addition, he helped establish Congregation Beth Israel on the Monterey Peninsula during the early fifties. He was an active member of the congregation, serving several terms as its president.

Abe loved to travel. He and his wife, Sylvia, took trips throughout the United States and traveled to Europe, Asia, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, Mexico and Canada. The couple moved to Sacramento 2 years ago to be near their children. He is remembered by his family and friends from around the country and the residents and caregivers at Sunrise Assisted Living in Sacramento.

It goes without saying that Mr. Abraham Sheingold was an honorable man with a commitment to his family, friends and community that will forever live in the lives of the people he so graciously touched. My heart goes out Abraham's wife and children. I am honored and humbled to join his family in celebrating the life of this amazing man who will never be forgotten.

HONORING CHIEF DEPUTY U.S. MARSHAL JOHN DUKE BUTLER

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2008

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor John Duke Butler, Chief Deputy United States Marshal for the Western District of Texas, as he enters the beginning stage of his retirement. Mr. Butler's lifelong commitment to public service, demonstrated by his 32-year career in Federal law enforcement, is worthy of much praise and recognition.

Mr. Butler began his career in May of 1976 when he became Deputy U.S. Marshal in Minnesota. Over time, he held various Federal law enforcement roles and in 1995 became the Chief Deputy U.S. Marshal for the Western District of Texas. He served here until his retirement in July of 2008.

Throughout his career, his commitment to his community stretched beyond Federal law enforcement, as he was an active member of various volunteer associations, including local chapters of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy Associates for 25 years.

Mr. Butler's admirable lifelong commitment to public service and Federal law enforcement has set a great example for each and every community in which he has resided. I am proud to call him a constituent, and on behalf of my colleagues here in Congress, thank Mr. Butler and his family, including his wife Shannon and their children Juliette and Cecilia, for his lifelong service, community involvement, and commitment to justice and law enforcement.

PSORIASIS ACT

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2008

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the serious, debilitating, chronic diseases of psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, and to urge you to support H.R. 1188, the Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis Research, Cure, and Care Act for 2007—important bipartisan legislation that I have introduced with my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH.

This legislation would be the first ever legislative action to fill important gaps in psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis data collection and research, and is an important step in providing relief to the as many as 7.5 million Americans that the National Institutes of Health estimates suffer from these noncontagious, genetic autoimmune diseases.

Psoriasis is widely misunderstood, minimized, and undertreated. In addition to the pain, itching, and bleeding caused by psoriasis, many affected individuals also experience social discrimination and stigma. Of serious concern is that people with psoriasis are at elevated risk for myriad co-morbidities, including but not limited to, heart disease, diabetes, obesity, and mental health conditions. As such, psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis impose significant burdens on individuals and society; psoriasis alone is estimated to cost the Nation 56 million hours of lost work and between $2 billion and $3 billion annually.

Also, I wish to take a moment to recognize that August is National Psoriasis Awareness Month and commend the National Psoriasis Foundation, headquartered in my district, for its annual efforts surrounding National Psoriasis Awareness Month. Moreover, I thank the foundation leaders and staff for working tirelessly each day to help our Nation make progress toward a cure and to ensure that people with psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis have access to the care they need and deserve.

On average, each of us has 17,000 constituents with psoriasis. As most of us will be at home frequently this fall, I encourage my colleagues to meet with affected constituents, learn more about psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, and work to reduce the misconceptions surrounding these conditions. I further urge you to join with me and the other 82 cosponsors in supporting people living with psoriasis by cosponsoring H.R. 1188.

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF MADAM ANNIE B. DANIELS

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2008

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and work of a treasured citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Madam Annie B. Daniels. The year 2008 marks the 50th year Madam Daniels has operated her business on Chestnut Avenue in Newport News. In recognition of both this anniversary and her many civic accomplishments, I would like to say a few words about this remarkable woman.

Annie B. Daniels was born in Grove Hill, Alabama. At an early age, Madam Daniels had the desire to become a hairdresser, having been inspired by her great aunt Lady Bell Pugh, a local hairdresser. Madam Daniels began her formal beautician training at the Barnett Institute in Grove Hill and continued at the Freeman Beauty School of Savannah, Georgia. She moved to Newport News, Virginia, and enrolled in the Spratley Beauty College. Upon graduation, she worked in privately owned salons until she opened her singularly owned and operated beauty parlor on 1309 30th Street in 1948.

Although the ability to operate her own salon was empowering, Madam Daniels was unsatisfied with her first business and in 1958 she established the Madam Daniels' Salon at 2901 Chestnut Avenue. A year later she added an educational component to the salon and the Madam Daniels' School of Beauty Culture was born. Starting with just four students and a basic course of study, the school has grown tremendously in both enrollment and curriculum. Madam Daniels' School of Beauty Culture is a fixture of the southeastern Newport News community, and its graduates have gone on to make their mark in the beauty industry around the world.

Hand in hand with her entrepreneurial work, Madam Daniels has been an important advocate for civil rights and social justice in Virginia. She was active in the Civil Rights Movement in Virginia, becoming the first fully paid female life member of the Newport News branch of the NAACP. For over a decade she chaired the local life membership committee, and through her efforts to increase life memberships, the branch was nationally recognized.

Madam Daniels's civic engagement has been recognized by the City of Newport News, the NAACP, Hampton University, the Urban League of Hampton Roads, the Peninsula Chapter of 100 Black Men of America, and the Virginia General Assembly. Her advice and counsel are actively sought by local mayors, city council members, and state and national representatives, including myself. I congratulate Madam Daniels on her 50 years as a successful entrepreneur and for her 50 years of commitment and service to her community, state, and country.

SECRETARY ROBERT GATES' REMARKS AT THE U.S. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP CAMPAIGN TRIBUTE DINNER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2008

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, on July 15, the Secretary of Defense, Robert M. Gates, was honored at the annual Tribute Dinner of the U.S. Global Leadership Campaign, USGLC, for his leadership in supporting our Government's foreign affairs budget. The USGLC has been an important organization supporting adequate funding levels for the conduct of our country's foreign affairs and international assistance programs. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice introduced Secretary Gates and acknowledged his contributions.

In his remarks, Secretary Gates strongly advocated for a robust civilian capacity within the U.S. Government: "When it comes to America's engagement with the rest of the world, it is important that the military is—and is clearly seen to be—in a supporting role to civilian agencies." In order to further U.S. national security, Secretary Gates argued that our civilian institutions of diplomacy and development

must be adequately staffed and properly funded. It is a message that Secretary Gates has been giving to the American people and to our nation's leadership here in Washington.

I wholeheartedly agree with Secretary Gates' thoughtful statement and welcome his support for rebuilding the US civilian diplomatic and development capacity. Over the last four months, I have held a number of hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on reforming American foreign assistance programs and rebuilding our civilian capacity. We will be having another hearing on this issue in September.

Madam Speaker, the next Congress and the next Administration will have to take on the necessary, but difficult task of reforming our foreign assistance programs, and equally important, improving the diplomatic and development functions within our government. I look forward to this job that lies ahead of us.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the full text of Secretary Gates' remarks to the U.S. Global Leadership Campaign be placed in The RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give careful attention to the Secretary's thoughtful speech.

AMERICA'S VOICE FOR SECURITY, PROSPERITY, AND HUMANITARIAN VALUES—REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT M. GATES AT USGLC TRIBUTE DINNER, JULY 15, 2008

Thank you very much for the introductions. Thank you Condi Rice for the kind words, and above all, for your principled and visionary leadership of the Department of State.

One of the reasons I have rarely been invited to lecture in political science departments—including at Texas A&M—is because faculty correctly suspect that I would tell the students that what their textbooks say about government does not describe the reality I have experienced in working for seven presidents. Organization charts, institutions, statistics, structures, regulations, policies, committees, and all the rest—the bureaucracy, if you will—are the necessary pre-condition for effective government. But whether or not it really works depends upon the people and their relationships. For significant periods since I entered government 42 years ago, the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense were not on speaking terms. The fact that Condi and I actually get along means that our respective bureaucracies understand that trying to provoke us to fight with one another is not career-enhancing. Such efforts still occur, of course. After all, this is Washington. But the bureaucratic battles are a good deal more covert.

Of course, the human side of government is always a source of both humor and embarrassment. Will Rogers once said, ''I don't make jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts.'' And the conduct of diplomacy, where—as Secretary Rice can attest—protocol and propriety are so very important, provides an especially fertile ground for amusement.

For example, there was the time that President Nixon met with Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir, shortly after Nixon had appointed Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State. With Golda Meir in that meeting was her very erudite foreign minister, Abba Eban, a graduate of Cambridge. At one point in the meeting, Nixon turned to Golda Meir and said, ''Just think, we now both have Jewish foreign ministers.'' And without missing a beat Golda Meir said, ''Yes, but mine speaks English.''

Then there was the time that President Nixon visited Italy and had a meeting with the Pope. Kissinger and Nixon had along with them Secretary of Defense Mel Laird, but they decided that Laird as, in effect, secretary of war shouldn't be invited to a meeting with the Pope. So, Nixon the next morning went in for his private audience with the Pope, and the other Americans waited outside for the general audience. And who should come striding down the hall of the papal apartments but Mel Laird smoking an enormous cigar, he had decided he wanted in on the meeting. Kissinger was beside himself, but finally said, ''Well, Mel, at least extinguish the cigar.'' And so Laird stubbed out his cigar and put it in his pocket.

The rest of the American party a few minutes later went in to their meeting with the Pope, everyone took a seat. A couple of minutes into the Pope's remarks, Kissinger heard this little patting sound going on, he was in the second row with Laird on the end, there was a wisp of smoke coming out of Laird's pocket. Everything seemed under control. A couple of minutes later, Kissinger heard this loud slapping noise. He looked over smoke was billowing out of Laird's pocket. The Secretary of Defense was on fire. Now the rest of the delegation heard this slapping noise, and they thought they were being cued to applaud the Pope. And so they did. And Henry later told us, ''God only knows what his Holiness thought, seeing the American secretary of defense immolating himself, and the entire American party applauding the fact.''

I am honored to receive this award, and I consider it a privilege to be associated with the United States Global Leadership Campaign. It is a truly remarkable collection of ''strange bedfellows''—from Save the Children to Caterpillar, from Catholic Relief Services to AIPAC, and even Boeing and Northrop Grumman. This organization has been a prescient, and often lonely, advocate for the importance of diplomacy and international development to America's vital national interests—and I commend you for that.

Though my views on these subjects have become better known through recent speeches, in many ways they originated and were reinforced by my prior experience in government during the Cold War. Looking back, it is clear that the strength of America's military forces and intelligence capabilities—along with the willingness to use them—held the Soviets at bay for more than four decades. But there was another side to that story and to that struggle. There was the Agency for International Development overseeing development and humanitarian assistance programs that improved—if not saved—the lives of millions of people from disease, starvation, and poverty. Our diplomats forged relationships and bonds of trust, and built up reservoirs of expertise and goodwill that proved invaluable over time. Countless people in foreign countries wandered into a United States Information Agency library, or heard from a visiting speaker and had their opinions about America transformed by learning about our history and culture and values. Others behind the Iron Curtain were inspired to resist by what they heard on Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America.

In all, these non-military efforts—these tools of persuasion and inspiration—were indispensable to the outcome of the defining ideological struggle of the 20th century. I believe that they are just as indispensable in the 21st century—and maybe more so.

Just last month I approved a new National Defense Strategy that calls upon us to ''Tap the full strength of America and its people''—military and civilian, public and private—to deal with the challenges to our freedom, prosperity, and security around the globe.

In the campaign against terrorist networks and other extremists, we know that direct military force will continue to have a role. But over the long term, we cannot kill or capture our way to victory. What the Pentagon calls ''kinetic'' operations should be subordinate to measures to promote participation in government, economic programs to spur development, and efforts to address the grievances that often lie at the heart of insurgencies and among the discontented from which the terrorists recruit. It will take the patient accumulation of quiet successes over time to discredit and defeat extremist movements and their ideology.

We also know that over the next 20 years and more certain pressures—population, resource, energy, climate, economic, and environmental—could combine with rapid cultural, social, and technological change to produce new sources of deprivation, rage, and instability. We face now, and will inevitably face in the future, rising powers discontented with the international status quo, possessing new wealth and ambition, and seeking new and more powerful weapons. But, overall, looking ahead, I believe the most persistent and potentially dangerous threats will come less from ambitious states, than failing ones that cannot meet the basic needs—much less the aspirations—of their people.

In my travels to foreign capitals, I have been struck by the eagerness of so many foreign governments to forge closer diplomatic and security ties with the United States—ranging from old enemies like Vietnam to new partners like India. Nonetheless, regard for the United States is low among the populations of many key nations—especially those of our moderate Muslim allies.

This is important because much of our national security strategy depends upon securing the cooperation of other nations, which will depend heavily on the extent to which our efforts abroad are viewed as legitimate by their publics. The solution is not to be found in some slick PR campaign or by trying to out-propagandize al-Qaeda, but rather through the steady accumulation of actions and results that build trust and credibility over time.

To do all these things, to truly harness the ''full strength of America,'' as I said in the National Defense Strategy, requires having civilian institutions of diplomacy and development that are adequately staffed and properly funded. Due to the leadership of Secretary Rice and before her Secretary Powell, and with the continuing strong support of the President, we have made significant progress towards pulling ourselves out of the hole created not only by the steep cutbacks in the wake of the Cold War—but also by the lack of adequate resources for the State Department and the entire foreign affairs account going back decades.

Since 2001, international affairs spending has about doubled, State has begun hiring again, billions have been spent to fight AIDS and malaria in Africa, the Millennium Challenge Corporation is rewarding better governance in the developing world, and Secretary Rice has launched a program of transformational diplomacy to better posture the diplomatic corps for the realities of this century. The President's budget request this year, as Condi said, includes more than 1,100 new Foreign Service officers, as well as a response corps of civilian experts that can deploy on short notice. And, for the first time in a long time, I sense real bipartisan support in Congress for strengthening the civilian foreign affairs budget.

Shortfalls nonetheless remain. Much of the total increase in the international affairs budget has been taken up by security costs and offset by the declining dollar, leaving little left over for core diplomatic operations. These programs are not well understood or appreciated by the wider American

public, and do not have a ready-made political constituency that major weapons systems or public works projects enjoy. As a result, the slashing of the President's international affairs budget request has too often become an annual Washington ritual—right up there with the blooming of the cherry blossoms and the Redskins' opening game.

As someone who once led an agency with a thin domestic constituency, I am familiar with this dilemma. Since arriving at the Pentagon I've discovered a markedly different budget dynamic—not just in scale but the reception one gets on the Hill. Congress often asks the military services for lists of things that they need, but that the Defense Secretary and the President were too stingy to request. As you can imagine, this is one congressional tasking that prompts an immediate and enthusiastic response.

It has become clear that America's civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long—relative to what we spend on the military, and more important, relative to the responsibilities and challenges our nation has around the world. I cannot pretend to know the right dollar amount—I know it's a good deal more than the one percent of the federal budget that it is right now. But the budgets we are talking about are relatively small compared to the rest of government, a steep increase of these capabilities is well within reach—as long as there is the political will and wisdom to do it.

But even as we agree that more resources are needed, I believe that there is more to this problem than how much money is in the 150 Account. The challenge we face is how best to integrate these tools of statecraft with the military, international partners, and the private sector.

Where our government has been able to bring America's civilian and the military assets together to support local partners, there have been incredibly promising results. One unheralded example, one you will not read about in the newspapers, is in the Philippines. There the U.S. Ambassador—Kristie Kenney—has overseen a campaign involving multiple agencies working closely together with their Philippine counterparts in a synchronized effort that has delegitimized and rolled back extremists in Mindanao. Having a strong, well-supported chief of mission has been crucial to success.

The vastly larger, more complex international effort in Afghanistan presents a different set of challenges. There are dozens of nations, hundreds of NGOs, universities, development banks, the United Nations, the European Union, NATO—all working to help a nation beset by crushing poverty, a bumper opium crop, and a ruthless and resilient insurgency. Getting all these different elements to coordinate operations and share best practices has been a colossal—and often all too often unsuccessful—undertaking. The appointment this spring of a UN special representative to coordinate civilian reconstruction in Afghanistan is an important step forward. And at the last NATO defense ministerial, I proposed a civilian-military planning cell for Regional Command South to bring unity to our efforts in that critically important part of the country. And I asked Kai Eide, when I met with him last week, to appoint a representative to participate in this cell.

Repeating an Afghanistan or an Iraq—forced regime change followed by nation-building under fire—probably is unlikely in the foreseeable future. What is likely though, even a certainty, is the need to work with and through local governments to avoid the next insurgency, to rescue the next failing state, or to head off the next humanitarian disaster.

Correspondingly, the overall posture and thinking of the United States armed forces has shifted—away from solely focusing on direct American military action, and towards new capabilities to shape the security environment in ways that obviate the need for military intervention in the future. This approach forms the basis of our near-term planning and influences the way we develop capabilities for the future. This perspective also informed the creation of Africa Command, with its unique interagency structure, a deputy commander who is an ambassador not a general, as well as Southern Command's new orientation and priorities in Latin America.

Overall, even outside Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States military has become more involved in a range of activities that in the past were perceived to be the exclusive province of civilian agencies and organizations. This has led to concern among many organizations—perhaps including many represented here tonight—about what's seen as a creeping ''militarization'' of some aspects of America's foreign policy.

This is not an entirely unreasonable sentiment. As a career CIA officer I watched with some dismay the increasing dominance of the defense 800 pound gorilla in the intelligence arena over the years. But that scenario can be avoided if—as is the case with the intelligence community today—there is the right leadership, adequate funding of civilian agencies, effective coordination on the ground, and a clear understanding of the authorities, roles, and understandings of military versus civilian efforts, and how they fit, or in some cases don't fit, together.

We know that at least in the early phases of any conflict, contingency, or natural disaster, the U.S. military—as has been the case throughout our history—will be responsible for security, reconstruction, and providing basic sustenance and public services. I make it a point to reinforce this message before military audiences, to ensure that the lessons learned and re-learned in recent years are not forgotten or again pushed to the margins. Building the security capacity of other nations through training and equipping programs has emerged as a core and enduring military requirement, though none of these programs go forward without the approval of the Secretary of State.

In recent years the lines separating war, peace, diplomacy, and development have become more blurred, and no longer fit the neat organizational charts of the 20th century. All the various elements and stakeholders working in the international arena—military and civilian, government and private—have learned to stretch outside their comfort zone to work together and achieve results.

For example, many humanitarian and international organizations have long prided themselves on not taking sides and avoiding any association with the military. But as we've seen in the vicious attacks on Doctors Without Borders in Afghanistan, and the U.N. Mission in Iraq, violent extremists care little about these distinctions.

To provide clearer rules of the road for our efforts, the Defense Department and ''InterAction''—the umbrella organization for many U.S.-based NGOs—have, for the first time, jointly developed guidelines for how the military and NGOs should relate to one another in a hostile environment. The Pentagon has also refined its guidance for humanitarian assistance to ensure that military projects are aligned with wider U.S. foreign policy objectives and do not duplicate or replace the work of civilian organizations.

Broadly speaking, when it comes to America's engagement with the rest of the world, you probably don't hear this often from a Secretary of Defense, it is important that the military is—and is clearly seen to be—in a supporting role to civilian agencies. Our diplomatic leaders—be they in ambassadors' suites or on the seventh floor of the State Department—must have the resources and political support needed to fully exercise their statutory responsibilities in leading American foreign policy.

The challenge facing our institutions is to adapt to new realities while preserving those core competencies and institutional traits that have made them so successful in the past. The Foreign Service is not the Foreign Legion, and the United States military should never be mistaken for the Peace Corps with guns. We will always need professional Foreign Service officers to conduct diplomacy in all its dimensions, to master local customs and culture, to negotiate treaties, and advance American interests and strengthen our international partnerships. And unless the fundamental nature of humankind and of nations radically changes, the need—and will to use—the full range of military capabilities to deter, and if necessary defeat, aggression from hostile states and forces will remain.

In closing, I am convinced, irrespective of what is reported in global opinion surveys, or recounted in the latest speculation about American decline, that around the world, men and women seeking freedom from despotism, want, and fear will continue to look to the United States for leadership.

As a nation, we have, over the last two centuries, made our share of mistakes. From time to time, we have strayed from our values; on occasion, we have become arrogant in our dealings with other countries. But we have always corrected our course. And that is why today, as throughout our history, this country remains the world's most powerful force for good—the ultimate protector of what Vaclav Havel once called ''civilization's thin veneer.'' A nation Abraham Lincoln described as mankind's ''last, best hope.''

For any given cause or crisis, if America does not lead, then more often than not, what needs to be done simply won't get done. In the final analysis, our global responsibilities are not a burden on the people or on the soul of this nation. They are, rather, a blessing.

Thank you for this award and I salute you for all that you do—for America, and for humanity.

LEAD-SAFE HOUSING FOR KIDS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2008

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6309 the "Lead Safe Housing for Kids Act". First, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, KEITH ELLISON of Minnesota, for introducing this important legislation. This bill will amend the "Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992" by setting the environmental intervention level for lead to 10 micrograms per deciliter. Its purpose is to enact stricter provisions concerning the hazards resulting from lead-based paint in households. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this act.

The "Lead-Safe Housing for Kids Act" is important because of its potential to ensure