

troops, "How you yet live will echo throughout eternity." Corporal Valentine lived a short but faithful life to the things that were important to him: family and country. He was 21 when he was killed.

Mr. Speaker, General George Patton was right about such warriors. We should thank God that such men as Corporal Donald Valentine III died and lived.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

□ 1930

IN OPPOSITION TO RESOLUTION REGARDING ARMENIA

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the floor of the House tonight and add my voice to a lot of my colleagues in opposition to the dangerous resolution condemning Turkey for reported atrocities against the Armenian people. Everyone regrets what happened at the end of the First World War; but, Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a very complicated war, a complicated war in which every ally is valuable to our war effort.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, this resolution has the potential to inflict damage on the United States-Turkish relationship such that it would be very difficult to repair it, and this should be at the forefront of our minds as we consider bringing to the floor for a vote.

I am concerned about this resolution, and I urge the Speaker not to allow these actions.

I am asking us to consider the long-lasting negative effects that this resolution could have on our foreign policy interests. The last thing we need is for an American ally to stray from the path of victory in Iraq, and with President Abdullah Gul threatening to withdraw Turkey's support of the Iraq war should we vote on and pass this risky resolution, this possibility unfortunately is moving ever closer to reality.

Mr. Speaker, Turkey continues to be a consistent U.S. partner in developing some of the crucial defense equipment we're going to need to protect our country into the future. Currently,

Turkey is aiding in the development of Lockheed Martin's F-35 Lightning fighter. I can testify to the significant importance of sustaining positive relations with Turkey, because the final assemblage of the aforementioned aircraft will, in fact, take place at Lockheed Martin's Ft. Worth plant which is very near my district in North Texas. These are important developments in the war on terror and now is not the time to compromise these efforts.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, this resolution is ill timed and ill suited for a country at war. What will happen to the transport of goods, fuel, food, fiber through Turkey into northern Iraq?

And if those shipments, if those shipments of food, fuel and fiber are delayed or ended by the Turks, who wins and who loses?

Mr. Speaker, I will submit that the average American probably doesn't know the answer to that question. It's not that they're indifferent, but they just don't know if there's going to be a winner or a loser. The average Turk, while he may care, is really just pretty mad about it all.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit it is the Iraqi citizen who is on our side who will lose. They will be denied sustenance. They will be denied food for their family. They will be denied fuel to heat their homes in the coming winter in the northern part of Iraq, in a country that has been ravaged by war.

Well, if Iraqis who are friendly to us are likely to be hurt, what about the enemy in Iraq? Well, Mr. Speaker, they may be the indirect winner because after all, we know they love chaos; and anything that increases disorder in Iraq's fragile social system benefits our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I am not connecting dots that have not already been connected. Right as we left before the August recess the majority whip was quoted as saying if things go well in Iraq, it's bad for us; it's bad for our majority party.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, then we've seen several times during the month of September where it does seem like sometimes they're invested in defeat.

But who really bears the brunt is the United States soldier. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not just a theoretical concern. October 2000, same bill, conflicts are a little bit different. Northern watch, keeping the Iraqis from attacking the Kurds. Those planes in northern Iraq to enforce the no-fly zone and keep Saddam from attacking the Kurds, those F-16s flew out of Turkey and they kept watch every day of every week during what we now know as Northern Watch. They kept the Iraqi Republican Guard in a box and kept them from attacking Kurds.

Mr. Speaker, I was not in Congress in October of 2000. But I will tell you that a young man who is now a constituent, actually stationed in Clovis, New Mexico, but was moved to Incurlik, Turkey, and was on duty then, he talked to

me back in October of 2000. He said, we were away from home in a place that really was awfully strange for a 21-year-old. And then we picked up our newspapers one morning and there's a big hole in the side of a United States ship, the USS *Cole* which was bombed in October of 2000. The tension was mounting daily. Other attacks were a possibility. And then all hell broke loose outside the base. There was protests, there was shouting, there were people yelling at us at the gate. None of us were allowed off the base. And why? Because the House of Representatives was going to take up the Armenian genocide resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this constituent was my son. He asked me then, Dad, why is Congress making things tougher for us over here? I didn't have an answer for him now and I don't have an answer for him now. President Clinton did not support this bill in 2000. Majority Leader Arney refused to allow it to come to the floor. Don't make life tougher for our soldiers. We're a country at war. Let's act like it for once.

PERU FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, in the coming days Congress will consider the Peru Free Trade Agreement. I rise tonight to ask why are we in such a rush to approve a flawed and misguided trade policy.

The Peru Free Trade Agreement doesn't enjoy the support of any of the constituencies which it's supposed to benefit. No labor unions vocally are out supporting this agreement. Why would they? The labor standards are unenforceable. It doesn't protect "buy America." It promotes off-shoring of our industries.

The Peru Free Trade Agreement is just like the NAFTA-CAFTA framework. NAFTA has cost Maine over 23 percent of our manufacturing base. The new labor environmental language will do nothing to improve the situation.

The Bush administration claims that the agreement will improve labor standards in Peru and, in the next breath, Tom Donahue, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce states that he is "encouraged by assurances that the labor provisions cannot be read to require compliance with the ILO conventions."

So why are we rushing to approve such a toothless measure?

Why is Congress moving so fast to approve a trade policy which has not been subject to a full hearing since the deal was announced? The last hearing on the Peru Free Trade Agreement in the Ways and Means Committee was held in 2006. There are no environmental groups that are rallying support for the unenforceable environmental protections. That includes the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth.

So why are we not taking the time to consider the impact the Peru FTA will have on our environment, our intellectual property or privatization of Social Security?

Even the labor leaders of major Peruvian labor organizations oppose this agreement. They urge Congress to vote "no," claiming that it will weaken labor standards, encourage illegal immigration to the United States, and increase the rates of drug trafficking and violence.

So who supports this agreement? Big Business. It's the large multinational companies who seek to profit off the backs of working men and women in our country.

Remember back on May 10 when we heard about the new trade model? Well, if it's so new and great, then why aren't we hearing from all sides on the trade debate asking us to support it? There is a reason: there is not much new about it. It's the same old model with a little fancy title.

I ask my colleagues to take a step back and consider this agreement carefully, demand the enforcement of the labor standards that conform with the ILO Conventions and environmental protection that might actually protect the environment.

I ask my colleagues to consider the impact of this agreement and to question why we are moving so quickly to box ourselves into a corner. And I'm asking Members to listen to their constituents.

All across this country, the American citizens are opposed to these bad, flawed trade deals. This is more of the same. We must have a new trade model. We have to start thinking globally of how we're going to deal with the globalization in this world today. So I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Peru trade deal.

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

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

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

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

STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we've been talking the last several weeks here in Congress about the SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

This is the SCHIP face I'd like to show America. Before I discuss with you in the next several minutes the SCHIP program, I'd like to show you the face of Kailee Meronek from Appleton. I represent her. She's not here to speak for herself, so I have the great honor and duty of speaking on her behalf. She has a younger sister who is 3 months of age, and a young mother who's earning \$2.33 an hour at a restaurant. She qualifies for SCHIP. She has benefited from SCHIP; and because she is covered by this state-run program, she sees her doctor in the doctor's office and not in the emergency room. Kailee needs our help and she needs our support. She will some day have to pay for a war that is costing the American taxpayers \$400 million a day. And yet we're not even paying for this war. The occupation of Iraq is being paid for by borrowed money from China that Kailee and her younger sister, Cassidy, will have to pay back some day.

The SCHIP program is a state-run program that's been very successful. We aim to reauthorize this program and expand its coverage to all children in America who are eligible. That's up to about 10.8 million to 11 million children who are the lowest income strata in the country.

The SCHIP program will focus on the working families who need the help the most. It will guarantee access to health care at the doctor's office, not at the expensive emergency room. If anyone listening thinks that SCHIP is not a good deal, you're going to spend much more money taking care of Kailee and her family at the emergency room than at the doctor.

SCHIP reduces your taxes. It cuts the cost of caring for families who are most in need.

How about the money? \$3.50 a day. Kailee is not asking for that money; she deserves it.

What kind of Nation are we? What kind of Nation would turn their back on Kailee and Cassidy and their mother, Wendy? Not this America.

I want my country back. I want a country that still cares about people more than corporations. I want a country that respects its laws and obeys all of its laws, including signing statements. We don't need signing statements. We need someone in our offices in the administration who cares about people.

Kailee and her sister, Cassidy, need our help. I'm asking all Republicans, all Democrats, forget your party leadership. Forget your association with your party. Think about the people you represent, like this young girl.

We aim to cover 57,778 people in Wisconsin on the SCHIP program, and hope to expand it another 37,000. We do it in a fair way, in a way that's called pay-as-you-go, not like our occupation of Iraq. We're going to pay as we go.

I ask America tonight to put a human face on the SCHIP program. Help Kailee. Support Kailee, her sister and her family and everyone in this country who needs our help.

What kind of Nation are we? We'll find out on Thursday. America is listening.

My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to support the SCHIP bill and override the Presidential veto.

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

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

□ 1945

HEALTH CARE FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN WAR VETERANS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for the President of the United States to pay attention to the over 100,000 Iraqi and Afghani veterans that are coming back to our country, U.S. citizens who have been wounded, 100,000.

This House passed a bill that increases spending in the Department of Veterans Affairs by 18 percent, the largest increase in American history, which is deserved because we have injured soldiers coming back to us who are not being treated. That bill is log jammed in the Senate. I invite the President of the United States to call over to the leadership in the Senate to say he's going to sign that bill and to move that bill this week.

Yesterday, I was out welcoming in an official ceremony the 983rd Combat Engineer Unit Heavy from the State of Ohio. It's a Reserve unit, over 1,000 soldiers who have been deployed to the theater in Iraq who came home, and this was the official welcome home ceremony to present them their warrior citizen flags and medals. It was a moving ceremony honoring their valor and their service to our country.

I had the opportunity at that ceremony to talk to Mrs. Tiffany Eckhart, the widow of Andy Eckhart, who lost his life in Iraq. And he was on his second deployment to Iraq.

She said several things to me. She said, Marcy, my husband never should have been deployed a second time because he had been injured in his first deployment. He had had a head injury, and she said, I want you to go back to Washington this week and tell the Congress and tell the Secretary of Defense and tell the President of the United States that every soldier who has been in combat in Iraq or in Afghanistan if they have had a head injury, before they are sent back again, they should be examined to make sure that there's nothing wrong, that there isn't a problem that affects their vision or in some way affects their functioning, which she claims is the reason for his death.

Now, if we are rotating people through so quickly and we aren't paying attention to the soldiers who are in