribute to a fallen American hero. Joseph Henry Washington passed away on June 13, 2006. He was not well known beyond his Charleston, South Carolina community, but he represents so many unsung African American heroes who courageously defended America in the armed forces at a time when this country was denying their civil rights.

Joe Washington was a survivor of Pearl Harbor. His life was an ordinary one, but on December 7, 1941, it became extraordinary.

Mr. Washington was the youngest son of Isaac and Elvira Delura McCants Washington. After his father's death, his mother struggled to raise her two young boys by "taking in washing" for wealthy Charleston residents. Despite the hardships, no one wanted young Joe to leave home and join the Navy. Yet he was determined to see the world, and his mother gave permission for her son to fulfill his dream.

Navy recruiting officers welcomed young Joe. However, he quickly learned that the only place for men of color was as a Mess Attendant for Naval officers. Still he boarded a train for Raleigh, North Carolina and took the oath to dutifully serve his country. On August 9, 1937, Joe Washington reported for Basic Training in Norfolk, Virginia. In just three short months, he was prepared for his first assignment in the Ward Room on the USS *Arizona*. His initial duties included seeing to the needs of the ship's officers, including LCDR Commander Samuel G. Fuqua, a man Mr. Washington would later credit with saving many lives at Pearl Harbor.

While serving on the USS *Arizona*, he attended the Cook and Stewards School, which was the only upwardly mobile field open to African Americans in the Navy. After completing the course, Mr. Washington was assigned to Steward's Duty and helped plan the meals.

His time on the USS *Arizona* passed uneventfully until the "day that will live in infamy." While on duty in the Ward Room, Joe Washington heard a big explosion and then alarms sounded. His first thought was this was a drill, but when bullets began hitting the decks he knew this was the real thing.

Mr. Washington later recalled that a Japanese plane dropped a bomb right down the smoke stack directly into the ammunition room resulting in a terrific explosion. He joined his fellow sailors in securing the ship by closing portholes in their section to keep out the water and bullets. Then he tried to return to his quarters and found the hatches closed and locked by those who had gone before. He made his way to the deck and found most of the crew there dead or badly burned. He went to work helping those he could. A lifeboat came to rescue some of the men. Mr. Washington escaped by wading to shore. He came through the bombing without a scratch, and was one of only two surviving African Americans on the ill-fated Arizona.

Joe Washington spent two days at a hanger at Hickam Air Field in Washington. Yet because of his dedication to the Navy and his need to distract himself from the tragedy at Pearl Harbor, Mr. Washington volunteered to go back to work on the USS *Oklahoma* and the USS *California*.

In November 1946, Mr. Washington was admirably discharged from Navy. Some twelve years later, he returned to Hawaii to appear with then-retired Rear Admiral Fuqua on the popular television show "This Is Your Life." During that visit, he returned to the site of the Arizona's remains and said a silent prayer. In a 1985 interview he recalled, "I couldn't help thinking that I hope they didn't die in vain."

Joseph Washington spent the rest of his professional career as a government employee at the Brooklyn Navy Yard in New York. He returned home to Charleston in the 1970s after retirement and became an active and faithful member of Morris Brown AME Church. He never spoke of the events of December 7, 1941 unless he was asked, yet when he did, he would always exclaim, "It was a miracle that I came through the bombing. I was one of the lucky ones."

Joe Washington died last Tuesday at the age of 87, and will be buried in Charleston on Saturday. Mr. Washington never married. He leaves to mourn his passing a sister-in-law, and five beloved nieces including Emily E. Clyburn, the wife of our colleague JIM CLYBURN.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me and members of the Congressional Black Caucus in remembering Joseph Henry Washington by saying that we are the lucky ones. We enjoy many freedoms today because men like him were willing to fight for their country even when they didn't enjoy the full benefit of what it meant to be an American. Because of Joe Washington and so many other unsung heroes, today our country is truly the home of the brave and the land of the free.

IN TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN H. LOUNSBURY

HON. JIM MARSHALL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. John H. Lounsbury, of Milledgeville, GA for his efforts on behalf of Georgia's children and for his long record of service in the field of education.

After serving our country during World War II, Dr. Lounsbury went back to school. He earned both a Bachelor's and a Master's Degree and quickly started his long, distinguished career in education. In 1954, he received his Doctorate and shifted his career from teaching students to teaching teachers. In 1960, he accepted the position of chairman of the Department of Education at Georgia College, and in 1977 became dean of the School of Education. Since 1983, he has served as dean emeritus.

Throughout his career, Dr. Lounsbury has been a leading force in middle grades education. He helped shape the future of middle grades education while working on the original development committee for Middle School/Junior High School Evaluative Criteria as well as the revision committee a decade later. The long-lasting impact he's had in this area is perhaps his most important legacy.

In addition to his work at Georgia College, Dr. Lounsbury has been the chairman of many professional associations, and has also served as a member or chairman of more than 25 visiting committees for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Georgia State Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, despite these many obligations, Dr. Lounsbury still found the time to author or co-author more than 130 articles, 2 college textbooks, and 5 national research reports. He has made scores of presentations to various professional conferences, professional institutes and conventions.

Roundly respected as a man who has truly dedicated his life to bettering education, Dr. Lounsbury has received so many awards and honors from his peers that I cannot name them all for fear I will omit one. The most recent of those honors included a presentation here in Washington, DC. Dr. Lounsbury received the Joan Lipsitz Lifetime Achievement Award, presented by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform "Schools to Watch" Program, for his significant and continuous contributions to the development, implementation and sustained growth of middle level education.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when middle school students were treated no differently than their younger counterparts, with no attention to their unique needs, abilities and challenges. Today, we know that children learn differently at different ages. Dr. Lounsbury played a key role in teaching all of us this important lesson. He is an architect of middle grades education and to this day remains a champion for this special age group.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. SHELBY SAMUEL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Shelby Samuel, a distinguished member of the medical community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Shelby Samuel, M.D. is Chief of Gastroenterology at North General Hospital. He is an Assistant Professor of Medicine at Downstate Medical Center, State University of New York. Dr. Samuel received his undergraduate degree at Yale University and his Medical Degree at Downstate Medical Center.

Dr. Samuel is the recipient of awards for community involvement and leadership. He has been involved in efforts for promoting the academic advancement of young people at the level of junior high school, high school, college, and medical school. Dr. Samuel is involved in active research regarding problems in gastroenterology and hepatology that affect the minority community. He has presented his research findings at national academic meetings, including research findings on the knowledge and attitudes regarding colon cancer prevention in a high-risk urban population. Dr. Samuel has a private practice in gastroenterology with offices in Brooklyn and Manhattan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. Shelby Samuel, a man who has made giant strides in the field of medicine, and whose service makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Shelby Samuel's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

HONORING CAMP MAC SUMMER CAMP FOR BOYS AND GIRLS

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Alabama's own Camp Mac, as well as all the other fine summer camps located throughout the country.

Truly an ''institution'' in Alabama, Camp Mac Summer Camp for Boys and Girls was established in 1948 by Mr. and Mrs. E.A. McBride. Today, almost 60 years later, Camp Mac is still owned and operated by the McBride family, a true success story spanning three generations.

Camp Mac is situated in the beautiful Cheaha Mountains and surrounded by the two hundred thousand plus acres that make up the Talladega National Forest. The location is ideal for the fun and safe summer programs that are the hallmark of Camp Mac.

Since its founding, Camp Mac has provided a refuge from the negative influences that the world has to offer today's youth. Campers enter into a world of ''Safety, Fun, and Instruction.'' With over 70 activities to choose from, campers are strengthened both in skill and confidence through the instruction they receive.

The summers spent in this wholesome environment provide an opportunity for the campers to independently develop unique and special relationships which can—and often do—last a lifetime. Campers are also given the independence to choose their own adventure for the summer because they are free to choose the activities in which they wish to participate.

These new-found friendships and activities are all carefully watched over by a staff that is second to none. The caring and nurturing staff of Camp Mac is made up of individuals who are of the highest character and are dedicated to the camp's mission. The devoted staff is just one more hallmark of Camp Mac.

It is my sincere hope that the mission of this wonderful refuge and those who work towards that mission will continue to thrive in the years to come, and I rise today to honor Camp Mac and the McBride family, and salute them for the positive difference they have made in the lives of so many young people.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 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, 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:

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, lead paint hazards still threaten communities with exposure to toxins in the home triggering asthma at a great cost to American families and the national economy. Those most vulnerable are low-income and minority children living in older, substandard housing.

Despite these facts and the continued bipartisan support for HUD's lead hazard control grants, this bill cuts funding by approximately $35 million. With only one-third of the HUD requests from cities and States being funded, these cuts would only further jeopardize the health and safety of children and families across the Nation.

I, therefore, rise today to urge you to support the Slaughter-Velázquez-Terry amendment which restores funds for this critical program that will help with prevention efforts and move us closer to the national goal of eradicating lead poisoning altogether. Last year, a similar amendment passed the House with bipartisan support.

Voting for this amendment will ensure that children and families nationwide will have a safe place to call home, free from the worry of harm from household toxins.

H.R. 5522

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, Darfur is in a state of chaos and the humanitarian situation is more dire than it was a year ago. Security is desperately needed and unfortunately the 7,400 African Union personnel have not been able to provide stability in the region. Their lack of numbers, limited mandate and supplies have hindered their ability to stop the atrocities.

However, they are currently the only force on the ground. We hope that the African Union Mission in Sudan, AMIS, will be transitioned into a United Nations mission as soon as possible, but there are no guarantees as to when that will occur. I understand that a joint AU–UN Assessment Mission is currently on the ground in Sudan and that we are expecting a deployment of troops by October 1. Despite the beginnings of this work, it is unclear that this will lead to a deployment by the expected date. In fact, the Government of Sudan is still opposed to a U.N. force in Darfur.

I understand that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations did not include funding for AMIS in this bill as the U.N. mission is expected to begin before this bill is completed. However, I am concerned that the U.N. mission will take much longer and that AMIS will not have enough funds to provide security and complete their new daunting tasks under the Darfur Peace Accord.

The needs of AMIS are great and I hope that a U.N. mission will be deployed to Darfur in the immediate future.

However, if the U.N. mission is not in place when we go to conference on this bill and AMIS is in need of funding, I hope that the committee will support reprogramming funds in this bill to support AMIS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 2006, I was attending my daughter Karen's middle school graduation ceremony in New Jersey and, therefore, missed 13 recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously, and had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on recorded vote No. 274; ''yes'' on recorded vote No. 275; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 276; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 277; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 278; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 279; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 280; ''yes'' on recorded vote No. 281; ''yes'' on recorded vote No. 282; ''yes'' on recorded vote No. 283; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 284; ''no'' on recorded vote No. 285; ''yes'' on recorded vote No. 286.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006—CONFERENCE

SPEECH OF

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2006

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental appropriations legislation passed by the House will spend nearly $95 billion of taxpayer money yet will not help our veterans, will not secure peace in Iraq, and will not make our homeland safer and better for working families.

The Bush administration continues to underfund the health care services for veterans and sent our troops to war without a plan to secure the peace. When our servicemen and women return home they are returning to a system that cannot care for them or provide the benefits they so greatly sacrificed for and deserve. And the hurricane season began again on June 1 but this Nation is no closer to be prepared for a hurricane under this administration than it was the day before Hurricanes Katrina and Wilma struck land. This bill will not resolve these issues.

Instead of passing the biggest supplemental ever passed by Congress, Congress should take real steps to help protect our country and ensure our veterans and their families receive the care they need. We should pass the GI bill of rights for the 21st century to ensure affordable and accessible health care, education benefits and job training. We need to take seriously the impact of the war on veterans and their families and pass legislation I have introduced to ensure access to needed mental health counseling. We should develop a real plan to bring our troops home safely and secure the peace.

I strongly support our troops, our veterans and their families and will continue to fight to ensure they receive the well-deserved support of their country. I will continue to fight to improve the quality of life for working families. And I will continue to make sure America is a safer place.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. CLIFFORD YOUNG

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Clifford Young, a distinguished member of the medical community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Dr. Clifford Young is affectionately known by members of the Brooklyn, New York community as ''The People's Doctor.'' Dr. Young is a man who overcame tremendous challenges to practice medicine, and then did his best to help people once he got his degree.

Dr. Young was born on the multiple island nation of St. Vincent and the Grenadines located in the eastern Caribbean. Upon graduation from secondary school, he received a PAHO/WHO scholarship to the Barbados Community College where he studied laboratory technology. After a short tenure at the lab of the Kingstown General Hospital, he migrated to the U.S. to continue his studies. In 1980, he enrolled at Hunter College of the City University of New York and in 1984 he graduated with a bachelor's degree in chemistry. In 1989, he received a doctor of medicine degree from the State University of New York, Downstate Medical Center. After completing his residency, Dr. Young served as an attending physician at the Woodhull Medical Center in Brooklyn, a position he still holds today. Dr. Young is also an attending physician in the Department of Medicine at the Brookdale University Hospital, and is the medical director of Citi Medical of Carnasie in Brooklyn. But Dr. Young doesn't stop there. He is also a clinical assistant professor with the Department of Medicine at Downstate Medical School, SUNY; a Diplomat of the Medical Board of Medical Examiners, a Diplomat of the American Board of International Medicine and a Fellow of the American College of Physicians. In recognition of his outstanding charitable work and contributions, Dr. Young also received the Family Service Network of New York 2005 Community Health Award and the Thomas R. Fortune Professional Health Care Award in 2006.

Dr. Young is happily married to the former Hilma Foster; they have two daughters, Nyasha and Chantay, and one son, Clifford Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. Clifford Young, a man who has made giant strides in the field of medicine, and whose service makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

EXPANDING DEMOCRACY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an upcoming event that should be of interest to my colleagues. The Democratic Pacific Union was founded in August 2005 and its Pacific Congressional Caucus (Taiwan Chapter) was inaugurated on May 20, 2006. Chaired by Taiwan Vice President Lu Hsiu-lien, the Taiwan Chapter has been very active in promoting democracy, peace and prosperity through the publication of the Democratic Pacific Union Quarterly, the scheduling of regional meetings in the East and the West Pacific regions, the initiation of the Pacific Economic Advisory Group and the Pacific Congressional Caucus project.

I commend Chair Lu Hsiu-lien of the Democratic Pacific Union for her hard work and applaud the Taiwan Chapter for all its initiatives on behalf of the Democratic Pacific Union in their pursuit of a stronger democratic process.

The Taiwan Chapter will also sponsor a symposium on congressional reform this summer in Taipei from August 12–14. The symposium will discuss the relationships between legislature and democracy, the electoral process, rules and campaign finance. As the world's strongest democracy, the United States can contribute greatly to this event. I urge my colleagues to attend this symposium and share their knowledge and expertise with fellow lawmakers from the Pacific region.

TRIBUTE TO THEODORE FLOYD: RESPECTED COMMUNITY LEADER AND DEVOTED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a dear friend, Detective Theodore Floyd of the Indian River Sheriff's Department.

As a former Florida Highway Patrolman myself, I have proudly worn the titles ''law enforcement officer'' and ''first responder.'' But Theodore Floyd is more than that, because he is truly a peace officer who takes a broader view of his responsibilities.

On Saturday, June 17, 2006, at St. Peter's Missionary Baptist Church in Vero Beach, Florida, a service of appreciation will be held for Mr. Floyd, who has had a distinguished 15-year career in law enforcement with the Indian River Sheriff's Department.

Detective Floyd recently implemented crime prevention strategies in communities throughout Indian River County. He has built strong relationships with community leaders and elected officials that have increased the security and safety of Indian River County residents. He has aided in rallying county government to improve living conditions for the County's less fortunate.

Detective Floyd has previously been honored by many organizations over his long career. He has been recognized by the Daytona Beach and Volusia police departments, and has been named Pastoral Law Enforcement Man of the Year.

Mr. Floyd is an active member of many community-based organizations, including the Progressive Civic League, the local NAACP, Habitat for Humanity, the Treasure Coast Business League, and the Gifford Activity Center, among many others.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Pastor's Association, Indian River County Sheriff Roy Raymond, Indian River County Commissioner Gary Wheeler and Vero Beach City Commissioner Bob Solari in honoring Detective Floyd for his incredible dedication and service, both on-duty and off.

As a dear friend of Teddy's, I take pride in his distinguished career. As a public servant myself, I admire what he has been able to achieve.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL DAY

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Michael J. Day, who tragically died in the line of duty earlier this week. Mr. Day, the Deputy Assistant Fire Chief and 27-year veteran of the Providence Fire Department, was dedicated to his profession and to serving his community.

On June 13, Mr. Day had returned to the Washington Street Fire House after responding to a fire earlier in the night. As the overnight shift began, Michael had been working in his office when a coworker found him unconscious. While his fellow firefighters did all in their power to resuscitate him, they were unable to do so.

A lifelong resident of Providence, Mr. Day came from a family of firefighters, which included his father and three brothers. He attended LaSalle Academy and after graduating from the fire academy, he was appointed to the Providence Fire Department in 1979. He earned a Bachelor of Arts in Physical Education from Rhode Island College in 1980 and another B.A. in Fire Science at Providence College in 1981.

Michael was promoted to Lieutenant in 1989, the same year he was honored as the Providence Firefighter of the Year and received the Heroic Action commendation for rescuing four people from the roof of a burning house. This was just one of many times he would be recognized for his outstanding service and courage on the job. He was promoted to Captain in 1995, Battalion Chief in 2000, and most recently to Deputy Assistant Fire Chief on June 30, 2005. He oversaw operations at multiple fire stations and was the top ranking officer of his shift. Michael had just completed his final class in the Executive Officer program at the National Fire Academy.

As a beloved father figure to his fellow firefighters, I have no doubt that Michael Day will leave a lasting legacy to the entire Providence Fire Department and the Providence community. I extend my condolences to all who knew and loved Michael Day, especially his wife, Cynthia; his son, Michael; and his daughters, Amanda, Brianne and Stephanie. May we keep his loved ones in our thoughts and prayers as they endure this difficult period.

50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF SAMUEL R. AND JESTINE W. FOSTER

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House a milestone in the lives of an all-American family. Fifty years ago, on June 14, 1956, Samuel R. Foster and Jestine Wright were united in a marriage that inspires all of us who know them. Both dedicated their lives to public service as school teachers and administrators. Early in the era of school integration, Sam Foster was selected as principal to start a new school, Northwestern High School in Rock Hill, South Carolina. This was a great challenge for an African-American educator, but Sam rose to the challenge and won the respect of students and parents, white and black. Sam Foster moved from education to elective office and served with distinction in the South Carolina General Assembly. He became known throughout the state for his wisdom and ability and especially for his facility to see all sides of an issue and cut to the essence of an argument. Sam Foster completed his career in public service as a commissioner on the South Carolina Employment Security Commission. All who know the couple well know that Sam Foster has derived much of his wisdom and insight over the years from the counsel of his wife, Jestine.

Two sons were born to Sam and Jestine Foster, Sam and Alan, both of whom have been successful in their own right, bringing further distinction to their parents.

Mr. Speaker, I call the Fosters to the attention of the House because their marriage and family are exemplary and worthy of recognition throughout the Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO CHERYL McKISSACK FELDER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Cheryl McKissack Felder, a distinguish member of the business and civic communities. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Born in Nashville, Tennessee, to teacher Leatrice and architect, William D. Berry McKissack, Cheryl McKissack Felder's passion for the skill and art of design/build evolved through five generations of master builders. In sustaining the McKissack tradition in a male-dominated industry, Cheryl's innovative ideas and business leadership skills has proven to be triumphant in exceeding the expectations of clients and colleagues alike.

Joining the family business in 1989 after achieving her Master of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from Howard University, Cheryl holds a unique position in the construction and engineering industries as the head of the Nation's oldest African-American and women-owned design and construction firm. Her hands-on and close client interaction management approach assure clients that every detail of each project will be handled with care and precision. With McKissack providing services throughout the United States, Cheryl has contracted over $50 billion dollars in projects. Some of Cheryl's most distinguished clients include the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Housing Authority, Dormitory of the State of New York, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, New Jersey Port Authority and Philadelphia International Airport.

With offices in Philadelphia and New York, Cheryl has pioneered the McKissack company to today's, McKissack & McKissack, LLC; the corporate entity and holding company and 721 Chestnut; a real-estate company. Cheryl serves as the President of The McKissack Group, Inc., a full service construction management firm specializing in new construction and renovation projects. She is the Chief Executive Officer of McKissack and Associates, Inc., a professional architecture firm that provides conceptual and schematic design, preconstruction administration and design development services. Cheryl stays on the cutting edge of technology as the Chief Executive Officer of M&M Solutions, LLC, an information technology firm providing advanced web-based technology, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), infrastructure, telecommunications and IT project management. Services provided by MMS include business process integration, web development, multimedia design, wireless communications and application development.

Cheryl is also a community leader. She has served as the Vice Chair of the Philadelphia Authority of Industrial Development, and co-chair on Philadelphia Mayor John Street's Transition Committee for Small Business. Cheryl is also an active member of the National Liberty Museum Board, where she has been honored as a ''Hero of Liberty'' for her support of humanitarian initiatives and promoting the responsibilities of a free and diverse America.

A strong community leader and a business mogul, Cheryl prides herself with her most dedicated and greatest accomplishments of being a wife and mother.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Cheryl McKissack Felder as she offers her talents and philanthropic services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Cheryl McKissack Felder's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

A STIRRING STORY ABOUT SERGEANT CEDRIC CALDWELL

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a stirring story about Sergeant Cedric Caldwell, one of my constituents, from Rock Hill, South Carolina. His story is one example of the brave men and women serving in Iraq.

[From the Herald, May 28, 2006]

ROCK HILL SOLDIER SAVED LIVES OF COMRADES IN IRAQ WHEN BOMB SHREDDED CONVOY TRUCK

(By Andrew Dys)

The U.S. Army convoy rolled where death lives.

About 30 miles north of Baghdad. Night in Iraq couldn't have been darker. Late April, a little more than a month ago.

Rock Hill's ''Corn Dog,'' Sgt. Cedric Caldwell, manned the front machine gun on one of the convoy escort trucks. A sergeant from California named Torres was beside him. A private first class named Squires drove.

The truck looked like America. A black guy, a white guy and a Hispanic guy.

But Iraq in the night is not like America where so many spend nights howling about blacks and Hispanics. In Iraq in Alpha Battery, 3rd Battalion, 321st Field Artillery Regiment, your brothers who don't look like you are all you've got.

No color matters but the indigo of night and the yellow of fire and the red of blood.

''All of a sudden, there was a loud explosion, and I fell down inside the cab on Torres,'' Caldwell remembered.

The truck rolled and tipped over on its top.

''I must have gotten knocked out for a minute,'' Caldwell said. ''Then all I could see was fire and smoke everywhere. Except for the picture in my mind. It was just like a photograph. My wife and my daughter. It's

true. Your life does flash in front of your eyes. I saw it.''

Caldwell saw the hatch opening for the truck and climbed through as the calls of ''I'm hit! I'm hit'' pierced the night and cut through the flames.

Caldwell didn't run for the safety of the roadside ditch. He didn't call for a doctor for himself. He pulled Torres to safety through the hatch. Then he dragged Torres about 20 meters from the truck so the explosions wouldn't kill him.

The munitions in the truck were blowing up in the fire. Bullets, shells, shrapnel designed to kill the enemy now trying to kill them.

''I could still hear screaming,'' Caldwell said.

PUTTING OTHERS' NEEDS FIRST

Again, Caldwell didn't run for safety.

''All I could see was Squires' hand,'' Caldwell said. ''So I reached in, grabbed on, and pulled him out.''

Squires was burning alive.

''It was like a stunt double in the movies,'' Caldwell said. ''His whole legs were on fire. I rolled him around to try and put the fire out, but it didn't work. So I took off my vest and my shirt and tried to smother the fire.''

Finally, the fire was out, but Squires' clothes were so hot Squires was still burning. Shirtless, bare-chested in a place where snipers are the law, Caldwell knelt in the road and pulled off Squires' clothes. Finally, he got Squires to the ditch.

Before the medics arrived, Caldwell poured what water he could find over Squires' wounds.

''I kept telling him he was going to be OK, that he was going to live,'' Caldwell said. ''He was yelling. I was yelling. But I wasn't going to let him die. Both of them are really good soldiers. They would have done the same for me.''

Torres suffered a broken arm and other injuries and is now back at Fort Bragg, N.C., where all three soldiers are based. Squires is in intensive care at the Brook Army Medical Center burn unit in San Antonio, Texas, hospital officials confirmed.

Caldwell suffered a concussion and has a dent in his forehead where an ammunition box thumped him. He has shrapnel in his leg. He has cuts and bums on his face and hands. His back is covered with an I8-inch burn.

STRONG SENSE OF HONOR, DUTY

He is a sergeant with responsibility for 14 men. He said his superiors have put in for a Purple Heart for his wounds in action and a Combat Action Badge, and either a Bronze Star or Silver Star for valor.

Caldwell could have come home, too. But he chose to stay in Iraq.

''My men here need me,'' Caldwell said by telephone this week.

Caldwell's wife and parents were distraught that he was injured, but they rejoice he is alive. Maybe even more, they take pride that Cedric Caldwell did what every man hopes he would do when an overturned truck is on fire with men underneath that truck.

Caldwell did not run. He didn't ask for help for himself. He helped his men.

''He went back,'' said the Rev. Willie Caldwell, the father. ''I prepared myself when he left that my son could come back in a pine box. I supported this war then and now. I believe in freedom. It's not cheap. And then when he was at the hospital, he saw all those other guys who are hurt worse. He told me, 'Daddy, I need to stay. These guys need to come home, not me.' ''

Caldwell's wife, Tiffani, is a military child whose parents are both immigrants from the Caribbean. Her father came from Jamaica to the Air Force. He served in the first Persian Gulf War. Her mother came from Barbados to the Army.

Torres came from Mexico, Caldwell said.

Americans gnash their teeth over immigration, ask for fences to be built or borders to be shuttered, while the sons and daughters of immigrants or immigrants themselves fight the wars over freedom.

''CORN DOG'': A LOCAL HERO

''My best friend is a hero,'' said Travis Canty, who has been ''like a brother'' with Caldwell since both were little kids in Rock Hill. It is Canty who spilled the beans that the nickname ''Corn Dog'' comes from Caldwell eating corn dogs for lunch during school.

''He didn't run. He didn't hide. He saved those guys,'' Canty said.

Caldwell went first to Kosovo when the war on terror began. He was home a short while, then spent almost a year in Afghanistan. A few months with his wife and then Iraq. Caldwell was home for a few days in January, just missing the birth of daughter Tiffanie. He saw her, kissed her and his wife a few times, then went back to Iraq.

And then he cheats death. And still he stays in Iraq.

''I guess my military background prepared me for this,'' Tiffani Caldwell said. ''I haven't cried yet. My husband is alive. He is a soldier. He'll come home when his deployment is finished.''

RETURN TO A SIMPLER LIFE

Caldwell's enlistment is up in February. He said he's not staying in the Army.

''No way, no more Iraq,'' said Williatte, his mother.

''We are done,'' said Tiffani, his wife.

Caldwell plans to come back to Rock Hill with his wife and daughter. He'll play music in his father's Abiezer Baptist Church. He wants to be a Realtor.

''I truly believe that without God, me and Torres and Squires would not have survived,'' Caldwell said.

Caldwell may be right.

Maybe God wanted the black and the Hispanic and the white guys to live.

But one thing seems to be for sure.

A Rock Hill guy, Northwestern High class of 1998, who joined the National Guard while still in high school then leapt into active duty and never left, didn't leave his brothers to die in the dirt and flame and blood of Iraq.

Monday, on Memorial Day, no monuments will be etched with the names Torres or Squires on granite.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO H. RES. 861—RESOLUTION ON THE WAR IN IRAQ

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the crafty language in this resolution, there is no connection between 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. The Global War on Terror and the War in Iraq are not synonymous.

The President has admitted this, yet the Republican Party in this House continues to support his failed policies in Iraq under the guise of fighting terror—consistently providing billions of off-budget funding, allowing waste, fraud and abuse to go unchecked and failing to exercise even the semblance of oversight. So, instead of debating solutions for Iraq today, we are discussing a non-binding resolution that is equally as short-sighted and devoid of direction as President Bush's Iraq policy.

We all have unwavering pride for our troops. The quagmire that Iraq has become is not the fault of the troops who have performed superbly—it is the failure of the President to plan for a transition to peace.

That is why I support the Murtha resolution. It would provide a plan for peace, redeploy our troops and allow us to bring them home as soon as practicable.

Let's stop the carnage. Our presence in Iraq makes stability impossible. By remaining in Iraq, we make both Iraqi and American soil less secure. Let's bring our troops home.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GRACE COMMUNITY CHURCH

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Grace Community Church in Boulder City, Nevada, which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year.

The Grace Community Church began as an inter-denominational Protestant religious church in April of 1932, and the first service was held on January 29, 1933. The church was officially dedicated on February 22, 1933, ''to the glory of God and the Blessing of Man.'' The church quickly became a center for various community groups, and assumed a key role in the development of the community.

The Reverend Thomas Stevenson of California, who gave his first sermon in the unfinished basement of the church, was chosen as the church's first minister, and led the church's congregation until 1937. The Reverend Harold Eymann replaced Reverend Stevenson, and the formal by-laws for the congregation were adopted and the church was incorporated under state law during Reverend Eymann's ministry. Reverend Eymann left Grace Community Church in 1942, feeling he should serve as a military chaplain during World War II. Reverend Winston Trever from Azusa, California served from 1942–1949. The Reverend Olaf Stoeve ministered at Grace from 1949–1953. The Presbyterian Reverend Earl Seymour Fox (1953–1961) found the congregation growing and recommended that two services be held on Sunday and a building be added next to the American Legion Hall, which soon became Fox Hall.

Boulder City incorporated as a Nevada Municipality in 1960 and inherited all government land leases. The Reverend Guy Holliday (1961–1978) became the minister, and Grace Community Church entered a 50-year lease for the land under the church facility. The Reverend Melvin Pritts (1978–1982), from First Methodist Church of Phoenix, succeeded Reverend Holliday. The Reverend M. Kenneth Criswell (1982–1985) arrived from Ventura, California in time to give support and leadership to the committee working on the church's 50th anniversary. He found a debt-free church and a vital, caring congregation. The Reverend Dr. John J. Rousseau (1985–1990), who served three Methodist churches in Hawaii, arrived on July I, 1985. The Reverend Dr. Richard Smith (1990–1999), was serving

Grace Community Church when the land was purchased from Boulder City in 1990. The Reverend Dr. Ronald S. Freel (1999–2004), who was worshipping with and volunteering as an Associate Pastor, became the Senior Pastor. Pastor Kevin Roach, the new senior pastor, preached his first sermon on July 18, 2004, and continues to serve today. Serving under the direction of Senior Pastor Kevin Roach are: Associate Pastor Gard Jameson, Music Director Carol Simak, Assistant Music Director Barbara Walker, and Sharon Wieczorek, who served as the Office Manager for the past 7 years is retiring, and is being replaced by Jan Liebhauser.

The church recently recognized 14 people who have been members for 48 years or longer, and four who have been members for more than 60 years. Carol Bourne, Jack and Dorothy Rants, Lin Diebold, Roy and Elnor Gear, Byron Miller, Robert Austin, Del and Eloise Blue, Agnes Lockette, Lillian Rigney, and Bob and Virginia Moore have all been members for 48 years or longer, and at the age of 94, Mary Eaton has been a member for 72 years, Violet Tracht at 96, has been a member for 63 years, with Velma Stice a member for 65 years and Innis Risley being at the 60 year mark.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Grace Community Church and its accomplishments in Nevada's history. I commend the church for its long history of service to the city of Boulder City and wish them good fortune for the next 75 years.

A TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER SMITH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Christopher Smith, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York, educational and civic communities. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Mr. Smith considers that the very nature of education dictates that it takes place all the time, anytime and anywhere. As an educator in the New York City Public School System, Mr. Smith employs the concept of "teachable moments" in and out of the classroom. Mr. Smith posits that teachable moments are times in the life of an individual where one consciously learns from trial and error. He believes that learning through this method allows students cognition to develop critically and to balance multitudinous tasks tossed at them by life.

The village it takes to raise a child is evident at Boys and Girls High School. Mr. Smith provides students and staff with many opportunities to learn how to develop, implement and evaluate programs and extracurricular activities. This includes the development of the Exemplary Mentoring Program, after-school tutoring, the Annual Scholarship Luncheon, the Annual Talent Show, the development of Black & Latino Awareness programs, the Academic Bowl, Pep rallies, Student Government, and other activities to increase school spirit. It is important to Mr. Smith that the legacy of this great institution continues.

Born and raised in Bedford Stuyvesant (Gates Avenue), Christopher Smith is a product of the New York City Public Schools system. After graduating from Boys and Girls High School in 1996, he received his Bachelors of Science Degree in Business Administration at the State University of New York at Oswego, and received his Master's Degree in General Education and Special Education from Touro College in New York City. This summer, Mr. Smith is embarking on a path in his pursuit of obtaining an Educational Administration Master's Degree at the College of St. Rose in Albany, New York. When he successfully completes his Educational Administration Degree, he looks to earn his Educational Doctorate.

Mr. Smith works hard to keep the Boys and Girls High School legacy alive in the Bedford Stuyvesant community. He knows that his children are definitely the "Jewels of Bedford Stuyvesant". Although this task is not easy, God has equipped him with valor to complete this stringent journey and he works according to the following mantra: "It doesn't matter where my children come from but where I hope to help them get to."

Mr. Smith further states that when we derive pleasure from our daily lives, are stimulated or challenged by our work, enriched by the new things we learn, and by our contact with others; our lives are successful regardless of the specific setbacks of a particular day. When it is all said and done, and he recalls the day's events; he is satisfied in knowing that he was able to help his community.

Mr. Speaker, Christopher Smith's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 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, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purpose:

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of restored funding for Section 8 vouchers. Our Nation is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis—and hard working families are bearing the brunt of the short fall. Yet again Section 8 is funded below the President's request—this year $144 million less than proposed

The Nadler-Velázquez amendment will restore $70 million for Section 8, providing vouchers for approximately 10,000 families. This increase will ensure that families working to create a better life for their children will have a safe, decent place to call home—something that is critical to positive outcomes for the future.

The Section 8 program is a lifeline for millions of families struggling to make ends meet and end the cycle of poverty so common in low-income communities. In my district—and districts around the country—families have been waiting upwards of ten years for vouchers. We cannot turn our backs on families striving to achieve more for their children against the odds.

HONORING GENE & MARY McCARTHY ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a tremendous sense of pleasure the recognize the personal accomplishments and the long career of two of Western New York's finest citizens, a couple I am proud to call my friends Mary Dories and William Eugene "Gene" McCarthy.

Mary and Gene McCarthy are lifelong—and tremendously proud—residents, of the Old First Ward in South Buffalo, New York. Mary grew up on Sidway Street and Gene grew up a few streets away on Kentucky Street.

Mary and Gene were married on May 7, 1955 and resided on Hamburg Street before moving to 271 Katherine Street where they live today. They raised their three children, Patty, Billy and Maureen in this home in the Old First Ward Neighborhood.

This neighborhood holds great significance in my Congressional District because it has long been recognized for the Irish legacy instilled upon the area during the city's formative years. Irish immigrants who worked on the construction of the Erie Canal made their home here. They went on to work in the shipping industry, as scoopers, railroad operators, and factory workers to name a few.

Gene McCarthy followed in this tradition working for several years in Buffalo's grain mills, ending his industry career at Pillsbury Flour Mill to pursue a business venture of his own.

Gene and Mary opened the doors to McCarthy's Tavern on July 20, 1964 at 73 Hamburg Street. McCarthy's Tavern, a classic neighborhood Irish Pub that has become a First Ward Landmark and a favorite spot for grain workers, firefighters, police officers, politicians, lawyers and First Ward regulars alike.

Hard work, long hours, true friendships and constant generosity were the hallmarks of Gene and Mary McCarthy's life in the Tavern Business.

Mr. Speaker, It is my distinct honor to recognize Gene and Mary McCarthy on the occasion of their well deserved retirement from the tavern business after 42 years of service. The wonderful memories, stories, and good times shared by those who routinely came in for the welcoming atmosphere that McCarthy's Tavern offered will be present in the minds and hearts of many Western New Yorkers for years to come.

H.R. 5252, THE COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWKSY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5252, the Communication and Enhancement Act. The COPE Act would allow telephone companies to reap the rewards of the, cable business with few responsibilities and could also threaten the innovative nature of the Internet. I believe the passage of this bill would be a major setback for consumers, communities, and the public interest.

I think we all agree that there is a need for consumer choice and competition in cable. Currently, most communities are served by the cable industry's quasi-monopolies. However, ''competition'' in cable shouldn't have the effect of, cutting consumer protections, reducing public broadcasting, and eliminating local rights. ''Competition'' shouldn't be about providing lucrative markets with several cable service options and leaving those in poorer neighborhoods with low-quality service and the potential for ever increasing cable raising rates.

The COPE Act would put the Federal Communications Commission in charge of what our localities have been successfully handling for years. Do we really think the Federal Communications Commission will do a better job at resolving consumer complaints? Is the FCC going to come out to Skokie, Illinois and take care of problems that may arise concerning the town's public right-of-way? And, does the FCC have the resources—both in budget and personnel—to do so?

I am also greatly concerned that there are not adequate protections in this bill for the Internet as we know it. The telecom industry has already told us that they plan to operate their own form of censorship, slowing down or speeding up delivery of content depending on it relationship to the provider. I am concerned that they could also start blocking email from advocacy groups they don't agree with and shutting down startups that may offer competition to products they provide.

I understand that many argue that the cost of continuing with an open Internet will fall on the shoulder of consumers, and that the Titans of the Internet will get a free ride if we pass a net neutrality provision. However, while the COPE Act would allow the telcos to set up their tollbooths, there are no guarantees, no protections, nothing to stop the telcos from bilking consumers—even if the telcos were to charge Google and Yahoo. They could double dip—and why wouldn't they? One can say that it probably won't happen, but there is nothing in this bill to stop them.

Mr. Speaker, the COPE Act is not the answer to lack of competition in cable service. I urge my colleagues to oppose its passage.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK KOGOVSEK

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker I rise today to pay tribute to Frank Kogovsek, a man of quiet but firm character who spent his life making a difference in the lives of ''underdogs.''

Frank Kogovsek was born June 22, 1939 in Pueblo, Colorado, to Frank L. and Mary Blatnick Kogovsek. He graduated from Pueblo Catholic High School in 1957 and went on to the seminary. He was ordained a Catholic priest in 1965. His fifth assignment was in La Junta, where he served as assistant pastor of Assumption Churchl in Bessemer.

He taught at Seton High as well, a Catholic school for girls. At Seton High he reconnected with a former classmate who had become a nun, Leona Reinert. Frank left the priesthood and Leona gave up being a nun and they were married in November 28, 1970 in Lakewood, Colorado.

Leona fondly remembered his work with students, describing him as a mentor who was ''always looking out for the underdog, trying to guide them and educate them as to things available to assist them. He was a kind, understanding, soft-spoken person.''

Frank continued to work with underdogs when he and Leona moved to Adams County. He took on a job as a probation officer for the City of Denver. Until 1995, he worked with at-risk youth, mentoring and guiding young people that were mixed up with the law.

Frank and Leona's love of children led them to adopt three of their own. They had a daughter, Jennifer, and two sons, Greg and Jerome. Jennifer fondly remembered her father's love for the simple things in life. ''He loved his backyard,'' she said. ''He built a patio when we were kids. He just loved to be outside in summer.''

Weakened by Parkinson's disease, Frank succumbed to pneumonia on February 22, 2006 at the age of 66. Frank was a common man that spent his life making an uncommon mark upon individuals that often had nowhere else to turn. I join his family in grieving his loss and commemorating his life of service as an example for all of us.

A TRIBUTE TO HENRY FRANK

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Henry Frank, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Henry Frank was born in the Republic of Haiti, and was trained as an anthropologist. His research works have taken him all over Africa, Europe, the Caribbean and South America, particularly Bahia, the bastion of the African culture in Brazil.

Dr. Frank has given lectures on the African Preserved Religions in the New World especially Vodou as well as other aspects of the New World Cultures at many Universities and Museums in the U.S. and abroad. For nine years, Dr. Frank was the Assistant Director of Caribbean Studies in the Education Department at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City. He has also participated in conferences and has given lectures at several prominent institutions, hospitals and healthcare facilities.

From 1982 to 1990, Dr. Frank served as a scholar for the New York Council for the Humanities program, ''Speakers in the Humanities''. In April 1990, he was appointed Consul General of Haiti in New York in the government of Mme.Ertha Trouillot, the first woman president of Haiti. From 1986 to 1990, Dr. Frank serve as the Executive Director of the Haitian Neighborhood Service Center (HNSC) in NYC while simultaneously serving as a lecturer on African/Caribbean Culture and History for the NYC Council for the Humanities.

Dr. Frank has participated in many radio and TV programs in the U.S. and Europe. He appeared on French and German television and was a specialist on African Preserved Religion in the Americas and narrator for FINNISH TELEVISION in Finland. He was a consultant for the Voodoo segment of the series ''In Search of Voodoo by Landsburg Productions''. The program was first aired on WNBC–TV. He also was a consultant for WABC–TV in the 20/20 segment on ''Zombification''. He appeared with Wade Davis, the author of The Serpent and the Rainbow, as a guest on The Geraldo Riviera Show in opposition to the film of the same name. Dr. Frank was a consultant for the fabulous exhibit at the American Museum of Natural History in New York entitled, ''The Sacred Art of Haitian Vodou'' that was on view from October 10, 1998 to January 3, 1999 and attracted 70,000 viewers. He also gave numerous lecture presentations and participated in panel discussions in conjunction with the exhibit. He continually serves as a consultant for that scientific and cultural institution.

Since April 1991, Dr. Frank has been the Executive Director of the Haitian Centers Council, a consortium of eight Haitian Centers nationwide. It is important to note that the Haitian Centers Council (HCC) offers the most comprehensive HIV/AIDS education and prevention program to the Haitian community at large for over 20 years, but not exclusively. It also provides services to other Caribbean and minority communities including French-speaking Africans. The oganization has a 16 unit residential facility with support services for people with AIDS (PWA). In collaboration with the NYC Department of Education and United Way of NYC, HCC conducts programs for high school students pertaining to academic enhancement, cultural and historical enrichment, leadership, and socialization skills. HCC also provides a comprehensive Domestic Violence Prevention program to the Haitian community at large and other minority communities. Under Dr. Frank's direction, HCC has been on the forefront of immigration issues, and the protection and defense of Haitian immigrant rights in the U.S and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Henry Frank, as he offers his talents and services for the betterment of our local and global communities.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Frank's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes him most worthy of our recognition today.

CONGRATULATING BOXER BERNARD HOPKINS

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate celebrated boxer Bernard Hopkins on his illustrative career spanning 18 years and 53 fights as the former WBA, WBC, IBF, and WBO undisputed middleweight world champion and light heavyweight world champion.

At the age of 41, Bernard Hopkins accomplished what few other boxers were able to do successfully. A 3–to–1 underdog, Hopkins jumped two weight classes and soundly defeated light heavyweight champion Antonio Tarver, who previously had a 24–4 record. Hopkins' victory over Tarver quieted critics who claimed Hopkins was overly ambitious in his desire to challenge Tarver for the light heavyweight championship, and secured his place in the boxing world as one of the best pound-for-pound fighters in history.

Overcoming adversity as an underdog is a situation in which Hopkins is well familiar. Born and raised in North Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Bernard Hopkins grew up in an environment surrounded by poverty, hardship, and violence. A repeat juvenile offender at the age of 13, Hopkins was a frequent visitor to a detention facility for juveniles in Philadlphia. By 17 years of age, Hopkins estimates that he appeared before a juvenile offender judge at least 30 times. After being charged with his eighth felony for strong-armed robbery, Hopkins was convicted and served in an adult detention facility until the age of 22. It was in prison where Hopkins found religion and his inspiration to dedicate his life to boxing.

Citing his time of incarceration as a ''blessing,'' Hopkins boxed in prison and turned pro shortly after his release. Despite suffering several early career losses, Hopkins quickly gained the reputation of being an ''old school'' type fighter, dispatching his opponents mercilessly with speed and precision. By the end of 2000, Hopkins defended his IBF title 12 times without a loss, while beating upper-echelon fighters such as John David Jackson, Glencoff Johnson, Simon Brown, and Antwun Echols. Perhaps the most defining fight of Hopkins boxing career occurred when he defeated six-division titleholder Oscar De La Hoya for the undisputed middleweight championship with a jarring knockout blow in the ninth round.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Bernard Hopkins for establishing his place in boxing history as one of the most prolific professional fighters of all time.

A TRIBUTE TO GWENDOLYN TOWNS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mrs. Gwendolyn Towns, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn community. It behoove's us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Mrs. Gwendolyn Towns attended college in her home State of North Carolina where she received a Bachelor of Science degree in Early Childhood Education from North Carolina Agricultural and Technological State University. Later, she earned a masters degree in Guidance and Counseling from Brooklyn College, and obtained postgraduate credits from Pace University.

She has advocated for quality education for children and adults through her work with several organizations including the Women's House of Detention and NYC Public Schools where she spent over 30 years training both students and teachers to fulfill their potential.

Mrs. Towns continues her leadership and commitment to education issues as a member of various national and local committees. Her accomplishments include raising over $850,000 for undergraduate and graduate scholarships as chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) Spouses Annual Golf and Tennis Tournament. In the 10th Congressional District, she administers the General Mills/CBC Spouses scholarship program, which provides financial resources to undergraduate, graduate and doctoral candidates pursuing careers in a health-related profession.

Additionally, Mrs. Towns serves on the Board of Directors of the Brooklyn Children's Museum, and as President of the Interfaith Medical Center Auxiliary where she coordinates Toys for Tots and insures that each patient is remembered during the holiday season. As co-chair of the Interfaith Medical Center Foundation's annual fund raising ball, she is helping to ensure that the hospital continues to grow to meet the community's needs. Mrs. Towns is also affiliated with the NYC Chapter of Jack and Jill of America, Inc., Concerned Women of Brooklyn, Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Boys and Girls High School Women's Day (Women on the ''High''), Bridge Street Martin Luther King Day Award, Barber Scotia College, New Lots Lion Club, NAACP and Berean Missionary Baptist Church.

Most importantly, she and her husband, Congressman ED TOWNS, are the proud parents of two children: Assemblyman Darryl Towns and Deidra Towns Blount. They have five grandchildren: Kiara, Jasmine, Kristian, Trinity and Dale.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Mrs. Gwendolyn Towns as she offers her talents and philanthropic services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Gwendolyn Towns' selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. KENNY C. HULSHOF

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 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, 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:

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hooley-Hulshof-Skelton amendment to increase funding for the HIDTA program. For the past 5 fiscal years, the HIDTA program has essentially been level funded at $226 million. Our amendment increases the fiscal year 2007 amount by $8 million for a new total of $235 million. This increase is offset by reducing the bill's funding level for the National Archives by $8 million, which will leave Archives with an estimated $1.4 million increase over last year's funding level.

I would like to thank the gentlelady from Oregon for working with my office on this amendment. I know Oregon has a significant meth problem just like Missouri, and I'm glad that we can work together to combat this horrific drug. I also would like to thank my good friend from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, for his support.

Methamphetamine use and production is a serious problem in my home State of Missouri. Since 2002, Missouri has led the Nation in the number of reported clandestine meth labs. These labs are an insidious problem. Not only are these labs highly volatile and prone to explosions, they create environmental hazards and pose significant health risks for those living in surrounding areas. The highly toxic byproduct that meth makers leave in their wake pollutes the environment and groundwater, leaves homes uninhabitable and puts law enforcement and clean-up crews in peril.

But most importantly, we must take every step possible to stop the spread of this drug because of the terrible toll it is taking on people in our communities. Sadly, I think it is safe to say that all my colleagues are all too aware of the irreparable harm this drug takes on the physical health of its users. Many of you have seen the before and after photographs of these emaciated, scarred—both mentally and physically—and often toothless users.

The recent enactment of the Combat Meth Act was a step in the right direction. This law is a preventive measure designed to limit meth makers access to cold medicines containing pseudoephedrine, which is a common precursor to meth. While I am hopeful that this law will help curb domestic production, we must remain vigilant in our efforts to combat meth trafficking. That is why it is so crucial we continue to provide funding for law enforcement programs, such as HIDTA.

This joint endeavor between Federal, State and local law enforcement has been highly effective in combating the trafficking of illegal

narcotics. In 2005, Midwest HIDTA, which encompasses Missouri and five other States, arrested more than 9,000 individuals for various drug violations, seized more than 650 pounds of meth, almost 7,000 pounds of cocaine and seized nearly 1,700 firearms. Of these individuals, roughly 1,400 were charged with methamphetamine offenses.

This program is a key component of our national drug enforcement policy. HIDTA's greatest strength is that it is a cooperative endeavor among local and national officials who coordinate and devise a strategy to effectively curtail drug trafficking in the U.S. I believe this is a worthwhile amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support its adoption.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM ''BILL'' LAWRENCE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in profound sadness to express my deepest sympathy and condolences to the family and friends of William ''Bill'' Lawrence. Bill was a dear friend of mine who touched the lives of all who came in contact with him and I am privileged to have known such a wonderful person.

Bill was truly a great man who dedicated his life to our country. He began this service at the young age of 16 when he enlisted in the Navy. Following his four years of naval service in China in 1927, Bill was honorably discharged, and he chose to make his home in San Francisco. Once again, Bill sought a job that would benefit the public. He first worked as a cable car conductor on the Market Street Railway, one of the few union jobs in San Francisco at that time.

In 1938, Bill began working for the U.S. Postal Service in San Francisco, and he became an active and dedication member of the Golden Gate Branch 214 of the National Association of Letter Carriers. He delivered mail in the City of San Francisco for 35 years and worked as Secretary of Golden Gate Branch 214 of the NALC for 6 years. Bill remained a member of the National Association of Letter Carriers until the day he died.

Bill's dedication to his local community was even more evident when he began his political career. In 1970, Bill was elected to the Brisbane City Council and over the next two decades he continued in that position, serving twice as Mayor. In an effort to better his community, he oversaw the construction of Crocker Industrial Park. After his tenure on the City Council, Bill continued to act as the Legislative Liaison for the California State Association of Letter Carriers.

Bill's love of public service and his desire to improve the quality of life of Brisbane residents led him to join the Brisbane Lions Cub. His unfaltering dedication was obvious, as he insisted in participating in every Lions Club initiative. Each year, Bill Lawrence painted 1,800 Easter eggs and volunteered at the Christmas tree lot. He continued to attend meetings, even after his hearing and eyesight began to fade.

Although Bill Lawrence officially retired at the age of 65, he could not imagine not serving his country and local community. He refused to allow age and deteriorating health to stand in the way of public service. For the past 30 years, Bill has served as Brisbane's ''Santa Claus,'' bringing smiles to many families during the holiday season. Only last year, at age 97, Bill finally was forced to retire from this post, which brought so much joy to him and children throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to call Bill Lawrence my friend. He always said that his love of politics stemmed from the rewarding feeling he got from helping people. Indeed, Bill helped thousands of people throughout his lifetime. His naval service, postal work, and political activism allowed him to touch lives throughout the world for the past 98 years. It is rare to come across a man who not only dedicated his life to his country but also to his family, his dear wife, Honey Bee, and his children and grandchildren. Bill Lawrence will be sorely missed by the residents of Brisbane as well as by all who knew him, but Bill's legacy of love for his country and for public service will forever remain alive in our hearts.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House agreed to 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.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5987–S6024

Measures Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3531–3534, and S. Res. 514. **Page S6013**

Measures Passed:

Senate Legal Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 514, to authorize testimony and legal representation in City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek. **Page S6022**

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: **Pages S5990–S6004**

Adopted:

Warner (for Sessions) Amendment No. 4295, to require a report on reporting requirements applicable to the Department of Defense. **Pages S5995–96**

Levin (for Obama/Coburn) Amendment No. 4254, to require the use of competitive procedures for Federal contracts worth over $500,000 related to hurricane recovery, subject to existing limited national security, public interest, and other exceptions. **Pages S5995–96**

Warner (for Allard/Salazar) Amendment No. 4296, to prohibit the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site until the Secretary submits a report analyzing such expansion and provides to the congressional defense committees the extent to which the expansion could be carried out through transactions with willing sellers of the privately held land. **Pages S5995–96**

Warner Amendment No. 4297, to make technical corrections to provisions related to the National Museums of the Armed Forces. **Pages S5995–S6004**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia. **Page S5990**

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. **Page S5990**

McConnell Amendment No. 4272, to commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces. **Page S5990**

Dorgan Amendment No. 4292, to establish a special committee of the Senate to investigate the awarding and carrying out of contracts to conduct activities in Afghanistan and Iraq and to fight the war on terrorism. **Pages S5990–95**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 2 p.m. on Monday, June 19, 2006. **Page S6022**

Ikuta Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached, modifying the order of June 14, 2006, providing for consideration of the nomination of Sandra Segal Ikuta, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, at 4 p.m., on Monday, June 19, 2006, with the time until 5 p.m., to be equally divided between the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their designees, with a vote to occur at 5 p.m., on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S6022**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Nancy Montanez-Johner, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services.

Michael V. Dunn, of Iowa, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring June 19, 2011.

Nancy Montanez-Johner, of Nebraska, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Geoffrey S. Bacino, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board for a term expiring February 27, 2013.

Thomas C. Foley, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ireland.

Manfredi Piccolomini, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Kenneth R. Weinstein, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Jay Winik, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Josiah Bunting III, of Rhode Island, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Wilfred M. McClay, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Robert S. Martin, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Mary Haybeck, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2012.

Karl Hess, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Science Board , National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 2008.

Thomas N. Taylor, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

Richard F. Thompson, of California, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

Mark R. Abbott, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

Camilla Persson Benbow, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

John T. Bruer, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

Patricia D. Galloway, of Washington, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

Jose-Marie Griffiths, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2012.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

A routine list in the Foreign Service.

Pages S6022–24

Measures Read First Time: **Pages S6013, S6022**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S6013**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6013–14**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6014–15**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6012–13**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6015–22**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S6022**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 1:47 p.m., until 2 p.m., on Monday, June 19, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6022.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 5 public bills, H.R. 5632–5636; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 89; and H. Res. 872–876 were introduced. **Page H4189**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4189–90**

Reports Filed: Report were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5631, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007 (H. Rept. 109–504); and

H.R. 4890, to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority, with an amendment (H. Rept. 109–505, Part I). **Page H4189**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Gillmor to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4137**

Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary: The House agreed to 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 256 yeas to 153 nays with 5 voting "present", Roll No. 288. Consideration of the measure began on yesterday, Thursday, June 15th. **Pages H4139–74**

H. Res. 868, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to on yesterday, Thursday, June 15th, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 287, after ordering the previous question without objection.

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, June 21st. **Page H4175**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, June 19th; for Morning Hour debate; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, for Morning Hour debate. **Page H4175**

Agreed by unanimous consent to H. Res. 872, removing a Member from the Committee on Ways and Means. **Page H4175**

Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors: The Chair announced the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors for a term of two years: Mr. Thomas A. Fuentes, Lake Forest, California. **Page H4175**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4173–74. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:16 p.m.

Committee Meetings

D.C. DISABLED SERVICES

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled "Disabled Services in the District of Columbia: Who is Protecting the Rights of D.C.'s Most Vulnerable Residents?" Testimony was heard from the following officials of the District of Columbia: Robert C. Bobb, Deputy Mayor/City Manager; and Brenda Donald Walker, Deputy Mayor, Children, Youth, Families and Elders; and public witnesses.

SYNTHETIC DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing entitled "Evaluating the Synthetic Drug Control Strategy." Testimony was heard from Scott Burns, Deputy Director, State and Local Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Uttam Dhillon, Director, Office of Counter-Narcotics Enforcement. Department of Homeland Security; Joseph Rannazzissi, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, DEA, Department of Justice; Don Young, Assistant Secretary, Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

SCREENING APPLIED FAIRLY AND EQUITABLE TO TRUCKERS ACT OF 2006

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection and Cybersecurity held a hearing on H.R. 5604, SAFE Truckers Act of 2006. Testimony was heard from Robert Jamison, Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *, p. D 643)*

H.R. 4939, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–234)

S. 193, to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane language. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–235)

S. 2803, to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to improve the safety of mines and mining. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–236)

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 19 through June 24, 2006

Senate Chamber

On *Monday,* at 2 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 2766, National Defense Authorization; at 4 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Sandra Segal Ikuta, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, with a vote on confirmation to occur thereon at 5 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any other cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriation bills and conference reports, when available.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: June 20, to hold hearings to examine the Rural Development Programs of the Department of Agriculture, 10:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Armed Services: June 19, closed business meeting to consider S. 3237, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, 6 p.m., S–407, Capitol.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 20, to hold hearings to examine the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 10 a.m., SD–538.

June 20, Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, to hold hearings to examine issues for the future relating to the Federal Housing Administration, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: June 20, business meeting to mark up S. 3521, 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, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 21, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine, to hold hearings to examine economics, service, and capacity in the freight railroad industry, 10 a.m., SD–562.

June 21, Subcommittee on Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness, to hold hearings to examine accelerating the adoption of health information technology, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

June 22, Subcommittee on Trade, Tourism, and Economic Development, to hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. tourism industry, 10 a.m., SD–562.

June 22, Full Committee, business meeting to mark up S. 2686, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and for other purposes, 2 p.m., Room to be announced.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: June 19, to hold hearings to examine implementation of the Renewable Fuel Standard in the 2005 Energy Bill and the future potential of biofuels such as biodiesel, cellulosic ethanol, and E85, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

June 20, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine the National Park Service's Revised Draft Management Policies, including potential impact of the policies on park operations, park resources, wilderness areas, recreation, and interaction with gateway communities, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

June 21, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the nominations of Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, and Jon Wellinghoff, of Nevada, each to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 11:30 a.m., SD–366.

June 21, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office report entitled ''Wildland Fire Suppression-Lack of Clear Guidance Raises Concerns about Cost Sharing between Federal and Nonfederal entities'' (GAO–06–570), 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

June 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine S. 2747, to enhance energy efficiency and conserve oil and natural gas, 10 a.m., SD–366.

June 22, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 574, to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to increase the authorization of appropriations and modify the date on which the authority of the Secretary of the Interior terminates under the Act, S. 1387, to provide for an update of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan for the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, to extend the authority of the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the undertaking of a special resource study of sites and landscape features within the Corridor, and to authorize additional appropriations for the Corridor, S. 1721, to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, S. 2037, to establish the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area in the State of Colorado, and S. 2645, to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 21, to hold hearings to examine safer technology in the context of chemical site security, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

June 22, Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety, to hold oversight hearings to examine

the regulatory processes for new and existing nuclear plants, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 19, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert D. McCallum, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Australia, and Leslie V. Rowe, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, 3 p.m., SD–419.

June 21, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (the ''Corruption Convention''), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on October 31, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 109–06), 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

June 21, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion, with the *Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Narcotics Affairs, to hold joint hearings to examine international methamphetamine trafficking, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.*

June 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine energy security in Latin America, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

June 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Clifford M. Sobel, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: June 22, to hold hearings to examine new ideas for making the medical liability system work better for patients, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: June 20, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Paul A. Denett, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, 10 a.m., SD–342.

June 20, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine United Nations headquarters renovation, focusing on transparency, accountability, financial and ethical integrity at the international body, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

June 22, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine effort to assure healthy initiatives in health information technology, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: June 21, to hold hearings to examine S. 480, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and S. 437, to expedite review of the Grand River Band of Ottawa Indians of Michigan to secure a timely and just determination of whether that group is entitled to recognition as a Federal Indian tribe, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

June 22, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the report on the Indian Lobbying Misconduct Investigation, and other pending matters, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 19, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship, to hold hearings to examine learning from the mistakes of 1986 relating to immigration enforcement at the workplace, 2 p.m., SD–226.

June 20, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine implications on repealing the insurers' antitrust exemption relating to the McCarran-Ferguson Act, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

June 21, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine if Congress can protect copyright and promote innovation relating to the analog hold, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

June 21, Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights, to hold hearings to examine policy and perspectives and views from the field regarding the Voting Rights Act, 2 p.m., SD–226.

June 21, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine pending nominations, 4 p.m., SD–226.

June 22, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

June 22, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold hearings to examine the AT&T and BellSouth merger and its meaning for consumers, 3 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: June 21, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Steven C. Preston, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, 10:30 a.m., SR–428A.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: June 22, business meeting to consider pending VA legislation, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 20, closed business meeting to consider intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

June 21, Full Committee, closed business meeting to consider intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

June 22, Full Committee, to hold a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: June 21, to hold hearings to examine ensuring seniors don't outlive their savings relating to managing retirement assets, 10 a.m., SD–106.

House Committees

Committee on Armed Services, June 20, hearing on significant force realignments of the Department of Defense, including beddown, support, and other costs and requirements related to those realignments, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations Committee, joint hearing on trafficking in persons, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on space and U.S. national power, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

June 22, full Committee, hearing on military power of the People's Republic of China, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 19, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''A Review of NRC's Reactor Oversight Process,'' 4 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 21 and 22, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearings entitled ''Internet Data Brokers and Pretexting: Who Has Access to Your Private Records?'' 10 a.m., on June 21 and 2 p.m., on June 22, 2322 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, entitled ''Universal Service: What Are We Subsidizing and Why? Part 1: The High-Cost Fund,'' 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, June 21, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled ''Commercial Insurance Modernization'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Bank Secrecy Act's Impact on Money Services Businesses,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, June 20, Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, hearing entitled ''Poverty, Public Housing and the CRA; Have Housing and Community Investment Incentives Helped Public Housing Families Achieve the American Dream?'' 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

June 21, full Committee and the Committee on Small Business, joint hearing entitled ''Northern Lights and Procurement Plights: The Effect of the ANC Program on Federal Procurement and Alaska Native Corporations,'' 1 p.m., 12154 Rayburn

June 21, Subcommittee on Energy and Resources, hearing entitled ''Deep Water Royalty Relief: Mismanagement and Cover-ups,'' 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 22, full Committee, to consider pending business, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, June 21, hearing entitled '' DHS Terrorism Preparedness Grants: Risk-Based or Guess-Work?'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

June 22, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity, to mark up H.R. 5604, SAFE Truckers Act of 2006, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

June 22, Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack, hearing entitled ''Reducing Nuclear and Biological Threats at the Source,'' 2 p.m., room to be announced.

Committee on House Administration, June 22, hearing entitled ''You don't need papers to vote?'' Non-citizen voting and ID requirements in U.S. elections, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on International Relations, June 21, to mark up H. Res. 846, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to strategies and plans either designed to cause regime change in or for the use of military force against Iran, 9 a.m., followed by a hearing on Democracy in Latin America: Successes, Challenges and the Future, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Middle East and Central Asia, to continue hearings to Review U.S. Assistance Programs to Egypt, Part II, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, to mark up the following measures: H. Res. 860, Calling on the Government of Germany to take immediate action to combat sex trafficking in connection with the 2006 FIFA World Cup; H.R. 4319, Assistance for Small and Medium Enterprises in Sub-Saharan African Countries Act of 2005; H.R. 4780, Global Online Freedom Act of 2006; and H.R. 5382, Central Asia Democracy and Human Rights Promotion Act of 2006; followed by a hearing on Can Religious Pluralism Survive in the Middle East: The Plight of Religious Minorities? 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, June 21, full Committee, to mark up the following measures: H. Res. 819, Requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to submit to the House of Representatives all documents in the possession of the President and the Attorney General relating to requests made by the National Security Agency and other Federal agencies to telephone service providers requesting access to telephone communications records of persons in the United States and communications originating and terminating within the United States without a warrant; H. Res. 845, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, documents relating to the termination of the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility's investigation of the involvement of Department of Justice personnel in the creation and administration of the National Security Agency's warrantless surveillance program, including documents relating to Office of Professional Responsibility's request for and denial of security clearances; H.R. 2389, Pledge Protection Act of 2005; H.R. 1956, Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2005; and H.R. 5520, Veterans Identity Protection Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on the Constitution, oversight hearing on the Implementation of the Crime Victims' Rights Provisions of the Justice for All Act, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on H.R. 2679, Public Expression of Religion Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, oversight hearing entitled ''Is the Labor Department Doing Enough to Protect U.S. Workers?'' 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, June 20, hearing on S. 1003, Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Amendments of 2005, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 21, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on Addressing Forest Insects and Disease: A Growing National Problem, ''GAO Report on Invasive Forest Pests.'' 4 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 22, Subcommittee on National Parks, oversight hearing on the Reauthorization of the National Park System Advisory Board, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

June 22, Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing on Securing the Bureau of Reclamation's Water and Power Infrastructure: A Consumer's Perspective,'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, June 19, to consider H.R. 5631, Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 4 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

June 20, to consider H.R. 9, Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, June 21, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on Redefining Civil Aeronautics R&D at NASA, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 20, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on FY 2007 Coast Guard Authorizing legislation, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on Air Traffic Control Modernization: The Present and Future, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, oversight hearing on the Future of the Federal Courthouse Construction Program: Results of a GAO Study on the Judiciary's Rental Obligations, 11 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy—Can it be implemented to restore and protect the Great Lakes? 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 20, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs and the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, joint oversight hearing on Veterans Benefits Administration data security, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

June 21, Subcommittee on Health, oversight hearing to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs efforts to maintain the security and integrity of the electronic health records of enrolled veterans, while safeguarding sensitive personal veteran information from internal and external security threats, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

June 22, full Committee, oversight hearing on the legal implications of the theft from a VA employee's home of personal data regarding millions of veterans, active duty military personnel, and spouses, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, June 22, Select Revenue Measures, hearing on the Impact of International Tax Reform on U.S. Competitiveness, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, June 21, executive, hearing on DCIA as the HUMINT Manager, 3 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

June 22, executive, hearing on the CIA, Path Ahead for the Agency, 9 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, June 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 2766, National Defense Authorization. At 4 p.m. Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Sandra Segal Ikuta, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, with a vote on confirmation thereon to occur at 5 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, June 19

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bachus, Spencer, Ala., E1170
Berry, Marion, Ark., E1176
Biggert, Judy, Ill., E1173
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1187
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1169
Bradley, Jeb, N.H., E1181
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1188
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E1187
Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E1182
Chandler, Ben, Ky., E1167
Chocola, Chris, Ind., E1185
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E1176
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E1190
Davis, Tom, Va., E1173
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1179
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E1177
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1171
Etheridge, Bob, N.C., E1175, E1184
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E1193
Gonzalez, Charles A., Tex., E1171
Herseth, Stephanie, S.D., E1168
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1191
Hooley, Darlene, Ore., E1183
Hulshof, Kenny C., Mo., E1193
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1168
Langevin, James R., R.I., E1188
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E1194
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E1167, E1181
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1172, E1181, E1182
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1184
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1171
Marshall, Jim, Ga., E1186
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E1174, E1175, E1188
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E1183
Musgrave, Marilyn N., Colo., E1192
Myrick, Sue Wilkins, N.C., E1172
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1170
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1172
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1170
Pombo, Richard W., Calif., E1167
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E1168, E1169, E1170, E1171, E1190
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1180, E1185
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1187
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1183, E1192
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1169
Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E1188
Spratt, John M., Jr., S.C., E1189, E1189
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1173, E1174, E1174, E1175, E1176, E1176, E1177, E1178, E1178, E1178, E1179, E1183, E1184, E1185, E1187, E1188, E1189, E1191, E1192, E1193
Upton, Fred, Mich., E1168
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1187, E1191
Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E1186
Weiner, Anthony D., N.Y., E1173

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.