United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *109th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006 *No. 77*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

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

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KIRK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

ZARQAWI AND THE WAR ON TERRORISM

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICA NEEDS TO LEAVE IRAQ

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

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

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

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

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

OUR TROOPS DESERVE OUR THANKS

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

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

What I sensed from them was not only a sense of patriotism, but a love of this country. As we begin the debate today, and I know politics seems to permeate everything, I ask that we first think about those young men and women who have risked so much for this Nation, who have lost so much for this Nation, whose families are by their side today giving them the love and dedication they need to overcome this difficult struggle.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. Speaker, they have given the full measure of devotion to this Nation and they deserve our thanks. The invectives and political discourse need to focus on their sacrifice and not on our political ambitions.

URGING RESPECT FOR THE 9/11 WIDOWS

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

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

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

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

So rather than see 9/11 as a moment to unite America, Ann Coulter and her followers have chosen to divide and demonize fellow Americans. I am always amazed that the one casualty the American people would accept on 9/11 would be partisanship, and that is the one casualty you are not willing to give.

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

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

NO NEED FOR FLIP-FLOPPING IN THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the sound you hear on the other side of the aisle is the sound of flip-flopping. Democrats may have put off announcing their agenda, but they have managed to perfect the art of the flip-flop.

Just this week the minority leader stated that she voted against the war in Iraq because she had seen the intelligence and it did not support the threat being claimed by the Bush administration.

Strangely, the minority leader had a different opinion during the debate leading up to the vote authorizing the use of military force. Then she said that she was aware that Saddam Hussein was engaging in the development of weapons of mass destruction ''which is a threat to countries in the region,'' and that there was no question he had chemical and biological weapons.

Flash forward to this week, and the minority leader stated that there was never anything in the intelligence that Iraq posed an imminent threat. Mr. Speaker, which is it? As we begin this debate on Iraq and the war on terror, the American people need decisiveness, not flip-flopping. Republicans want to step up and meet the challenge. It is now time for the Democrats to do the same.

IRAQ WAR UNDERMINES FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, increasingly Americans are realizing there is a better way to support our troops than just sending more of them off to be killed. Would that more here in Washington had a little of our troops' courage to stand up to the myth-based policies of this Administration.

The good judgment of a strong majority of House Democrats, including the consistent position of our minority leader in opposing President Bush's original invasion of Iraq, was demonstrated again yesterday by a report from over 100 top foreign policy experts across the ideological spectrum.

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

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

LONE STAR VOICE—C.E. CUNNINGHAM

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

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

On the border I met crusty rancher, C.E. Cunningham of Quemado, Texas. He has lived on the land for seven decades, and he now writes me about the southern border invasion into America: ''We have had our livestock, wildlife killed, vehicles, tools, equipment stolen. I had to move my mother out of her own home when three illegals stole and robbed her. I have taken weapons away from thieves. I have seen the Mexican Army camped out on the riverbank, and I have seen their tracks on our side. I have tried to get the Mexican Government to help with the thieves, but they told me it was best they stole over here instead of Mexico. It seems to me the Mexican government sanctions these crimes against us.''

Mr. Speaker, Americans like C.E. Cunningham want their lives back, their land back, and their security back. We have to stop letting the Mexican Army and Generalissimo Fox invade the United States by encouraging illegal entry into our country.

And that's just the way it is.

DO NOT FOCUS TOO HEAVILY ON FEMA

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, all of the talk in the media these last few days has been about the fraud in the FEMA individual and housing assistance program.

Now, I am not saying that those who perpetrated the fraud should not be dealt with appropriately, or that FEMA and the Red Cross do not have to clean up their act.

But, folks, this is a disaster the likes of which we have never seen. What would you have had them do in such an emergency, apply miles and miles of red tape and risk not giving service to those who need it quickly?

Colleagues, do not let this be a smoke screen that would cause us to lose sight of the contracting and the purchasing waste, fraud and abuse that the big corporations have perpetrated on our government and all of us, while businesses in the Gulf Region went bust for lack of work.

It is always the little guy who bears the blame while the big ones get away. Our relevant committees in this Congress need to turn our focus to the Halliburtons of the world. When we look at the waste, the fraud, and abuse of these giants, that $1 billion will look like chump change.

□ 1015

ETHIOPIA BORDER DISPUTE

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

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

My constituents in Minnesota remember the destruction and death from the 1998 to 2000 war over the border that cost the lives of 70,000 people. I urge the President and the Secretary of State to leave no stone unturned to bring a peaceful resolution to this matter.

Additionally, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Ethiopian Consolidation Act, which would advance human rights in the Horn of Africa and links U.S. foreign aid assistance to full compliance with the Algiers Agreement. We must see to it that the tragedy of the last decade is not repeated.

HOUSE TO VOTE ON INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

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

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

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

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

POLITICAL PROGRESS CONTINUES IN IRAQ

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

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

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

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

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

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY TO MILLIONS OF AMERICANS BY INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING C.J. FOUTS

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

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

Mr. Fouts captured the essence of the American dream, Mr. Speaker. He came to Smyrna at age 18 from rural Georgia in search of work. He started his own business, a service station that later grew into a sales shop for cars, trucks and equipment.

Mr. Fouts gave his time, energy and passion to the Smyrna business community. He has the distinction of possessing the longest active business license in the city of Smyrna, 54 years. Just a few weeks ago the city honored him with a plaque commemorating him as a founding member of the Downtown Development Authority. I am so thankful to have been in attendance.

Mr. Speaker, our communities are blessed with men like C.J. Fouts. Their work ethic boosts our economy, and their determination allows our towns and our cities to flourish. Smyrna, indeed, and the State of Georgia, lost a great man this week, but his work and vision live on throughout the city.

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

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DEBATE ON THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

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

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

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

DEBATING THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

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

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise for a moment and honor the men and women of the Tennessee National Guard. They have had deployments in the past year, and they have served with distinction. Today many of the junior officers and the commanders of the Tennessee Guard are in town. They

were honored at a reception last night, and they are visiting us here on Capitol Hill today.

We welcome them. We honor them, and we thank them and their families for their outstanding service, for their sacrifice, for their commitment to freedom, for loving this Nation and for being the embodiment of that freedom on foreign soil.

LINE-ITEM VETO BILL

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

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

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

THE SUBURBAN AGENDA ON EDUCATION, HEALTH CARE, CONSERVATION AND THE ECONOMY

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

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

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

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

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

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

SAY NO TO PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

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

May I remind the American people how important Social Security is, not only to our seniors who need it to keep them out of poverty, but also to our widows who are taking care of children, for people with disability.

Social Security is the one plan that has worked since it was conceived here in Congress. Democrats will protect it. I will fight for it. The American people have answered a year ago. We want Social Security.

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

THE UNCHECKED UNITED NATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RISING COLLEGE EDUCATION COSTS

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we should encourage our young people to strive to achieve their full potential. We must give them the resources and opportunities to make their dreams a reality. For many students these dreams begin with access to higher education.

But after 6 years of Republican rule, access to college is now out of reach for too many of our Nation's youths. Since 2001, tuition and fees at 4-year public colleges have increased by 40 percent. At the same time, Republicans have made drastic cuts to higher education, including underfunding Pell Grants and cutting the higher education budget by $12 billion this year alone.

These cuts not only mean that more students have to take out loans to pay for college, but they will also face higher interest rates as they pay them back unless they refinance by July 1. That is when the Department of Education will raise Federal student loan interest rates to offset the Republican cuts.

As Members of Congress, we should be doing everything in our power to make college more accessible and affordable for all students, rather than cutting critical education dollars to fund tax breaks for the wealthy few.

□ 1030

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 868

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) ten hours of debate equally divided and controlled among the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not include instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Resolution 861 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and insert tabular and extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

First, should we have entered the war in Iraq? I remind the Members of this House that it was official policy of the United States Government beginning in 1998, agreed to by both Houses of Congress, to remove Saddam Hussein from power. We had good reason to do so. This is a person who had twice launched regional wars and took over a million lives; who pursued and nearly acquired nuclear weapons on two different occasions; who developed weapons of mass destruction and had used them against his own people; who was a state sponsor of terrorism; who had systematically worked his way out from under the restrictions applied to him by the United Nations; who had expelled weapons inspectors from his own country; who was a continuing threat; and, frankly, who had terrorized and brutalized and killed hundreds of thousands of his own people. The world is better off without Saddam Hussein.

Second, with him gone, what is at stake in Iraq? For that I think we should turn to the enemies that we fight today. al Qaeda, they have designated this and other terrorist groups as the central battlefield in the war on terror. I quote from the chief theoretician of al Qaeda: ''Iraq is the greatest battlefield against the infidel and his native allies. It is not the American war machine that should be of utmost concern. What threatens the future is American democracy. To allow Iraq to build a democracy would represent our biggest defeat.'' So the stakes are certainly worth the effort.

Next, what are our chances of success in Iraq? Frankly, I think they are very good, for two reasons. First, obviously, the skill, the bravery, the professionalism of our own people which was demonstrated only last week when they cornered and killed al Zarqawi, one of the world's worst terrorists; but second, and we ought to note this, the Iraqi people themselves. It is they who stepped up under the most difficult of circumstances and turned out in successfully greater numbers at three different elections. It is they who, in the civil turmoil they are going through, have fashioned a Constitution, have created a permanent government. It is their leaders who run the risk of being killed every single day, and it is their people who are standing up literally by the thousands and fighting back to defend their own country and to move it forward to a hopeful and democratic future. So I think our chances of success in Iraq are good.

Finally, though, where will the battle be won or lost? Finally, Iraq is a crucial theater. What happens there with our military, what happens with the Iraqis is determinative to the outcome; but I would also suggest that the United States is itself a battlefield, a political battlefield. The real question is whether or not we will sustain the will that it takes to ultimately be successful, and that decision will be made not in Iraq but in Congress and in the United States itself.

So what we are about today is a fight, I think, that involves us on the most critical battlefield of all, the battlefield of American public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, today we may hear about the ''unfairness'' of this resolution. We may hear charges of a rigged process. Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker. The minority was asked to provide their own party substitute to this resolution, and they did not choose to do so. We were ready to make this in order in the Rules Committee. They did not do so, and we moved forward with our resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if the other side of the aisle would like to argue process rather than substance, that is certainly appropriate, and that is their privilege. They should vote against this resolution. If they disagree with the resolution in substance, they should vote against it. If they disagree with the resolution because they consider it ramrodded, they should vote against it. That is their right.

Frankly, I believe their real challenge is that they have no common unified position on Iraq as a party. Whether we are right or wrong on our side of the aisle, we do have a common position, and it is expressed in the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those on both sides of the aisle who believe that winning the campaign in Iraq is of the utmost important in achieving success in the wider global war on terror to vote for this resolution. I believe that many Members of both parties will.

Mr. Speaker, to that end, I urge the support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we will not be having a real debate on Iraq today. It will be a pretend debate, one that will have absolutely no effect on U.S. policy. No amendments, no substitutes, no chance for Members of Congress to actually do their jobs by making thoughtful changes to the resolution.

The distinguished chairman of the International Relations Committee testified before the Rules Committee that the resolution before us will at least give Members the opportunity to ''get things off our chest.''

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

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

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

We are all committed to a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq. The important question remains, to achieve this goal, is the United States committed to keeping 150,000 or 100,000 or

50,000 American military men and women in Iraq for an indefinite amount of time, perhaps even decades into the future?

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the reality of our policy in Iraq is one characterized by corruption, mismanagement, incompetence and self-delusion. 2,493 American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have died since the beginning of the war, 94 percent of them since the President declared, ''Mission Accomplished.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the ground, reconstruction is not going well. A plan to build 150 health care clinics has not resulted in much more than empty shells and uneven walls. Power blackouts remain a constant frustration. Only 19 percent of Iraqis today have working sewer connections, down from 24 percent before the war. While most Iraq reconstruction projects are way behind schedule, there is one construction effort that is right on target: the $592 million U.S. embassy, which will be the size of about 80 football fields.

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

And still, Mr. Speaker, there is no accountability for this money and no accountability for this war, not within the Republican White House and not here in this Republican House.

This is a critical point, because this debate must be about more than simply how long we will stay in Iraq.

Where is the accountability for the corruption taking place in our reconstruction projects? Where is the accountability for our troops receiving faulty body armor and other equipment? Where is the accountability for the lack of funding to provide services for all the veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan who are dealing with post-traumatic stress and other needs? Where is the accountability for the creation of death squad-type militias within the Iraqi police and security forces? Where is the accountability for the abuse of prisoners and detainees which is costing the United States so much of its credibility and standing in the international community?

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¾ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

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

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

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

This is, Mr. Speaker, the debate of our era. We cannot wait until international terrorism attacks us. We must

take the war to international terrorism and defeat international terrorism before the terrorists attack us. That is the debate of our era, as President Bush has reiterated so often. And that is a debate that we as a country and as a Congress must engage in, and I am pleased to see that we are doing so today.

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

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

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

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

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

Two wars. That is why this is a disingenuous resolution before us.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding time, and I rise in support of this rule and the underlying resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying resolution.

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

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

When George Washington was elected the first President there was a king in France, a czarina in Russia, an emperor in China, and a shogun in Japan. The American President was the only elected leader at the time. Today, countries on every continent elect their own leaders. The number of democracies currently stands at an all-time high, and has been growing without interruption for some time. Freedom and self-government is on the march around the world. History has shown that those countries who elect their leaders are less belligerent than those that do not.

Democracy and freedom are a threat to the terrorists' ideology, which is why they fight so hard to keep self-government from taking hold. The Middle East is an area where democracy has faced significant challenges—it is a region where we see entrenched dictatorships, continued violence and civil unrest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying resolution that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the House Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, about two centuries ago, almost, this country was facing a war that devastated it for generations. The first day, the first battle was going to be at Bull Run, not far from here in Washington, and I am sure that some Members of Congress and many other citizens of Washington packed up lunches, got in their horse and buggy, and went out to watch the fight. Suddenly, they found the Union forces

were being routed, bloodied, and were told to run for their lives.

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

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

Contrast that with what this Republican leadership is giving us now, a day not about policy or progress but about politics and posturing. It is a day designed to provide the majority with a chance to make cheap political attacks against Democrats in anticipation of upcoming mid-term elections at a time when Americans and Iraqis are giving their lives in one of the most brutal wars of our time.

Yesterday, an internal Republican memo was circulated outlining the party's plan of attack for today. It instructs Republicans to paint a picture of ''A Democrat Party without a coherent national security policy that sheepishly dismissed the challenges America faces in a post-9/11 world.'' We are going to hear a lot of that empty propaganda today, I am absolutely sure. But how will that divisive rhetoric help our soldiers abroad, Mr. Speaker? What can it possibly have to do with the war we are fighting?

If this memo didn't show us the real motivations behind today, last night's meeting of the Rules Committee certainly did. My fellow Democrats and I had a simple request at the meeting. We asked for the rule to be an open one. An open rule would have given any Member on any side of the House who wanted to speak a chance to do so. And what is more, an open rule would have permitted Members from both sides of the aisle to present amendments to the resolution so that we could do more than just talk, so that we could try to improve the flawed policies being pursued in Iraq.

But the committee gave us a closed rule. Not one person here from either party will be able to amend this resolution. Now, why would the Republicans do this? Could it be because they are not interested in addressing the serious questions in a forthright way? There are certainly problems to be addressed. Let me give you one example.

Yesterday, I joined a group of Democrats repeating our call for the creation of a Truman Commission to oversee the Iraqi reconstruction. Rampant construction and incompetent Iraq contracting have prolonged our mission there and cost lives, with 75 percent of oil and gas and 50 percent of electricity projects remaining unfinished.

The GAO reports that $7 billion in funds have simply been lost. The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, Stuart Bowen, is investigating 72 cases of alleged fraud. Have Republicans dealt with these problems? They have not. They recently elected to block $1.9 billion in new reconstruction funds from being examined. They won't let Mr. Bowen and his team look at that, because he was doing the job too well. So they took the jurisdiction pretty much away from him.

I suppose it shouldn't come as a surprise that today, instead of proposing serious solutions to the problems we are facing, we are being offered a ''yes or no'' vote on a resolution drowning in patriotic rhetoric and offering us an open-ended fight against an open-ended enemy.

Debate is about choice, but there is no choice here today. What we have is less like our democracy and more like a Soviet election. Americans expect real debate in their Congress. They do not expect their representatives to passively acquiesce to the assertions of a meaningless resolution based on White House talking points. And they expect their elected officials to have a meaningful discussion on the future course of the greatest challenge to our Nation in a generation.

My friends on both sides of the aisle, we can stop this sham in its tracks by voting ''no'' on this rule. I implore every Member from both parties to realize what is at stake here. If you support the rule, you are saying you don't believe our troops and their families deserve a serious debate on the war. You are saying you don't think the massive troubles of the Iraqi people deserve more than a cursory glance. And you are saying you don't think this Congress should be anything more than the President's rubber stamp. What you are saying is that this war is just a political tool to be used at elections.

My fellow Democrats and I have said a lot about the death of democracy in this House. Over the course of the 109th Congress, of 144 different rules presented by this Republican Party, only one rule that was not an appropriations measure has been made open for debate and amendable by this leadership. One. And if there was ever a rule that should be open, if there was ever a day in which democracy should breathe freely in these halls, even if just for one day, it is this rule and it should be this day.

Your vote on this rule isn't about how you voted on the war, it is about respecting the troops. It is about respecting democracy. How can we ask the fine young men and women of our Armed Forces to die so that Iraqis can have democracy and debate when we are systematically undermining those same principles here? It is unconscionable.

□ 1100

Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, I implore every Member, everyone to take a stand for the values of democracy and the values of this Nation and vote please against this rule. Defeating this rule will show our troops that we have enough respect for them in this House to have a real debate on their lives and future and of the future of the Nation that we love.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on this day of debate while we discuss the merits and perils of our involvement in the war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Rules Committee.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is long overdue. For the past 3 years, the United States has had a military presence in Iraq. In fact, when the authorization for war in Iraq was authorized,

I was not a member of this body. Yet this is the first extensive public debate Congress will have had on the most important issue of the day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The War of 1812, Mr. MCGOVERN's State tried to secede from the Union.

In the Civil War, we had the greatest riots proportionately we have ever had in this country, and the Governor of New York inflammatorily said President Lincoln's goal was to kill all of the Irish.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Members will not be given a chance to offer amendments or alternatives to

let the House work its will. Rather, all that is offered is 82 seconds for each Member to state a view on the complex and difficult subject of the Iraq war.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to work on this resolution with my good friend, Chairman HYDE, on a bipartisan basis as I always have. But the Republican leadership expanded the original draft far beyond Iraq and rejected every one of our substantive suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should allow all Members to offer their own ideas through amendments to this resolution. At a minimum, it should allow a Democratic substitute, and it should provide enough time so that every Member has at least 5 minutes to express his or her views.

Mr. Speaker, just as the Democratic majority gave Republican minority leader Bob Michel an alternative in 1991 during the first Iraq debate, our Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, should have the same opportunity to offer a Democratic alternative with the same chance of prevailing in this House.

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

I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

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

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

□ 1115

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this war was launched without an imminent threat to our families. It endangers them more every day, creating new generations of terrorists. Radical ''know it all'' ideologues here in Washington bent facts, distorted intelligence, and perpetrated lies designed to mislead the American people into believing that a third rate thug had a hand in the 9/11 tragedy and was soon to unleash a mushroom cloud.

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

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

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

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

Instead of staying the course, we need to chart a smarter course. It is not weakness or retreat to recognize the Administration offers us only an endless ''spend and bleed'' policy.

When this talkathon ends, reject this fraudulent resolution, which cannot be amended or changed, to alter this Administration's deadly pursuit of a desert mirage. Neither paper resolutions, nor more Administration arrogance will defeat terrorism.

The harm from this Administration's disastrous decision to invade Iraq was apparent from the beginning. The warnings of many, as noted in my speeches, including those given on the floor on September 22, 2002 (H6410), October 9, 2002 (H7328), and October 10, 2002 (H7772), and the contemporaneous editorial below, went unheeded.

[From the Austin American-Statesman, Oct. 13, 2002]

OUR VOICES MUST WORK TO AVERT AN INVASION

(By Rep. Lloyd Doggett, U.S. House of Representatives)

I recently voted against what is really an authorization for launching a massive land invasion and military occupation of Iraq. More important than speaking with one voice, the votes of 133 Congress members against this rush to war underscored the importance of our continuing to speak as one democracy.

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

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

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

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

In addition to the cost in lives, the costs of war, to differing degrees, will touch us all. President Bush's top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated that the cost of waging this war may rise as high as $200 billion. At a time of chronic deficit spending,

these are precious resources no longer available for education, health care, retirement security and homeland security.

True security is more than a military second to none and effective law enforcement at home; it means working with nations to address our common security concerns. We are strong enough to defeat Iraq in combat, but we must be wise enough to rely on America's other strengths to rid the world of Saddam Hussein's danger.

No fool would trust Saddam Hussein with even one American life. Our choice is not between ''war'' and ''doing nothing'' or between ''war'' and ''appeasement.'' The prudent choice remains—first, attempt holding Iraq accountable through effective, comprehensive, international inspections.

Some of the most insightful arguments against invading Iraq were advanced by Republicans and military leaders. The first President Bush, in 1998, wrote: ''Trying to eliminate Saddam, extending the ground war into an occupation of Iraq . . . would have incurred incalculable human and political costs. . . . [We] could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land. It would have been a dramatically different—and perhaps barren—outcome.''

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

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

President Reagan used containment effectively against another ''evil empire,'' the Soviet Union, and from Cuba to Libya, a succession of presidents has avoided nuclear Armageddon. Containment and disarmament may not end all wars, but they are clearly superior to the new ''first-strike formula'' that risks wars without end.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This action is not military in nature. It is entirely political. But it will determine victory or defeat as surely as any battle in Iraq.

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

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

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

This debate, under the rule, is as critical a fight as any our troops could have on the battlefield. No one has any doubt our soldiers will win any fight we send them to. That is not the question. The world's doubt is entirely over the backbone of this Congress.

Because of the statements of Members of this body, not their votes, but what they say today, and of the Senate, that have given substantial propaganda assistance to the enemy, this rule, this debate is absolutely essential to preserving the victories of our troops that they have won with their blood and their lives.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the 173rd Airborne in 1968–69 Vietnam, I saw how the words of Senators and Congressmen undermine the hard-fought victories and sacrifices of our soldiers.

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

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

Where was our media? They instead chose to focus the world's attention on isolated American failure at My Lai.

Through carefully planned international media and political manipulations, the NVA and Viet Cong were encouraged to keep fighting, regardless of their defeats in the field. American media fell right into line with the enemy's public affairs plan.

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

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

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

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

Coincidence or planned strategy?

Same players, same actions, seeking the same result—unconditional U.S. withdrawal from a war on terror we didn't start, allowing barbarians to slaughter millions of innocent civilians, with the end result our Nation humiliated and compromised on the world stage.

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

The day that our enemies in Iraq believe this, the war will be won.

It's time for this body to start fighting for our soldiers.

The 173rd has been back in action in this war, and I will be darned if I will let what happened to us in Southeast Asia happen to these guys in the Middle East, if I can help it.

Let's finally bury the ghosts of Vietnam by committing to victory. In doing so, we greatly reduce the need for future military action, as potential enemies will no longer doubt our national resolve in a showdown.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

But sadly, the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress distracted us onto a path of a war in Iraq 1,143 days ago. 2,497 servicemen killed, 18,490 wounded. First it was weapons of mass destruction. Then it was about 9/11. Then it was about building democracy.

But now the Republicans want to pretend that it has to do all about the war on terrorism. They mentioned al Zarqawi. The Pentagon wanted to take out al Zarqawi. They had him in their sights before the war in Iraq, and the Bush White House and DICK CHENEY wouldn't let them because it would hurt recruitment for the coalition of the willing to invade Iraq, where al Qaeda did not exist.

If you strip out the rhetoric from this nonbinding resolution, with no Democratic alternative, no amendments allowed, it is a stay the course resolution with an open-ended commitment. As the President said, a future President will decide when U.S. troops will leave.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the National Security Subcommittee of Government Reform, a gentleman who has been to Iraq on 12 different occasions, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid we will lose the war in Iraq, ... in Iraq. I am deeply concerned we will lose the war in Iraq here at home.

Our efforts to remove Saddam Hussein from power and help bring democracy to the most troubled part of the world is a truly noble effort that must succeed.

Whether you believe al Qaeda was in Iraq when the war began, they are there now, and they think they can win because they believe we will leave too soon, before Iraqis can defend themselves.

True, we got their prince. Al Zarqawi is dead, but his fellow terrorists remain determined to succeed.

This resolution clearly links the war in Iraq with the war against Islamist terrorists. Islamist terrorists is exactly who the 9/11 Commission said we are confronting. If you agree, vote for this resolution and explain why. If you disagree, vote against the resolution and explain why.

I support the rule. I support the resolution. I support our efforts in Iraq, and I look forward to the 10 hours of debate.

When I ask individual Iraqis what is their biggest concern, it is not the bombings, the lack of electricity or anything else other than this. It is, and I quote, ''that you will leave us. That you will leave us before we can grab hold of democracy and defend ourselves.''

I pray we will not let them down. I look forward to the 10 hours of debate. I look forward to our being absolutely resolute in helping Iraqis have an opportunity they have worked so hard to achieve.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

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

My question to my friends across the aisle is very simple. What are you afraid of? Why are you not allowing any other amendment to be offered during this 10-hour debate? Why are you not allowing our side to have an alternative resolution so we can get into the very troubling aspects of this administration's conduct of war in Iraq and our strategy on global terrorism.

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

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

I encourage my colleagues to defeat this rule.

□ 1130

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Oklahoma has 6¼ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¼ minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

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

At best, the Republicans have structured a glorified 10-hour Special Order on Iraq. But let us not dignify it by calling it a debate when no Member will have the opportunity to vote on competing policy proposals.

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

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

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of my close, I simply want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle the simple fact is, despite their insistence to the contrary, our side never received a substitute amendment to consider. The Rules Committee received four amendments, none of which was a Democratic substitute. We cannot make in order what is not submitted to the Rules Committee.

Let me say that I suspect that this procedural problem really represents the fact that there is not a cohesive alternative presented by the other side. We have watched again and again and again as the Democratic Party has struggled to come to grips with this issue and find a united position, and so far no united position has emerged.

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

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

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

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

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

I am extraordinarily proud of this President. I am extraordinarily proud of this Congress with its bipartisan commitment to succeed in Iraq.

To close, I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is, under an open rule, is it a requirement that a substitute or that substitutes be filed with the Rules Committee in order to have them debated and voted on the House floor? Because my understanding is it is not a requirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is inquiring about the proceedings of the Committee on Rules, and it is not for the Chair to characterize those proceedings.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I think I made my point, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 194, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
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
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz

Waters	Waxman	Woolsey
Watson	Weiner	Wu
Watt	Wexler	Wynn

NOT VOTING—16

Burton (IN)	Lynch	Saxton
Capito	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Carter	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
Cubin	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Gordon	Rogers (KY)	
Johnson, E. B.	Rothman	

□ 1202

Mrs. TAUSCHER, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, MATHESON and BOUCHER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4939) ''An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.''.

ALLOCATING CONTROL OF TIME ON H. RES. 861

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated by House Resolution 868 to the ranking minority members of four committees instead be controlled by the minority leader or her designees.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 861

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whereas by early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal, Ba'athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global peace and security and was in violation of mandatory United Nations Security Council Resolutions;

Whereas the mission of the United States and its Coalition partners, having removed Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors;

Whereas the terrorists have declared Iraq to be the central front in their war against all who oppose their ideology;

Whereas the Iraqi people, with the help of the United States and other Coalition partners, have formed a permanent, representative government under a newly ratified constitution;

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

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

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

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

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

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The facts are clear. America has been struck repeatedly. Despite the life-ending attacks on Khobar Towers, our East African embassies, the USS *Cole* and the first World Trade Center bombing, U.S. policy tended to confuse these attacks with isolated law-enforcement events. We failed to recognize them as

the escalating strikes that they were. We failed to identify the networks behind the bombs. We convinced ourselves that these attacks were just somehow random acts of violence. And yet the attacks continued.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1215

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

As we watched some of our fellow citizens leap from burning buildings to their deaths, our fear turned to anger and then anger to resolute determination.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pakistan, a nation that once recognized the oppressive Taliban regime, has changed its course and now works closely with the coalition to round up terrorists. Yemen, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia have also moved aggressively within their borders to fight terrorism. Libya has given up her nuclear capability.

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

There is no doubt that since 9/11 our military, as well as our law enforcement intelligence agencies, have made great strides in uprooting terrorism. Nearly a dozen serious al Qaeda plots have been stopped since September 11th. But there is good reason for ongoing vigilance because the threat is still very real.

Just recently, our neighbor to the north, Canada, foiled a terrorist plot to storm that country's parliament and one of its major television headquarters. The terrorists planned to behead those they captured.

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

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

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

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

Saddam invaded the sovereign nation of Kuwait. He harbored terrorists in his midst, and he defied 17 United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

Just a few days ago, I was listening to the radio, and a pundit remarked on the sectarian violence in Iraq. He observed that perhaps the Iraqi people were better off under Saddam. Given the unspeakable and systematic brutality of Saddam's regime, such a remark either reflects a serious misreading of history or a very naive and forgiving nature.

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

While I was in Iraq, I met with Prime Minister al Maliki as well as my counterpart, the Speaker of the Iraqi Parliament. We talked about the birth of democracy in Iraq.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The ''stand up'' of this new Iraqi Government, which is the fruit of three elections where Iraqi citizens held up their ink-stained fingers and resisted intimidation, brings us closer to that day.

President Bush told us from the beginning that this road would not be easy. We have lost many American lives. And each one is precious to us.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Stand up for freedom. Adopt this resolution.

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

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes.

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

It is no secret that Iraq is of particular importance because of its oil. The United States consumes 20.6 billion barrels of oil per day. Yet we produce only 5.1 billion barrels of oil a day. China is the second largest consumer, with 6.9 million barrels per day, and they produce 3.6 million barrels per day. Iraq has the fourth largest oil reserve in the world. Saudi Arabia is number one, Canada number two and Iran number three. So all of us agree Iraq is important. But how do we get to a conclusion?

Let me compare Gulf War I with Gulf War II. In Gulf War I, Kuwait was attacked by Saddam Hussein. It was a brutal attack. President Bush I immediately reacted. He sent his emissary, Secretary Cheney, to Saudi Arabia. They got an agreement from Saudi Arabia to use their land to put troops in. He immediately sent in the Airborne Division, and he immediately sent in F–16 fighters to deter Saddam Hussein. All of us knew that there was a possibility at that time that he would have complete control of the oil in the Middle East. So we knew how important it was.

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

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

Matter of fact, President Mubarak said to me that King Hussein came to him and said if you support the United States, you will cut the throat of Saddam Hussein, and yet Egypt decided that they were going to go along with us.

Then he talked about that we needed to have a U.N. resolution, which we did have. Then we had to have a resolution in the Congress of the United States. But the big thing that he promoted was he got a coalition together, and this coalition ended up with 400,000 American troops and 160,000 coalition troops.

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

But I still thought there were weapons of mass destruction. I still thought there were biological weapons. I came back and we sent a team over there.

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

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

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

The first war, 160,000. And the first war was all paid for. It cost us $5 billion. The reason I remember this so vividly is I was chairman of the committee at the time the money came through our committee, and we then sent it over, reprogrammed it over to the Defense Department itself. But the discrepancy that we have seen, the mischaracterization, the optimistic predictions are the problems that I have had.

Now, I sent a letter, with DUNCAN HUNTER and a number of other people, and I said to the President, we need 100,000 more troops. Well, the President decided he didn't need 100,000 more troops. Now, imagine this, we are on the ground and we have won the war. The troops did a magnificent job, as we knew they would, but they completely miscalculated the problems that we were going to have afterwards.

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

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

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

I said on the floor of the House the most important thing in that first supplemental, in the $87 billion, was the $18 billion that went for reconstruction. And of course there are so many projects that haven't been finished. Now, after we sent the letter about the 100,000, and during that period of time, we asked a fella named Hamre, who was the former Under Secretary of Defense, who went over to Iraq and he did a study for the Defense Department. He came back and said, you have got 3 to 6 months to get this straightened out.

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

Now, let me go through why I get so distressed by the reports that I get about how well it is going. First of all, the number of daily attacks in Iraq have gone from in 2004, daily, 53 attacks in 2004, 70 attacks in 2005, and in 2006, 90 attacks a day.

Estimated size of the insurgency. Now, we are supposed to be making progress. That is what we hear. The estimated size of the insurgency in 2004 was 15,000. In May of 2005 it was 16,000. In May of 2006 it was 20,000.

This is the way I measure whether there is progress or not progress.

The amount of cash paid to families, this is an important point, to Iraqi civilians killed or maimed by the operation involving American troops went from in 2004, $5 million to $20 million.

Now, what does that mean? The problem is that all of us want to solve the problem, all of us want to have a satisfactory answer in Iraq. The problem is the way we have to operate as a military. The reason we won the first Gulf War is we were fighting a conventional force and we wiped them out. Nobody can match our military. They are the best in the world. But now we are fighting a guerilla war, and that is the type of problem that we have.

For instance, we went into Fallujah, we put 300,000 people outside their homes and only 100,000 have come back now. And when we put 300,000 people outside their home, every one of those are an enemy.

Abu Ghraib. Why did Abu Ghraib happen? Abu Ghraib happened because we had insufficient forces and untrained people and unsupervised people in that prison.

Now, what do I mean by untrained? We had one fella, who happened to be from my district, that had a court order against him because he had abused his family, and he couldn't carry a gun in Pennsylvania. And he said, I can't do this. This is against my nature. I don't know anything about taking care of prisoners. He is now in jail. But the point is he was untrained in that particular job, and even though he told them, they put him in the job. And of course we know the tremendous consequence, at the very time we went into Fallujah, at the very time we put 300,000 people outside their home.

And listen, I endorse this. I know we have to have, when we go into an area, we have to use overwhelming force. That is the way the military has to operate. But, you see, these payments from $5 million in 2004 to $20 million last year, that is because when we go into a place we kill them inadvertently. And when we kill people inadvertently we make enemies, and Abu Ghraib was the biggest public relations disaster we had since My Lai during the Vietnam War.

The number of complete or reconstructed projects, as I said, in al Anbar Province, imagine now, this is one-third of the geography of Iraq, and they have 2 million people, zero. Zero. Number of civilians who died in Baghdad last month, 1,400, in sectarian violence. What is the definition of sectarian violence? A civil war.

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

The average monthly U.S. war expenditure in Iraq: $4.4 billion in 2003, $5 billion in 2004, $6.1 billion in 2005, and $8 billion. The average monthly expenditure, $8 billion. Now, think what I am saying. The first Gulf War, and DUNCAN HUNTER remembers this, they paid internationally. We paid $5 billion. He was on the Armed Services Committee. He knows what I am talking about. We paid $5 billion and they paid $60 billion. They had 160,000 troops in the first Gulf War.

Now, let me talk about the sentiment and talk about the polls taken. We all look at the polls to see what is going on. Now, the only poll taken of U.S. forces in Iraq, about 3½ months ago: 72 percent of the American troops serving in Iraq think the U.S. should exit the country within a year.

Now, I can understand that. Let me tell you, it is hot, they are wearing 70 pounds every day when they are out there in the field, and I can certainly understand that. Forty-two percent say they do not know what the mission is. And that is devastating when they do not understand the mission.

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

And who do they trust? Who do they trust for personal security? Forty-three percent trust the Iraqi police, 35 percent trust the Iraqi army, 6 percent trust the insurgents, 6 percent trust the insurgents, 4 percent trust the armed militia, and 1 percent, 1 percent trust the multinational force. In another poll taken at the beginning of this year, 47 percent approve the attacks on the United States forces, and 87 percent of the Iraqis endorse a timetable for withdrawal.

Our global image couldn't have been higher after the first Gulf War, with 80 to 90 percent of the people in the world thinking the United States did a marvelous job. We had recovered from Vietnam, finally, in the first Gulf War.

Ten of 14 countries polled said the war in Iraq has made the world more dangerous, and most of the countries rated the U.S. troops in Iraq a bigger danger to world peace than the threat posed by Iran. Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Russia, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Jordan, and Turkey all have more favorable ratings of China than the U.S.

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

□ 1245

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

I visit the hospitals every week, and the only person to visit them more than I do is BILL YOUNG and his wife. I see these young people. I am so impressed by their determination, and I am so hopeful we can end this terrible tragedy.

When I got into this 6 months ago, I got into it because of the troops and because of the fact that I felt we couldn't do anything more militarily. We had done everything we could do militarily, and, second, because of the future of the military.

The bill we are going to pass next week, and very few people are going to vote against it, if you want to really support the troops, that is what you vote for. You vote for that legislation. That will say we will run out of money for personnel for the troops because we cut $4 billion out of the base bill by September. We will take care of that. We will find a way to do it. But the point is the base bill was cut by $4 billion.

Now let me tell you the difference in what I believe is the answer. I believe we redeploy and be ready; that is what I say. I say redeploy and be ready.

We are the targets. We are causing the problem. You know who wants us to stay in Iraq right now, the al Qaeda wants us there because it recruits people for them. China wants us there. North Korea wants us there. Russia wants us there. We are depleting our resources, just like Russia depleted their resources in Afghanistan. The same thing is happening with the United States. We will have spent $450 billion by the end of this fiscal year. Now think, the first gulf war we spent $5 billion. We have spent $450 billion.

Stay and we will pay, not only pay in dollars, in money; we are going to pay long term.

I figure it took us through the Reagan administration to pay for the Vietnam War. We had 18 to 21 percent interest rates during the Reagan administration, and the reason we did was because Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States, said we can have butter and we can have guns, and he didn't raise the taxes he should have raised when we had the war going on.

So we continue to pay with lives lost in terms of financial treasure and more than $8 billion a month. We pay in terms of international reputation. We pay in terms of the future of our military. We stay and pay. I say redeploy and be ready.

Let me tell this one last story.

When I came out of Vietnam, they gave me this small bullet. It is a 45 caliber without any powder in it. It says: ''First Marines, everything is going to be all right.''

A month after I came out of Vietnam in 1967, Lyndon Johnson said, and I believed in the Vietnam War. I thought we were fighting communism. But Lyndon Johnson said, and they had an election, one month after I came out of Vietnam, everything was going to be all right. Do you know how many people we lost from 1967 until we pulled out? 37,000.

Rhetoric does not answer the problem. Only the Iraqis can solve the problem in Iraq. They are fighting with each other, and our troops are caught in between. I say it is time to redeploy and be ready.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but comment on my good friend Mr. MURTHA's eulogy for the first gulf war. The problem we have had there is we quit too soon. We quit before the victory was secure. We left the Republican Army, we left Saddam Hussein, we just washed our hands and left. I hope we learned a lesson from that, what a mistake it was and it led to later difficulties.

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

The capacity to reproduce that fearful mushroom cloud which first terrorized the world in 1945 is multiplying and becoming the deadly plaything of rogue nations across the globe.

Partisans have charged the President with misleading us into war, ''misleading'' being a pale euphemism for lying. The acquisition is made more grave by the assertion that he concocted the war for purely political purposes.

By any measure this is a monstrous charge, but questions persist that must be answered if we are to honestly examine the President's rationale for intervention. It is essential to first understand the context in which the decision was made.

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

The threat from Saddam Hussein stretches back much further than many of today's critics care to remember. Saddam's effort to develop a nuclear weapon began in the 1970s, centered around the nuclear reactor being constructed at Osirak.

Despite the alarming evidence of its purpose, the world casually contemplated what it saw as a distant, perhaps even benign, development.

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

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

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

Unchastened by this setback, Saddam continued his aggressive campaign to dominate the region and control the world's oil supply, launching a decade-long war against Iran in 1980 during which over a million people were killed and in which he used poison gas and other means of mass slaughter.

After being beaten back from Iran, his attention then turned to Kuwait,

which he invaded and annexed in 1990, assuming the world would meekly accept this fait accompli.

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

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

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

This record of unrelenting aggression and implacable menace was the only context in which a reasonable person could view Saddam's future designs. This was the background in which the events of 9/11 occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Was our intelligence imperfect? In retrospect, that is obvious. But when is it ever perfect? Nor was this shortcoming uniquely ours. Every intelligence service in the world assumed that Saddam was once again engaged in developing weapons of mass destruction. After the invasion, we learned the astonishing fact that even Saddam's own generals believed he possessed them and was prepared to use them.

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

Permit me to quote from some of the most strident critics of this administration and its campaign against the terrorists.

The first is a United States Senator now serving with great distinction in the other body. And on September 23, 2001, 12 days after the events of 9/11 this Senator stated: ''The tragedy is at this moment that the single most important weapon for the United States of America is intelligence.

□ 1300

''We are weakest, frankly, in that particular area. So it is going to take us time to be able to build up here to do this properly.'' You will find that on CBS's Face the Nation, September 23, 2001.

But this same Senator, in 1995, introduced a bill, S. 1290, that would have reduced the intelligence budget by $300 million in each of the fiscal years, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000.

Then we have a gentlewoman serving with distinction in this body, from sunny California, and in 1998 she stated, ''it is time to totally eliminate the CIA.'' CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 18, 1997.

On several occasions in the 1990s, following the collapse of the Soviet empire, a majority of Democrats in the House voted to cut the U.S. intelligence budget. Yet, following the horrific events of September 11, the chorus of voices that had previously advocated reducing our intelligence capabilities quickly reversed their theme. Even they must thank God that they had been unsuccessful in their efforts. But on this subject we hear nothing but deafening silence.

One inescapable lesson of history is that passivity in the face of a threat is an invitation to strike. The desire to run away only encourages pursuit. We are seeing that fatal approach gather strength elsewhere in the world manifested in efforts to bind the hands of those who would attack terrorism at its source. The hope is that, as with the passing of a storm, the threat will move on and blue skies reappear and that the nightmare will at last be over. But the terrible reality is by succumbing to the fear of terrorism, by doing too little in the fear that we are doing too much, we condemn ourselves to a future of unending assaults.

Other countries have learned that, however meager their contribution to their own and the world's security, however ineffectual their actions, in the end the United States will rescue them. We will make the world right again. We will defend against all threats. We, however, no longer have that luxury. If we do not take action to defend ourselves, then we are lost because no one exists to rescue us if we fail.

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

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

No one can credibly question that this greatly enhanced credibility paid off with Libya's decision to abandon its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Qaddafi understood what President Bush's critics still refuse to acknowledge, that this administration is determined to eliminate threats to our country, both actual and potential, and if necessary, will use force to do so.

That is in sharp contrast to the passivity of the previous administration, whose failure to react to the repeated attacks on the United States only encouraged our enemies to make further attacks. What other conclusion could al Qaeda and others have reached from our baffling inaction and response to their assaults on our embassy, on our military, on us? They were taught the false lesson that they were free to slaughter us and we would do nothing.

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

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

The world of predictability and relative safety we once knew is gone. We are now engaged in a cruel, brutal struggle with those who would destroy us, one unprecedented in its challenge to our perseverance and courage, and one that will be fought not just in foreign lands but on our own soil.

To insist that decisions must await perfect intelligence, that the risk of action is to be more feared than the risk of inaction, that others will save us, is to guarantee our defeat. But defeat in this new and more dangerous world means annihilation. The smoking gun that some critics insist on might well be some of our cities.

We in this Chamber, our country, the entire world, owe this President not condemnation but our thanks for acting in Iraq, for refusing to wait for an avowed enemy to strike, for not temporizing and letting the forces of destruction wage unopposed their pitiless war to destroy everything we believe in.

To those faint of heart from temporary setbacks in Iraq or who seek to benefit politically from our differences there, permit me to quote from Thomas Paine. Thomas Paine wrote, ''These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shrink from the service of their country. But he that stands by it now deserves the love and thanks of men and women. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. Yet, we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.''

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

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

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

Let me comment on a couple of things the distinguished gentleman from Illinois said.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair reminds Members to direct their comments to the Chair.

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

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

We made the decision, as a country, to go into Iraq. At that time, Mr. Speaker, knowing the history and the culture of the Middle East, I sent two letters to the President of the United States, one on September 4, 2002, and one on March 18, 2003, before we went into Iraq. My letters warned against the aftermath.

They sent an Assistant Secretary of State and an Assistant Secretary of Defense over to see me and said, ''Ike, it will be all right.''

We know what happened in the aftermath insurgency because we allowed the looting, we sent the Iraqi Army home, rather than give them a paycheck and a shovel, and didn't have enough troops to quell any insurgency. And it arose. And here we are, some 3 years later.

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

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

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

□ 1315

What does this mean to us in the long run? Well, farmers in Missouri know that the quality of the corn that they plant will bring about the quality of the corn that grows. And we find ourselves militarily eating our seed corn in the country of Iraq. Sadly, a few moments ago we had a moment of silence for the 2,500th American that sacrificed a life in that sad country. But it means eating up the equipment, and we are using equipment right and left and it is going to take 3 years to refurbish the United States Army if the war would stop today equipment-wise. There are challenges in recruiting and retention. But I have to tell you how proud I am of those young people in uniform today. But if we do not take serious thought about the phraseology that is in the law creating the condition for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq, I think that we may be eating our military seed corn. And what does this mean? It means that the United States of America will be less prepared to either deter or defend an attack that might come at some future date.

This is serious business. We need to remain strong militarily. That is the way you deter problems. Should North Korea, somewhere in Asia, somewhere in Latin America, somewhere in Africa that would cause us to be involved, the question is, Mr. Speaker, would we be prepared militarily to meet that challenge?

That is why it is very important that we do our very best to take seriously the law regarding transition this year, the significant transition.

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 4, 2002.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

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

Before Congress can authorize any military action that might be part of the administration's plan, we must have answers to more questions than were able to be raised. at today's meeting. Our constitutional duty requires us to ensure that all implications of such action are considered in advance. The case has not yet been fully made as to what the threat is, why military force is an appropriate way of addressing the threat, and why action must occur now. In short, Congress and the American people must be clear on your strategic vision before we can authorize a specific course of action. I believe, like Clausewitz, that in strategy there is an ''imperative . . . not to take the first step without considering the last.''

Your strategy for dealing with Iraq must address the fundamental questions of the threat, the method of acting, and the timing. Furthermore, any strategy to eliminate Iraqi WMD must also address several component issues, each of which raises critical questions.

1. How to manage Iraq's transition to a stable post-Saddam regime:

As I mentioned to you this morning, this is a crucial question for administration strategy to answer in advance of any military action. I have no doubt that our military would decisively defeat Iraq's forces and remove Saddam. But like the proverbial dog chasing the car down the road, we must consider what we would do after we caught it.

As Sun-Tzu said in the classic strategic treatise, The Art of War, ''To win victory is easy; to preserve its fruits, difficult.'' Military planners and political leaders alike knew this in World War II. Planning for the occupation of Germany and Japan—two economically viable, technologically sophisticated nations—took place well in advance of the end of the war. The extreme difficulty of occupying Iraq with its history of autocratic rule, its balkanized ethnic tensions, and its isolated economic system argues both for careful consideration of the benefits and risks of undertaking military action and for detailed advanced occupation planning if such military action is approved.

Specifically, your strategy must consider the form of a replacement regime and take seriously the possibility that this regime might be rejected by the Iraqi people, leading to civil unrest and even anarchy. The effort must be to craft a stable regime that will be geopolitically preferable to Saddam and will incorporate the disparate interests of all groups within Iraq—Shi'a, Sunni, and Kurd. We must also plan now for what to do with members of the Baath party that continue to support Saddam and with the scientists and engineers who have expertise born of the Iraqi WMD program.

All these efforts require careful planning and long-term commitment of manpower and resources. The American people must be clear about the amount of money and the number of soldiers that will have to be devoted to this effort for many years to come.

2. How to ensure the action in Iraq does not undermine international support for the broader war on terrorism:

In planning for military operations in Iraq, we cannot ignore the lack of international support to date. Pre-emptive action against Iraq is currently vocally opposed by many of our allies and friends throughout the world and particularly in the Middle East.

When we are seen as acting against the concerns of large numbers of our friends, it calls into question the ''humble'' approach to international relations you espoused during the presidential campaign. More than that, it has several potentially damaging long-term consequences. First, it risks losing the large number of partners needed to prosecute the global war on terrorism. To ferret terrorist groups out of their many hiding places, we must have broad allied support. Second, it risks seriously damaging U.S. moral legitimacy, potentially providing states like India and Pakistan with a preemptive option that could drive long-standing conflicts beyond containable bounds.

Finally and perhaps most dangerously, actions without broad Arab support may inflame the sources of terrorism, causing unrest and anger throughout the Muslim world. This dynamic will be worse if Iraq attacks Israel—perhaps with weapons of mass destruction—and draws them into the conflict. Iran, which has the potential to seize a reformist path, may well move away from the United States in the face of attacks that could next be taken against them. Together, these dynamics will make achieving peace in the Middle East more difficult and may well provide the rationale for more terrorist attacks against Americans.

These concerns do not make military action in Iraq untenable. They do, however, highlight the depth and importance of the issues to be addressed before we strike. We need to ensure that in taking out Saddam, we don't win the battle and lose the war.

3. How to ensure that the United States can execute this operation successfully as well as its other military missions:

As you are well aware, Mr. President, the consideration of military action against Iraq comes at a time when U.S. forces are actively engaged throughout the world in a range of missions. Given the operational pressures these forces currently face, we must ask what the risks and trade-offs will be of defeating Iraq, particularly if Iraqi forces mass in Baghdad for urban operations. How many casualties must the American people be prepared to take in a worst-case scenario? What will the impact of sustained operations be on so-called high-demand, low-density assets? What military operations might we have to forego because of continued demands in Iraq? Will we still be prepared for the range of other threats that might emerge throughout the world? With little allied support and contributions, will we still be able to maintain military spending on transformational technologies and on sound quality of life for our forces if we are bearing a huge wartime cost alone? What will be the impact on the domestic economy of these resources drains and of the long-term costs of reconstructing Iraq? These questions must be answered before any military action commences so that the American people understand the risks and the sacrifices involved.

I ask these questions only to highlight the complexity of the undertaking and the need for Congress, the American people, and our friends around the world to understand exactly what is at stake and why we must act now. Only such a comprehensive strategic approach will ensure that we commit U.S. troops consciously and with full knowledge of the range of challenges we face—both in the initial campaign and in the long aftermath to follow. Even a strategy that has military action as its centerpiece will require great diplomatic efforts to ensure its success. I look forward to hearing the administration's answers and to working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2003.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

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

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we deal with the aftermath. I appreciate the efforts that members of your administration have made to keep me informed about plans for the administration and reconstruction of Iraq following military conflict. Your team has thought about many of the things that will need to be done.

Secretary Rumsfeld frequently talks about the list he keeps of things that could go wrong in an Iraq war. I have kept my own list—of things that could go wrong after the war is over. The list below is indicative of this broader list. My hope is that this will be helpful to members of your administration as you continue to plan for all possibilities. These are not complete scenarios but rather a series of possible problems that could occur in some combination.

INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND EXTERNAL INFLUENCES IN IRAQ

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

An uprising in Kirkuk leaves the Kurds in control of areas of the city and surrounding area. This triggers a large Turkish invasion to protect the Turkmen minority and to prevent Kurdish control of oil resources. Again this would require U.S. military resources with all the attending effects.

In the event that Turkey crosses into Iraq, Iran may do the same, ostensibly to stem the refugee flows from southern Iraq and to protect Shi'a interests.

Shi'a populations in the south rebel and undertake attacks against Sunnis. U.S. troops must step in to protect the Sunnis and restore peace. These tensions resurface during attempts to build a federal and representative government.

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

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

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

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

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

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons directly against civilian populations or against another Arab country and seeks to affix blame for civilian suffering to the United States. Over the period of occupation, this resentment complicates U.S. efforts to maintain support for reconstruction efforts.

U.S. troops are unable to quickly find all of Saddam's capabilities, requiring a long, labor-intensive search and anxiety as to when the task is complete.

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

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

OIL RESOURCES

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

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

INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT

The United States takes immediate control of Iraq's administration and of reconstruction. The United Nations can't agree on how involved to get given the divisions among the Security Council about the need for conflict. The lack of UN involvement in the administration makes the European Union and others less likely to give. This situation delays reconstruction and puts more of the cost on the United States and a smaller number of partners.

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

AMERICAN COMMITMENT

Stabilization and reconstruction prove more difficult than expected. U.S. troop requirements approach 200,000—the figure General Shinseki has mentioned—for a sustained period. This puts pressure on troop rotations, reservists, their families, and employers and requires a dramatic increase in end-strength.

Required funding reaches the figure suggested by a recent Council on Foreign Relations assessment—20 billion annually for several years. During a period of economic difficulty, the American public calls for greater burdensharing.

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

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

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Intelligence Committee for allowing me to take a little time early in this debate, although I know the Armed Services Committee is going to come up a little later. And I wanted to talk about this war and touch on some of the subjects that my good friend Mr. MURTHA has brought up over the last 15 or 20 minutes.

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

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

And I do not think we have to plow old ground about Iraq. I think everybody understands Saddam Hussein, Gulf I. But I think it is important and it is good that my friend Mr. MURTHA has pointed out that, in fact, even as we drove that armored spearhead north in this war against Iraq, taking Baghdad, Tommy Franks was intercepting communications even then from Iraqi officers to the effect that they were on the verge of using the ''special weapon,'' which we interpreted to be poison gas, a weapon of mass destruction, and he gave out orders that were right down to platoon and squad level, get ready for those weapons of mass destruction.

I can also remember giving a briefing, giving an invitation to every Member of this House, Democrat and Republican, before we voted on taking military action in Iraq, to come over and listen to intelligence experts in a closed briefing with no handlers, no White House personnel, and ask any question they wanted to ask about weapons of mass destruction. And they did that. Lots of them. We had over 100 Members at several of the briefings. And we had members of the intelligence apparatus of this country laying out differences. They talked about the aluminum tubes, how some people thought those were to be used in centrifuges for the conversion of uranium, the enrichment of uranium. Others thought they were to be used for rocket bodies. But we invited all the Members before they made that vote to give the President license to go into Iraq. They did that vote from an educated standpoint. They had an opportunity to pull all the information that they wanted.

Now, it has been stated that we did not have enough troops going into Iraq.

And I remember, as we were driving that armored spearhead north, and the Marines taking a piece of it, the Army taking a big piece of it, we had a number of experts appearing on national forums on a daily basis saying there were not enough troops. They used the term we are going to get ''bogged down,'' and what was interesting is even as they were on talk shows saying that there were not enough troops, the talk show would be interrupted with a news flash to the effect that Tommy Franks had taken yet another stronghold. And it was stated at the end of that drive toward Baghdad with what was described by some of the observers, some of the so-called experts, too few troops, that that lightning attack taking Baghdad would go down in history as an example of a low casualty level, and we did have an extraordinarily low casualty level, and a lightning advance in which the enemy in many cases was destroyed long before the American columns got to their land forces.

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

And let me just say one last thing, which is a hard, tough truth for this House. But when the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I, as we watched the last of the 1990s unfold and the Clinton administration left the White House, we noticed in our defense committees that we went into that administration in the early 1990s with 15 American Army divisions. We came out of that administration with 10, count them, 10. Roughly 33 combat brigades. That is a fact of life. That is what we had to go into this operation with. Now we are moving and we are building toward 43 combat brigades right now. But we cut the military, we cut the U.S. Army, by almost 40 percent, and that is what we had to go into this war with.

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

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. I would be happy to yield.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

So what are we doing? We have a mission, and the mission right now for the military is to provide a shield for this fledgling government as it goes into place, this new government. We are nation-builders. We are building a nation. It is also to train up the Iraqi military, and we are going to hand off this defense burden, that means our people come home after we train up and mature the Iraqi military.

If the question for us is, who is best equipped to decide when we take the training wheels off, when we let the Iraqi military go forward, I think we should leave that judgment up to the people who tracked down and brought to justice Mr. Zarqawi, a gentleman who said that he was going to take this war to Washington, DC, and London.

He is going to be a little late for that one, because we have an extremely competent American military on the ground in Iraq right now. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania would agree with that.

So let's use that same judgment of those combat commanders who are training those Iraqi units in their areas of operation who say, okay, this battalion is just about matured, this one is not, this one needs more equipment, this one needs some more training. Let's rely on their judgment as to when we can hand that load off to them and let them bear the security burden.

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

We are going to complete this mission. You know, they are lacking something that the Greatest Generation had. The Greatest Generation in World

War II had a united American public. When the 101st went into Northern Europe, they had a united American public. Let's give the 101st Airborne now in Mosul, and in that tough Sunni Triangle, let's give them the same support we gave them in Europe, a united American public and a united American Congress.

Let's give the 1st Marine Division that is out there in that tough province in the al Anbar Province out in Fallujah the same support we gave them when they were fighting Guadalcanal. The 1st Marine Division deserves a united American public and a united American Congress.

So let's send a message. The main message that is manifested in this resolution is that we should not have an arbitrary cut-off point, an arbitrary deadline, and, secondly, that we will complete this mission. Let's send this message to every soldier, every marine who is watching this thing from the mess halls in Mosul and Tikrit and Baghdad and Fallujah, the message that the United States House of Representatives stands with them.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe we send them a message when we vote on the armed services bill. Very few people voted against it. I believe we voted, in the defense subcommittee of appropriations, only 15 or 16 people voted against it. But Theodore Roosevelt said, ''If you disagree with a policy and you do not say anything, you are actually treasonous.''

I disagree with the policy. I do not disagree with supporting the troops. There is no one that supports the troops better than the Members of this Congress. And that is shown by the few people that vote against the bill.

One other thing: I think the gentleman made a mistake when he said we are for the war, against the war on terror. We are actually fighting for the war on terror is what we are doing. But I appreciate what the gentleman is saying.

I appreciate the fact that he and I both asked for more troops at one point. He was the lead sponsor at that particular time.

I recognize the gentleman from California for 13 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we went to war, President Bush and other administration officials made three promises to the American people: one, we would find weapons of mass destruction; two, we would be welcomed as liberators; and, three, the reconstruction of Iraq would pay for itself.

Well, all three promises proved to be false. Today I will focus on the reconstruction effort in Iraq and the massive waste, fraud, and abuse that have undermined our efforts.

Stuart Bowen is the Special Inspector General for Iraq reconstruction. He often talks about the reconstruction gap which is the chasm between the President's promises and reality.

Mr. Bowen is absolutely right: the gap is enormous. But it is dwarfed by the incompetency and corruption gaps in Iraq. The consequences of mismanagement and corruption are serious. Waste, fraud, and abuse have flourished. The taxpayer has been repeatedly gouged.

Iraq is not being rebuilt. We have lost credibility and are now viewed in Iraq as occupiers, and our troops did not get essential equipment when they needed it. We have now spent $50 billion on Iraq reconstruction, including $30 billion from U.S. taxpayers.

Let's look at what we got for the money. Despite spending $2 billion, Iraq's oil production is still well below prewar levels, running about a half million barrels below 2003 levels. We have invested $4 billion into improving electricity generation.

Not only is the administration 2,000 megawatts short of reaching its goal for peak output, but generation is actually below prewar levels. And we spent $6 billion on oil production and electricity generation. And we have actually lost ground.

The situation is the same for drinking water. In essence, we have squandered $50 billion. Profiteering has been rampant, and the taxpayer has gotten gouged and the work has not gotten done. And what is especially shameful about the wasteful spending is that we needed this money for our troops. When we first went into Iraq, our troops did not have enough body armor.

Families had to purchase armor off the Internet and ship it to Iraq in a desperate attempt to protect their loved ones. On congressional delegations, individual servicemembers have taken our staffs aside and begged for more night vision goggles.

Patriotic Americans even had to donate their frequent flier miles so troops who were dumped at the Baltimore airport by the Pentagon could make it home for the holidays. This should never have happened. It is inexcusable that our troops face desperate shortages of essential gear while billions of dollars were frittered away.

To understand the magnitude of this, there is no better place to start than Halliburton. Halliburton is the largest private contractor operating in Iraq. The company has three contracts that total more than $20 billion. We now know that political appointees, not career civil servants, decided to give Halliburton a secret no-bid contract for $7 billion to operate Iraq's oil fields.

As GAO has reported, the key decision that led to the award of the secret contract violated Federal procurement law. When a career attorney properly objected, he was simply overruled. And despite statements from the Vice President, we know now that his chief of staff, Scooter Libby, was personally briefed on this entire plan months before the war.

The decision to give those lucrative contracts to Halliburton has been expensive. According to Pentagon audits, Halliburton's total unreasonable and unsupported charges exceed $1.4 billion. Well, the examples of waste, fraud, and abuse are numerous. Halliburton charged $45 for a case of soda; $100 for a 15-pound bag of laundry.

When they had brand-new $85,000 Halliburton trucks, they abandoned them or torched them if they got a flat tire or experienced minor mechanical problems. Halliburton's contracts are cost-plus. That means that Halliburton is reimbursed for all of its costs, and then receives an extra percentage as additional profit.

In practical terms, this means that the more Halliburton spends, the richer it gets. Now we talked to former Halliburton employees who worked in Iraq. They told us the informal company motto was: ''Do not worry about price, it is cost plus.''

Halliburton was supposed to be in Iraq to provide support for the troops, but the company used one standard for the troops and a completely different standard for its own executives. Halliburton employees stayed at the five-star Kempinski Hotel in Kuwait, where it costs taxpayers $10,000 per day. This is the five-star Kempinski. This gorgeous hotel offered maid service, complimentary fruit baskets to Halliburton employees.

Our troops stayed in tents in the desert. At one point, a cost-conscious Army official asked Halliburton to move its employees into air-conditioned tents, but they refused.

To their credit, career government auditors identified these overcharges. When they examined Halliburton's second oil contract, they harshly criticized Halliburton's performance, citing profound systemic problems and exorbitant indirect costs. But their recommendations were rejected.

After reviewing Halliburton's first oil contract in Iraq, auditors recommended that the Army not pay $263 million in unreasonable and unsupported charges. But the Army ignored those auditors and paid Halliburton $254 million, over 95 percent of the disputed charges.

And in spite of the auditor's findings, Halliburton was paid nearly $100 million in profits and bonuses for overbilling taxpayers.

Well, Halliburton symbolizes what went astray in Iraq, but it is not the only contractor abusing the system. Parsons received the contract to rebuild health clinics throughout Iraq. But despite spending $186 million, Parsons completed just 20 of 142 health clinics they promised to build.

Another firm, Custer Battles, received two security contracts. A Federal jury recently found that the company committed 37 separate acts of fraud. These are not isolated instances. There are over 70 corruption investigations currently under way in Iraq. These cases involve allegations of

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

The U.S. management of the Development Fund for Iraq, which was the fund that held the proceeds of Iraqi oil sales, is a classic example of what not to do. The Coalition Provisional Authority handed out over $8.8 billion in cash, in cash, to Iraqi ministries. And they had no idea what happened to the money: $8 billion in cash simply vanished.

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

□ 1345

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

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

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

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

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

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

We owe more to our troops than slapping ''I support our troops'' bumper stickers on our cars and extolling their courage. Instead of wasting time on bipartisan charades, we should acknowledge and fix our mistakes so that Iraqis can take over and our troops in Iraq can come home.

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

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

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

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

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

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

First, our Nation is engaged in a long-term war. That war didn't begin on 9/11. We should maybe look back to 2/26. February 26, 1993, perhaps is when this war really did begin to come into focus. What happened on February 26, 1993? That was when the World Trade Center was attacked for the first time.

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

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

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

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

In 1996 bin Laden declared war against the United States in its fatwa. Throughout the 1990s, there were multiple attacks. Almost 300 people were killed, and there was a minimal U.S. response. No one in the 1990s connected the dots.

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

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

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

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

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

In August of 1998, we were here in this House when we got word that our two embassies, one in Kenya and one in Tanzania, had been attacked by bombs. The U.S. Attorney in the District of New York got 17 indictments, one of them for a man whose name wasn't really well known at the time. His name was Osama bin Laden.

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

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

The adherents to this movement are parasites who thrive in weak states and in failed regimes. That is why the terrorists made Iraq a central front in

their war. If they could foment civil war, if they could keep self-government in Iraq from being born, then they could thrive in the chaos and continue their attacks on us.

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

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

So that is the choice we face as a nation and why this debate today is so important. It is a choice between resolve and retreat. For me and my family, I choose resolve.

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

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

Al Qaeda views Iraq as a central part of this global war on terror.

I would like to yield to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

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

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

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

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

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

Our troops found a suicide vest factory that had 800 suicide vests equipped and ready to go in south Baghdad in April of 2003. Iraq was on the State Department sponsor of terrorism list. Saddam Hussein paid $25,000 cash to the family of suicide bombers in Israel.

You know, with every sacrifice made by our great American soldiers, for every girl that now walks in Iraq and Baghdad and goes to school, for every young mother that goes to a medical clinic to get treatment where there was none before, for every dead terrorist in Iraq, we make progress every day.

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

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

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

□ 1400

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

I would listen to what our enemies said when Zarqawi declared, ''We have declared a bitter war against the principle of democracy and all those who seek to enact it.'' They will kill American families at any given opportunity.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague from Michigan for those comments.

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

Some have said, well, this is a battle that should be fought in Afghanistan. This battle is not limited to Afghanistan or Iraq. Tell that to the people in Spain, the Netherlands, the U.K., Canada or Australia that this is really just a battle about Afghanistan.

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

I yield to Mr. THORNBERRY.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, part of the job of intelligence is to understand our enemy, and what we should clearly understand about our enemy in the war on terrorism is that they are very sophisticated. They are sophisticated users of technology using, as Chairman HOEKSTRA just mentioned, the Internet in order to recruit, in order to train its people, in order to intimidate populations to go along.

They use Internet video games in order to help train and indoctrinate people in the Arab world to their way of thinking. They use the Internet for communication. They use videotapes and DVDs to get their message out. They have very adept users of technology.

But they are also adept at using media. As a matter of fact, Prime Minister Blair said recently that they play our own media with a shrewdness that would be the envy of many a political party. They know, for example, that one horrific act of cruelty shown on video will get far more attention than a thousand acts of kindness or patience from our soldiers.

They are agile and clever in using cruelty through the media in order to achieve their ends; and, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the most important point we can make on their sophistication is that they know they cannot beat us militarily, and that is not their object. They are sophisticated enough to know that the way they can beat us is to influence our political decisions, to impact our political will.

There has been a very, what has now really become a classic study of this sort of warfare, often called 4th-generation warfare, a book called ''The Sling and The Stone,'' which traces this sort of attack from Mao's Tse-tung all the way through al Qaeda and its affiliated groups. One of the key points that the author makes, unlike previous generations of war, it does not try to win by defeating military's forces. Instead, it directly attacks the minds of enemy decision-makers to destroy the enemy's political will.

That is what is going on. Their use of technology, their use of cruelty, their use of the media has a target which is us because, as another author has written, it only takes a few hundred people in Washington, DC, to decide that this war is lost. So they are focusing their attention not on our strength, but on our weakness, which is potentially our political will.

That is why this resolution is important. It is why in order to meet a sophisticated threat, a political threat, which al Qaeda and its affiliated groups try to pose to us, we have to resist that sort of manipulation. Part of that resistance occurs on the floor of the House.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, this battle continues to evolve. We know that al Qaeda wants to attack us again in our homeland. That is why it is important to stay on the offensive, attacking them where they are and making sure that they do not have a safe haven to plan, to train and to develop the resources to attack us again.

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

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

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last February, the Justice Department indicted three men in Ohio for aiding insurgents in Iraq and planning to attack U.S. troops there. Two of the men were naturalized U.S. citizens, and one was a permanent legal resident. The men learned their craft by downloading terrorism instructional videos from jihadist Internet sites. They had no contact with al Qaeda. Had they not been arrested, they may have started looking for local targets that they could attack.

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

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

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

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague.

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

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

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

This all sounds good. It is all rhetoric. It is rhetoric. The number of daily attacks in Iraq have gone from 2004, 53 attacks per day; May 2005, 70 attacks per day; May 2006, 90 attacks per day. Electricity is less than prewar level. No water available to all, only 1 hour a day, Mr. Speaker, and the oil production which was supposed to pay for the war is less than prewar production.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Two thousand five hundred Americans soldiers, we are informed today, have died in Iraq. 19,000 American soldiers have been wounded, many of them missing limbs and suffering other very serious debilitating injuries that will afflict them the rest of their lives. The war has cost almost a half a trillion dollars in taxpayer money, and America's international reputation and respect in the world has been severely damaged.

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

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

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

We see the torture of detainees was approved at the highest levels in the Pentagon; and this, again, has led to an undermining of our position in the world, our moral position in the war in Iraq and the war against terrorism.

This is a policy blunder of historic proportions by this President, and it is very important that we understand that we are paying a huge price for these mistakes by this administration. Tragically, we stand here on the floor of this Congress today 3 years after the beginning of this war, but for 3 years questions were not raised in this Congress about that force structure, about that preparedness, about the detainee policy, about these actions that have so severely undermined us.

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

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

That is not what is happening day to day in the war in Iraq, and our troops are paying a horrible, horrible price for the lack of preparation, the lack of planning and the lack of prosecution of this effort and the initial mistake and lies by the President of the United States.

The President's policies in Iraq have severely undermined America's national security and made the world less safe.

In response to the clear failures in Iraq, the Republican Congress has acted like a rubberstamp for President Bush rather than the elected representatives of the people of America.

Republicans in Congress have hid their heads in the sand and refused to question the President, instead sheepishly pretending success is around the corner.

As a result, Iraq is engaged in a civil war that threatens to consume the country.

Congress has done nothing to stop the civil war in Iraq, nothing to hold the President accountable for the failures in Iraq, and nothing to put our troops on a safe and speedy path toward home, or to other parts of the world where they are needed to fight against terrorism.

The President and his allies in the Republican leadership in Congress have made up their minds.

They have a plan for Iraq. It is the same failed plan they started the war with. It is chaos with no end in sight.

There is no more that we can ask of America's troops. They have done everything they have been asked to do. It is time for them to serve their nation where they are needed most, and that is surely not in Iraq.

Now is not the time to stay the course of failure.

America needs a new direction in Iraq—a new direction that will make Americans safer.

□ 1415

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The historic blunder is that we didn't address this problem in the 1990s when it started rearing its ugly head.

I yield to my colleague for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to place a statement concerning this resolution in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's statement will be placed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, much of this resolution is language that everyone supports, especially the praise for our troops.

They do a great job everywhere they are sent, and it is certainly no criticism of them to criticize this war.

In August of 2002, two 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 evidence that 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 the war was "against a country that was not attacking us, did not have the means to attack us, and had never expressed any intention of attacking us, and for whatever real reason we attacked Iraq, it was not to save America from any danger, imminent or otherwise."

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

Millions of conservatives across this Nation believe that this war was unconstitutional, unaffordable, and, worst of all, unnecessary.

It was waged against an evil man, but one who had a total military budget only two-tenths of one percent of ours.

We are not going to be able to pay all our military pensions, social security, Medicare, and all the little things we have promised if we are going to turn the Department of Defense into the Department of Foreign Aid and attempt to be the policeman of the world.

This is contrary to every traditional conservative position on defense and requires huge deficit spending.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As a result, overall intelligence collection was decimated. James Pavitt, the former CIA Deputy Director for Operations, told the 9/11 Commission in April of 2004 that we were vastly underfunded and did not have the people to do the job, and noted that spending on CIA human collection was cut by 20 percent during the 1990s.

Analysis suffered equally in the 1990s, with low priority accorded to terrorism analysis. Intelligence analysts were

discouraged from writing original out-of-the-box assessments that might have raised awareness to terrorists staging unconventional attacks. And, instead, our analysts were pressured to craft politically correct analysis.

The death of Zarqawi and the arrests of 17 terrorist suspects in Canada are recent successes in the global war on terror. However, we still have a long way to go to rebuilding our networks of human sources. Reform has to continue, and we must acknowledge that many of the problems facing U.S. intelligence agencies today are the product of unwise and neglectful intelligence policies of the past.

It is simple to destroy, but it is much more difficult to build. Over the past 6 years, we have worked to rebuild our Nation's intelligence capability, and it may take a few more years to complete. There is not a moment to waste in carrying out these essential reforms to our intelligence community.

And I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we must continue this war. We must continue to let our intelligence community do their job.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield myself 1 minute.

One of the Members said, ask Spain about the threat. Fifty-six percent of the population of Spain believes the U.S. in Iraq is the most dangerous threat to world peace. They rank Iran lesser of a threat than the United States.

And one other thing. When we look back at the intelligence cuts, President Bush I felt it was a peace dividend and started to cut the intelligence budget years ago. So we have to make sure we don't let our rhetoric get ahead of the facts.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, since day one of the war in Iraq, Democrats have provided the President with everything he asked for, yet Republicans have denied the President the one thing he needed: Oversight.

In a post-9/11 world, the American people need the vigilance and the patriotic determination of every Member of Congress to demand answers to the questions their constituents are asking. Instead, the Republican Congress sat and watched the administration make mistake after mistake after mistake.

And don't listen to just one Member of Congress. Consider the words of Three Star General Greg Newbold, top Operations Officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After a scathing critique of Secretary Rumsfeld, he says, ''The Bush administration and senior military officials are not alone in their culpability. Members of Congress defaulted in fulfilling their Constitutional responsibility of oversight.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

Twenty-five hundred brave Americans, male and female, have given their lives in trying to stabilize Iraq. Last month was the bloodiest in Iraq's history. According to Major General Rick Lynch, attacks against civilians increased 80 percent since November 2005.

We cannot achieve the end of victory and continue to sit and watch, stand pat, the status quo. That is the Republican policy. Democrats are determined to take the fight to the enemy. In the words of President John Kennedy, ''We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.''

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

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

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

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

To have the talk of rhetoric, because the electricity isn't where it is, let's come home in defeat; because the oil isn't going exactly the way we would like it, let's come home in defeat; that is no standard for victory.

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

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

Afghanistan is now an ally in the war on terror. Their intelligence services, their military, as a matter of fact just this morning, launched a 10,000 troop crackdown on terrorists. This morning. Last week, Iraq launched a 70,000 security personnel crackdown on terrorists. This week, they are our allies now in the war on terror.

Libya. That is the components of the nuclear weapons program of Libya. It is now in the possession of the United States of America. They gave it to us not because we stood here and debated but because we had brave men and women with boots on the ground who showed courage and commitment and said we will take the fight to you. We will not allow you to take the fight to us.

Which country would you have go back? Which one would you say, ah, it wasn't important that they became an ally? Four Muslim nations have stood up against the ravages and the terror and the brutality of terror today because of actions our brave soldiers take overseas.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members to address their comments to the Chair.

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is to my great regret that at key moments like this the President of the United States does not seek to unify the country. He does not use these moments to bring people together, to strengthen us. He does not rally the country behind our men and women in arms and in harm's way.

We applaud our troops. Thank God for their willingness to sacrifice for our Nation. I take every moment to support them and their families. But the President and the Republican leaders, within moments of our soldiers' valor in eliminating one of the worst terrorists, is rushing for some political advantage, some way to hurt the Democrats and raise the President's poll numbers. Our country deserves so much better.

The President wants this Congress to simply applaud his current course in Iraq, which is an indefinite, open-ended commitment of U.S. troops in the middle of a sectarian religious war. By the President's own words, 3 more years, with generals now talking about 10 years and permanent bases.

I want to be clear. I do not want to stay the course with this policy which will make us less safe, undermine our military, help the terrorists, cost many thousands of lives and cost another trillion dollars. This Congress has never held the President and his administration accountable, even when there were no plans.

□ 1430

This President, more than any other, has politicized this war, ignoring the advice of the military at every step, from General Shinseki's call for more troops to General Casey's admission that our troops' presence was inflaming violence. They have imposed political judgments from ideologues at the White House at the expense of our military's best advice.

And this Congress supported the White House politicians, not the generals when our course was set. This Congress supported the White House politicians when they did not give our troops the body armor and Humvee armor they needed. Now, when the President says just support the politicians in the White House one more time, they are here with this resolution.

What our troops need is a policy that is good for America and for our military. Being bogged down in Iraq indefinitely will make us less safe. All of the countries in the world and the region and the Iraqi people need to hear that America will redeploy over a responsible period. The current course allows countries a free ride at the expense of American troops and taxpayers. A policy of responsible redeployment will force others to play their role.

No one on this floor is for a precipitous withdrawal, and the President's statements are reckless, political and a disservice. We all agree, as did both bodies of the Congress, that 2006 would be a turning point. The White House politicians have ignored that resolution.

I support a redeployment of our troops to meet critical security needs over the next 12 months, with a significant reduction by the end of 2006. Others support redeployment by the end of 2008, and some by the end of 2007. But we all believe America's interest and our troops are served by a new course.

So I ask the President to change. Why not speak to the country's better virtues and unite the country? We want you to succeed. We should work together for a stronger America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a colleague from the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, in November 1979, Ayatollah Khomeini, the former radical Islamic leader, seized power in Iran, riding the slogan, ''Death to America.'' Just 4 months after his rise to power, it became evident that agents of radical Islam would stop at nothing to kill Americans. This doctrine of hatred resulted in terrorists killing over 600 people prior to 9/11.

My colleagues, my chairman has mentioned this, Congresswoman WILSON mentioned part of this, and I wish everyone who got up here would go over this list.

In April 1983, 63 people died at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In October 1983, 241 died at the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In February 1993, six people were killed at the World Trade Center. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In June 1996, 19 American servicemen died after a truck bombing at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In August 1998, 224 died at the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. That is not rhetoric either; that is dead Americans.

In October 2000, 17 died on the USS *Cole* in Yemen. That is not rhetoric either; that is dead Americans.

If some people continue to preach cut and run from this war, then they will continue to kill Americans, kill Americans and kill Americans. The global war on terrorism must be fought. We can do it on the streets of our hometowns, or we can take the war to the terrorists. Either way, it has to be done; and personally, I prefer doing it over in Iraq rather than in New York or Washington, D.C. or San Francisco.

For the first 20 years, we allowed the terrorists to fight this war on their terms. 9/11 served as a wake-up call for us in the sense that we could no longer afford to sit on our hands and let the terrorists continue to kill innocent Americans. Under the leadership of the Bush administration, and with the support of this Republican-led Congress, we took the fight to the terrorists, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, right now their choice is Iraq. It is the central front in the war on terror. In fact, Osama bin Laden has said he believes the war going on in Iraq is nothing short of the Third World War. The importance of Iraq in achieving al Qaeda's objectives of killing Americans is clearly spelled out in a 2005 letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden's closest advisor, to Musab al Zarqawi, the man tapped by bin Laden to head al Qaeda operations in Iraq. He said that getting the U.S. out of Iraq is critical if they are to turn Iraq into a permanent base of recruitment, training and operations just like the one they had in Afghanistan.

This is why it is imperative that we stay the course and ensure that the democratically elected government can take hold. A democratic Iraq will be the death of al Qaeda, and those aren't my words Mr. Speaker, they are the words of Zarqawi.

Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished so much in the global war on terror, highlighted by the recent death of Zarqawi. We have significantly degraded the al Qaeda network by denying them a safe haven in Afghanistan and capturing or killing many of their leaders and associates. We have also built an unprecedented international coalition to combat and prevent terrorist financing and dismantle terrorist support networks.

Mr. Speaker, America is safer, but we are not yet secure. The enemy we are fighting is determined and serious about its desire to kill Americans. We can not allow Iraq to become a breeding ground for terrorist activity.

A free and democratic Iraq is absolutely essential to fighting the terrorist threat and building long-term peace and stability in the region. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), my colleague from the committee.

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks to American training and intelligence aid, the Philippine Government was able to rescue Gracia Burnham. Martin Burnham died in the rescue attempt. It was probably because we couldn't get close enough into the fight.

But the important thing that we need to remember is if we back off now, according to the paper, or the letter that was written from al Zawahiri to the now-deceased al Zarqawi, it will be considered a victory for al Qaeda if we leave. Al Qaeda is the one that has decided to bring this war to Iraq and to fight Americans. That information is available on their Web sites and in the information that we collect. It is what the captives tell us when we interview them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What we are caught in, we have become the target of the insurgency of the sectarian violence. It is the way that we are doing it is what I disagree with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

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

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

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

□ 1445

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

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

Americans are outraged that we don't have a citizenry and Members here who are willing to stand up and have accountability. We all support the war on terror. And this party, from Roosevelt to Truman to Kennedy, to JACK MURTHA, has stood on the watch wall of freedom and stood there valiantly, but collectively with the American people and in this body and in this Chamber, but that is not going on here today. Instead it is right out of the playbook, attack JACK MURTHA. Attack the messenger. That is a formula that works. It worked against Max Cleland. It worked against JOHN KERRY. Geez, that will work against JACK MURTHA also. Discredit this guy. Discredit what he has had to say because he had the temerity to speak truth to power in an administration that can't level with the American public, can't level with you.

Why don't you criticize General Baptiste, General Zinni, General Van Riper, all of these generals? Are they all wrong too for speaking truth to power? Shouldn't we be talking about how we can collectively move forward in a new direction for this country, instead of a tried and true playbook of political jargon on a resolution that is nonbinding? Speak truth to power.

I am proud to associate myself with Mr. MURTHA and everything he stands for.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would renew his request that all Members should address their comments to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the defense appropriations subcommittee, Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about politics. This debate is about America. It is about Iraq because Iraq is one of the many battlefields on which we fight the global war on terror. Afghanistan is another battlefield on which we fight the war on terror. But there are many battlefields on the war on terror, and we don't want any of them to be here in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is a lot about America, not only America today, America past, but America in the future. The world still remembers, and many Americans still remember December 7 of 1941 when American territory was attacked by an enemy. An America that was built out of the wilderness and was built by settlers, that was built by industrialists, that was built by just plain ordinary people, brick by brick, block by block, business by business, school by school, hospital by hospital, an America that many Americans paid a great price to create, to achieve. And that America has come under attack in many ways.

As I said, December 7, 1941, some of us remember that day and where we were. Others will never forget September the 11th of 2001, where we were, what we were doing and what it did to this great country of ours.

The global war on terror must be won. It is real. The threat is real. If you don't believe the threat is real, look at the old news reels of the Twin Towers in New York City or the field in Pennsylvania where Flight 93 crashed into Mr. MURTHA's district to avoid that aircraft from attacking this United States Capitol.

And just a few minutes ago I came from the Pentagon where a celebration of the dedication of the Pentagon Memorial was unveiled where 184 Americans lost their lives in that vicious attack on the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, this war has to be won. All over the world there are cemeteries where Americans lie in rest, Americans who lost their lives in different parts of the world to keep America what it is, to keep America what was created at so many sacrifices. And many of us have had the opportunity to visit those cemeteries and to pay our respects to those fighting warriors who went ahead and did what was necessary to do to preserve this great America.

There are American heroes in Iraq today and American heroes in Afghanistan today. And as Mr. MURTHA said earlier, he and I have spent a lot of time visiting with a number of those wounded heroes at our military hospitals. But they will tell you, and they will be the first ones to tell you, we have got to win this war. And the attitudes of these young men and women are outstanding because they will tell you that what they want is to be healed from their injuries and to get back to the fight because they believe in their country. They love their country, and they believe that it is important that we stop the threat to this great Nation of ours from those terrorists, the terrorists who attacked us on September 11 in New York, in Pennsylvania, at the Pentagon, those terrorists who attacked the USS *Cole*, killing many of our sailors and wounding many more, those terrorists who blew up the Khobar Towers, which was a home for American airmen in Saudi Arabia, those terrorists who blew up the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. These young troopers, these warriors understand the threat. America understands the threat. And ladies and gentlemen, it is important that we stand up to that threat and that the America that we know is the America that our kids will know and that our grandkids will know in the years to come.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, 1,184 days ago American troops invaded Iraq to rid Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction.

The weapons weren't there. But American troops still are. I have met some of those troops on my three trips to Baghdad and Afghanistan, as well as Pakistan, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. Our Armed Forces and intelligence personnel are extraordinary. Many are on their third or fourth tours.

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

Our action in Iraqi created a failed state and, tragically, our postwar mission, as presently defined, cannot succeed. There are too few troops to stabilize the country. They are inadequately equipped.

They are fighting an insurgency we didn't predict, at constant risk from IEDs we can't find, with no clearly developed goals to help the new Iraq government achieve political and economic security, and no exit strategy.

Two major failures led us to war, and we had best learn some lessons or risk making the same mistakes again. As ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, these failures haunt me.

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

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

The failure to assess Saddam's WMD capability accurately has been well documented. As CIA weapons inspector David Kay put it, ''we were all wrong.'' Overriding the advice of intelligence professionals, administration officials put stock in bogus sources like CURVEBALL, and self-promoters like Ahmed Chalabi.

But simply calling Iraq an intelligence failure ignores the larger policy failures that created the false momentum toward war.

The administration cherry-picked intelligence and hyped the threat. They talked in ominous tones about ''mushroom clouds,'' even though many questioned evidence suggesting Saddam had nuclear weapons capability.

They made a mantra of the claim that 9/11 hijacker Mohammad Atta met with Iraqi agents in Prague, a claim that has been thoroughly discredited.

Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz famously predicted we would be greeted as liberators, that Iraqis would throw rose petals, ignoring intelligence community assessments about the potential for armed resistance.

Writing in Foreign Affairs, Paul Pillar, the intelligence community's senior Middle East analyst, described how the Bush administration disregarded the community's expertise, politicized the intelligence process, and selected unrepresentative raw intelligence to make its public case.

To date, nobody has been held accountable for this misuse of prewar intelligence.

The intelligence failures did not end when we invaded Iraq. Our President declared ''Mission Accomplished'' in May 2003. Senior U.S. officials in Iraq asserted in July 2003 that insurgent attacks represented ''a limited problem of some bitter-enders'' loyal to Saddam.

Yet, 3 years after Saddam's fall, 2,500 U.S. troops are dead, a number confirmed by the Pentagon just today, and insurgents appear more active than ever.

We have surged intelligence resources into Iraq in a frantic effort to find the next IED. As a result, we have taken our eye off the ball in Afghanistan, where Taliban fighters are reconstituting themselves, even as the United States reduces the number of troops there. Osama Bin Ladin and Ayman al Zawahiri are still at large, inspiring a new generation of recruits to the jihad.

Just as constant deployments to Iraq cause burnout in the Army, National Guard and Reserves, we are also burning out large numbers of intelligence professionals. And assigning them to Iraq means they are not available to address other national security challenges, like Iran and North Korea.

There has been good news. U.S. intelligence agencies operating with Special Operations Forces have tracked down many key terrorist leaders. The takedown of Zarqawi showed the importance of fusing human intelligence, imagery, signals intelligence and a military strike capability in real time. That is how intelligence ought to work. It was a huge tactical victory.

But tactical victories alone are not enough. We need a new strategy for Iraq, a dramatic change of course. We need to hold senior officials accountable for massive policy and management failures. Replacing Donald Rumsfeld, the chief architect of the postwar policy, is long overdue. He ignored the advice of senior military advisers, ignored the careful recommendations of those who understood nation-building, and ignored those horrified by a prison situation careening out of control. And he prides himself, even now, on refusing to change a failed policy.

□ 1500

Congress must also provide aggressive oversight to learn why the administration erred so grievously.

Since I returned from my third trip to Iraq last September, I have been calling on the administration to develop an exit strategy, and I believe it is now time to begin a phased, strategic redeployment of U.S. and coalition forces out of Iraq on a schedule designed by military commanders. A schedule designed by military commanders, not designed by the U.S. Congress.

I believe the U.S. is part of the solution in Iraq, but our large military presence is part of the problem. Beginning to reduce the ''footprint,'' while maintaining an over-the-horizon strike force, will improve our chances for success.

I think we have 3 to 6 months to advance three objectives: first, helping the new Iraqi Government provide electrical power, particularly in Baghdad, and deliver other critical economic and social services to the Iraqi people. Second, supporting the Iraqi Government in its effort to disarm Shiite militias and integrate them into a trained Iraqi national security force. Third, continuing the process, begun by our able Ambassador Khalilzad, of obtaining buy-in from Sunni political leaders. Achieving these objectives will enable us to leave Iraq in better shape than we found it.

Mr. Speaker, the next 3 months are critical. We have a moral obligation to assist Iraq on its path to democracy. But if clearly defined minimum objectives cannot be achieved within that time frame, the prospects for success in Iraq could all but disappear.

So a change in course is urgently needed. The President's visit to Baghdad was important, but it is not a substitute for needed policy changes. And Congress cannot be infinitely passive. This debate today will only have meaning if, in fact, it leads to a change of course in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to lead. This resolution, in my view, is a press release for staying the course in Iraq. It does not signal a change in policy, and thus I cannot support it.

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

Mr. RENZI. I thank the chairman.

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

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

al Qaeda is a cancer. It has metastasized itself throughout the world. There is a lot of negativity, whether or not we want to join and take the war in Iraq and link it with terrorism. It is a cancer. It needs to be carved out, and the American people need to show the will and the endurance. Our troops do. Our people at home, I believe, have that will.

I believe there should be no arbitrary date set for withdrawal and yet no permanent, unending deployment. No cut and run, yet measured progress in helping a people who want to be free without an illusion of overnight success.

This enemy wants to take the fight into the later rounds. They want to prey on what they perceive is our lack of concentrated focus, and their captured documents refer to the U.S. being worn down and quitting.

Today's resolution is very similar to Rosie the Riveter. We bring out and ask the American people to stay strong. During World War II, we fought an enemy whose goal was to invade and dominate the land and the geography and to gain power and spread fascism. Terrorism is like fascism. While different tactics may be in place, Islamofascists want to establish a caliphate covering Southeast Asia,

Southern Europe, and North Africa, very similar to the same geography that we saw in World War II.

Zarqawi died in Iraq. Saddam was pulled out of a spider hole in Iraq. The Taliban was defeated in Afghanistan. Taking the fight to them works. With continued detainee reporting, coalition and allied sharing of intelligence, the Iraqi people working with us to identify safehouses, and the greatest group of unsung Americans sequestered in the backrooms of our intelligence agencies, we can keep the pressure on.

This resolution is about prevailing against our enemies, about achieving a shared success, Republicans and Democrats with the Iraqi and the Afghanistan people. This is about taking the fight to those who will strike America again and will wound this Nation and kill our innocent civilians.

America must endure, endure and prevail.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

First, I would yield 3¼ minutes to Representative BOSWELL who is ranking member on our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence.

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

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

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

So I come today to share that little bit with you. I finished up my tours in the military as an instructor at the Command Staff College, Department of Tactics. We rewrote 101–5. We might want to talk about that sometime. You might find it interesting. And I would say without reservation, LEONARD BOSWELL, JACK MURTHA, and probably everybody in this Chamber support our troops, absolutely, 100 percent. That is not on the table, as far as I am concerned. They are in a difficult mission. They are performing superbly. And we are very, very proud of them. That is not the question.

Last December IKE SKELTON and, I do not know, 12 or 15 of us, and I do not know how I got invited, but we got invited to the White House to meet with the President, the Vice President, Mr. Rumsfeld, Ms. Rice, General Pace. And the whole conversation was everything is going really, really good in Iraq. And I got a chance to engage in conversation with the President, and I said it seems to me what I am hearing here is we have got 90-plus battalions, at that time, and now it is over 100, 20-something brigades, several divisions, armed, equipped, and in the field. And I have been to Iraq. A lot of us have. I am not sure about that, but if that is true, then why don't we start a withdrawal program carefully?

Do you know when we do best? We do best when we are under a little bit of pressure, when we know we have got to perform, we got to get the job done. And I think that applies to everybody in my life experience, Iraqis included. Under pressure, we went through the liberation from Saddam, regardless of how we decided to make the decision. We can debate that if you want to, but I do not want to do that. I supported the resolution based on what information I had. But regardless of that, if we would look at it in this sense: we have liberated the people from Saddam. He is in jail. He is on trial. Now we are occupiers. We want to help them get settled. They had a great election. We all understand that. They have established a government. And it is pretty tough. They got it done, I am told.

You know, it is kind of like putting the team on the field. You haven't seen them play yet together. Maybe they will do well, or maybe they won't. I don't know. We don't know. But we wish them well. We want them to succeed absolutely.

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

And I salute you for that, Mr. MURTHA.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time on this very important matter.

To my good friend Mr. MURTHA, I also salute you as a Vietnam veteran, one that knows what the cost of war does to a family and to our country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the conduct of this war has made us less safe. This is what this debate should be about. It has distracted us from the global war on terror. It has hurt recruiting and retention in the military. It has broken our Army for possibly the next decade or more. It has hurt

our ability to work with other nations. I think that is where the real debate should occur.

□ 1515

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my California sister, a member of our committee, the ranking member of the Technical and Tactical Intelligence Subcommittee, Ms. ESHOO.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee and Congressman MURTHA. We salute you for your extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the majority has brought a resolution before the House. It is a resolution. It is a nonbinding resolution. For those that are listening in, it just means that we are going to talk. There is not any action that will come out of it.

Let us think about the context, the broader context of where we are today, June 15, 2006. Across this magnificent country, almost two-thirds of the American people, it matters not where they live, what their economic background is, what their political affiliation is, have now lost faith in the President's war in Iraq.

They have also lost faith in the President. He had high ratings. He is now down to about 33 percent. And it is about this issue of war in Iraq. Why? Why? Because what was advanced? We had to go in because there was an eminent threat. If we did not get them, they were going to get us. Except that premise, the President even acknowledged, did not turn out to be so.

We all honor and support our troops. None of us will stipulate to anything less. We all honor the tradition that they have set. We all stipulate to that. We know that there are terrorists in this world. And we will pursue them in the pursuit of the protection of our Nation.

But there is a difference between Iraq and the war on terrorism. And some people in the Congress, unlike people in the country, do not want to acknowledge that. So where are we today? Our intelligence agency demoralized, intelligence manipulated, the American people ashamed of what we are doing instead of being proud.

It is too bad, my friends, that the term ''cut and run'' is ever used against a man that has served so honorably and has the medals to show them. I submit that it is the Congress that has cut and run on accountability, on not doing oversight, on not watching where the money is going.

Potable water has not been improved in Iraq. Even retired generals, for the first time in my life of 63 years have I ever heard retired generals that have spoken out and said this is not a policy, stay the course is not a policy.

Yes, we need a debate. We need a debate about alternatives. About alternatives. This is a regrettable instrument that you have brought to the floor today. I think two-thirds of the American people understand it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to Mr. HOLT of New Jersey, ranking member of the Intelligence Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. I salute Mr. MURTHA, and I salute the servicemen and -women in the field, recovering at Walter Reed, and waiting to serve.

This is a critical matter that we waited far too long to debate on this floor. And instead today we now get a meaningless resolution that says, well, stay the course, whatever that means.

Well, today I was meeting with some seventh and eighth graders. And I asked them to help me put in perspective what we are talking about here today, what would we say that 10 years from now we wish that we had said about the war in Iraq.

The first one said, too many lives have been lost already. The second one said, the reasons for going to war were wrong, maybe even deceptive. The third said, the Iraqi people are worse off today than they were before.

We should ask ourselves how posterity will regard Congress for giving President Bush everything he asked for without oversight, without accountability. There are shifting rationales for war: oh, it was weapons of mass destruction; oh, no, it was retribution for September 11; no, actually it was about human rights abuses under Saddam; no, actually it was containment and disarmament and the U.N. were not working.

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

No, it is not about terrorism. This is not about Khobar Towers. It is not about the USS *Cole*; it is not even about the World Trade Center. Today's debate is about Iraq, a war of choice. And this is a resolution that says, stay the course.

The other side, Mr. Speaker, is engaging in classical misdirection. This has nothing to do with terrorism except that Iraq has now become a breeding ground and a training ground for terrorists. And meanwhile the war has warped American priorities and cost us dearly.

Numerous powder kegs around the world are being ignored. International standing and our ability to counter terrorism is hurt. Here at home, I must say, Hurricane Katrina crystallized American thinking when they realized that the President and Congress were putting our attention, our resources in Iraq and not for the needs of the people here at home.

History will remember this war as a colossal blunder. When we leave Iraq, and I hope we will begin immediately, no one will wish that we stayed longer. No one will look back and think the current course could ever have been successful. This war is not making us safer. It is not making Iraq safer.

The generals understand that. You have heard that today. The large majority of the Iraqis understand that. The U.S. public understands that. And, yes, even seventh graders in New Jersey understand that.

Let us begin our redeployment immediately, rather than approve a meaningless stay-the-course resolution.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague from California, a member of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. ISSA.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly think it is important that this debate go back and forth as it has between the defeatist attitude of my colleagues and what I believe is the appropriate stay the course of this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, we are often alleged of only doing two things in the Congress, either nothing or overreacting. Today, by a measured response of saying stay the course, we are doing exactly what we need to do. This is not meaningless.

Just in the last week a declassified document taken from the safehouse in which Zarqawi met his appropriate punishment, and I will read just short excerpts, our time is short, but they are meaningful and I think many Members listening throughout their offices and here on the floor probably have not yet read this.

Zarqawi says, however, here in Iraq, speaking of why time is on the side of al Qaeda, however, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be of service to the American forces and harmful to the resistance for the following reasons.

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

He goes on to say, the resistance has had its financial outlets cut off and restricted. He talks about how, in fact, we have been effective in creating big divisions among the ranks of what he called the resistance.

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

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

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

My time is short. I just want to do two things. One is, to say that, unlike Congressman MURTHA, I did not serve in combat. But I entered the Army in

1970, and I entered as a grandson of Lebanese immigrants.

And throughout the 1970s and 1980s and 1990s, I visited Lebanon, and I visited the region, and I got to know my fellow Arabs of the world. And I knew there was a problem and they knew there was a problem and we were not addressing it. We are now addressing it.

So we will be punished by the opposition any time we either do nothing or do something. But I would rather do something in the interests of freedom.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, many on this side advocate a strategy for success.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1530

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the rookie on our committee, Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The troop presence of our country impedes success and fuels the insurgency. Nine out of 10 Iraqis want a timeline for withdrawal. Seventy percent, including the Prime Minister, want a time set for withdrawal. It appears that the Bush-Rumsfeld group wants to be more Iraqi than the Iraqis.

It is time to shift the focus to political and diplomatic solutions. It is time we disavow any intention to permanently remain or to keep permanent bases. It is time to revitalize our military, refocus on Afghanistan and Osama bin Laden and the Taliban, and

secure our own country by fulfilling the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Zarqawi's document:

However, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be of service to the American forces, harmful to the resistance, for the following reasons.

Time is on our side. We are making progress.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard a lot about who is right and who is wrong. Let me quote, at the outbreak of the Civil War, from Leroy Walker, who later became first Confederate Secretary of War. He said that he could wipe up with one handkerchief all the blood that would be spilled in the coming dispute between the North and the South. He was wrong.

We have been wrong, too. We were wrong about weapons of mass destruction. We were wrong about the costs, and we were wrong about the tenacity of this insurgency. But Tony Blair came here about a year and a half ago and he gave a great speech, and he said something very important we ought to be reminded of.

He said if we were wrong about weapons of mass destruction, and all we did was liberate a noble people from a brutal dictator, he said that history would forgive. But had we failed to act, and had we been right about weapons of mass destruction, he said that history would not forgive.

So this debate about who is right and who is wrong, I think, misplaces the interest of the United States. We were right that Saddam Hussein and his sadistic sons were a clear and present danger to his people, his neighbors, the region, and to American interests. Saddam Hussein plotted to kill a former U.S. president.

And just like megalomaniac leaders of the past, he attacked his neighbors in Iran, and he invaded Kuwait. Some prefer to ignore the historic comparisons to the Sudetenland and Liebensprau. Montezuma was right, those who refuse to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

Dr. Henry Kissinger was right, too, when he said that with domestic policy, actions have consequences. But with foreign policy, inaction can have consequences. We are now seeing the suffering played out in Darfur and Somalia because of inaction.

Millions of innocent women and children are now at the mercy of the followers of bin Laden and al Zarqawi, and al Qaeda understands what some in this body refuse to acknowledge, that Iraq and Afghanistan are part and parcel of their war against us. When they are defeated there, and I pray that they will be, their ability to wage terrorist war against us will be diminished dramatically.

When we talk to the troops who come home from that region, they talk about progress. They talk about schools and hospitals that are open. Members, let me read for you from an e-mail that came back from a Minnesota soldier back to Minnesota. This was after the first election in Iraq.

He said, despite everything that has been going on around them, they still voted. Despite all the violence, they stood in line to be heard. Word is that despite the insurgents' best efforts, voter turnout may be as high as 72 percent across the country. Shoot, even in the States, that would be a great turnout.

All I can say is that together we, the United States and the Iraqis, no kidding, we did it. I know full well that this doesn't solve everything. Sure, there will be tough days yet to come. But for today, we won, we all won.

Our returning military personnel tell us something else. Iraqi and Americans have one thing in common. They want American forces to come home, but not just yet. Members, now is not the time to go wobbly. Let's give victory a chance and a lasting peace will surely follow.

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

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

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

The American people want a change in our Iraq policy, and as their representatives, we have an incredible opportunity to speak to those concerns. But, quite frankly, we won't do that today.

As a New Yorker, and as the only Member of this House to lost a relative on 9/11, I am sickened that once again my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to try to spin this as an answer to 9/11.

If we thought that Ann Coulter's criticism of the Jersey girls who fought for an independent inquiry into the 9/11 attacks was bad, today Ms. Coulter pales in comparison to this Republican-led Congress. They still use the victims of 9/11 as a reason for being in Iraq in the first place, when all evidence, all evidence says otherwise.

When I hear my colleagues continue to talk and say that Iraq is a stop in the war in terrorism, what happened to the first stop? What happened to Osama bin Laden? Five years later, we have yet to capture or eliminate the person responsible for that action in the first place. But yet we find ourselves in a quagmire in Iraq. I intend to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), a member of the committee.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I just want to make a couple of observations. To my colleagues on the minority side, ladies and gentlemen, debate what you wish to debate. No one is telling you what to debate here today. All I have heard you do is complain about what you can and cannot say. I very much want to hear your strategy.

Ms. HARMAN talked about we have a strategy for success. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, talked about we want to take the fight to the terrorists. I would love to hear how.

That is what we are doing at this moment. There is an old country and western song that teaches you, you know, while I was busy dreaming about yesterday, tomorrow hit me right between the eyes.

What you are doing is dreaming about yesterday. We are in Iraq. Mr. HOLT had it right. It is today a training ground, a recruiting ground for terrorists. It is interesting, it is instructive, and we should talk about how that happens so we don't repeat it in the future.

But it is the reality for the moment. What do we do to end it? Where do we draw the line? Where do we say this is where we have to win? It is Iraq, and we better get it right.

Ms. HARMAN. To the prior speaker, we are trying to articulate exactly what we should do.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the final minute of the Intelligence Committee's time to Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, a member of the National Security Subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee.

I thank Mr. MURTHA for yielding me the 30 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we can say what we want on the floor of this House. We can debate and vote on nonbinding resolutions like this. But what is most important to the American people is not what we say here but what we do here.

This resolution does not commit this House to do anything. It does not require this Congress to take any measures to hold the Bush Administration or ourselves accountable for what is happening in Iraq.

The Bush administration was totally wrong about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. No one has been held accountable. The Bush Administration totally miscalculated the number of troops that would be required to provide greater stability on the ground in post-invasion Iraq. No one was held accountable. The Bush Administration got the costs of the war totally wrong. Again, no one was held accountable.

It is a simple principle. If you reward and ignore failure today, you are going to get more failure tomorrow. This House has ignored those failures. While our men and women have been fighting bravely in Iraq, this House has been AWOL when it comes to providing oversight.

Instead of providing a system of checks and balances, this Congress has been a blank check and a rubber stamp.

If we were a board of directors, we would be sued by shareholders for gross negligence.

I proposed a simple amendment to this resolution. It would have required this Congress to actually do something—to conduct adequate oversight and to implement the 9–11 Commission's recommendations, including those requiring this body to reform its own intelligence oversight process. The Republican leadership refused to allow us to debate or vote on my amendment. It apparently wants this House to remain an accountability free zone.

Ten hours of debate does not excuse years of giving the administration a blank check on Iraq. A non-binding resolution is not a substitute for an action plan. Let's start doing our job. We owe it to our troops and the American people. Shame on this House for abdicating its constitutional responsibility.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Thank you Mr. Chairman, for yielding me a few moments today to speak with our colleagues and with the American people.

As I traveled with seven colleagues earlier this year to visit our troops in the Middle East and Central Asia, I learned a great deal about the American spirit, the spirit of our volunteer servicemen and women and what drives them to risk it all. It is the defense of freedom. It is the understanding that vigilance and sacrifice are requirements for our Nation's security.

Back home in the comfort of their living rooms though, many Americans lack that focus. They forgot about Iraq's violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions and the mounting incidence of attacks on our Nation leading up to 9/11. They began to loudly dissent and doubt and distract from our mission in Iraq.

One of the generals who I spoke with while I was in Kuwait took the opportunity in a quiet conversation to ask a very pointed question. He said, is America fighting this war, or is it just our military who is fighting this war?

We today, together with all Americans, must answer that general's thoughtful question. We must answer it for him, for ourselves, for the rest of the world, but especially for our enemies, so they know America is truly committed to liberty and the victory of civility and opportunity for all who love freedom and support democracy.

These enemies have long been committed to robbing the world of liberty. The United States and others have been targets of these terrorists many times leading up to 9/11 because of our commitment to the ideal of freedom. These enemies include regimes which harbor terrorists, but most especially those loosely connected terrorist organizations operating outside a national framework who share an ideology of oppression, tyranny, control, hatred resentment. They value no life, no man, no woman, no child.

We Americans cannot continue to be free if we spend all our time questioning our mission. Many Americans want to debate the validity of prewar intelligence or weapons of mass destruction. Whether one nation or another supported al Qaeda, how many troops do we need? Americans have to look beyond the tactical challenges.

We must do as Tony Blair did. The people who are fighting us, he said, know what is at stake. The question is, do we?

□ 1545

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 60 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) from the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I ask unanimous consent she control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this resolution as the chairperson of the 72-member Out of Iraq Caucus of the House of Representatives. Tomorrow will mark the 1-year anniversary of the Out of Iraq Caucus.

My colleagues and I joined together to form the Out of Iraq Caucus to pressure the Bush administration into telling the truth about what is going on in Iraq, to admit their mistakes, and to admit their misjudgments, and to force them to devise a plan to bring our troops home.

The Bush administration cannot deny that they misled the world about the reasons we invaded Iraq. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. There was no connection between the unfortunate destruction of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. We have not been welcomed with open arms in Iraq. We have no substantial support for this war by other countries. Yet, Mr. Bush, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. Rumsfeld, Ms. Rice, Mr. Wolfowitz, and Mr. Karl Rove continue to squander the American taxpayers' dollars on a war that cannot be won with a military solution.

Here we are 3 years later, 2,500 American soldiers dead, 18,498 U.S. soldiers seriously injured, and Congress has appropriated over $320 billion for this war, and the costs will only continue to rise. Even Condoleezza Rice admitted there have been thousands of missteps. The American people are increasingly aware of this mismanaged, corrupt, and bungled war.

The company that Vice President CHENEY served as CEO of, Halliburton, has been awarded no-bid contracts for billions of dollars, and they have had over $400 million in unsupported costs and another $1 billion in questioned costs. In simple words, they are cheating the American people. Yet they are not being held accountable for their criminal actions, and the administration has facilitated these illegal actions.

However, Congress has done virtually no oversight of this war, no hearing, no acknowledging the generals that are trying to tell us about Mr. Rumsfeld's mismanagement of this war. We have not done the oversight, and today, we find that we have this debate. It is not sufficient, nor has it been properly characterized. This resolution we are debating is a sham.

As a matter of fact, it is a trap. It is an attempt to force Democrats to sign on to a resolution that will do nothing to bring our troops home. Oh, they want to make us sound as if we are unpatriotic. They want to make us sound as if we do not support our troops. We love our troops. We are as patriotic as anybody, and so I would implore my colleagues not to get caught into this trap.

This resolution is not intended to solve any problems or chart a new course that will permit us to preserve the lives of our troops or to be successful in Iraq.

I know what is happening. My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are getting frightened. They went home on the break, and they heard the American people. They saw the polls, and they came back with a Karl Rove-constructed resolution to try and make it seem as if now they get it. But this resolution does nothing. It will only continue to mislead.

We formed the Out of Iraq Caucus to oppose any permanent bases in Iraq. We support H.J. Res. 73 to redeploy U.S. forces from Iraq, commonly referred to as the Murtha resolution.

There are a lot of misconceptions about what the Murtha resolution is. So let us take a minute and explain clearly what the resolution says.

Section 1 says: ''The deployment of United States forces in Iraq, by direction of Congress, is hereby terminated and the forces involved are to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date.'' They would have you believe this is meant to withdraw immediately. That is not what it says, and let us get that straight today. What that means is there will be no more U.S. troops sent to Iraq and that the troops in Iraq will be redeployed as soon as possible, a judgment that should be made by military officials on the ground. So stop misrepresenting what this resolution is all about.

Section 2 says that ''a quick-reaction U.S. force and an over-the-horizon presence of U.S. Marines shall be deployed in the region.'' That means a group of marines will remain in the Middle East to respond to threats that destabilize our allies in the region or the national security of the United States.

Section 3 says: ''The United States of America shall pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.'' This war cannot be won through military means alone. We must put the full weight of the United States behind diplomacy in order to end bloodshed in Iraq.

The Murtha resolution endorses these principles, and there is no reason why the entire Congress of the United States cannot get behind this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Out of Iraq Caucus supports the Murtha resolution as the clear plan for America. We support bringing our troops home, and stop saying we do not have a plan. We have a plan. It is a good plan. It is the Murtha resolution.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be able to control the remainder of the Intelligence Committee's time on this side of the aisle.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, and I commend the brave American and coalition soldiers who have risked their lives to fight terror and promote freedom around the world, including the 14 courageous Delawareans who have lost their lives while honorably serving their State and this Nation.

Despite weeks of significant progress, we are now facing a critical stage in the war on terrorism. I believe an immediate withdrawal or the establishment of a hard deadline to withdraw will be comparable to an abandonment of the new Iraqi Government and would encourage the terrorists and violent factions to bide their time, inviting mayhem and guaranteeing chaos.

Such a decision may also embolden our enemies to, once again, attack our homeland and interests abroad, thus further endangering American citizens. The future of the Middle East and the security of free nations around the world depend upon the development of a strong and stable democracy in Iraq.

Therefore, in order to reach an acceptable level of stability in Iraq, it is extremely important that we, as an international community, intensify our efforts to reduce the influence of militias, restore electricity, rebuild schools, and assemble a modern and sustainable economy for the benefit of all Iraq's citizens. A greater emphasis on the development of the Iraqi security forces, with a focus on the selection and education of effective military officers, is absolutely imperative so that we may begin supplanting our forces in the region with Iraqi troops at the earliest date possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we honor our brave soldiers by continuing to work with our international partners to promote democracy and protect freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and I commend the brave American and coalition soldiers and all other personnel who have risked their lives to fight terror and promote freedom both at home and abroad. These courageous men and women have made tremendous sacrifices to ensure our security, and they deserve our utmost respect and appreciation.

There have been three successful elections held in Iraq since the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime, and in recent weeks significant progress, both politically and militarily, has been made in the region. As a former member of the House Intelligence Committee, I firmly believe that the elimination of al-Zarqawi will prove to be a key psychological and organizational blow to al Qaeda's terrorist network.

Still, the facts are undeniable—progress in Iraq and Afghanistan has come at a tremendous cost. My small State of Delaware alone has lost fourteen brave soldiers, each of whom honorably served their State and Nation. My heart goes out to these noble Delawareans and their families.

And while elections and military victories are crucial, many challenges still lie ahead. We are now facing a critical stage in the war on terrorism, and it is essential that the international community come together to support Iraq's efforts to build a strong, unified government capable of steering the country toward a path of peace and democracy.

Although, several of my colleagues have suggested that the U.S. should set a hard deadline for withdrawal from the region, I believe such a course would be unwise. An immediate withdrawal, or the establishment of a hard deadline to withdraw, would be comparable to an abandonment of the new Iraqi government and would encourage the terrorists and violent factions to bide their time, inviting mayhem and guaranteeing chaos. Such a decision may also embolden our enemies to once again attack our homeland and interests abroad, thus further endangering American citizens. The future of the Middle East, and the security of free nations around the world, depends upon the development of a strong and stable democracy in Iraq.

Therefore, in order to reach an acceptable level of stability in Iraq, it is extremely important that we intensify our efforts to reduce the influence of militias, restore electricity, rebuild schools, and assemble a modem and sustainable economy for the benefit of all Iraq's citizens. A greater emphasis on the development of the Iraqi security forces—with a focus on the selection and education of effective military officers, is absolutely imperative. Over the last few years, we have trained and equipped thousands of Iraqi soldiers and police officers and it is now crucial that we do more to improve this process, so that we may begin supplanting our forces in the region with Iraqi troops at the earliest date possible.

Mr. Speaker, the thousands of Americans who have served in the war on terrorism exemplify the very courage and honor on which our Nation was formed. It is essential that we recognize their service by continuing to work with our international partners to promote democracy and protect freedom around the world.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership and her strong voice over the years on so many issues, especially with regard to this unnecessary war.

It has been almost 4 years since Congress authorized this unnecessary war, and we are really still not having a debate on Iraq policy. So, quite frankly, this debate is a sham. It attempts to, and you have heard this before and you will hear it again, it attempts to link the war on terror with the bloodshed and violence and killing in Iraq. How deceptive can you be?

As a founding member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I believe that we should be debating and passing the Murtha resolution today. The Murtha resolution would redeploy our troops from Iraq at the earliest practicable date and pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.

Instead, the Republicans continue to play political games at the expense of our brave troops.

This resolution is a disingenuous attempt by the Republicans to really rewrite history by claiming that Iraq is linked to the terrible tragedy of 9/11. This is deplorable. We all know that Iraq had nothing to do with the tragic attacks of 9/11. Yet, the President misled the American people into a war of choice, with no end in sight.

We could have avoided this, and you remember Congressman SPRATT and myself, we introduced substitutes to the use of force back in 2002, which would have allowed the United Nations' inspectors to ensure that Iraq was not developing weapons of mass destruction.

And what is the cost of finding out that there are no weapons of mass destruction? Today, we reached the sad milestone of 2,500 American brave troops who have given their lives; and by the end of the year, we will have committed close to $400 billion.

Are we any safer as a result of this purposeless war in Iraq? Not according to the 9/11 Commission, whose report card gave the administration a failing grade in virtually every category relating to terrorism preparedness.

The Republicans try to claim that Iraq is the central front on the global war on terror, but the fact is that it has undermined our ability to protect our Nation. National security professionals recognize this, Mr. Speaker, and let us be clear: we are spending billions of dollars to occupy a country that did not have weapons of mass destruction or terrorist ties. At the same time, we are cutting programs to secure our ports and keep nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists. There is something really wrong.

Worse still, this President and the Republican majority really refuse to level with the American people about when our troops are coming home, also really if they are coming home.

While we are debating this very bogus resolution, the most substantive

decision on Iraq policy in very recent days was taken out by the Republican majority behind closed doors. They stripped from the war supplemental an amendment that we offered to prevent the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq.

The American people do not want an open-ended war and occupation. Quietly removing a measure that was approved by both the House and the Senate is a gross abuse of the democratic process and is further evidence that Republicans are afraid to level with the American people about their real plans for Iraq.

Let me tell you, there will be a day of reckoning. The American people are demanding answers. They deserve a truthful accounting of how we got into this unnecessary war, how the billions of dollars have been misspent and when our troops are coming home, and also, they really deserve to know if our troops are coming home, given recent reports that the administration is considering leaving a permanent force of 50,000 troops in Iraq and indications that establishing permanent military bases are not off the table.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American people will not forget that, instead of answers to their questions, the Republican majority keeps giving them rhetoric and posturing like they are doing today, and the American people deserve better.

This sham resolution, it really should be rejected. We should support the Murtha resolution. That is what we should talk about today. That will take steps to end this war. It would take steps to bring our young men and women home; and I tell you, if we do not debate this, we do not know when the opportunity to debate or to have a real debate will take place.

It should have been a real debate today. Unfortunately, this has deteriorated into posturing into rhetoric and into misrepresenting what the facts are.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Maryland, I yield myself 30 seconds to read a quote we mentioned earlier in this debate from Osama bin Laden. He said, ''This Third World war is raging in Iraq. The whole world is watching this war. It will end in victory and glory, or misery and humiliation.'' That is not this side of the aisle. That is Osama bin Laden.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

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

As we debate the war in Iraq, Afghanistan and the war on terrorism, there will be strong, heartfelt feelings and expressions on this House floor. Let us, however, as we debate have a powerful sense of resolution, a powerful sense of urgency, a powerful sense of urgency to end the war and to end the war successfully.

A stable, free Iraq, a stable, free Afghanistan will be a blessing to the Iraqis, a blessings to the Afghanis and a blessing to the region and the world at large.

The war on terrorism is the next stage of the Cold War. Civilized people who believe in the rule of law, justice, equality and freedom cannot allow self-anointed fanatics to rape, pillage and murder at will around the globe.

A great Islamic theologian once said, ''One hour of justice is equal to a hundred-year prayer.'' The world wants to hear from us. It is our job to end the war in Iraq successfully. The United States, with the assistance of and for the good of the civilized world, can and will defeat terrorism. This debate is our hour of justice.

□ 1600

General Eisenhower said, ''The emphasis of the military is on authority and obedience; the emphasis on public office is communication and consent.'' As we craft this resolution, I urge you to keep these themes in mind.

And as we will eventually walk across the graves in Arlington Cemetery, listen to these words: ''We are the dead. Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved and were loved. And now we lie in Flanders Field.'' Let us work together through this debate to figure out how to end the war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, Representative WOOLSEY, 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us voted against this war from the very beginning. In fact, 60 percent of the Democrats voted ''no'' to the war in Iraq. Since then, we have hosted informal hearings, we have founded the Out of Iraq Caucus, we forced a debate and vote on the House floor, Mr. MURTHA offered his intelligent proposal to redeploy our troops, and last night I gave my 151st 5-minute speech on Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 39 months since our troops were sent to Iraq, and today, more than 37 months after the President declared ''Mission Accomplished,'' our troops are still there.

Just this week, the President of the United States said this about Iraq, and I quote: ''My message to the enemy is don't count on us leaving before we succeed. Don't bet on American politics forcing my hand, because it is not going to happen.'' Except, Mr. Speaker, it is completely unclear what constitutes success or when the mission will be accomplished under these circumstances. Saying we will stand down when the Iraqis stand up? Well, that is just talking points that give the American people no clear guide as to when they can expect this war to end.

By leaving this question vague, by defining success entirely on his own terms, the President is allowing himself an open-ended commitment and a blank check in Iraq. As for his hand being forced by American politics, what the President calls American politics is actually a majority of our citizens outraged at the loss of life, the hundreds of billions spent, and the global credibility we have squandered.

The American people, as of this morning, see 2,500 U.S. troops killed, more than 18,000 U.S. soldiers gravely wounded, and thousands more mentally and physically traumatized from their experience in the war. They see the United States losing an equivalent of one battalion every month in Iraq, and the American people want answers. They do not want partisan resolutions like the one before us today, a resolution that does nothing to end this war.

They see all the sacrifices, Mr. Speaker, and they ask, for what? They know none of it is making Americans in Iraqi safer. In fact, the presence of nearly 150,000 American troops in Iraq has become a rallying point for anti-American extremists in the Arab world. The people of this country support our troops. They see nothing inconsistent about having the deepest contempt for this war while expressing the utmost admiration for the soldiers on the front lines.

Last fall, I traveled to Iraq and I visited with our troops. My conversations with them confirmed what I already knew: These are uniquely loyal, intelligent, and courageous Americans. If only those civilians who are running this war had half the honor and integrity of the men and women who are fighting it.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, this Congress caught up to the American people. It is time that the Commander in Chief stepped up by offering a solution, instead of dismissing American anxiety as just politics. It is time to establish a multilateral security force to keep the peace in Iraq while shifting the U.S. role from military occupier to reconstruction partner. It is time to give Iraq back to the Iraqis, not continuing to occupy the bases, not attempting to control their oil.

This is what the American people want, Mr. Speaker. They want an end to this war. They are not certain exactly how or when, but that is our job to execute those details. They are looking to us for leadership. It is time this Congress and the President of the United States provided the leadership to bring our troops home.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, a leader on national defense affairs, Mr. WICKER.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, what is the status of our effort in Iraq today, and where do we go from here?

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle see the situation getting worse and worse. I see real progress. I see three successful elections, I see the completion of a national unity government, and I see the elimination of Abu Musab al Zarqawi. But more than anything else, Mr. Speaker, it is the returning troops I talk to who convince

me that our mission is succeeding and that their sacrifice is accomplishing a valuable service for our effort and for our people. I haven't surveyed many seventh graders, but the soldiers I see express support for what we are doing and frustration over the coverage they see in the media.

Now, as to the question of where we go from here, two things are certain: Iraq is ground zero in our global war on terror. And the decisions we make will affect U.S. credibility for decades to come.

Al Qaeda attacked our homeland unprovoked on 9/11, and it is that same al Qaeda we fight today in Iraq. We must defeat them there and anywhere else until their terrorist threat has ended. But make no mistake, this is the same enemy that demolished the World Trade Center and attacked the Pentagon.

Another argument we have heard today is that this war was a mistake to begin with; that it was unnecessary; that it was in fact based on a lie. This view, of course, ignores the fact that intelligence agencies not only in the U.S. but from Israel, Great Britain, Germany, and France, to name a few, were unanimous in their conclusions that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. President Bill Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright cautioned that it was a real possibility Saddam would use these weapons or share them with terrorists intent on attacking the U.S. again.

But if you think about it, Mr. Speaker, what such an argument really advocates is a present day Iraq with Saddam Hussein still in power. That would have been the logical result of their point of view. An Iraq still ruled by intimidation, humiliation, rape, and torture. A Saddam Hussein still free to continue his proven network of chemical and biological weapons research. A Saddam Hussein with plans and advanced designs for long-range missiles to threaten our allies and our interests.

To some, this may be an acceptable alternative. But it is not to me. The world is a better place because Iraq is free of Saddam Hussein, and the world will be safer if we maintain our resolve. The administration has embarked on a sound plan for freedom and stability in the region and for better security for our citizens. Stay the course.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Washington, Representative MCDERMOTT, 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this debate begins with one fundamental truth. We are in Iraq and our leaders have no plan to get us out of Iraq.

The President says U.S. soldiers will stay in harm's way for as long as he says so. ''We will stand down,'' our leaders say, ''when the Iraqis stand up.'' In other words, Iraqi clerics and the factions they control and the decisions they make about whether to cooperate with the Iraqi government will determine what we can do. The extent of our involvement, the length of our stay, the number of our dead is controlled by religious clerics in Iraq because we have no strategy except to wait for the Iraqis to stand up.

Republican leaders in this Chamber say we will stay because Iraq is a model of success and it is helping us win the war on terror, as if a resolution they alone write will somehow make Iraq the role model for projecting U.S. influence around the world.

Today, the American people say with a growing voice that Iraq was a mistake, and staying with no plan or timetable is the wrong course for our soldiers and our Nation. The unending war, the permanent bases, the fortress embassy we are building all make a powerful argument that our involvement in Iraq is more an occupation than a liberation. This promotes terrorism. This helps recruit terrorists. It doesn't help end the terrorism.

U.S. soldiers in Iraq are doing an heroic job, but we are not doing ours. It is not partisan politics to insist that a nation at war have a plan to achieve the peace. The resolution and its backers seem to think it is unpatriotic to ask questions and to demand a plan. That is not true. Our foreign policy fails when we fail to ask enough questions, not too many.

American soldiers are falling every day, and there is no one, not a single person in this House who does not respect and support our soldiers. But this resolution is intended to paper over the truth about the Iraq war and it does not support our soldiers and will not make a difference in winning the war. Our soldiers need and the American people expect their leaders to develop a battle plan that will work in the field because it is based on military intelligence, not political expediency.

We are in a war and we need a battle plan from the President, not a message memo from the House majority leader. War isn't waged by a political party nor is it won by political ideology. Iraq needs a credible battle plan. There is only one at the moment, and we should be debating it.

JOHN MURTHA put forward a plan 6 months ago and only today are we able to discuss it at all, with no ability to alter the resolution before us. This is not an honest debate, an honest attempt to seek answers for our problems in Iraq. It is a debate about a letter of endorsement for the President, not an examination of our options.

JACK MURTHA has emerged with a battle plan, and it is no surprise. He is a decorated combat soldier who reflects what the best military minds believe. As a veteran myself of the Vietnam era, I must say that Jack is a soldier's soldier, a combat hero who has one and only one goal: To defend our Nation with the finest military and the best plan.

JACK has a plan: Strategic redeployment. It is smart, proud, honest and effective. You can't win a war with rhetoric and resolutions. You win with a thoughtful plan. I support the Murtha resolution that puts in place a plan to protect our soldiers, protect American interests in the Middle East, and protects American people here at home. It is a battle plan that resolves to bring our troops home on a timetable driven by the United States, not subject to the approval of Iraqi clerics. It is a commitment to secure the peace by being smart about the war.

The American soldiers need a battle plan, not a resolution that reflects a bunker mentality of the Republican Party losing its grip on political control.

Two grim things came out of the Pentagon today. When the President declared ''mission accomplished,'' 141 people had died. Today, the 2,500th person died. The other thing that came out was a 74-page booklet to help Republicans manage spin control during the Iraq debate on the floor. It is called ''The Iraq War Debate Prep Book.''

The Defense Department is putting out PR pieces. That is an affront to the American people. It is not a front on the war. The American people want change because the Pentagon under this administration distributes PR plans. Debate talking points. What is the military doing with that kind of stuff up here on the Hill in this body? We see no military plan.

Support U.S. soldiers by passing Jack Murtha's plan to get out of Iraq.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. After September 11th, Mr. Speaker, bin Laden's deputies said, ''People of America, your government is leading you into a losing battle. Remember, your government was defeated in Vietnam, fled in panic from Lebanon, rushed out of Somalia, and slapped across the face in Aden. Your government today is leading you into a losing war.''

And no wonder. Look at our past. November 1979: 52 Americans taken hostage at the U.S. embassy in Iran. We had a failed response. April 1983: 17 Americans killed at our embassy in Beirut. We took no action. October 1983: 241 Marines killed, 100 wounded. Our Marines were redeployed. April 1988: 259 killed in the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. We sought indictments. February 1993: Six killed and a thousand injured after the explosion of the first World Trade Center bombing. We took them to court. October 1993: 18 U.S. servicemen were killed and 84 wounded in Somalia. We withdrew our troops. August 1998: 224 killed at U.S. embassies. We fired cruise missiles in Afghanistan and Sudan.

□ 1615

October 2000, 17 U.S. killed and 30 wounded in the USS *Cole* attack. We took no action.

However, since September 11 we have been much different. We fought the Taliban in Afghanistan, and now we are fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, and the U.S. is sending a message to the terrorists and the world, and we are different and we will respond.

Now, there will be disagreements between leaders who are retired and current ones. This is part of history. Witness the disagreements between Lincoln and McClellan, Patton and Montgomery, MacArthur and Truman.

But now we are having success. Our troops are being redeployed outside of the cities of Iraq. We are transferring the battle to Iraqi security forces and their police, and now they have a government where they must face the scourge of al Qaeda, and we cannot let them face it alone.

I wish we could finish quickly, but I know we cannot finish hastily. I think one wounded soldier said it to me, summed it up best, he said, I want to go back and finish the job, I want to fight them there, not in our suburbs.

I know we cannot fight them in our courts. I know we cannot fight terrorists with our police in our streets. I know surely we cannot fight terrorist murderers with diplomacy. Let's finish the job of terrorism, then we bring them home.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as a founding member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I rise in strong support of our brave troops and in strong support of Congressman MURTHA's plan for a responsible redeployment from Iraq.

Americans want the truth about the Iraq war. Americans deserve the truth, and despite all the talk from those who declared this war, ineptly pursued this war, and still today justify this war, the American people in overwhelming numbers have determined for themselves the truth about this war.

Polls taken even after the killing of al Zarqawi show that only 33 percent of American adults think that the results of the war were worth the loss of life and other costs. Only 33 percent approve of the way George W. Bush is handling the situation in Iraq. Only 26 percent of Americans feel that the United States is better off because of the war.

The American people in their wisdom have been able to distinguish reality from rhetoric. The truth has been a major casualty in the war of Iraq.

It is worth reviewing just a few of the statements presented as truth that have been proven to be not true, never true, and still today not true:

DICK CHENEY said in August 2002, ''Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.''

In March 2003, Donald Rumsfeld said, ''We know where they are. They're in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad and east, west, south and north somewhat.''

The President said in May 2003, ''We found the weapons of mass destruction.''

And Donald Rumsfeld on the cost, ''Well the Office of Management and Budget has come up with a number that is something under $50 billion for the cost. How much of that will be the U.S. burden and how much will be other countries is an open question.''

DICK CHENEY said May 30, 2005, ''I think they are in the last throes, if you will, of the insurgency.''

And what happens to those experts who tell the truth? Are they heeded and embraced by the Bush administration? Hardly. Although it is now universally agreed we didn't have enough troops to avoid the chaos and violence after the initial invasion, when the Army's top general, Eric Shinseki, testified in February 2003 ''something on the order of several hundred thousand soldiers'' would be necessary to achieve victory in Iraq,'' he was immediately and publicly repudiated by Secretary Rumsfeld who said that ''the idea it would take several hundred thousand U.S. forces I think is far off the mark.'' Shinseki was quietly ushered into retirement, and Secretary Rumsfeld remains in place leading the failed Bush administration policy in Iraq.

When Dr. Lawrence Lindsey, former assistant for economic policy to the President, told the Wall Street Journal in September 2002 that the war's cost could reach $200 billion, he was fired by the President.

Yet by the end of this year we will have spend $450 billion in Iraq. Some say at the end of the day the war will cost $1 trillion taxpayer dollars.

Since the time the President announced on May 1, 2003 that ''major combat operations in Iraq have ended,'' more than 2,350 U.S. soldiers have lost their lives, and the President has not attended a single one of their funerals. And the United States is spending in excess of $8 billion a month to wage the war. That is $266 million a day, $11 million an hour, $185,000 a minute and $3,100 a second, every second for this war. Certainly we could have afforded body armor and proper Humvees for our soldiers.

We could have insured 165 million children for 1 year, provided more than 13 million American students with 4-year scholarships at public universities, fully funded global anti-hunger efforts for 11 years, give basic immunization to every child in the world for 92 years, and I believe that would have bought us more security than invading Iraq has done.

Our military men and women have done a magnificent job in the Iraq theater and deserve better. The civilian leadership in the White House and the civilian leadership in the Pentagon have failed. Time after time they have been wrong. They projected the cost of the war and got it wrong. They predicted the length of the war: wrong. They predicted the existence of weapons of mass destruction: wrong. They predicted the Iraqi reaction to our occupation: wrong. They got the reconstruction of Iraq wrong. When it came to providing needed equipment, they got it wrong.

And who will pay the price for those mistakes? None of the architects of this war. No one of them has been held accountable. The only ones paying the price are dead and wounded soldiers, our men and women in uniform.

We need a new direction in Iraq. The majority has nothing to offer in terms of a plan, just more political ploys, more talk, more mistakes like those cited today.

It is time to redeploy our troops from Iraq. There is a plan, the Murtha plan; and we should make sure that we are not establishing a permanent military presence there.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, a while ago one of the members of the Armed Services Committee said under the rules of the debate today that we can discuss anything we want to, debate anything we want to.

It occurs to me while this is not a proposal for statutory change, it is a sense of the House resolution. Under the rules of this debate, may I present my amendment to reestablish the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations in the House Armed Services Committee so we may properly provide oversight? Is that allowed under the rules of this debate today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under House Resolution 868, the previous question has been ordered on adoption of the resolution without intervening amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to terrorism and in support of honoring our commitments. I rise in support of this resolution.

It is clear that one-half of those engaged in this debate believe we need to get out of Iraq and believe we need to get out soon. In support of their position, they cite mistakes that were made leading to the war and mistakes that have been made in conducting the war, and they cite the recent increase in terrorist attacks and incidents.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, reneging on our commitment to defeat terrorism in Iraq now would be a mistake of monumental proportions for which future generations would pay and pay deeply.

Of course mistakes have been made. In every human endeavor, mistakes are made. That is the nature of human endeavors.

I personally am convinced we had too few troops in Iraq when Baghdad fell. I joined my colleague JOHN MCCAIN in visiting Iraq. I have been there multiple times, and it was obvious to me

we needed more troops there. I have joined his call for sending more troops repeatedly, and I join those who call for sending temporarily more troops now to take advantage of the death of Zarqawi as an opportunity to crush the insurgents. And no doubt, other mistakes have been made. But whatever mistakes have been made, they do not justify cutting and running.

Recently, a constituent of mine, a Vietnam War helicopter pilot, approached me in Phoenix and said, This war is unlike Vietnam. It is unlike Vietnam, he explained, because were we to abandon this effort without succeeding, make no mistake about it, the consequences would be far reaching and disastrous.

Let's talk about some of those.

First, it would be a humiliating defeat for the United States. Look no further than the words of Osama bin Laden. He said: ''The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries. It's either victory and glory, or misery and humiliation.''

Future commitments by the United States could be scoffed at by our allies and by our enemies around the world for generations to come. It would shatter the trust we have built amongst our allies in the region. The newly elected Iraqi Government, and I find it ironic that we are having this debate within days of its selection, would collapse and we would have the creation of a radical, oil-funded terrorist state. But sadly and most importantly, to fail now would establish beyond a shadow of a doubt that our brave soldiers, men and women, who gave of their lives or who suffered grave injuries that will be with them for the remainder of their lives did so in vain.

Most importantly, it is not necessary. We can succeed, but the path to defeating terrorism in Iraq is not surrender; it is resolve. The opponents argue that we have suffered recent increases in violence and insurgent attacks. The increase in those attacks is not proof that we are losing, and it is certainly not proof that we cannot prevail. Rather, I submit to you it is proof that the insurgents understood that the period leading up to the election of a permanent representative government in Iraq was their best chance, and they took their best shot. And they failed.

For all that is rational, for that is honorable, we must not now within days of the election of that new permanent government cut and run. No, indeed, we must give it an opportunity to do its job, an opportunity to succeed.

Now, those who say that we are losing ignore that by their own admission al Qaeda is acknowledging that it is failing in Baghdad. I urge us not to cut and run now for our children and for our grandchildren.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first let's note what a degradation of democracy is taking place here.

The majority party has put forward a resolution that allows no amendment. There will be a debate in which those of us who think some things are good and some are bad, contrary to every reasonable democratic procedure, will have no opportunity to say so.

Here is the tactic that is being used: they take a number of things that people agree with, they mix in with them things which are quite controversial. They treat them as if they were not separable.

Let me say what I have said again before. The majority party thinks the way to legislate is the way you feed a pill to a dog: you take the unpalatable with the popular.

Now I will have to say this: one of the things we are trying to do is to persuade the people in Iraq to be able to work together and make democracy work. We are trying to persuade, we are told, the Shiia and the Sunni to work together. We are trying to tell the majority Shiia to share power.

Mr. Speaker, how can you and your party believe that we inspire people to share power by giving the example of its monopolization in an abusive fashion?

I just hope that the members of parliament in Iraq who may hear about this will remember a very important point: please do not try this at home.

Now let's get to the substance.

This war in Iraq came after September 11. It was not the response to terrorism the war in Afghanistan was. I am struck in listening to the Members on the other side of the aisle that Afghanistan appears to have too many syllables for them to pronounce. What is in fact happening is that the war in Afghanistan, which was the response to the terrorist attack, which was almost unanimously supported here and by Democrats in the Senate, is in fact not going as well as it should.

One of the prices we are paying for the war in Iraq is the deterioration in Afghanistan. Now, the war in Iraq was launched based on a couple of lies we were told. And I am struck to hear people still defending the arguments about the weapons of mass destruction. It seems my colleagues on the other side have decided to adopt a Marxist idea. The Marx in question, of course, is Chico, and the mantra is: Who are you going to believe, me or your own eyes? Having been repudiated overwhelmingly by the facts, they stick to the rhetoric.

Here is the price we are paying. We shouldn't have gone in. Of course having gone in, we are victimized by one of the most incompetently administered examples in American national security history. But here is the price we pay: the war in Afghanistan deteriorates our ability to protect ourselves at home. Every time you hear that we can't afford communications, we can't afford more people at the border, we can't afford port security, every time people hear that we can't afford something that would enhance our security at home, understand that it is the war in Iraq that makes it impossible for this Nation to afford it.

□ 1630

If we did not have these hundreds of billions being drained there, we could take care of the agenda.

Finally, it constrains us elsewhere in the world. It has led to an increase in anti-Americanism which I deplore, with which I disagree, but it is a fact.

Our ability to deal with the potential Iranian nuclear weaponry is constrained by the fact that we are in Iraq. In fact, the Iranians have been among the major beneficiaries of what we have done in Iraq.

So you went into a war on the basis of two lies. You have handled it incompetently. We are now at the point, well, does that mean you pull out? And here is the point. You tell us on the one hand that there is great success. We have built a government, et cetera, et cetera. But also, you tell us simultaneously that if we withdrew American troops the house of cards falls. Well, which is it? Have you built a successful entity in Iraq? If you have, why can't we pull out? Why can't 28 million people in Iraq, with a couple of hundred thousand Iraqis under arms deal with 15 or 18,000 terrorists?

The fact is that this is a failed policy that gets worse every day.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Dr. WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, the President's plan, and our troops.

In recent days U.S. and Iraqi forces have dealt terrorists in Iraq a decisive blow. The brutal leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu al Zarqawi, responsible for untold deaths and inciting widespread unrest has met his end, and none too soon, thanks, mainly to our troops, courageous men and women in the field who got the job done.

And let us not forget, Ramzi Yousef, the man who plotted and attempted the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center that could have led then to tens of thousands of deaths, was an Iraqi intelligence agent.

And let us remember the great accomplishments of our troops in the field. For too long U.S. news media has focused only on the negative and has chosen only to report bad stories, stories of terrorist attacks. Indeed, for every story that reports heroism and accomplishment of our troops in the field, our American news media focuses 9 or 10 stories on terrorist attacks and the failings of our military. Where our military can accomplish great things over and over again, the American news media ignores it and instead looks for a negative story to report.

Well, I want to report on one good story, a great story that shows that we are getting the job done and the Iraqi people are with us. And indeed, this

was reported by our news media. 60 Minutes in March reported about our efforts in a town called Tal Afar. In 2005, al Qaeda ran the town of Tal Afar in Iraq. It is a great example of how our U.S. troops can get the job done. Prior to the U.S. victory there, al Qaeda had unleashed a reign of terror on Iraqis that defies adequate description. Decapitated heads were left in the streets to intimidate residents. Decapitated children were often left in the streets by terrorists to bait their parents to come in so they could kill them. Terrorists roamed the streets, kidnapping and publicly executing people.

For 3 days in 2005, U.S. troops led the successful assault on Tal Afar to liberate innocent men, women and children from their terrorist captors. Thanks to our brave soldiers, schools in Tal Afar are now open. And once terrified Iraqi citizens are now able to shop, travel the streets openly, go outside their homes.

And as 60 Minutes noted, some of our American soldiers involved in the liberation of that town now have throngs of Iraqi children follow them admiringly in the streets.

Mr. Speaker, Tal Afar is just one example of the great job we are doing there. There are many, many more. We need to stay the course, not cut and run.

I support the resolution.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I agree with most of what has been said.

I support the Murtha proposal for an immediate and orderly redeployment. There is one subject I would like to raise which has not been discussed very much here, however, and that is the role of the American oil barons who have contributed greatly to the colossal mess of the war in Iraq.

Our troops today are as good as they were when they were labeled the greatest generation and defeated Hitler. But in Iraq, today's counterparts of Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, the Colin Powells, the John Murthas, they were not allowed to take charge. Lust for control of the oil made the oil barons push everyone capable of carrying out a reasonable destruction of Saddam Hussein aside. This administration encouraged the oil barons to overrule the military professionals.

Lust for oil is still the problem. Seldom discussed in America, but very much on the minds of the people of Iraq. We cannot succeed as long as the ordinary Iraqi people see us as oil thieves responsible for the terror and their day-to-day misery.

We went into Iraq fighting fanatics, fighting Saddam Hussein and his oligarchy of brutal, decadent killers. No great crowds greeted our troops with flowers. But there is good reason to believe that the masses of citizens were hoping for some real improvements. But we guarded only the oil wells, while the water systems and the electricity grids collapsed.

As the people observed our preoccupation with oil, the insurgency began to grow. The leadership of the oil barons could not run a country, and they could not manage an occupation.

Oil revenues must be addressed in order to regain the confidence of the Iraqi masses. We need a transparent, open, full discussion of what are the arrangements that have been proposed, what is being proposed or what contracts are already in place.

Chevron, BP, Exxon, they are there. Contracts have been written. Is there a committee in this House or a subcommittee that knows what kinds of contracts have been written? What will the Iraqi people have left after these contracts are executed? They were executed before the government was in place.

Oil is the greatest resource that Iraq has, of course. They are number four among the nations of the world. To what degree is Halliburton going to control the revenues as their payment for reconstruction of some of the oil wells? To what degree are the foreign oil companies going to control revenue because of their arrangements for the pipelines and the shipping and retail outlets? What is going to happen to the oil? These are the questions that the Iraqi people are asking. Everybody in every section of the country wants to know how are the oil revenues going to be distributed? If I live in a province where there is no oil, will my area benefit?

These questions need to be answered honestly. Congress must seize the initiative from the American oil barons and demand justice for the Iraqi citizens. The oil belongs to them.

We must win their trust and separate the masses of the Iraqi people from the fanatical murderers. Follow the logic of the Murtha resolution. Give the people control of their oil revenues and get out of Iraq. We can do that when we have the trust of the Iraqi people.

When the Iraqi people have their own revenues, they can equip their own police forces. They can take charge of their government in a competent way. They don't need us, and they will be less likely to join hands with the insurgents and protect the fanatical murderers that have now found greater receptivity in the population than ever before.

Get out of the Iraq. Give the people control of their oil revenues.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the defense appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, especially after my recent visit, that progress is being made in Iraq. But much of that would be lost if we prematurely remove our troops before the Iraqi people are fully capable of governing and securing their own country.

Success in the global war on terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan is the defining challenge of our generation, whether some war opponents like it or not.

Bin Laden's deputy has declared Iraq to be the place for the greatest battle, where he hopes to expel the Americans and then spread the jihad wave to secular countries neighboring Iraq. Such statements reaffirm why withdrawing our troops would be a disaster for the future of Iraq.

Our own national security can actually embolden those who hate our way of life to further harm us. A premature withdrawal or premature deployment home would represent a clear defeat for American interests, not just in Iraq, but in the wider region around the globe. Terrorists everywhere would take heart at this serious blow to our credibility.

Frankly, if we were to abandon the Iraqis now, who in the world would openly assist us in the global war on terror? What country would allow our military to deploy and operate on its territory? Worse yet, who would dare to be seen as our partner, ally or friend?

As even the Washington Post said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in its lead editorial, Iraq's new democratic government deserves a chance to succeed. And yes, this is the time to support our brave young warfighters, who are truly doing the work of freedom, and not undercut their service and sacrifice.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I might offer that I am proudly a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus out of a duty and a sense of patriotism and love of my country. And so this is a very somber debate.

And I remind my colleagues of the very tense moments of the presentation of Secretary Powell before the United Nations. All of us were in a sense of awe, listening to the devastating evidence of why we should go to Iraq. So I come to this podium today with a very heavy heart because we are constrained, not Members of Congress, we are of no relevance, but the American people are constrained in not allowing a debate or dissent. That is what we are showing here today, that we can have no dissent, we can have no recognition that Democrats and others, we do have a plan.

And so, on the birthday of the Army, I want to salute the Army. Mr. MURTHA, I want to salute you for your service and your plan. And I want to salute all of the United States military. And might I say that our soldiers are doing their job. They have done their job. And out of doing their job, the casualties are some 19,000, and today, I am very sad to say that 2,500 of them are now dead.

And so I come with a heavy heart to suggest that there are myths that we need to overcome. And one of them is that there is something called ''cut and run.'' It is not ''cut and run.'' It is the opportunity of involvement, debate and patriotism, a belief that we can put forward a plan that the American people will believe in.

The Bush Iraq policy has harmed the United States military, and I might say that I am glad to stand with a retired Marine Lieutenant General, Gregory Newbold, who says, ''my sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with a casualness and a swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results.''

And so I come again to suggest that no, there is no ''cut and run.'' There is reality. A Pentagon commission study concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operation in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force.

We realize that the large and extended deployment of the National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. We realize that resources are being diverted and, therefore, we are not able to fight the global war on terror.

I don't want my friends to pigeonhole us. We want a debate and a plan to save lives, and we want a free, independent and democratic Iraq. That can happen with a new change, a new day, Democrats and others, who believe in leading this country to a new future.

I don't want the same old plan, and I am not ashamed of saying so. That is why I am here to open the doors to dissent, tell the American people to come marching into the United States Congress. Don't let us talk for you. You want redeployment. You want the troops out. You don't believe the Democrats believe in ''cut and run.'' You understand that the General, Lieutenant General, has said we are careful about this war. Come home.

Murtha plan, the Out of Iraq Caucus is proud of our patriotic stand.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I rise to speak on H.R. 861, a resolution which declares that the "United States will prevail in the Global War on Terrorism." I believe that it is the resolve of all Members of this House and of all Americans. But to prevail in the global war on terrorism, we must remain focused on the global war on terrorism, and not allow ourselves to be diverted or distracted.

Unfortunately, we have been distracted from waging a full-scale, all-out global war on terrorism by the President's fateful decision to go to war in Iraq. Before and after 9/11, Iraq was not a part of the global war on terror, much less the central front. It only became so when the President launched his ill-advised preemptive attack.

I am proud to be among the majority of House Democrats who voted against the Resolution Authorizing the Use of Military Force, AUMF, in 2002, which authorized the President to use military force to disarm Iraq of its alleged weapons of mass destruction, WMD. I voted against going to war in Iraq because I thought it a diversion from the important task facing the Nation and that was winning the global war on terror. History has shown that we were right. The ill-advised rush to war in Iraq has not only been a diversion from the war on terror but a strategic disaster of epic proportions. As Thomas Jefferson would say, to prove this let facts be submitted to a candid world.

(I) THE BUSH IRAQ POLICY HAS HARMED THE U.S. MILITARY

We just learned today the sad news that the 2,500th soldier has been killed in Iraq. More than 19,000 others have been wounded. The Bush administration's open-ended commitment of U.S. troops to Iraq has weakened the U.S. Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserves. The extended deployments in Iraq have eroded U.S. ground forces and overall military strength. A Pentagon-commissioned study concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operations in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force. So more than 3 years of a continuous deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq has:

Contributed to serious problems with recruitment, with the U.S. Army missing its recruitment targets last year;

Forced the Army to lower its standards for military recruits; and

Led to military equipment shortages that hamper the ability of U.S. ground forces to do their job in Iraq and around the world.

The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard's high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.

(1) War in Iraq has diverted resources and attention from other fronts in the fight against global terrorist networks.

The killing of Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi last week was a major success for U.S. troops, but it is not likely to diminish Iraq's insurgency. Iraqis make up 90 percent of Iraq's insurgency, unlike foreign fighters like Zarqawi, and a primary motivation for Iraq's insurgency is the U.S. troop presence. Even after the Samarra shrine attack in February threatened to push Iraq into all-out sectarian civil war, the vast majority of attacks still target U.S. forces.

Outside of Iraq, the Bush administration has failed to present a realistic strategy for countering the threat posed by the global terror networks. In a recent survey of more than 100 of America's leading foreign policy experts conducted by Foreign Policy magazine and the Center for American Progress, eight in 10—84 percent—do not think that the United States is winning the war on terror. The war in Iraq has not helped America win the broader fight against global terrorists. Instead:

By invading Iraq without a realistic plan to stabilize the country, thei Bush administration created a new terrorist haven where none had previously existed.

By maintaining an open-ended military presence in Iraq, the Bush administration is presenting U.S. terrorist enemies with a recruitment tool and rallying cry for organizing attacks against the U.S. and its allies.

According to the National Counter-Terrorism Center, the number of large-scale terrorist attacks in Iraq increased by over 100 between 2004 and 2005, with a total 8,299 civilians killed in 2005.

Osama bin Laden remains at large and Al Qaeda offshoots proliferate.

By diverting resources and attention from Afghanistan to an unnecessary war of choice in Iraq in 2003, the Bush administration has left Afghanistan exposed to a resurgence of the Taliban and Al Qaeda. The United States needs to complete the mission in Afghanistan and cannot do it with so many troops bogged down in Iraq.

By focusing so many U.S. resources on Iraq, the Bush administration has taken its eye off the ball in places like Somalia, which was overrun by Islamist militias tied to Al Qaeda last week.

(2) The War in Iraq has increased the burden on U.S. taxpayers without stabilizing Iraq or making Americans safer.

Over the last 3 years, the United States has spent more than $300 billion in Iraq, yet the investment has failed to stabilize Iraq or improve the overall quality of life for most Iraqis. According to the Congressional Research Service, total assistance to Iraq thus far is roughly equivalent to total assistance, adjusted for inflation, provided to Germany—and almost double that provided to Japan from 1946 to 1952. Yet on key metrics like oil production, Iraq has failed to advance beyond pre-war levels, and quality of life indicators remain dismal:

Oil production is below pre-war levels—2.6 million barrels per day in 2003 vs. 2.1 million barrels per day in May 2006;

The majority of water sector projects and health care clinics planned in 2003 remain not completed, despite spending hundreds of millions of dollars;

One in three Iraqi children is malnourished and underweight, according to the United Nations Children's Fund.

Rather than a record of progress and achievement, the Bush administration's record is one of corruption and waste:

$8.8 billion given to Iraqi ministries by the Coalition Provisional Authority, CPA, remains unaccounted for, according to the Congressional Research Service;

Iraqi Defense Ministry officials spent $1 billion on questionable arms purchases;

The Interior Ministry has at least 1,100 ghost employees, costing $1.3 million a month.

In short, we have no strategy, no support from allies or friends in the region, a nascent civil war in the country we are supposed to be helping, an overstretched military, a misdirected counterterrorism effort, and a massive diversion of funds in support of a failed effort.

(II) RESPONDING TO ADMINISTRATION MYTHS AND FANTASIES

The Bush administration and its rubberstamp Republican allies in the House have politicized national security in the past. They have used national security as a wedge issue to divide the country and push for policies that have not made Americans safer. But today a majority of Americans are now skeptical about the Bush administration's Iraq policy.

Myth 1: Democrats want to quit while we are ahead and the Iraqis are just getting started.

Conservatives argue that Democrats who criticize and offer alternatives are snatching defeat from the jaws of victory, retreating just as the Iraqi Government needs the most help.

Fact: The time has come for the United States to give Iraqis the incentive to stand on their own two feet and take control of their own affairs. In a few short months, the U.S. military involvement in Iraq will be longer than it took the United States to win World War II. The open-ended commitment of U.S. troops fuels as much as it retards the insurgency and civil conflict in Iraq. Nearly 9 in 10 Iraqis approve a time line for U.S. withdrawal, and 70 percent of the Iraqi public supports the withdrawal of U.S.-led forces by the end of 2007. A growing number of Iraqis, including the new prime minister, are saying that Americans must begin to leave.

U.S. troops have done their share. By getting rid of Saddam Hussein, they have given Iraqis an historic opportunity to take charge of their destiny.

By fostering the birth of the constitution and the holding of elections, they have assisted in the building of a new democracy. They have trained more than a quarter of a million Iraqi security forces. It would be self-defeating for the United States to want Iraq to succeed more than Iraqis do.

Myth 2: Democrats offer only ''cut and run'' and ''retreat and defeat.''

Facts: Belittling opponents will not divert attention from a failed policy. Staying the course and offering a vague and open-ended commitment of U.S. troops gives Iraqis a blank check and a veto of America's national security.

The future of Iraq cannot be more sacred to Americans than to Iraqis. Responsible redeployment offers Iraqis a chance to take responsibility for their political and security future after we have already aided in the creation of a new constitution, the staging of two elections, and the training of a quarter of a million security forces.

Myth 3: Democrats who raise questions and oppose the Bush Iraq policy are unpatriotic.

Over the past 3 years, the Bush administration has questioned the patriotism of its critics.

Facts: Our country's democratic system requires the active involvement of Congress on key policy questions—particularly at a time of war. The United States has a strong tradition of its Congress asking tough questions. During a time of war, including the hearings organized by Democratic Senators like Senator Harry Truman during World War II and Senator William Fulbright during Vietnam, even though the White House was controlled by Democrats.

It is the patriotic duty of Members of Congress to hold the executive branch accountable, especially during a time of war. Two prominent Vietnam war veterans, Republican CHUCK HAGEL and Democrat JOHN MURTHA, have recently argued that it is unpatriotic not to raise questions in a time of war. America suffers when Congress and the public are silent.

Myth 4: Democrats reject the Bush administration's efforts to advance freedom.

Facts: The Bush plan for Iraq is solidly grounded in a flawed view of combating terrorism, arguing that promoting a narrow vision of democracy will crowd out and defeat terrorists.

The United States must and should support real democratic transitions around the world. But the Bush administration's naive approach to democracy promotion—narrowly focused on elections—has failed by giving terrorist organizations an opening to seize the reins of power, as seen by the Hamas victory in the Palestinian elections earlier this year. Terrorists have been exploiting the Bush administration's flawed and narrow strategy focused on the most ostensible images of democracy, like purple fingers in elections.

Despite impressive gains in Iraq's political transition, the country remains in the very early and fragile stages of a long-term process of building a real democracy. Contrary to the rhetoric put forth by the Bush administration, Iraqis do not live in freedom, according to Freedom House, which measures trends in political rights and civil liberties over the past three decades. The rights of women and minorities are not protected; the rule of law is honored more in the breach than the observance; and political violence remains rampant. Despite much work left undone, the Bush administration has cut funding for programs to support freedom and democracy in Iraq this year.

Myth 5: Democrats who criticize the Bush policy hurt the morale of the troops.

The Bush administration and its conservative allies have said that offering criticisms and concrete policy alternatives on Iraq hurts the morale of U.S. troops.

Facts: There is no evidence that debate at home has any effect at all on the morale of troops. But other factors directly impact the lives of U.S. troops and morale—including going to war without the equipment and armor, not having a realistic strategy for Iraq and not taking care of the troops after they come home.

Not equipping the troops. When asked by a soldier in the field why U.S. troops did not have the right armor for their vehicles, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, ''As you know, you have to go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you want.'' Iraq was a war of choice, and the Bush administration had time to get ready.

Not taking care of the troops when they come home. The Bush administration has not developed policies to take care of the troops when they return from battle. Health care has proven inadequate, and wounded veterans have been hounded by debt collectors because of inefficiencies in the Pentagon's administrative systems.

Myth 6: Democrats who oppose the Bush Iraq policy are ignoring and not listening to the generals.

Facts: It is the Bush administration that has failed to listen to top U.S. generals before and during the invasion by not sending enough troops to stabilize the country. It is Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld who has constrained free expression in the military by firing or forcing out those who disagree.

Nonetheless, even the current commanding officers argue that the United States needs to take realistic steps to reduce its military presence to remove the fuel that fires the insurgency. For example, in October 2005, GEN John Abizaid, the commander of Central Command Forces, argued that the United States must reduce its ''military footprint'' in Iraq and the region as a means to create more stability, but President Bush has continued to stick with a ''stay the course'' message.

Myth 7: Democrats who criticize the Bush Iraq policy are helping the terrorists and giving them what they want.

The Bush administration has argued that questioning its plan emboldens America's terrorist enemies, an unconstitutional argument aimed solely at shutting off real debate at home. Harkening back to 2002, when Bush officials warned that people should ''watch what they say,'' President Bush and top officials in his administration have warned against ''irresponsible'' debate to limit and control democratic political debate at home, even while the Bush administration purports to advance democracy abroad.

Facts: Bush policies at Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib do more to undermine our place in the world than any words spoken by administration critics. The Bush administration policies that coerce rather than create cooperation through dialogue and common purpose undermine how others view us. A new poll by the Pew Research Center finds that America's image has slipped further, and global support has declined for the U.S.-led war on terrorism.

Myth 8: Democrats prefer a world with Saddam Hussein still in charge of Iraq.

Facts: Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator, and it is a good thing that he is no longer in power. But that is not the key question today. The key question is: Where is Iraq now, and where does it go from here? And the many mistakes made by the Bush administration—including sending in too few troops to secure the country and invading without a clear and realistic plan for Iraq's reconstruction—have made the situation in Iraq much worse off than it should have been.

Iraq has become a failing state and is suffering from several major internal conflicts—in large part the consequence of the Bush administration's failure to plan for the post-war situation. And moving forward requires Iraqis, not Americans, to be in charge of the future.

Myth 9: Democrats just want to criticize and politicize Iraq and do not have plans about what to do.

Facts: This is simply not true. A growing number of leading Democrats and other progressive leaders have offered sensible alternative visions about what the United States should do next to set the right course in Iraq. Nearly all progressive plans recognize that the United States must intensify its political and

diplomatic efforts in Iraq and that the commitment of U.S. troops to Iraq should not be permanent or open-ended.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I close by quoting from the Declaration of Independence and the motto of the U.S. Army, which marks its 231st anniversary today. It may seem odd to quote the two together. But I do so because real patriots have courage—courage to face the truth and the courage to speak truth even when it is unpopular. The Declaration of Independence, with its affirmation of the inalienable human rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness gave patriots the courage to fight for a cause that was just but at the time thought by most to be unattainable. A motto of the U.S. Army is ''We will not falter, we will not fail.''

The war in Iraq does not help us in the global war on terror. There are only two directions to take in Iraq: President Bush's plan of staying the course and letting a future President clean up the mess, or the Murtha plan to change the direction of that course. I stand with Representative MURTHA in calling for the redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq to make our country safer, our military stronger, and the region more stable. I support the Murtha plan. It is the only plan for success in Iraq that is worthy of the sacrifices made by our troops. And I support a plan for greater coalition support for Iraq as it moves to protecting itself as a soverign nation.

Our troops in Iraq have never faltered and they have never failed. They were never defeated in battle. They won the war they were sent to fight. They completed their mission. They performed magnificently. Well done. Well done. Well done.

Our troops have earned the right to return home and be reunited with their families and loved ones. Now is not the time for us in Congress to falter or fail. Now is the time to embrace a plan for our troops in Iraq that offers a chance of success. We need a plan that will work. There is only one such plan. It is the Murtha plan that allows for redeployment of our troops as soon as practicable and allows for redeployment of troops at the perimeter of Iraq to be used in time of crisis. This is a plan that will work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution. In my capacity as chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Health, I was fortunate enough to visit the American cemetery in Normandy, France that is located overlooking Omaha Beach. Our brave soldiers during World War II were in France not to fight the French, but to fight the Nazis that had occupied France.

Today our soldiers are not in Iraq and Afghanistan to fight the citizens of those countries, but we are there to fight the insurgents and the Taliban. In listening to the debate today, it reminded me of my visit and reading some of the names of the brave soldiers that fought for our Nation during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 9,300 patriots buried in Normandy today. Those brave souls fought in a war against the forces of evil then, just as our soldiers in Iraq are fighting against the forces of evil today.

□ 1645

What would have happened back then if America had pulled out of the World War II before the mission was accomplished? What kind of world would we be living in today?

As many of my colleagues have done, I have personally visited Iraq. I have seen the progress, and I have seen the good job that our brave men and women are doing for us and for the people of Iraq and Afghanistan. I was proud to sit down and share a meal with many soldiers from South Carolina's First District. And the question that many of our soldiers kept asking me was ''Why are none of the good stories making it back to the folks back home?''

Mr. Speaker, I think many of us today are trying to share some of the good stories and recognize all of the positive things that our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are doing for us.

The good news is that now women in Afghanistan are able to vote in democratic elections for the first time in their lives. The good news is that Iraqi citizens are now able to protest and let their opinions be heard in public.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I support the Murtha resolution.

This war of choice so far has cost us the lives of close to 2,500 American men and women, let alone tens of thousands of Iraqi lives, and has cost us $320 billion and has weakened the United States' prestige and brought our interests and our values into question to a degree not seen since the Berlin Wall divided Europe.

It is our failure here in Congress to perform our duty of oversight which has cost America most. From the beginning of the march to war, the President and his advisers blundered into failure after failure. False claims about African uranium and mobile anthrax labs. Unlikely claims of Saddam's leaks to al Qaeda. Stubbornly ignoring the advice of the uniformed military about troop levels. Turning a blind eye to the venal corruption that swallowed $9 billion of Iraqi money, U.N. Oil-for-Food money, without a trace. Shame on us.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers in their wisdom gave us a mechanism, a defense against tyranny called congressional oversight, and it is about time we start doing our duty to the American people by performing that oversight. While I welcome this debate, it is a poor substitute for what we really should have been doing.

I call upon you to withdraw this empty resolution, this meaningless, self-congratulatory, fraudulent scam and let us work together to examine our mistakes, fix them, and bring our troops home. Let Iraqis rebuild their own nation.

The President says we need to stay in Iraq until the mission is complete, but the President cannot explain to the American people exactly what the mission is, let alone tell us when he expects to complete it.

Let us take credit towards victory by sighting the completion of a democratic government in Iraq and killing the biggest terrorist there, claim these as a victory, and keep our word by honorably deploying our forces. Three and a half years is hardly cutting and running.

We all share the same dream that the Iraqi people do. We want them to live in peace in a secure and prosperous society where they are free to choose their government. But the presence of our troops and our occupation of Iraq has become such an obstacle to that future that we can no longer ignore reality. How can we win a war against terrorism when terrorism is a concept? You must change the hearts and the minds to succeed.

So let us work together to bring our courageous troops home and put an end to this devastating war of choice.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I would speak on this issue. I do support this resolution, but more than that, I would like to remind people why we are here.

There are not many in this room, but there are a few that remember 1939. I lived in that era and I listened to people speak about ''Hitler's really not a bad guy. He's just minding his own business. He's taking care of his people. We shouldn't be involved.'' Fifty-two million people later, we won World War II. We should have knocked him in the head when we had a chance instead of listening to Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of Britain. We should have aggressively pursued him as we did Saddam Hussein. In my heart of hearts, I believe that we would be, in fact, in a nuclear war if we had allowed him to continue his trek.

But this President stood up and he was a leader and he stopped it. Now we have done that deed and we are in a place where we should continue and finish this job.

Someone said this is not a cut and run, that we have been there 3½ years. But I ask you to ask your military people, ask those people out at Walter Reed, as I have. Most of them are proud of their service and their duty. And I salute each one of them, him or her,

and the commanding officers who fulfilled their duty.

If you believe in democracy and believe in peace, we must continue this trip that we started. We must finish it and make sure that democracy reigns in the Middle East. If we do not do so, we would a do a great disservice to our armed services and America as a whole. Remember, ''He's really not a bad guy. He's just minding his own business. It's his country.'' Fifty-two million people later, the war was ended. Our people, their people. And I do not want to have that happen again.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Representative SOLIS.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our troops and in opposition to the President's stay the course in Iraq.

The war in Iraq was under taken with too few troops, not enough of the right equipment, and no plan for peace. Without a plan to secure the peace, 2,500 servicemen and women have been killed, including 10 in my district: Private First Class Jose Casanova, Jr., age 23; Lance Corporal Manuel Ceniceros, age 23; Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores, age 21; Lance Corporal Benjamin Gonzalez, age 23; Corporal Jorge Gonzalez, age 20; Sergeant Atanacio Haromarin, age 27; Specialist Leroy Harris-Kelly III, age 20; Corporal Stephen Johnson, age 24; Corporal Rudy Salas, age 20; Marine Corporal Carlos Arellano, age 22.

I have celebrated their sacrifices and mourned their passing with their families: with their parents, with their spouses, and with their children.

Eighteen thousand four hundred and ninety servicemen and women have been injured during the war in Iraq, 8,501 so badly they will be permanently damaged from their injuries. I have visited with many of them at the Walter Reed Hospital.

And even with more veterans returning from Iraq, President Bush refuses to provide adequate funding for their health care. At a time when more than 17 percent of the troops returning from Iraq suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, this is the wrong course of action.

No one can question the commitment of our troops, especially our green card soldiers like Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores, who was granted posthumous citizenship but could not realize the beauty of our citizenship because he was not granted that before he died.

Since 9/11, 25,000 servicemembers have become U.S. citizens. Despite the commitment and sacrifices of thousands of green card soldiers and their families, many in this House are not willing to provide them with support because they lack documentation.

Mr. Speaker, amid the doubt and anger I have expressed about the war, I have never ever questioned the commitment of our troops to this Nation. They deserve a real plan to secure the peace so that they can be redeployed, and I wholeheartedly support the Murtha plan.

American taxpayers, Members, deserve accountability for the $17 billion in no-bid contracts for Halliburton and real measures to protect the homeland and our port security. The Bush administration has failed to fulfill its responsibilities to our troops, veterans, and all Americans. This resolution fails them.

It is a sad day when this resolution is the only thing that can be offered for our servicemen and women. Francisco Martinez Flores did not die in vain. He deserves the very best. The American people deserve a real debate.

Bring our troops home and no permanent bases in Iraq.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the families of East Texas, especially those with loved ones serving overseas, I strongly support this resolution.

Despite what the national media portray, the inconvenient truth is this: Terrorists have been attacking America freely for more than two decades. We should have learned we cannot push America's security forward by retreating from terrorism. We cannot strengthen the world by weakening our resolve, and we cannot support our troops by belittling them at every turn.

It is clear to all but perhaps us that the terrorists' strategy is not to defeat America in Iraq. They cannot do that. Their strategy is to defeat America in America. They are counting on the American public to lose its will and for Washington politicians to undermine the morale and support of our troops overseas.

The truth is if America quits, if America turns back now, no nation, no community will be safe from terrorism again. Terrorists will learn that they can wait us out one public opinion poll at a time. And the next time America is attacked, the next time innocent people die and we vow justice, who will believe us then? Who will support us then?

I stand with the President. We must persist in Iraq and Afghanistan until these nations are no longer safe havens for terrorism. We have ''taken the hill'' against the terrorists. Too many Americans have sacrificed their lives for us to give it back now. Americans like Chief Warrant Officer Chuck Fortenberry of Woodville, Lance Corporal Shane Goodman of Orange, Staff Sergeant Christopher Everett of Huntsville, Specialist Michael Weger of Spring, and Specialist Hoby Bradfield of The Woodlands, among many.

Our troops have proven they will not quit. The question is will we? Our troops know what is at stake. The question is do we?

Let us not snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Let us put aside our partisan politics and unite until terrorism is truly and soundly defeated.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding and for her leadership on a real strategy against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. It contains no plan, no solution, no way forward. I support the Murtha plan, which clearly aims to more strategically engage U.S. forces to redeploy and be ready.

Indeed, the invasion in Iraq has diverted our Nation from the war on terrorism and created a new terrorist training platform. Across the Middle East, Central Asia, Africa, and the Pacific, United States policy has engendered more hatred, yielding a counterreaction of more radicalism and protest.

In Egypt, the most populous Arab nation and a key ally in the Middle East and Africa, recent parliamentary elections yielded a quantum leap in representatives from the Muslim Brotherhood, a radical anti-Western party. This group now comprises 88 members of their parliament, up nearly 25 percent from 17 in the 2000 election.

In the Palestinian Authority, the peace process with Israel is dead. Rather than parties moving toward peace with Israel, we witness another tragic breakdown as Fatah and Hamas mass in the streets and Israelis and Palestinians shoot and kill with abandon.

Mogadishu, Somalia has just fallen into the hands of Muslim extremists. That failed state is another breeding ground for terrorism.

In Afghanistan more loss of life has resulted this year than at any time since the U.S.-led invasion and President Karzai remains a prisoner of circumstance, unable to move freely without heavily armed guards.

Mr. Speaker, we are not winning the war on terrorism. The situation in Iraq teeters on all-out civil war between the Sunnis and the Shiias.

□ 1700

To win the war on terrorism, the United States must use our military assets wisely, not just robustly. We must transfer policing to Iraqi forces and remove ourselves as a source of friction.

Secondly, we must decouple ourselves from the repressive oil dictatorships that create regional antagonisms there and become energy independent here at home.

And, thirdly, the Palestinian-Israeli standoff must be elbowed to the peace table, because it is a primary lightning rod for unrest across the region.

Our current presence in Iraq is counterproductive in the broader war on terrorism. Meanwhile, diplomatic channels are totally frozen by this administration. Unfortunately, this resolution offers no plan. It offers no solution. It offers no way forward.

This Congress should support the Murtha plan for our military forces, redeploy and be ready.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself the remainder of the time allocated to the Intelligence Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2½ minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the first 5 hours of this debate, trying to listen carefully to each speaker. And it seems to me that some people try, as best they can, to isolate Iraq from the rest of the war on terror.

Now, that may be politically convenient for them to do, but it is not what the real world is like. As a matter of fact, it was not long ago that we found a letter from Zawahari, Osama's number two, to Zarqawi in Iraq talking about tactics.

Just as the Cold War had several battles across the globe, the war on terrorism has several battlefields across the globe. And I believe that it is clear from their own words, the terrorists see Iraq as the central front in our war against them now and into the future.

Secondly, we seem to have a lot of armchair strategists who want to redeploy this way or redeploy that way, because they say nothing is going right. I would recommend they read the document found this morning, or released this morning, that was found in Zarqawi's house.

It says that things are going pretty well for us, and not so well for them. I think it is a little early to give up.

Thirdly, there are a lot of people who want to debate the procedures or debate Congress's job or debate past decisions. And it is true, history will have to pass judgment on decisions that the military commanders and the President and the Congress have made in the past. They will do so when the air of partisanship has faded.

But the truth is, however you feel about where we are, we are where we are. And the question is, do we leave a job half done? Do we leave early, and leave those Iraqis who are willing to put their lives on the line by being part of the government or part of the police force or part of the military, do we abandon them when they are trying to build a country? I think that would be a mistake.

In fact, I think to retreat at this point, whether you call it a strategic retreat, a strategic redeployment, or whatever word you want to use to back up now, will only embolden the terrorists. We have seen time after time, when they sense political vacillation, they strike. They struck in Istanbul in 2003, in Madrid in 2004, in London in 2005.

Where they sense weakness, it is like an animal. Where they sense fear, they attack. We have got to do better and make sure we win this war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, ground zero on the global war on terror is not, never was Iraq. It was Afghanistan; 9/11, it was planned in Afghanistan by Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda, with the complicit help of the Taliban.

In a near-unanimous vote on the floor of this House, we voted to go in there and root them out and end that threat once and forever. But something bad happened on the road to victory, and the eradication of the Taliban and al Qaeda, and the capture, dead or alive, dead or alive, of Osama bin Laden. Remember that.

We got mired in Iraq. And today the Taliban, al Qaeda, and Osama bin Laden are still at large and they are resurgent. I just saw 800 Oregonians off to Afghanistan. We need more troops there. We need to finish the job we abandoned to go into Iraq.

But 1,093 days ago, a complicit, compliant Republican-dominated Congress acceded to the Presidential demand to divert our energy into an unnecessary war in Iraq. I was one of the 60 percent of the Democrats to vote ''no.''

Here we are, 2,497 troops have died, 18,490 seriously wounded. We all honor those troops and do not question that. But we disagree, not on the noble service of the troops, but the competence of the leadership of President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and Secretary Rumsfeld in initiating an unnecessary war in Iraq and insisting on an open-ended, indefinite commitment of U.S. troops in the middle of a civil war.

The President has said, ''Bringing U.S. troops home from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents.'' That means after 2009. That is what George Bush is talking about. That is not acceptable.

At its core, this resolution says stay the course indefinitely. We should be debating a real policy on Iraq, not a nonbinding politically motivated resolution. We should be debating the Murtha resolution, a real plan.

As a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I resent the fact that we have here a meaningless, nonbinding Karl Rove-politically inspired resolution on the floor, not amendable, no substitutes allowed; and they call that a debate on the policy in Iraq.

They say they are honoring the troops. That is a dishonor to the people of America and those who serve us. And they talk about cut and run. We have won. Saddam Hussein, he is on trial. They have a Constitution. They have a government. They have succeeded. We have succeeded.

But they have a sectarian problem. They have been fighting for 1,400 years. And they are going to continue fighting. We need to negotiate a timetable with their legitimate government to get the U.S. troops redeployed, out of Iraq, to other hot spots and bring the remainder home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Middle East and Central Asia Subcommittee, I have traveled to Iraq, having led a delegation just this last January. And I met with officials again and received a wealth of congressional testimony here in DC. All confirmed that the U.S.-led liberation of the Iraqi people is having a positive reverberation throughout the broader Middle East.

Iraq is a catalyst for hope, a vivid example that the future of the broader Middle East belongs to freedom and democracy. To fully comprehend just how far Iraq has come with the assistance of U.S. and coalition forces, we must consider the horror that was Iraq under Saddam Hussein: chemical attacks resulting in scores of innocent deaths; a gruesome campaign to exterminate Iraqi Kurds; the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi refugees who fled Saddam's persecution; the deaths of 400,000 Iraqi children in his regime's final years killed by malnutrition and disease due to the failed policies of his regime; the use of rape and the beheading of women as tools of coercion and intimidation as part of their regime opposition.

Mr. Speaker, now let us consider what has been accomplished thus far since we removed Saddam Hussein from power. The progress achieved serves to honor all of our men and women as this chart shows. They have fought, and some have fallen for the fulfillment of our noble, our just, and our necessary mission in Iraq.

Some of the highlights of progress, Mr. Speaker: Iraqis participated in elections three times since 2005, with ever-increasing voter participation each time. The Iraqi press is free and it is growing. Iraqi women are playing an increasingly pivotal role in their society.

A market-based economy is being established as Iraq emerges from three decades of Saddam's neglect. Over 260,000 Iraqi police and security forces have been trained and have been equipped. Iraq now has a democratically elected government for the first time in its history that includes all ethnic groups.

We should therefore focus on what we need to do to help ensure a free and secure Iraq and not on how soon we can leave it, ignoring that it is in our national security interest to succeed there.

The jihadists are determined and they have declared Iraq to be the central front of their campaign of terror. Are we to waver in front of these challenges? Absolutely not. Terrorist mastermind al Zarqawi, now dead, acknowledged in a February 2004 letter to al Qaeda the threat that success in Iraq posed to the extremist effort.

He said, Our enemy is growing stronger by the day, by God, this is suffocation. One of Osama bin Laden's closest associates wrote about Iraq a couple of years ago. And he said, a far more dangerous threat is secularist democracy, because it drives Muslims to refuse to take part in jihad.

Mr. Speaker, this clearly demonstrates that our efforts in Iraq are serving long-term efforts of spreading democracy as an antidote to Islamic terrorism and extremism.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of President Ronald Reagan's words in his first inaugural address when he said, ''Above all we must realize that no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenal of the world is so formidable as the will and the moral courage of free men and women.''

Every day the Iraqi people are proving how true that statement is. We too must demonstrate the will to press ahead. Leaders from the Arab world have confided their views on how important it is for their own efforts to have the U.S. in Iraq. However, the best evidence that we are on the right path comes from those closest to me, including my stepson, Dougie, and his fiance, Lindsay, both marine officers, both who have served as fighter pilots in Iraq.

And I hear it from one of my subcommittee staffers, Matt Zweig, who is currently deployed in Iraq. Their unwavering belief that success in Iraq will make us safer at home confirms that our strategy is correct and that our goals are sound.

They remind me that we must heed the advice issued by Winston Churchill when he said, ''One ought never to turn one's back on a threatened danger and try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly and without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half.''

Mr. Speaker, we must not, we will not flinch in Iraq.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution because we should not be echoing the lies we have been fed to justify this cruel and deceitful war. We should not continue pretending that by fighting the war in Iraq we are advancing the war on terrorism.

Our intelligence tells us that only 7 to 8 percent of those we are fighting in Iraq are Islamic terrorists. The other 92 to 93 percent are fighting a war for power between contending religious groups.

There is no compelling reason to send our young people to die to determine how to divide the spoils between the Sunnis and the Shiites. We should be redeploying our resources to fight the real war on terrorism, going after Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, fighting jihadist ideas all over the Muslim world, getting the loose nuclear material out of the former Soviet Union before it is smuggled to al Qaeda to make nuclear weapons, screening all of the shipping containers before they enter our ports, and protecting our chemical and nuclear plants against sabotage that could kill tens of thousands of Americans.

But the Bush administration and this Congress will not vote the funds to fight the real war against terrorism. And every reason we were given for invading Iraq has been shown to be false. Weapons of mass destruction. Not there. Saddam Hussein working hand in glove with al Qaeda. Not true. And the more information that leaks out, the more apparent it becomes that these were not mistakes, but deliberate lies.

But does this Congress get to the bottom of this? Not this Republican Congress. This Republican Congress sees no evil, hears no evil, and speaks no evil when it comes to a war that has already killed 2,500 of our young men and women and promises to kill thousands more.

This Republican Congress asks no questions about what we can possibly achieve that can justify the continuing slaughter.

□ 1715

I ask you, if the President had gone to the American people and said, we must invade a country that poses no imminent threat to us, we must sacrifice thousands of lives in order to create a democratic government in Iraq, would we have agreed? I think not.

As the President now says to us that we should continue indefinitely to expend American blood and treasure to support one side in a sectarian civil war, a side, moreover, that is increasingly cozying up to the mullahs in Iran who do pose a threat to us, should Congress continue to consent? I think not. This Congress should agree with the Out of Iraq Caucus. We should say enough already. Enough with the lies and the deceit and the evasions. Enough with the useless bloodshed. We should ensure the Iraqi people that we desire no U.S. military bases in Iraq.

This Congress should adopt the Murtha resolution. We should adopt a swift timetable to redeploy our troops out of Iraq and bring them home and let the Iraqi oligarchs know they cannot depend on the United States forever.

It is our crucial moment in American history to concentrate our resources on the real threats that face us around the world and at home and put an end to this bloody, senseless and diversionary war.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. The gentlewoman has been a leader for freedom all around the globe, and this country should appreciate her for that.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to lead a bipartisan all-female Congressional delegation to Iraq. It was one of the most emotionally overwhelming experiences of my professional life. We met women of enormous courage and hope.

They told us that they want to work, they want to vote. They want to be a part of their society, a democratic society. But we also heard about what life was like before the coalition came. We heard about the treatment of women under Saddam Hussein and during torture, oppression, that most of us could not imagine.

We were told of the heart wrenching stories of husbands torn from their homes in the middle of the night by brutal, secret police, and the women left behind, usually with children, faced with the impossible burden of providing for their families in a society that doesn't even allow women to work. Some were raped, some were tortured, but that was before liberation.

The road to liberation has been a rocky one. But our troops are doing good work every day in Iraq. We saw soldiers building schools and hospitals, vaccinating hundreds of children. They coach soccer. They tutor. They make a difference. They risk their lives every day to protect the newly acquired rights of Iraqis, but especially the women.

If I were asked to give one good reason why we should stay in Iraq, I would tell you to stay. We need to stay for the women.

Well, I saw women of diverse ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic classes. They were empowering each other with education, with hope, with friendship, just like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. Another courageous woman I met, Nasreen Barwari, the Minister of Public Works, was later the target of an assassination attempt. Her crime, being an outspoken woman in a important position. Thankfully she survived, but her bodyguard was killed. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi of the Iraqi Governing Counsel, was not so lucky. She was tragically gunned down.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we stay in Iraq, one of the major reasons is to stay for the women.

Just over two years ago, I was privileged to lead a bipartisan, all-female congressional delegation to Iraq.

It was one of the most emotionally overwhelming experiences of my official life. We met women of enormous courage and hope. They told us they want to vote, to work, to be a part of the democratic process.

Some said they wanted to run for office and help create the laws that will build a new Iraq.

But we also heard about life before the coalition came.

We heard about the treatment of women under the Saddam regime—enduring torture and oppression that most of us could not imagine.

We were told heart-wrenching stories of husbands torn from their homes in the middle of the night by a brutal secret police.

The women left behind, usually with children, faced the impossible burden of providing for their families in a society that didn't allow women to work or remarry.

Some were themselves raped and tortured.

But that was before liberation.

The road since liberation has been a rocky one.

But our troops are doing good work every day in Iraq.

We saw the soldiers building schools and hospitals, vaccinating thousands of children, and putting an archaic infrastructure back in operation.

They coach soccer, they tutor—they make a difference! And they are risking their lives to protect the newly acquired rights of all Iraqis—but especially women.

If I were asked to give you one good reason why we should stay in Iraq, I would tell you we should stay for the women.

If we can make the values of a free society—the rule of law—work for the women of Iraq, we create the conditions for these new democratic values to take root and spread.

While there I saw women of diverse ethnicities, religions, and socio-economic classes empowering one another with education, hope and friendship—much like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.

In Mosul, we met with the Women's Social and Cultural Society. They had been meeting secretly, but now felt safe enough to be public and actually welcome our delegation.

These women, accompanied by their wide-eyed daughters, are creating a new Iraq as they promote social, political and educational equality for all Iraqis. But they're not alone.

One of my favorite stories of the trip was of two Iraqi women who arrived one day at a fountain in the town center of Hillah dressed in traditional Muslim women's clothes but with a decidedly non-traditional mission.

A courageous woman I met, Nasreen Barwari, the Minister of Public Works later was the target of an assassination attempt.

Her crime? Being an outspoken woman in an important public position. Thankfully, she survived, though her bodyguard was killed.

Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky.

She was tragically gunned down outside her home.

The dangers Iraqi women face can't be underestimated nor can the obstacles put in their path to liberation. But these women remain undaunted!

We also visited the police academy in Baghdad where 29 women were training to be the first female police officers ever in Iraq.

These wonderful women told us how excited they were to be learning skills to hold their first job. Many had barely been out of the home setting before. Their exuberance was infectious.

We also went to a residential area in Mosul to talk with a group of neighborhood women—some educated, but many not. We met in the crowded living room of one of the members. All the rooms were packed. The electricity was only on for half of our afternoon together. But that was more than they had had in years. The curiosity of the men on the street outside was so thick you could cut it with a knife.

The women's group had many questions for us.

''How do we find our voice?'' they asked. ''How do we organize other women to make an impact? How can we affect the direction of this country?''

They were asking the most fundamental and basic questions of civic involvement—how to construct the foundation of the democratic process. As we left, their children came forward with flowers for us.

I think it's fair to say that U.S. soldiers have liberated more women in the last 4 years than anyone or anything else in the last 20—maybe longer.

Still, changing 2,000 years of tradition isn't going to happen with stroke of a pen. It will take time and patience.

This is not the time for us to abandon these courageous women—not when they have come so far.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague, whose resolution I support, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution before us. Let us be clear from the outset that those who have opposed the Iraq war stand solidly and proudly in support of our troops and their families. To suggest that calling for the return home of our brave troops somehow denigrates their service and their sacrifice is absurd. We can best support our troops by bringing them home.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible numbers we have bandied about here are not mere statistics. Each one represents the tragic story of a ruined life and a shattered family, 2,500 troops dead, more than 18,000 wounded, many so grievously. The average tour for National Guard members has been 342 days, turning the lives of countless American families upside down.

The material cost of the Iraq war is about $320 billion. But you can never put a price on its toll in human suffering, nor can you realistically argue, Mr. Speaker, that the war in Iraq has made our country safer or advanced our effort to combat global terror.

Those that come to the floor and link Iraq to 9/11 are certainly wrong. They are factually wrong, because there remains no evidence that Saddam was involved in the al Qaeda attacks on our Nation, and they are morally wrong to invoke the memories of the victims of September 11th to justify this indefensible war of choice.

I am pleased that al Zarqawi is dead, but his death does not change the fact that Iraq has become a haven for terrorists and the best recruitment tool we could have handed our enemy. No, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this war are not soft on security. We believe strongly and passionately that keeping the troops in the middle of this increasingly bloody civil war only weakens our security.

It is a disgrace it has taken so long for Congress to spend a few hours of this day debating the Iraq war, but the American people will not be fooled. They recognize that a debate on a cynical and politically motivated resolution is no substitute for a thoughtful Iraq policy that advances our national interests and listens to the voices. Let us vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Transportation and HUD Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us. I want to convey a very simple message. We must stay the course. At this crucial point in our history, it is unacceptable to enact a policy of passivity, resignation or defeatism in the face of terror.

Some say that we should surrender and pull out. They may think that this will win them votes and that it is good politics, but it is terrible policy, devastating policy. It is essential that we continue to fight in Iraq so that the fight does not come into our backyards.

Make no mistake, we do not choose Iraq as a front line on the war on terror. Al Qaeda has done that. But we must have that fight over there so we don't have it back here.

Like many of my colleagues, I have visited Iraq and seen firsthand the revitalization of country. The men and women our Armed Forces are fighting terrorists who are trying to claim Iraq for their own. Without their valor and dedication, the progress made in Iraq would not be possible. It takes time, will, patience and perseverance to transition a country once ruled by a tyrannical despot.

Terrorists who seek to eliminate anyone who provides hope for the future have infested Iraq, but they will not succeed. The Iraqi people are committed to freeing their country from these fanatical invaders, and we are too. The Iraqi people's future is in their hands, and right now they want U.S. help.

Just this week, Iraqi army and police forces backed by U.S. troops launched Operation Forward together. This operation was created by Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki and his parliament, and it is their first major security action since a new government of national unity was sworn in on May 20.

Mr. Speaker, the resolve of the United States should never be questioned. The world must know that the United States finishes what it starts.

We will win the fight against global terrorism, including in Iraq.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and submit a statement for the RECORD in opposition to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in opposition to this resolution. As illustrated by the House Majority Leader's memo establishing this debate as ''a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats,'' the primary intent of this resolution is political—shifting attention from the real issues behind the slow progress in Iraq. In this election year, just 4 months shy from the polls, Republicans are using this resolution as a divisive strategy rather than holding a substantive debate on Iraq.

Today's debate, which should have been an opportunity for Members of Congress to have a serious discussion on the war and to pose tough questions to the Administration on Iraq, has regrettably become nothing more than a partisan ploy. While I do not hesitate to applaud certain aspects of the resolution honoring the sacrifices of our courageous soldiers who are risking their lives in Iraq, I cannot be supportive of capitalizing on these very sacrifices for political gain.

I also disagree with the dangerous analogy made in this resolution between Iraq and the Administration's ''war on terror'' policy. There is not, and never has been, any credible intelligence linking Iraq to 9/11 and Al Qaeda. Focusing the discussion on the war on terror and victories won, rather than on workable policies to bring our troops home, reduces this debate to no more than a justification for maintaining the Administration's status quo agenda in Iraq.

Seizing the political momentum after the killing of Zarqawi, Republicans are offering a resolution which does little more than tout recent ''impressive victories'' in Iraq. While the death of Zarqawi is reassuring, we must be careful not to pat ourselves on the back prematurely for another ''Mission Accomplished.'' Terrorist cells are still numerous and active, violence is still prevalent, and our brave men and women still continue to fight.

Although I voted against the initial resolution approving the war in Iraq, I have consistently voted to support our troops with much-needed armor and supplies. However, this should not be construed as favoring continued occupation. Today the Pentagon's report confirming the overall U.S. death toll at nearly 2,500, underscores the grave and violent situation that our troops face every day. I believe it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to devise a responsible exit strategy. We must ensure that we do not lose sight of our real end goal in this debate: to bring our troops back home as quickly as possible.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you, Mr. MURTHA, and the Out of Iraq Caucus.

The President will not bring an end to this war. He says it is a decision for the next President. But he is building permanent bases in Iraq, and he is determined to keep 50,000 troops in Iraq into the distant future.

This Congress may not bring an end to this war because the real power to end the war is in a cutoff of funds. Congress keeps appropriating funds in the name of the troops, and the troops will stay in Iraq instead of coming home. Only the American people can bring an end to this war as they brought an end to the Vietnam War. Let this be a time of stirring of civic soul.

It is a time for a reawakening of civic conscience. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, but there are WMDs in D.C. Lies are weapons of mass destruction. 2,500 soldiers dead. Over 10,000 Iraqis, innocent Iraqis have died. It is time for an end to our national sleepwalk to the graveyard of the Iraq war.

It is a time for truth, a time for clarity, a time for action, a time for teach-ins, for meet-ups, for marches, for rallies about the war to begin at college campuses, at churches, at labor halls, at libraries. It is time to gather in civic centers, in town halls, to discuss the truth about this war and to plan civic action to end it, time for the American people to exercise their first amendment right to stand up and speak out, time to redirect the policies of this country, time to learn and practice peaceful, nonviolent conflict resolution, time to believe in our capacity to evolve beyond war, to believe and act under the belief that war is not inevitable and peace is inevitable if we are ready to commit to the daily work of peace building everywhere.

The global war on terror has become a global war of error: attacking or threatening countries which did not attack us, bombing neighborhoods to save neighborhoods, committing atrocities in the name of stopping atrocities, losing our vision, losing our way in the world, sacrificing our children and their future, giving up their future resources for education, for health care, for housing, piling it all high on the altar of war and worshipping a false god of destruction.

When we begin these proceedings with this remembrance, Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, we are not talking about any nation. We are talking about a force which is above all of us. The world is not ours to conquer. There is no glory in the abuse of power. This President will not bring an end to this war after the Murtha resolution, this Congress may not bring an end to this war, but the American people certainly will bring an end to this war. They will do it in the streets, and they will do it at the ballot box, and the American people will become the Out of Iraq Caucus.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the subcommittee on State, Justice and Commerce appropriations.

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

Mr. WOLF. The war on terror and this whole thing began really in 1980 when our embassy was taken over in Iran and the bombing of the Marine barracks in 1983, Lebanon, embassy in 1983, USS *Cole*, Khobar Towers, Nairobi, Tanzania.

I have so much that I want to say. I will just say this. If we were to set a date, the Mujahedin would say we defeated the Russians in Afghanistan, we defeated America in Iraq and the jihad would take place all over this world. This would be a very, very dangerous thing to say.

So I rise in strong, strong support of this resolution and say we can and will win this war. I remember when I read the book by Whittaker Chambers. He was a witness. He said when I left the Communist Party, I believed I was leaving the winning side and joining the losing side. Whittaker Chambers was wrong because of people like Ronald Reagan. We must be resolute. I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 861 and to show my support for our troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan who are on the front lines in the global war on terrorism. I commend our forces for the recent actions in targeting Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the insurgent leader killed in an airstrike June 7. I also commend President Bush for his visit earlier this week to Iraq to meet with Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki and encourage the work of the new Iraqi government.

I share the deep concerns about the continuing violence in post-war Iraq, which is taking the lives of U.S. military personnel and civilians. I continue to pray for the protection of the men and women who are putting their lives on the line every day to help the Iraqi people as they build their own government, and also for their families here at home who continue to make tremendous sacrifices.

I recognize there were good and reasonable people on both sides of the decision to send U.S. armed forces to Iraq. But whether or not you agreed with that decision, we are there now and cannot just walk away. Too much is at stake. The success of our efforts in Iraq and the success of the Iraqi people in establishing their own government are critical to the overall war against terror and to the security of our country and the world.

Our efforts in Iraq, many believe, are an important campaign in the global war on terrorism. Our world is a dangerous place, and as we learned on September 11, 2001, terrorism is not something in a far away land. We did not seek this war. We were attacked on our own soil, and this war is a different kind than any our Nation has ever fought. But it is one we are fighting to make our own nation and the world more secure. It is critical that we remain resolute in this fight.

I believe a case can be made that the war on terrorism really began more than 20 years ago with the attacks against America at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. The bombing there in the spring of 1983 killed 63 and wounded 120. Later that year, 241 U.S. servicemen—220 Marines, 18 Navy members and three Army members—were killed when a truck bomb exploded at their barracks in Beirut. Those attacks were followed in 1993 by the first World Trade Center bombing in New York City, in 1996 by the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia, in 1998 by the U.S. embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, and in 2000 in the attack in Yemen on the USS *Cole*.

After the attacks on the two embassies in Africa in 1998, I became very concerned about the U.S. response to terrorism and authored the legislation creating the National Commission on Terrorism. On the cover of that report is a photo of the twin towers in New York on fire after the 1993 attack. The foreboding nature of that photo is now all too real as we relive the destruction of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001.

Late last summer I returned to Iraq for a third time. I have now visited all but the Kurdish areas in northern Iraq. With each successive trip, I have seen improvements—renovated schools, cleaner water systems, new Iraqi army constituted. I also have seen the continuing and serious security problems and other challenges facing a liberated Iraq, and I

have heard caution from varied sources about the potentially cataclysmic consequences of America withdrawing before our mission is complete. I had the opportunity to speak with our troops who are performing their duties with professionalism and dedication. They are positive about their mission and are doing an outstanding job in fulfilling it.

One interesting comment I heard on that trip is that we can't expect to rebuild Iraq on our timetable, but rather it must be on Iraq's timetable. Life—and timetables—in Iraq are not the same as in the United States. This is a very key point, and one the Bush administration needs to do a better job of explaining.

It also is important to remember that the United States had its share of growing pains. While our revolution was in 1776 it was 11 years before our forefathers began to draft a constitution and it wasn't ratified until 1789. Few remember that our constitution was debated in complete secrecy. Delegates knew that they would generate heated differences and did not want to advertise their own dissensions or put crippling arguments into the mouths of the opposition. We also had leaders like George Washington, Ben Franklin, George Mason and James Madison who had the benefit of understanding British history in addition to being exposed to the workings of the House of Commons. Democracy and an elected government is truly a foreign concept to the Iraqi people.

The Bush administration also needs to do a better job of explaining what the consequences of ''failing'' in Iraq would mean to the average person in Chantilly, VA, Topeka, KS, or Portland, OR. I repeatedly asked people I met during the trip—from generals, to State Department officials, to members of the Iraqi government—what they thought ''failure'' would mean. The responses were frightening.

I heard references to Somalia—think of the movie ''Black Hawk Down''—and the former Yugoslavia with all its ethnic cleansing. The images that flashed in my mind when I heard these countries were disturbing. I was in Somalia during the crisis in 1993. I traveled to Sarajevo and the Yugoslavia region several times in the early to mid-1990s where so many were killed. In fact, all the people I met with in Vukovar, Croatia, in 1991 were killed several months later and are now buried in mass graves.

Many speculated that civil war would break out in Iraq and even more foreign fighters from across the region would pour into Iraq in hopes of influencing the outcome. I was told almost all of the insurgents carrying out the suicide attacks are foreigners, most coming across the Syrian border from places like Syria, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Sudan and Afghanistan. I was told militias continue to fight each other on a regular basis in some parts of the country.

If our mission fails and civil war comes, the country would almost certainly break into three parts: the Kurds in the north, the Sunnis in central Iraq, and the Shias in the south. It is believed the Kurds would most likely be able to keep from being drawn into the fighting and govern themselves. In the central region of the Sunni Triangle, warring factions would fight for control and most agree that there would be sheer chaos. Iran's presence was felt in the south as it tried to influence the recent elections and if civil war were to break out, elements in Iran may well involve themselves in the south.

With civil war, almost everyone I asked said that Iraq would become a haven from which terrorist groups could launch attacks against the United States and other countries. No one has to be reminded of what happened on 9/11. Thirty people from my congressional district died that day among the 3,000 who perished.

Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups would like nothing more than to have a new ''base'' from which to operate, much like Afghanistan in the 1990s after the Soviets were defeated. There is no denying that the terrorists have designs on the United States and, as one officer told me, ''We must win the war so we don't fight the next war in America.''

Terrorists are doing everything in their power to prevent the United States and its coalition partners from being successful in Iraq. They believe time is on their side and that they can ''wait out'' the United States. They will do anything—including blowing themselves up in busy marketplaces—to disrupt our progress and turn the Iraqi people against us. They believe that the war being fought in Iraq is not a ''military'' war but rather a ''political'' war and American public opinion will dictate when the United States leaves, not military success.

There is a general belief among terrorism experts that the top priority of terrorists is to seek chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons. The video of two commercial airliners being flown into the World Trade Center is ingrained in every American's mind. I shudder to think what terrorists would do if they obtained a biological or chemical weapon.

Many I spoke with also said failure in Iraq could destabilize the entire Gulf region and possibly lead to the downfall of the governments of Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Failure also could have serious impact on the world's economy. Japan gets more than 75 percent of its oil from the region, Western Europe, 30 percent, and the United States, 22 percent. We saw what happened in the wake of Hurricane Katrina as consumers feared gas shortages. Failure in Iraq would make oil costs even higher and have a major negative impact throughout our entire economy.

Others said they believe the United States has a moral obligation to the people of Iraq to successfully complete what it started. They asked how the American public would feel if civil war were to break out and thousands upon thousands of innocent Iraqis were slaughtered in the subsequent fighting?

Finally, many believe the United States's credibility is at stake. In a piece in the Washington Post's Outlook section last September, Victor Davis Hanson, a military historian at Stanford University's Hoover Institution and the author of ''A War Like No Other,'' wrote:

> . . . If we fled precipitously, moderates in the Middle East could never again believe American assurances of support for reform and would have to retreat into the shadows—or find themselves at the mercy of fascist killers. Jihadists would swell their ranks as they hyped their defeat of the American infidels. Our forward strategy of hitting terrorists hard abroad would be discredited and replaced by a return to the pre–9/11 tactics of a few cruise missiles and writs. And loyal allies in Eastern Europe, the United Kingdom, Australia and Japan, along with new friends in India and the former Soviet republics, would find themselves leaderless in the global struggle against Islamic radicalism.

Failure cannot be an option in Iraq nor can creating an arbitrary deadline for pulling out U.S. troops. The ramifications on our country and other countries in the West would be huge. Our withdrawal must be event driven and not artificially tied to a calendar. Many I talked to said we must set conditions for victory, not dates for withdrawal.

The Bush administration needs to do a better job articulating just what is at stake and the potentially catastrophic consequences. No one believes we will lose the war on the ground in Iraq; it's here at home that there is a concern. I had one general officer say point blank that the ''center of gravity'' for our success in Iraq is the American public.

That said, I strongly believe that it would be of great value to have an independent review of ongoing operations in Iraq. I call this effort ''fresh eyes on the target'' and offered this suggestion following my latest trip to Iraq. On March 15, I was pleased to attend the announcement of the formation of the 10-member bipartisan Iraq Study Group, being led by former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, who co-chaired the 9/11 Commission. The members, as are their co-leaders, are among America's most honorable and venerable citizens: former CIA Director Robert Gates, former U.S. Attorney General Ed Meese, former Clinton adviser Vernon Jordan, former Clinton Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, former Defense Secretary William Perry, former Virginia Senator Chuck Robb, former Wyoming Senator Alan Simpson, and former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

The study group was launched in partnership with the United States Institute of Peace, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Center for the Study of the Presidency, and the Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University. Its mission is to undertake a bipartisan, forward-looking assessment of the current and prospective situation on the ground in Iraq, its impact on the surrounding region, and its consequences on U.S. interests and it will focus on political, military, security and reconstruction in Iraq. The group will travel to Iraq and report to the American people. I understand they will meet with President Bush this week.

It will assess what is working and what changes should be made in helping the Iraqi people to establish their own government and stop the terrorist insurgency which is continuing to foment the violence of the Saddam Hussein regime. One of the most critical jobs of this panel is to determine the ramifications of failure to accomplish our country's mission in Iraq and to explain that to the American people.

In the 1930s, the world failed to stand up to fascism. When we—with our allies—did stand up and fight, we defeated fascism. It also took some time for the world to stand up to communism. But when we did, we defeated communism. Now we face al Qaeda and its leader Osama bin Laden, who in his own words has said he will use chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons against us. We must continue the determined effort now that we have had in the wars over the years as we fight terrorism. Standing together, I believe we can defeat this threat to the freedoms and liberties and way of life we have fought to maintain for well over two centuries.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us, House Resolution 861, is an unfortunate farce. It is part of an extension of the political propaganda, which has come from the Republican Party in defense of their so-called war on terror. It is not the first example. We have had many others.

Some of the highest-ranking members of this administration have purposefully and intentionally misled this Congress and the American people by providing them with wrong information. We saw it right here in the House of Representatives when the President himself talked about how the British had learned that Iraq was importing enriched uranium from Niger.

He was told before he delivered that speech that there was no evidence that that was true. Yet he came here and said it and put the responsibility on Great Britain knowing that what he was saying was untrue. It is a criminal violation of Federal law, two criminal violations of Federal law to consciously, purposefully, intentionally, mislead the Congress, particularly when you are trying to obtain actions from the Congress which result from that purposeful and intentional misleading.

□ 1730

What has been the cost? So far, 2,500 American service men and women killed in Iraq. We hear today from the Republicans how they honor the servicemen, but they continue to have them killed, wounded, continue to have them suffer on the basis of false information, deceit and lies.

They claim that this is continuing the war on terror. Well, what happened to the real war on terror? We were attacked by the al Qaeda. The al Qaeda had nothing to do with Iraq. We know that to be the case. We know that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We know that to be the case.

Yet, after we went into Afghanistan, which was providing solace and security for the al Qaeda network, and chased Osama bin Laden up into the Tora Bora Mountains, the administration decided and the Defense Department decided that they were going to abandon the search. Why did they not pursue the person who was responsible for this attack?

Well, there is one logical answer to that question, and the answer is if they had found Osama bin Laden, the rationale for the attack on Iraq would disappear. That is why we need to get out. That is why we need to pass the Murtha resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, there are few certitudes in these complicated times. Anyone who was not conflicted in the original decision to invade Iraq or who does not see a downside to all courses of action today is not thinking. But I am hard pressed to believe anything except that the case for a steady, measured drawdown of troops in Iraq is compelling. The neocon desire to establish a semi-permanent presence in a divided Muslim country is foolhardy.

It is true that there are circumstances where it is better to fight over there than here at home. Afghanistan is a case in point. But we should not be so naive as to fail to recognize that there are also circumstances where fighting over there can increase the likelihood that conflict will spread to our shores. A decision to prolong unnecessarily our intervention in Iraq could be a case in point, as could a military confrontation with Iran.

There are tipping points in all struggles. The signs are evident that we are close today to a calamity if we do not recalibrate our policies. The irony is that our troops have lost no battles and shown great heroism, but Western occupation is intolerable for Muslims. It is also not the American way. The longer we stay, the greater the prospect that anarchistic acts will multiply and spread, perhaps to our shores.

The issue is no longer, as is so frequently asserted, the need to stay the course. It is to avoid overstaying our presence.

Sometimes it is harder to know how to end a war than to start one. Just as it is important to think through the ''why and how'' of committing troops to conflict, we must also think through the ''why and how'' of ending an engagement. Timing is a key element of both considerations.

For many Americans, including me, the war in Iraq has been difficult to justify. But all Americans, except perhaps a few who may be partisanly vindictive, should want as positive a result as possible, given the circumstances we now face. The decision to go to war may have been misguided and strategies involved in conducting it mistake-ridden; nonetheless there should be clarity of purpose in ending the conflict, with the goal neither to ''cut and run,'' nor simply to cut losses. At this junction of involvement we should define cogently our purposes and by so doing create a basis both for a viable future for Iraq and for a U.S. disengagement that respects the sacrifices of those who have served so valiantly in our armed forces and those of our coalition allies.

Americans understand that three rationales were given at successive stages for the war. The first involved Iraq's complicity in 9/11; the second was the imminent threat of Iraqi WMD; and the third was the desire to replace the despotic regime of Saddam Hussein with a free, democratic government. The first two arguments have proven frail. The third has some legitimacy, but to many of us it never seemed compelling, particularly in relation to the costs of the conflict.

In any regard, whether or not democracy provided a compelling rationale for starting the war, it offers the most appropriate rationale for ending it. If we do not prepare to leave Iraq on our terms, stating clearly that now that a Constitution has been adopted, elections held, and a government formed, we are prepared to proceed with a comprehensive and orderly drawdown of our troops, we will be viewed as an occupying power lacking credible motivations. When we eventually leave, the other side will claim they forced us out. That is why it is as critical to define the rationale for our disengagement as the reason for going to war. And democracy is the only rationale I know that can be used as a basis for ending our involvement in this conflict with any hope of suggesting a partial measure of success. The key is that we must control and be seen as controlling our own fate.

All Americans should be respectful of the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform. They have been placed in an untenable situation. If they had not been so heroic and in many cases so helpful in rebuilding neighborhoods and schools, the U.S. would face a far more difficult dilemma today.

But we have no choice except to assess whether Osama Bin Laden and his movement have not been given added momentum by our intervention in Iraq, and whether the ideologically advocated policy of establishing long-term bases or one of returning our troops home is likely to be the more effective strategy in prevailing in the world-wide war on terror.

Here, it should not be hard to understand that prolonged occupation of a country which encompasses an area of land where one of the world's oldest civilizations prospered is humiliating to a proud people and those elsewhere who share its great religion. It should also not be hard to understand that the neocon strategy of establishing a long-term military presence in Iraq with semi-permanent bases raises the risk of retaliatory terrorist attacks at home and abroad.

Indeed, according to the University of Chicago scholar, Robert Pape, in his definitive book on suicide bombers, Dying to Win, the principal reason anarchists choose to wrap themselves in explosives and kill innocent civilians is to register martyred objection to the occupation of countries or territories by the armed forces of Western or other Democratic governments. Suicide bombing, by implication, will exist as long as occupations continue.

In this regard, a note about al Qaeda is in order. Just as neither Iraq with its secular leanings nor any Iraqis were responsible for 9/11, so Saddam Hussein apparently considered Osama Bin Laden as much a rival as a soul brother. It is Western military intervention that has precipitated al Qaeda's rapid growth in Iraq and elsewhere, creating a ''cause celebre'' for its singularly malevolent actions. If American withdrawal policy comes to turn on the question of anarchy—i.e., troops can't be drawn down as long as IED attacks continue—we place ourselves in a catch-22 and, in effect, hand over decision-making discretion to those who wantonly kill. We allow the radical few to use our presence as the reason for their actions and at the same time cause our involvement to be held hostage to their villainy.

On the other hand, if we proceed with a turn-over of responsibilities to the new, freely elected Iraqi government, Sunni dissidents will confront a critical choice: to pursue the insurgency or join the political process. Pursuing the insurgency would be a risky gamble; if it fails, Sunnis may fall under Shiite domination

for years to come, and the demise of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi makes prospects of expanding influence through terrorist tactics less likely. Joining the political process, on the other hand, would guarantee Sunnis a role in governing the country.

Though the prudential and civilized choice may seem obvious to us, a continued American military presence in Iraq gives Sunni radicals a popular cause—ridding the country of the occupier—for rallying popular sentiment in Iraq and elsewhere and justifying continued violence. Announcing the commencement of an orderly drawdown of our troops, and trumpeting it widely, would rob radicals of this powerful cause, allowing moderate Sunnis to join the government and pursue sectarian interests through the constitutional process.

In the realm of policy timing can often be as important as substance. Just as Senator DIRKSEN once noted that a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon you're talking about real money, in foreign affairs a week here and a week there can soon add up to a policy dilemma.

It is possible, of course that civil strife will ensue when we withdraw, but this is just as likely to be the case in 2026 as 2006. In any regard, civil union is for the Iraqi people to manage. It's not for American troops to sustain. The authorization this Congress gave to the Executive to use force contemplated the clear prospect of military intervention in Iraq. It did not, however, contemplate prolonged occupation. If this is not understood by the Executive branch, the current overwhelming Iraqi polling sentiment favoring American troop withdrawal will be more than matched by shared American sentiment. And in a democracy no one can be a leader without followers.

The older I get, the more central I consider the human factor to be in international relations. Logic is never totally dominant. No one knows the exact origins of the seven deadly sins, but to the degree human nature is the least changed aspect of the human condition, it is relevant to today's debate to contrast two human foibles: avarice and pride. Let me suggest that avarice, the weakness of business classes, is fundamentally more pragmatic than pride, the weakness of politicians, and pride is fundamentally more dangerous than avarice.

For example, if a bookstore owner were to read two books and strongly prefer one to the other, he might inventory half a dozen of the one he prefers and one of the other. But if his customers buy the one he likes least, he will not reorder the one he likes. He will put it on the discount shelf and re-order the public's choice. His pride isn't hurt. In politics, on the other hand, the tendency is to avoid embarrassment, never acknowledge error. Mistakes are often repeated to avoid political inconsistency.

An anecdote comes to mind. In one of my early terms in Congress I was invited to the Library of Congress to a seminar Henry Kissinger was asked to give on the 1973 Paris Peace Accords. Before going, I perused one of his autobiographical tomes and was struck by a singular paragraph. In December 1968, Kissinger as the National Security Council Advisor-designate met with Richard Nixon, then the President-elect. They agreed, he wrote, that their policy would be to disengage from Vietnam. After Kissinger had delivered his lecture, I asked him about his pre-Presidency strategy talk with Nixon. Why, I inquired, didn't the Nixon administration immediately do what he said they had decided in December 1968, to do? Kissinger looked at me and responded: ''We meant with honor.'' I asked him if honor required escalation. ''Absolutely,'' he replied.

''Honor'' and ''pride'' do not have the same meaning. But in some circumstances they are clearly first cousins.

I mention this incident as a reflection of human nature and the psychology of decision-making. LBJ was too much of a Texan to reverse gear on his own policies; Nixon was too much a product of the Cold War to risk being perceived as less tough than his Democratic predecessor.

All wars evoke analogies to prior conflicts; Vietnam is on everyone's mind. My sense is that references to our Southeast Asian experience are somewhat oblique, but important to ponder. Of particular relevance is the advice of a former Vermont Senator, George Aiken, who suggested we just declare victory and get out of Vietnam. Aiken's advice was rooted in frustration, but wise as it was, represented more spin than reality. Given the strategies then in play, victory wasn't close at hand. Today, on the other hand, despite the escalation of world-wide violence and the precipitation of widespread mistrust of the United States, particularly in Muslim societies, the Administration can point to positive political change in Iraq. An Aiken approach might not be historically compelling, but it would have more currency now than when originally suggested.

In governance, judgment to be good must be timely. If we maintain a heavy presence much longer our president could find himself in a dilemma of the kind Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon came to know too well. Despite the overwhelming nature of our military capacities and the courageous commitment and sacrifice of our armed forces, well-intentioned policies can fail if they are inadequately justified, poorly executed, or pursued too long. The timing and explication of disengagement can be as consequential as the decision to intervene.

This is why clarity of purpose and flexibility of response are so crucial. Hasty withdrawal is problemsome; orderly, philosophically cogent decisions to wind down the military dimension of our presence in Iraq should, however, be our highest national interest priority.

It would be a mistake of historical proportions if respectful relations not only between America and the Moslem world but between America and its traditional allies were to rupture. We are obligated to see that they don't.

In a broader historical and philosophical context, the American intervention in Iraq underscores the need to probe the question of the limits of power of a superpower and the possible anomaly that there are liabilities of power, particularly for a superpower.

Does, for instance, overwhelming military might alone protect us from terrorism, or if wielded unwisely, does it escalate our vulnerability to terrorism?

Likewise, does overwhelming economic power ensure loyalty and buy friendship even from countries most indebted to the United States, or does it inspire resentment?

With each IED explosion and suicide bomb attack it becomes clearer that America and the world community are in a strategic pickle. In an era of anger, of divisions in the world based on economics, on color of skin, on ethnicity, on religious upbringing, on happenstance of family and place of birth, those who have causes—good and bad—have new globalized techniques of being heard and felt. Great leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King appealed to the higher angels of our nature and achieved revolutionary change with non-violence. More mendacious leaders like Adolf Hitler, Saddam Hussein and Osama Bin Laden have sought to impose their wills on others through appeals of hate and reliance on increasingly wanton instruments of oppression.

The policy question Americans must think through is whether great powers may be more effective with policies of restraint rather than intervention. Just as Gandhi and King led non-violent revolutions which have proved more lasting than the barbarism of Stalin and Pol Pot, maintenance and embellishment of the American model of governance may itself be more intrusively revolutionary in oppressed societies than interventionist policies.

Caution and restraint are better models for 21st Century statecraft than naïve adventurism.

With this admonition in mind, it is critical that Members of the Executive Branch must understand that how and what they say to justify various policies determines how others respond.

Anyone who ever studied physics may recall that Sir Isaac Newton set forth three fundamental laws, the second of which was that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. A decade ago when the Congress was led by an extraordinary upstart whose first name was Newt, I suggested, at first as a pun, the existence of a fourth ''Newt-onian'' law, this one of social physics: reaction is greater than action. My thoughts at the time related to the partisan bickering within Congress. But with the passage of time I have come to the conclusion that international slights have graver consequences than domestic.

When, for instance, we use words like ''evil,'' reference events like the Crusades, and employ tactics designed expressly to ''shock and awe,'' should we not expect others to think and respond in like or escalated terms, although the methods employed might in the current vogue be described as asymmetric?

This brings me to several broad precepts, one of which is seemingly trite, and others of which are intended to form a theoretical and practical framework for a recalibrated foreign policy.

First, the trite. Every society has a sage who cautions that wise leaders should put themselves in the shoes of their adversaries before reaching self-centered judgments. The profoundest illustration of this comes from literature rather than Clausewitz or Tsun Tsu.

When speaking to constituents of the rationale for and against the Iraq War, I have over the past couple of years referenced a set of books that provides more geo-political wisdom than balance of power strategists: the Alexandria Quartet by Lawrence Durrell.

Set in inter-war Egypt, each of Durrell's four books chronicles the same series of events through the eyes of a different participant. While the events repeat, the stories are profoundly different. The implicit moral is that one set of eyes, one set of interactions, is insufficient to gain a full grasp of what is happening around us. Likewise, in world politics one

country's perspective is not enough. The views of others matter. If we are to manage prudently the affairs of state, we have to use more than just our own eyes, rely on more than just our own experience, and reference more than our own historical circumstance.

The Muslim experience, for instance, gives substantially less weight than the Western experience to the two cataclysmic wars of the 20th century. Despite Lawrence's involvement in Arabia and the battles between Allied forces and Rommel's tanks, the engagements in the Middle East and North Africa were skirmishes compared with the struggles in Europe and the Far East. Not only do Muslims see the 20th century differently from Westerners, but Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of common experience to current challenges in the Middle East.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, historians and political strategists in Europe rightly concluded that the European alliance system had been too rigid and the assassination of a relatively minor figure, an archduke, should not have precipitated a war of such devastating consequences. Hence European leaders in the 1930's falsely concluded that historical wisdom necessitated initial accommodation with Hitler's adventurism. Too little flexibility caused one war; too little spine led to Munich. In the current context, President Bush sees himself as Churchill rather than Chamberlain, but Europeans see 9/11 as more analogous to the shots fired at Archduke Ferdinand than as a cause for a doctrine of preemption or war with Iraq, a war that could too easily spring into a clash of civilizations.

If we're ever going to have a chance to shape or deter the actions of others, we must understand their reasoning. Failing to understand or respect Muslim culture, for instance, resulted in the greatest intelligence failure of our era. It is, however, not the sole intelligence failure. In one of the greatest judgmental errors of our time, we appear to have attempted to combat the ideological posturing of others by ideologizing our own intelligence. Based on what is known today, policymakers wrongly implied Iraq played a role in the 9/11 attack and not only erred in assessing Saddam Hussein's WMD capacities but put too much faith in a narrow cadre of policymakers who suggested the United States would be welcomed as a liberating rather than conquering or, worse yet, colonizing force in Iraq. Estimates of the costs of war, of the ramifications of our involvement, of the expected reaction of the population and of the likelihood of foreign respect and support were dead wrong.

Now, given the anarchy that has mushroomed in the country, Washington is swept by occupation analogies of World War II. Japan and Germany, it is noted, were occupied for more than five years after hostilities ceased. Hence, many are suggesting, we must be prepared to stay at least this long in Iraq.

I have seldom been more apprehensive about an historical analogy. Japan and Germany were the instigators of war; their citizens understood this. The Muslim population throughout the world does not see it this way. They see the U.S. as the aggressor. Images from Al-Jazeera portray a country under siege. In the Moslem world Iraq looks more like a police-cordoned West Bank than a great and ancient society on the move to a better life. Outsiders are viewed as unwanted intruders acting out of great power self-interest, disrespectful of the culture and values of the country being occupied.

Yet if we take the most difficult geo-strategic issues of the day, it is impressive how we seem to misunderstand the fundamentals of human nature. Publics in many parts of the world are crying out for two aspirations: respect and hope. But our policy response is an entirely parochial one, rooted in the so-called doctrine of American Exceptionalism, which neo-cons do not define as refining a shining City on a Hill but as the right of a superpower to place itself above the legal and institutional restraints applied to others.

In the Neo-con world, values are synonymous with power. The implicit assumption is that American security can be bought and managed alone, without allies, without consideration of contrasting international views or the effect of our policies on others. Treaties like a Comprehensive Test Ban, which every President since Eisenhower has propounded, have been rejected, as have negotiations to strengthen the verification provisions of the Biological Weapons Convention.

Legitimacy is critical for all countries. There may be times and circumstances in which the U.S. national interest requires action without the support of our allies or without United Nations sanction. But the U.N., in particular, is ignored at great risk, especially when the international community is largely at odds with American policies. In this context, recent rhetorical attacks by ideologues in and out of government on the U.N. and other multilateral institutions would appear to particularly ill-serve the American national interest.

The diplomatic issue our government has to come to grips with today is the problem of sequencing. Which comes first—the chicken or the egg—is the most cheerful and abstract philosophical discussion Americans engage in. But which precedes the other—talk or war—is neither cheerful nor abstract. Experience would seem to indicate that while war may not be averted by negotiations, it is less likely to break out if direct dialogue occurs beforehand. In adversarial situations pacific results can seldom be achieved without human interaction. That is why our founders clearly contemplated that the new American Republic would have diplomatic relations with undemocratic states. It is why Prime Minister Rabin, when faulted for talking to Arafat, noted that you don't make peace with friends.

There are few examples in history where empty chair diplomacy has proved effective. Indeed, it is next to impossible to reach mutual accommodation if there is not mutual understanding and a modicum of trust and respect which only personal relationships can provide.

The sequencing dilemma is particularly evident with regard to Iran. Not only should we not fear to negotiate, we must understand that as the stronger party, we can afford to put on the table steps, particularly related to process, that weaker parties are less able to initiate without seeming to capitulate. Unfortunately, we have over a number of Administrations chosen to isolate rather than engage Iran. The question is whether isolationist policies drive a proud people to greater extremes. A stigmatic refusal to interact has characterized our policy toward Iran for a generation and, just as haplessly, Cuba for two.

Some of us have fretted for a long time that a more forthcoming U.S. diplomatic approach might have produced a more stable Persian Gulf. Five years ago Senator SPECTER and I invited to Capitol Hill the Iranian Ambassador to the U.N. In a long meeting over dinner in a small room on the Senate side of the Capitol, I indicated that while many of us would like to see more direct contact between the U.S. and Iran, normalization of relations was inconceivable unless Iran ceased supporting Hamas and Hezbollah. The ambassador responded with frankness. He chillingly acknowledged Iranian support of Hezbollah but then asserted that such support would cease the moment a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians was reached in a framework acceptable to the Palestinians.

The slight hope implicit in this position may or may not have reflected Tehran's real position at the time, but it is apparent that Ahmedinajad is far more radical today than Khatami was yesterday. While neither has nor had the power of the Ayatollahs, the hardening of Iranian public attitudes toward us and Israel makes questions about the effectiveness of our strategic and psychological isolation of Iran important to ponder.

Last week the administration suggested a possible policy shift. We indicated a willingness to join the Europeans in talks with Iran if Iran first agrees to freeze uranium enrichment activities. This approach might presage a nuanced new American flexibility. But much depends on the Iranian response. Our position appears to be that we will proceed with sanctions and contemplate sterner actions if Iran does not capitulate on the uranium issue, but we will not talk to the government unless it first acquiesces. In other words, the goal of negotiations must be achieved before we will negotiate. Conditional approaches like this are needlessly ''high wire''; nevertheless, in contrast with prior diplomatic intransigence they may represent the best hope yet of yielding a conflict-averting break-through on the NPT issue.

Yet policymakers in Washington appear to underestimate a series of strategic phenomena. Hezbollah is far larger, more sophisticated and experienced in terrorist undertakings than Al Qaeda. A preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities would unleash a level of anarchy in world affairs that would be unprecedented. It would slow but not stop its ability to develop nuclear weapons. It would have little effect on Iran's ability to obtain such weapons elsewhere. The ''loose nuke'' phenomenon is real. A rich country has as good a chance to purchase or steal weapons of mass destruction as it does to develop them on its own. And if that country is attacked as part of an effort to block nuclear development, it has to be assumed it will have new incentives to seek and use such weapons. This prospect could presumably be heightened if bunker busting bombs tipped with small nuclear warheads are employed.

The U.S. thus faces a double catch-22: embargoing Iran hurts our economy more than theirs and attacking militarily the Iranian infrastructure ensures immediate asymmetric violent responses as well as the greater likelihood that weapons of mass destruction once obtained will be used against us and our allies at a later point.

This brings us to the last underestimation by Washington. We may be considering a conflict

of a few weeks duration—one to three weeks of intensive bombing. The Iranians may be thinking of a multi-decade or multi-century response. Western history has known a 30-year war. Eastern peoples carry in their hearts the burden of centuries of crusades, and many Islamic radicals today would like the 21st century to be a continuation of what they consider to be a struggle against Judeo-Christian intervention. Sequencing is a historical as well as diplomatic term of concern.

The Iranians, too, are in a quandary. They recognize that no American President can take the force option completely off the table. They suspect DOD has made extensive contingency plans and they see a President who has little hesitancy to take difficult, unpopular decisions. They know he is in his last term and does not want to pass on strategic problems to his successor. They may reason that a U.S. decision to attack is irrational because it would solidify a radical reaction in Iran, in other Muslim countries, and perhaps even within the U.S., but the government of Iran cannot be certain that the President will conclude that he would be passing on a bigger mess if he attacked rather than engaged.

The Iranian challenge is stickier than many Americans assume. The President may see himself in a position analogous to that of John Kennedy in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Kennedy was dealing with Khrushchev and a Soviet system that had many despotic dimensions. But while communism was manipulated in such a manner as to become a quasi-state religion, it is fundamentally about political and economic rather than spiritual relationships. Iran, on the other hand, is a theocracy in a region where religion and, too frequently, its perversion are dominant themes. Just as the Iranian government must understand the strong will of the President, Washington has to come to grips with the pride and principles of an adversary which is the inheritor of one of the oldest civilizations on earth. Each side may understand the consequences of individual actions, but that does not mean that decisions in one or the other country will not unfold domino-like in a manner that could be catastrophic for all. That is why human interrelationship—diplomacy—is so key.

Let me suggest a corollary to Lord Acton's maxim that power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. The Leach corollary is that military power tempts and excessive power tends to tempt excessively. America's enormous military strength is critical at this stage in history. But while we are obligated to recognize that its maintenance is imperative, we must also realize that its utilization may not fit, and may indeed be counterproductive, in certain strategic settings.

Analogies between all wars exist, but comparisons between Iraq and Vietnam are frail. What must be understood is not that Iraq could be as bad as Vietnam; rather, that it is becoming far worse. Vietnam, after all, involved no WMD issues; and while the North was predominantly Buddhist and the South Catholic, there were no implications of a world-wide religious struggle; nor of a conflict that might last many decades, if not centuries. The issue at the time was Communism and fears that if Vietnam fell, neighboring governments would topple like dominoes. In retrospect, the real domino lesson of Vietnam was about political decision-making. Once the patriotic flag was raised, stands taken, words uttered, one doubtful decision precipitated another, and the pride of politicians did not allow a change of course until the people demanded common-sense reconsideration.

Interestingly, in the 19th century, two obscure Italian political theorists, Vito and Pareto, noted that for all the differences in political systems, one person alone at the top had the power to make critical decisions for a nation. While these decisions might be of a social magnitude, they are personal in the making.

Our Founders were moral as well as political thinkers. They feared kingly powers and wanted shared decision-making, especially when it came to war. But as we all have come to understand, modern times have produced wars without formal declarations approved by Congress. In response to Vietnam, Congress fashioned the War Powers Act to establish new constraints on the Executive. While most Constitutional scholars are convinced the Act would be declared unconstitutional if it were ever tested, it stands today as the law of the land. What is often overlooked, however, is that the Act also empowers the Executive wide-ranging options to commit American forces for a period of several months. Hence, there is little doubt that the administration assumes it has no need to come to Congress if it decides to launch an air assault on Iran, as long as it is only of multi-week duration.

Let me conclude with an observation about priorities, contrasts, and principles.

First, priorities. The Iraqi war has had the unfortunate effect of decreasing American attention on both Afghanistan and the Israeli-Palestinian dilemma, both of which have extraordinary consequences for U.S. national security. In addition, while I have assumed for most of my adult life that war and peace is the biggest issue in the world, the bigger challenge to life itself may be disease control. We have lost nearly 2,500 American troops in Iraq and 20 to 40 times as many Iraqis have been killed. But over the past two decades more than 20 million people have died of AIDS, and this number will double or triple in the next decade or two. Likewise, a new flu epidemic might match or exceed these numbers. Yet we are spending less on these problems than the cost of one month's fighting in Iraq.

Second, contrasts. Educated Americans are well aware of the ideas that Samuel Huntington and Joe Nye of Harvard have propounded about the dangers of a clash of civilizations and of the importance of soft as contrasted with hard power in diplomacy. These are important frameworks of thought for the American public to dwell upon. But I would add to those considerations the elements of individual judgment and the contrasting model of realism vs. pseudo-realism in policymaking. Realists look to effect, not to appearance. But Washington today has come under the sway of the grim neo-con notion that diplomacy, particularly multi-lateral diplomacy, is soft-headed. Is this not pseudo-realism? What is more realistic and more consistent with the American heritage than attempting to advance the rule of law? An earlier excess of pseudo-realism caused the Senate to reject Wilsonian idealism and ignore the League of Nations. Nevertheless, it approved U.S. participation in the World Court. Americans want law and order. Americans also prefer to work in alliances. It is neo-con nonsense, realism inverted, to press a foreign policy rooted in snubbing the concerns of others.

One of the myths of our time is that realism is principally about might. Actually, realism is about the human condition. A great power must maintain a strong military capacity, but it is the human condition that must be improved if national security is truly to be secured. Impoverished nations are breeding grounds for radicalism. Where there is no hope, there is nothing to lose. When life, as Hobbs described, becomes nasty, brutish, and short in a jungle of hopelessness, and humiliation, it becomes easily expendable, sometimes by martyred self-choice.

Finally, a note about principle. Never has it been more important to return to the basics. Whether it be tax policy or foreign policy, the concern must be for justice and the common good, what the 19th century British utilitarians described as concern for the greatest good of the greatest number.

The public wants its leaders to unify and uplift. Elections are about whether political leadership is up to the task. Democracies provide continual verdicts. This fall will be one measure.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank all the members of the Out of Iraq Caucus who have spoken so eloquently this afternoon.

I rise in opposition to H. Res. 861 and in support of Representative MURTHA's proposal to redeploy our troops.

Since this war began, we have seen nearly 2,500 casualties. This number does not include the nearly 20,000 who have been wounded. I would like to take a moment to talk about the significance of those casualties and wounded because I often feel that we gloss over those numbers and forget that each one is or was an actual person. They were somebody's son or daughter, somebody's mother or father, somebody's brother or sister.

They are real people, as real as 19-year-old Private Brandon Sloan and First Sergeant Robert Dowdy, who were the first soldiers from my congressional district to become casualties in the 507th Maintenance Group incident. They are as real as the 325th Marine Regiment of Brookpark, Ohio, who suffered multiple casualties. I attended those funerals and those memorials.

They are as real as Sergeant Shurvon Phillip, an East Cleveland resident and Shaw High School graduate, who recently returned to Cleveland after suffering serious injuries in Iraq and enduring weeks of recovery. Shurvon is now paralyzed, and because of a brain injury, he cannot talk. We welcomed him home last Saturday at the Louis Stokes VA Medical Center.

Shurvon's mother, Gail, had this to say: ''That JACK MURTHA, he came to see my son three times and each time he treated Shurvon as his own son.'' Shurvon's mother, Gail Ulerie, had this to say about President Bush when he came to see him to give the Purple Heart to her son while he has at Bethesda Naval Hospital: ''I am glad for

my son to receive a Purple Heart, but he was in no condition to appreciate it. He was in bad shape. I also said some things to President Bush that he, President Bush, did not like. I basically told him he should end this war and bring our troops, like my son, back home. He did not answer, just walked away.''

I say we should not walk away from the young men and women who are left over in Iraq and Afghanistan. We should remember what Shurvon's mother said. Bring our troops home. Bring our troops home. Bring our troops home. She said she did not want to see any more young men or women laying back like this, and if you saw Shurvon you would know what I meant. He is in a chair, where he is sat up like this. His lips are swollen, sticking out. He can hardly say a word. We are saying to him, you know, Shurvon, we are sorry you are a casualty; you stood up for your family; you stood up for the United States of America. But he cannot stand up for himself.

Let us stand up for the young men and women of America. Bring our troops home, redeploy them, and let us think of America first.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, of our International Relations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of U.S. forces have performed their mission in an exemplary, professional fashion and deserve both our praise and profound thanks.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Iraq remains a dangerous place today because hate-filled fanatic, perhaps even psychotic, mass murderers bomb and shoot innocent men, women, and children. The terrorists have a morbid fascination with all things violent. There is nothing whatsoever benign or noble or praiseworthy about these people. They are mass murderers.

If left unchecked, the terrorists would impose dictatorship once again on Iraq and Afghanistan, which would result in more mass killings, systematic torture, rampant fear, political prisoners, and an end to freedom and liberty.

While I respect the right of those who criticize our Iraq policy and our solidarity with the Iraqi people, I do remain deeply disappointed that those who protest U.S. policy outside of this Chamber seldom, if ever, criticize the terrorists. No harsh, mocking words of condemnation of George W. Bush is left unspoken. You hear it on TV, talk shows, and at war protests; but no such righteous anger is directed at the mass murderers who blow up our soldiers or incinerate pious worshippers in prayer or kidnap, torture and kill humanitarian workers.

American coalition soldiers in Iraq are peacemakers who have the toughest job in the world. They are peacemakers who put their own lives at risk to create sufficient space and order so that democracy and respect for human rights can grow and peace can be established.

I want our soldiers to come home and to come home soon, but that fervent hope must be tempered with reality on the ground and what our commanders on the ground think best. To leave prematurely or pursuant to an arbitrarily arrived at deadline established by Members of Congress may unwittingly put more lives at risk and strengthen the fanaticism and hope of the terrorists.

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

The Hyde resolution honors—and profoundly thanks—all those American, Iraqi, Afghan, and coalition forces who have so courageously fought the war on terror, especially those who have lost their lives in the defense of freedom.

Our war dead—and wounded—define anew what it means to be brave and honorable and good.

And our condolences and prayers go to the families of the fallen.

The overwhelming majority of U.S. forces have performed their missions in an exemplary, professional fashion—and deserve both our praise and profound thanks.

We all know that Iraq remains a dangerous place today because hate-filled, fanatic—perhaps even psychotic—mass murderers bomb and shoot innocent men, women, and children. In the past their thugs were in the government suites and Hussein's opulent palaces—now some remain in the streets—hopefully not for long.

The terrorists have a morbid fascination with all things violent. There is nothing whatsoever benign or noble or praiseworthy about these people.

They are mass murderers.

If left unchecked, the terrorists would impose dictatorship once again on Iraq and Afghanistan, which would result in more mass killing, systematic torture, rampant fear, political prisoners and an end to freedom and liberty.

While I respect the right of those who criticize American policy and our solidarity with the Iraqi people, I remain deeply disappointed that many of those who protest U.S. policy outside of this chamber seldom—if ever—criticize the terrorists.

No harsh, mocking thoughts of condemnation of President George W. Bush are left unspoken. You hear it on TV and radio talk shows and at war protests, but no such angst is directed at the mass murderers who blow up our soldiers or incinerate pious worshipers at prayer in Mosques or who kidnap, torture, and kill humanitarian workers trying to save and enhance the lives of the vulnerable.

American and coalition soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are peacemakers and they have the toughest assignment in the world. They are peacemakers who put their own lives at risk to create sufficient space and order so that democracy, respect for human rights, and peace can be established and grow.

I want our soldiers to come home—and soon.

But that fervent hope must be tempered with realities on the ground. What do our military commanders on the ground think? To leave prematurely or pursuant to an arbitrarily arrived at deadline established by members of Congress may unwittingly put more lives at risk and strengthen the fanaticism and hopes of the terrorists.

Still, public debate on exit strategy is important—even necessary—because it puts pressure on us all to figure out how to prudently accomplish redeployment and it puts constructive pressure on Iraqi leaders to move more quickly to take ownership of their own security.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House wants our Nation and our coalition partners to succeed in helping the Iraqis establish a democratic government that respects human rights and abides by the rule of law and to succeed in standing up Iraqi security forces that can maintain order and protect their citizens.

We pray, of course, for the safe return of our brave servicemen and -women who are fighting for freedom half a world away, and we applaud their success last week in eliminating the terrorist murderer Zarqawi. The professionalism, bravery, and sacrifice of our Armed Forces are indeed awe-inspiring.

This year, Mr. Speaker, 2006, should be a year of transition in Iraq; and it is my expectation that the United States will be able to reduce the American troop deployment over the ensuing months and transfer the risks and responsibilities to the duly elected government of Iraq. That is what has been proposed.

Today, it is regrettable that this Republican majority seeks to exploit this critical issue of national security for political advantage. The resolution before us, like the Hunter resolution that was debated last December, was drafted, in my view, for political reasons.

As Majority Leader BOEHNER explained, its purpose is an opportunity to create ''a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats.''

For our country's sake, for our troops' sake, the majority should have offered a resolution that sought unity, rather than division.

There are provisions in this resolution, of course, with which all of us agree. I, for one, strongly share the resolve to prevail in the war on terror. However, this resolution misstates, in my opinion, the facts about why the Bush administration instigated our military action against the Hussein regime in 2003. It paints a picture of Iraq today that does not comport with the reality on the ground, and it ignores the fundamental responsibility of this Congress to conduct meaningful oversight of the administration's conduct of this war.

The political motivations underlying this resolution have been laid bare; and, thus, I will be forced to vote ''no.''

The American people will not be deceived by this exercise today which our Republican colleague of North Carolina (Mr. JONES) labeled a charade.

The American people know, as Lieutenant General Gregory Newbold, the former commanding general of the 1st Marine Division, said, ''What we are living with now is the consequences of successive policy failures.''

The administration manipulated intelligence on weapons of mass destruction. It ignored the advice of top military commanders and sent too few troops to accomplish the task; and, consequently, we failed to stabilize Iraq after Hussein was rightfully removed from power.

It fired police and security forces and oil workers, which fueled the instability and initiated war before making alternative plans to shut off escape routes to the north when the Turks would not let us come in.

It had no effective plan to quickly get infrastructure repaired and rebuilt. It failed to properly equip our own troops, as Mr. MURTHA has observed, 2,500 of whom have given the ultimate measure of sacrifice in this war.

It grossly underestimated the costs of the war at about $60 billion, which now stands six times larger and more.

And when confronted with concrete evidence of widespread mistreatment of detainees in American custody, the President failed to hold anyone in his administration accountable.

Sadly, and dangerously, according to the Pew Research Center, the global credibility of the United States has sharply declined.

The record of the Republican Congress is, in my opinion, no less disturbing. This proud body, the people's House, has abdicated its oversight role and failed to root out waste, fraud and corruption so prevalent in Iraq today.

Nearly $9 billion in reconstruction funds are unaccounted for. No-bid contracts have been awarded to private contractors such as Halliburton. Detainees in American custody have been abused and, in some instances, killed, and still, still, there is no effective oversight on these matters in the Congress of the United States.

In the face of one of the most important issues before our country, we have been presented with politics as usual.

□ 1745

It is an effort to divide, when an effort to unite was in our country's and our Armed Forces' best interest.

I regret that I have to vote ''no.'' I believe success in our efforts in Iraq is important to achieve, but partisanship only impedes the attainment of that objective; an objective, hopefully, that we all share.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who chairs the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation for our International Relations Committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is good that the American people are able to hear this debate and judge for themselves who should be making the policies and which policies are best for our country.

I have been through this before. I worked in the White House with Ronald Reagan for 7 years, and I heard some of the same shrill voices that we hear today in those days. I heard the same gutting of the President of the United States for political purposes, but also for idealistic reasons during those days. I heard Ronald Reagan called a warmonger. I heard all of the charges that we hear today aimed at our President aimed at Ronald Reagan, and by some of the same people, I might add.

We have voices who are idealistically opposed to war and are in fact affected in their heart, perhaps more than others, when war does come, as it comes to all free people because without strength of purpose and willingness to fight there will be no freedom in this world. But when we fought communism, President Reagan stood firm when the shrill voices of defeatism and retreat attacked him personally and attacked our effort and tried to undermine that effort in the same way our effort today is being undermined by nitpicking, backbiting, and defeatism. Yet, he stood firm and, guess what? The world was amazed when the evil of communism collapsed.

Well, today we are in a war with radical Islam, which is every bit as much a threat and hates Western democracy every bit as much as the Communists did. We have made a stand in Iraq, and I would hope that people understand that had Ronald Reagan backed down, we would still be in the middle of the Cold War. And if we back down today, as is being advocated, what I consider to be a cowardly retreat, it will have consequences. It will not end the war.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. BUYER for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

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

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

Immediately following the attacks on September 11, 2001, this Nation's focus was on countering the fundamental ideals of terrorism that spawned the attack on our homeland. Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network, Saddam Hussein, and the Taliban, connected together through the terror they inflicted, had shared ambitions to destroy our way of life. Five years later, we have witnessed successes of historical proportions. Saddam—imprisoned and on trial for acts against humanity; Osama is on the run and we captured his number two; the Taliban no longer exists—for the first time in Afghanistan, their citizens are free to hope and dream; women are receiving an education. Al Qaeda is demonstrating what comes from the crushing pains of defeat, left only with cowardly acts of desperation in a weakening effort to survive the blows that we have dealt it.

Today in Iraq we are on the verge of the blossoming of a successful new republic, accomplished by the perseverance of its citizens, and the sacrifices of many. Yet, some of our own countrymen are showing a dangerous tendency to waiver, their faith shaken by the drive-through mentality of our society. They are verbalizing their doubts at a time when we need them to stand strong. The peace-doves who turned hawks of circumstance after September 11 were predicted to not have the intestinal fortitude to see this fight through to its necessary resolution. They are living up to that prediction despite the threat of terrorism still lurking around the world.

We cannot forget that the goals of Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden are to destroy western culture in all of its forms and manifestations. All across America, our constituents live their lives—take their kids to school, go to work, earn a living—and this is the strength of our Nation. However, we still live in the shadow of a real and looming threat to our way of life. We must remain vigilant of that threat and stand firm in our vow to dismantle it. While we have not been attacked on our own soil since September 11, we cannot afford the ramifications of complacency. The recent arrest of bomb-building terrorists across the border in Canada is clear evidence of that. We have forced the terrorists into making this an ''away game,'' the battlefield pushed from our homeland, but nonetheless the outcome must be in our favor. Yes, the victories in this battle are many, but we must have the resolve and determination to defeat terrorism here at home and abroad. To succeed we must be absolute and have constancy of purpose.

For decades Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq with an iron fist of repression. In the midst of that oppression was the intense yearning of the Iraqi people to taste freedom. They were forced to keep their hopes hidden, wrapped in a cocoon that they could one day blossom into the living principles from which they could rebuild their nation. They have emerged from that cocoon and are attempting to fly. The elements that were forming in it have manifested themselves in the formation of their new government, two successful national elections, and a successful national constitutional referendum.

Iraq cannot continue to succeed in the transition from war to building their Nation without our continued help. The people of Iraq have appealed to us in this critically important period. We have pledged our commitment to them and we need to see it through. The Iraqi people are proud of their accomplishments thus far, but they have asked for a steady hand of reassurance from us to help guide them in this transition.

The pride and motivation that the Iraqi population has demonstrated to this point are key elements to making their young government a success. We must continue to nurture their growth of confidence so that they can effectively govern, defend, and sustain themselves. The motivation to man a completely volunteer Iraqi army is one point of evidence that these people have pride and faith in their new republic. We cannot fail the security of our own Nation and the people of Iraq in a time of such dire need. The consequences of walking away at this point are too great to fathom. We must maintain our resolve to follow through with our commitment to the people of Iraq and in the global fight to free ourselves from the grip and fear of terrorism.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time and yield the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his indulgence and for the recognition, and I want to focus on something that has been little discussed in this debate, and that is how much this war is costing us.

Cost is not the ultimate determinant. When we have troops in the field, we should be unstinting in their support. But when the cost runs into hundreds of billions of dollars, it has to be a consideration. The greatest cost, of course, is counted in human lives: 2,514 killed so far, 17,774 wounded so far. The dollar cost is not nearly so precious, but it is substantial.

First, for comparison, here is what the first Persian Gulf War cost us: $61 billion. But our allies contributed $10.6 in kind, $48.4 billion in cash contributions, and so out-of-pocket we were $2.1 billion. That, my friends, is the benefit of having allies.

Now, look at the annual cost of the war we are fighting. Notice that it has increased by almost 100 percent from 2003 when the war itself was fully going on, to this year, 2006, an increase from $51 billion to $104 billion a year, annually.

The next chart then sums up the expenditures year by year, and you can see the bottom line. Thus far through this year, the cost is $318 billion. Thus far. Iraqi Freedom alone is $318 billion. To express that in monthly terms, something the Pentagon calls the ''burn rate,'' the average expenditure per month for the troops we are maintaining there, 130,000 strong, is running at $8.4 billion a month. That is $8.4 billion a month.

Now, we have asked CBO, and CBO itself decided to set up a model to estimate what the outyear cost of this deployment would be, assuming that after this year there is a substantial drawdown to the point where 50,000 troops remain in theater, Afghanistan and Iraq. This covers both. The total cost of this, over a period of 10 years, is $371 billion, assuming a modest increment in our deployment to that theater of 50,000 additional troops. This is CBO speaking.

Now, if you add $371 billion to $318 billion, you get $689 billion. That is what this war could cost us if its goes on at its current level. And we have not reflected in this number the accrued costs we are incurring daily due to the harsh environmental conditions in the desert. The Army says it will cost $24 billion alone over the next 2 years to restore and repair and replace equipment.

Now, as I said, cost is not the ultimate determinant, but it has to be a consideration when it reaches this magnitude. I do not think we can debate the deployment in Iraq in existing troop levels in a vacuum, as if the cost does not matter, as if we had infinite resources. Cost matters if we are ever to balance our budget. Cost matters in meeting other military needs for operations elsewhere in the world, for transformation, and for modernization.

It is too bad we cannot have a full debate where we could express fully all of the grave issues facing us due to the deployment in Iran.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation of our International Relations Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. It becomes clearer by the day, Mr. Speaker, that we are confronting a brutal, determined, and resourceful enemy: Islamist terrorism, as the 9/11 Commission identified it.

We have seen messianic, violent ideologies before, but al Qaeda and its ilk represent a more severe threat. In today's world, terrorists could acquire weapons of mass destruction. Bin Laden has made clear his intention to do so. It was such a concern that led President Bush to remove Saddam Hussein from power, and Iraqis are better off for it.

We have heard legitimate debate of choices made in Iraq: Disbanding the Iraqi army, troop levels, and we have heard other critiques. Looking back, it is clear that this mission's difficulty and expense were underestimated. Hopefully, we have improved our intelligence. But dwelling on past choices does not get us ahead.

Looking ahead, I don't see how we succeed by immediately withdrawing, as some are calling for. The position that our troops should stay longer in Iraq makes us all uncomfortable. But an alternative, an immediate withdrawal, concedes that Iraq will fall into chaos, because there is no way that the Iraqi security forces could stand alone yet. That is the judgment of our military professionals. So if you are going to argue that the costs of staying are too high, you are obligated to calculate the cost of withdrawing or the cost of what most certainly would be our defeat.

The real world is dangerous, and unpleasant choices must be made. An honest appraisal is that we don't know Iraq's future, but we know with far greater certainty that an American withdrawal would spin Iraq into chaos. Bedlam in the region would likely follow. This outcome would be a stunning boost for jihadists, the forces determined to deliver as big a blow as they can against the American people. We owe our Nation and the Iraqi people our continued effort.

We know Iraq today is a central front in our struggle against terrorism. Al Qaeda has said it, and last week's killing of al Zarqawi in Iraq made it clear that our success there and our success in the high stakes fight against terrorism go hand in hand.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ).

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, you know, this resolution before us today commends our troops, and we realize that our troops are the greatest in the world. This Nation must never forget that. And, of course, we all agree that Saddam should have been removed. The problem was our tactics, our planning. But this resolution nowhere addresses the central issue that the American people are crying out for us to discuss: Where do we go from here?

I think that the American people want an honest discussion about where this Nation stands in the two wars that we are prosecuting today, and in particular Iraq. I think that we owe this to the American people who are risking their lives on a daily basis. We owe it to their families, to the American people, and to our allies.

Supporting our troops means more than bumper stickers on trucks, though of course we appreciate those people that put on the bumper stickers. We appreciate that. But it is time to talk about the bottom line in terms of soldiers, their blood, their future, their hopes, hopes for the young people of this great country and the people in Iraq, their young people.

I wish the resolution before us provided the context for this debate. Honest discussion must include the nuts and bolts of this policy, literally what we are expending daily in Iraq. You know, when we talk about the policy, are we going to allow for us to conduct another preemptive attack? Was this the wise thing to do? Was the planning correct? Do we need to correct our mistakes? Do we need to change the training? These are the things we need to look at.

If we truly want the Iraqis to stand up and protect their country, and if we are ever ready to stand down, to stand down, are we ready to put the money in the budget? I just came from a hearing a few moments ago and we are having problems buying helmets to protect our soldiers. We don't have a uniform policy on what helmets will protect the soldiers. Our soldiers don't have the equipment that they need, and for us to stand down, we need to provide the Iraqi army what they need, the equipment. And we wonder, because we haven't been able to do that for our troops.

Our military is the best. It has been feared throughout the ages for our ability to respond immediately anywhere in the world, to be ready to defend our freedom. I do support our troops.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), who has been to Iraq three times.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I attended my oldest son's eighth grade graduation, and graduating with him was Jennifer Davis, the daughter of Karen and Major Miles Davis, who could not attend because he was deployed to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I believe we owe Americans an account of our progress in the world war on terror, an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq, as well as an affirmation that we will defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle for survival. Unfortunately, this resolution fails to do so, for it is strategically nebulous, morally obtuse, and woefully inadequate.

This resolution sanitizes the hard truth that the enemy is trying not only to intimidate us but to kill us. It provides an abashed defense of our Nation's sovereign right to preemptively eradicate the terrorists and their state sponsors before they kill us. It implies our preemption of this threat must meet a global test for legitimacy.

It further fails to affirm the battle for Iraq was waged because Saddam Hussein's regime was a direct threat to the United States of America and was in violation of mandatory treaty obligations of said United States of America.

It fails to stress our mission is to ensure a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq at peace with the United States, its coalition partners and all other peaceable nations.

It fails to stress that terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists' aspirations for the United States of America, Iraq, our coalition partners and the broader Middle East.

It asserts how despite the enemy having declared Iraq a central front in the war on terror, the United States and its coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as only a part of the war on terror.

It omits any mention of the battle for Iraq's difficulties and does not offer a comprehensive strategy on how to conquer them. It overlooks the fact our troops' return home hinges upon creating Iraqi security forces and destroying the enemy's insurgency.

□ 1800

Finally, this resolution calls the terrorists our adversary, not our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, at the graduation I did not try to comfort Karen Davis by declaring her husband, Major Miles Davis, was in Iraq defending global peace and security or enforcing United Nations resolutions. No, I thanked Karen for her family's sacrifice because Miles was in Iraq honoring his solemn pledge to God and to us to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies.

So in this time of war when we ask the best of our troops and we ask the best of their families, we must ask the best of ourselves. We have not done so with this resolution, and that is why I will be voting ''present,'' because I am committed to victory in the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, recently, I attended my oldest son's eighth grade graduation. Graduating with him was Jennifer Davis, the daughter of my childhood friend, Major Miles Davis, who could not attend. That night, I talked with Miles' wife, Karen, who told me how painful it was for their family to have Miles so abruptly deployed to Iraq.

Such heart rending scenes throughout our land are why I believe we owe Americans more in this resolution than a simple declaration of our resolve in Iraq. We owe them an account of our progress in the world War on Terror; an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq; and an affirmation we will defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle for survival.

Thus, I rise to express my profound disappointment with this resolution before us, because it is strategically nebulous; morally obtuse; and woefully inadequate.

To begin, this resolution's purpose is limited to ''Declaring the United States will complete the mission in Iraq and prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.''

This is patently inadequate to the task at hand; and, unfortunately, under continued examination the resolution fares no better. To wit, the first ''Whereas'' clause informs us: ''. . . the United States and its allies are engaged in a Global War on Terror, a long and demanding struggle against an adversary that is driven by hatred of American values and that is committed to imposing, by the use of terror, its repressive ideology throughout the world.''

This clause elicits elementary questions: what ''values'' of ours cause our enemy to hate us; and what, precisely, is the enemy's ideology? Sadly, this clause provides no clues.

The second clause recounts how: ''. . . for the past two decades, terrorists have used violence in a futile attempt to intimidate the United States.''

This clause is too sanitized. The hard truth is the enemy has not tried to intimidate us. The enemy has tried to kill us and too often succeeded. The enemy does so because our very existence as sovereign citizens of a free Republic constitutes a beacon of hope for all who are—and all who yearn to be—free; thus, we are our enemy's paramount obstacle to world dominion.

Next the third clause right asserts: ''. . . it is essential to the security of the American people and to world security that the United States, together with its allies, take the battle to the terrorists and to those who provide them assistance.''

Agreed. But this clause must stress both a philosophic principle and a strategic tenet.

Philosophically, any state-sponsor of terror is a threat to the United States, because terrorism is an attack upon the self-evident, inalienable human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Strategically, this clause falters as an oblique and abashed defense of our Nation's sovereign right to preemptively eradicate terrorists and their state-sponsors before they kill us. Instead, the clause must reaffirm our Nation's full right of self-defense.

The seventh clause decries how: ''. . . by early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal, Ba'athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global peace and security and was in violation of mandatory United Nations Security Council Resolutions.''

Bluntly, this clause omits the obvious: By early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal Ba'athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against the United States of America and was in violation of mandatory treaty obligations to the United States of America.

By omitting the fact Hussein's regime deemed the United States not as just a part of the global community, but as a mortal enemy, this clause wrongly implies our preemption of his threat must and does meet a ''global test'' for legitimacy.

The eighth clause reiterates: ''. . . the mission of the United States and its Coalition partners, having removed Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors.''

Again, the point is missed. Our mission is to transform Iraq from a rogue dictatorship aiding terrorists into a representative democracy eradicating terrorists; and into a sovereign, free, secure, and united nation at peace with the United States, its Coalition partners, and all other peaceable nations.

Next, clause eleven's belief: ''. . . the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists' aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East,'' also misses the point. As an American, I believe the clause should read: ''the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists' aspirations for the United States of America, Iraq, our Coalition partners, and the broader Middle East.''

Now, at last, we reach the resolution's three lethal failings:

To start with, taken together, the ninth and fifteenth clauses raise a stark conundrum. Ignoring that the United States, in word and deed, first targeted Iraq as a ''central front'' in our War on Terror, clause nine notes: ''the terrorists have declared Iraq to be a central front in their war against all who oppose their ideology.''

Later, clause fifteen asserts: ''. . . the United States and its Coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as part of the Global War on Terrorism.''

These clauses' collective conundrum is this: if, after we militarily deposed Hussein, the terrorist enemy now deems Iraq a central front in its ''war against all those who oppose their ideology,'' why do we now view Iraq as but ''part of the Global War on Terror''? Upon this critical question and its ramifications, the resolution is silent.

The resolution's second lethal failing is found, interestingly enough, in clause twelve, which offers hopeful news of how we, our Coalition partners, and the Iraqis have: ''. . . scored impressive victories in Iraq, including finding and killing the terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.''

Well said. But nowhere does this resolution explain the battle for Iraq's past, present, and future difficulties, or proffer any concrete or comprehensive strategy as to how U.S., Coalition, and Iraqi forces will confront and conquer

these challenges. One irony proves the point. My allotted time to speak on this amendment is under the section dedicated to Iraqi reconstruction. Yet nowhere in this resolution appears the word ''reconstruction.''

The resolution's final, and paramount, failing occurs in clause thirteen, which assures us: ''. . . Iraqi security forces are, over time, taking over from the United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight against terror in Iraq.''

This clause's logic implies the enemy will remain operationally active in Iraq when our military leaves the battlefield. This implication stems from the incessant lack of emphasis accorded the concomitant and equal pillar of the administration's military strategy in Iraq. Specifically, the time required to win and bring our troops home hinges upon creating Iraqi security forces and destroying the enemy's insurgency. Continuing to emphasize the creation of security forces while de-emphasizing the destruction of the terrorists' insurgency, will only lengthen the time required to accomplish the mission in Iraq and welcome our troops back.

Mr. Speaker, my time grows short, so, in conclusion, I will focus on the one word in the resolved clause which, in fact, inexplicably permeates the resolution; and, inexorably, precludes my support of this resolution. The offending word is ''adversary.''

Starkly and sanely understood, within Iraq and the overarching world War on Terror we do not have an adversary. We have an enemy. Thus, because words have meaning, even if I could ignore the fact this resolution is strategically nebulous, I will not overlook the fact it lacks the moral clarity to call the terrorists our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, at St. Edith's eighth grade graduation, I did not try to comfort Karen by declaring her husband Major Miles Davis was in Iraq defending global peace and security; I did not try to comfort Karen by proclaiming Miles was in Iraq to enforce violated U.N. resolutions; no, I thanked Karen for her family's sacrifice, because Miles was in Iraq honoring his solemn pledge to God and to us to ''support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies.''

Mr. Speaker, amidst an anguished era ennobled by our sacrifices in the unsought struggle against a bloodthirsty enemy, we ask our troops to do their best; we ask their families to do their best; and we ask our fellow citizens to do their best But we, in ''the people's house,'' have not done our best; and upon this resolution I will be voting ''present.''

I submit for the RECORD President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Ninth Annual Message to Congress, January 6, 1942.

In fulfilling my duty to report upon the state of the Union, I am proud to say to you that the spirit of the American people was never higher than it is today—the Union was never more closely knit together—this country was never more deeply determined to face the solemn tasks before it.

The response of the American people has been instantaneous, and it will be sustained until our security is assured.

Exactly one year ago today I said to this Congress: ''When the dictators . . . are ready to make war upon us, they will not wait for an act of war on our part . . . They—not we—will choose the time and the place and the method of their attack.''

We now know their choice of the time: a peaceful Sunday morning—December 7, 1941.

We know their choice of the place: an American outpost in the Pacific.

We know their choice of the method: the method of Hitler himself.

Japan's scheme of conquest goes back half a century. It was not merely a policy of seeking living room—it was a plan which included the subjugation of all the peoples in the Far East and in the islands of the Pacific, and the domination of that ocean by Japanese military and naval control of the western coasts of North, Central, and South America.

The development of this ambitious conspiracy was marked by the war against China in 1894; the subsequent occupation of Korea; the war against Russia in 1904; the illegal fortification of the mandated Pacific islands following 1920; the seizure of Manchuria in 1931; and the invasion of China in 1937.

A similar policy of criminal conquest was adopted by Italy. The Fascists first revealed their imperial designs in Libya and Tripoli. In 1935 they seized Abyssinia. Their goal was the domination of all North Africa, Egypt, parts of France, and the entire Mediterranean world.

But the dreams of empire of the Japanese and Fascist leaders were modest in comparison with the gargantuan aspirations of Hitler and his Nazis. Even before they came to power in 1933, their plans for that conquest had been drawn. Those plans provided for ultimate domination, not of anyone section of the world, but of the whole earth and all the oceans on it.

When Hitler organized his Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance, all these plans of conquest became a single plan. Under this, in addition to her own schemes of conquest, Japan's role was obviously to cut off our supply of weapons of war to Britain and Russia and China—weapons which increasingly were speeding the day of Hitler's doom. The act of Japan at Pearl Harbor was intended to stun us—to terrify us to such an extent that we would divert our industrial and military strength to the Pacific area, or even to our own continental defense.

The plan has failed in its purpose. We have not been stunned. We have not been terrified or confused. This very reassembling of the Seventy-seventh Congress today is proof of that; for the mood of quiet, grim resolution which here prevails bodes ill for those who conspired and collaborated to murder world peace.

That mood is stronger than any mere desire for revenge. It expresses the will of the American people to make very certain that the world will never so suffer again.

Admittedly, we have been faced with hard choices. It was bitter, for example, not to be able to relieve the heroic and historic defenders of Wake Island. It was bitter for us not to be able to land a million men in a thousand ships in the Philippine Islands.

But this adds only to our determination to see to it that the Stars and Stripes will fly again over Wake and Guam. Yes, see to it that the brave people of the Philippines will be rid of Japanese imperialism, and will live in freedom, security, and independence.

Powerful and offensive actions must and will be taken in proper time. The consolidation of the United Nations' total war effort against our common enemies is being achieved.

That was and is the purpose of conferences which have been held during the past two weeks in Washington and Moscow and Chungking. That is the primary objective of the declaration of solidarity signed in Washington on January 1, 1942, by twenty-six nations united against the Axis powers. . . .

Plans have been laid here and in the other capitals for coordinated and cooperative action by all the United Nations—military action and economic action. Already we have established, as you know, unified command of land, sea, and air forces in the southwestern Pacific theater of war. There will be a continuation of conferences and consultations among military staffs, so that the plans and operations of each will fit into the general strategy designed to crush the enemy. We shall not fight isolated wars—each nation going its own way. These twenty-six nations are united—not in spirit and determination alone, but in the broad conduct of the war in all its phases.

For the first time since the Japanese and the Fascists and the Nazis started along their blood-stained course of conquest they now face the fact that superior forces are assembling against them. Gone forever are the days when the aggressors could attack and destroy their victims one by one without unity of resistance. We of the United Nations will so dispose our forces that we can strike at the common enemy wherever the greatest damage can be done him.

The militarists of Berlin and Tokyo started this war. But the massed, angered forces of common humanity will finish it.

Destruction of the material and spiritual centers of civilization—this has been and still is the purpose of Hitler and his Italian and Japanese chessmen. They would wreck the power of the British Commonwealth and Russia and China and the Netherlands—and then combine all their forces to achieve their ultimate goal, the conquest of the United States.

They know that victory for us means victory for freedom.

They know that victory for us means victory for the institution of democracy—the ideal of the family, the simple principles of common decency and humanity.

They know that victory for us means victory for religion.

And they could not tolerate that. The world is too small to provide adequate ''living room'' for both Hitler and God. In proof of that, the Nazis have now announced their plan for enforcing their new German, pagan religion all over the world—a plan by which the Holy Bible and the Cross of Mercy would be displaced by Mein Kampf and the swastika and the naked sword.

Our own objectives are clear; the objective of smashing the militarism imposed by warlords upon their enslaved peoples—the objective of liberating the subjugated nations—the objective of establishing and securing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear everywhere in the world.

We shall not stop short of these objectives, nor shall we be satisfied merely to gain them and then call it a day. I know that I speak for the American people—and I have good reason to believe that I speak also for all the other peoples who fight with us—when I say that this time we are determined not only to win the war, but also to maintain the security of the peace that will follow. . . .

The superiority of the United Nations in munitions and ships must be overwhelming—so overwhelming that the Axis nations can never hope to catch up with it. And so, in order to attain this overwhelming superiority the United States must build planes and tanks and guns and ships to the utmost limit of our national capacity. We have the ability and capacity to produce arms not only for our own forces, but also for the armies, navies, and air forces fighting on our side.

And our overwhelming superiority of armament must be adequate to put weapons of war at the proper time into the hands of those men in the conquered nations who stand ready to seize the first opportunity to

revolt against their German and Japanese oppressors, and against the traitors in their own ranks, known by the already infamous name of Quislings. And I think that it is a fair prophecy to say that, as we get guns to the patriots in those lands, they too will fire shots heard 'round the world.

This production of ours in the United States must be raised far above present levels, even though it will mean the dislocation of the lives and occupations of millions of our own people. We must raise our sights all along the production line. Let no man say it cannot be done. It must be done—and we have undertaken to do it. . . .

Our task is hard—our task is unprecedented—and the time is short. We must strain every existing armament-producing facility to the utmost. We must convert every available plant and tool to war production. That goes all the way from the greatest plants to the smallest—from the huge automobile industry to the village machine shop.

Production for war is based on men and women—the human hands and brains which collectively we call Labor. Our workers stand ready to work long hours; to turn out more in a day's work; to keep the wheels turning and the fires burning twenty-four hours a day, and seven days a week. They realize well that on the speed and efficiency of their work depend the lives of their sons and their brothers on the fighting fronts.

Production for war is based on metals and raw materials—steel, copper, rubber, aluminum, zinc, tin. Greater and greater quantities of them will have to be diverted to war purposes: Civilian use of them will have to be cut further and still further—and, in many cases, completely eliminated.

War costs money. So far, we have hardly even begun to pay for it. We have devoted only 15 percent of our national income to national defense. As will appear in my Budget Message tomorrow, our war program for the coming fiscal year will cost $56 billion or, in other words, more than half of the estimated annual national income. That means taxes and bonds and bonds and taxes. It means cutting luxuries and other nonessentials. In a word, it means an ''all-out'' war by individual effort and family effort in a united country.

Only this all-out scale of production will hasten the ultimate all-out victory. Speed will count. Lost ground can always be regained—lost time never. Speed will save lives; speed will save this nation which is in peril; speed will save our freedom and our civilization—and slowness has never been an American characteristic. . . .

We cannot wage this war in a defensive spirit. As our power and our resources are fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack against the enemy—we shall hit him and hit him again wherever and whenever we can reach him.

We must keep him far from our shores, for we intend to bring this battle to him on his own home grounds.

American armed forces must be used at any place in all the world where it seems advisable to engage the forces of the enemy. In some cases these operations will be defensive, in order to protect key positions. In other cases, these operations will be offensive, in order to strike at the common enemy, with a view to his complete encirclement and eventual total defeat.

American armed forces will operate at many points in the Far East.

American armed forces will be on all the oceans—helping to guard the essential communications which are vital to the United Nations.

American land and air and sea forces will take stations in the British Isles—which constitute an essential fortress in this great world struggle.

American armed forces will help to protect this hemisphere—and also help to protect bases outside this hemisphere, which could be used for an attack on the Americas.

If any of our enemies, from Europe or from Asia, attempt long-range raids by ''suicide'' squadrons of bombing planes, they will do so only in the hope of terrorizing our people and disrupting our morale. Our people are not afraid of that. We know that we may have to pay a heavy price for freedom. We will pay this price with a will. Whatever the price, it is a thousand times worth it. No matter what our enemies, in their desperation, may attempt to do to us—we will say, as the people of London have said, ''We can take it.'' And what's more we can give it back—and we will give it back—with compound interest. . . .

Many people ask, ''When will this war end?'' There is only one answer to that. It will end just as soon as we make it end, by our combined efforts, our combined strength, our combined determination to fight through and work through until the end—the end of militarism in Germany and Italy and Japan. Most certainly we shall not settle for less.

That is the spirit in which discussions have been conducted during the visit of the British prime minister to Washington. Mr. Churchill and I understand each other, our motives, and our purposes. Together, during the past two weeks, we have faced squarely the major military and economic problems of this greatest world war.

All in our nation have been cheered by Mr. Churchill's visit. We have been deeply stirred by his great message to us. He is welcome in our midst, and we unite in wishing him a safe return to his home.

For we are fighting on the same side with the British people, who fought alone for long, terrible months, and withstood the enemy with fortitude and tenacity and skill.

We are fighting on the same side with the Russian people who have seen the Nazi hordes swarm up to the very gates of Moscow, and who with almost superhuman will and courage have forced the invaders back into retreat.

We are fighting on the same side as the brave people of China—those millions who for four and a half long years have withstood bombs and starvation and have whipped the invaders time and again in spite of the superior Japanese equipment and arms.

Yes, we are fighting on the same side as the indomitable Dutch.

We are fighting on the same side as all the other governments in exile, whom Hitler and all his armies and all his Gestapo have not been able to conquer.

But we of the United Nations are not making all this sacrifice of human effort and human lives to return to the kind of world we had after the last world war.

We are fighting today for security, for progress, and for peace, not only for ourselves but for all men, not only for one generation but for all generations. Weare fighting to cleanse the world of ancient evils, ancient ills.

Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism, by unholy contempt for the human race. Weare inspired by a faith that goes back through all the years to the first chapter of the book of Genesis: ''God created man in His own image.''

We on our side are striving to be true to that divine heritage. We are fighting, as our fathers have fought, to uphold the doctrine that all men are equal in the sight of God. Those on the other side are striving to destroy this deep belief and to create a world in their own image—a world of tyranny and cruelty and serfdom.

That is the conflict that day and night now pervades our lives. No compromise can end that conflict. There never has been—there never can be—successful compromise between good and evil. Only total victory can reward the champions of tolerance, and decency, and freedom, and faith.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership and for making sure that our men and women in uniform get everything that they need.

This is an unfortunate day in the House of Representatives, the people's House, where Members of this body were told we could have a debate on Iraq. Surely it is time to have a discussion of our misguided policy in Iraq. But rather than give us a debate on Iraq, we see a resolution that comes from the Republican leadership that was drafted by political experts on spin.

We all support our troops. We merge the war on terror with the war in Afghanistan and the war in Iraq so that we can cloud the debate and make the debate about whether and who supports the troops.

Surely we can do better than that. 2,500 Americans have been killed; 19,000 brave men and women have been injured. And there is no accountability on the part of this Congress to the mistakes that have been made.

''They will welcome us when we get there.'' We had a window of opportunity, and we missed it. We didn't send enough troops in to secure the peace in Iraq. General Shinseki warned us, and they ignored him and sent him out to pasture.

We didn't vet Saddam's army so we could secure Baghdad. Mistake. Mistake. We have less oil production now than we did when Saddam was in power. The Iraqi people have lost their opportunity. They have 3.9 hours of electricity in Baghdad and we are talking about things getting better? In a time of war, this administration and this Congress has an obligation to tell the truth about what is happening in Iraq.

We also have a responsibility to provide the oversight so we correct mistakes, we get our troops into the background because we are sitting ducks up there because we have an occupation that our own State Department polls say is unpopular by 85 to 90 percent of the Iraqis.

I hear them talk about the terrorists and how we are fighting al Qaeda. Al Qaeda was not in Iraq until this President stood before the world and said, ''Bring it on. Bring it on.'' Well, they brought it on and now 10 percent of the insurgency are actually terrorists. When we leave Iraq, they will leave Iraq.

We ought to listen to what the State Department told us in advance. We should look at our own investigations and analysis by the State Department that tell us we cannot win this war militarily. You don't beat an insurgency with military conflict; you beat

an insurgency through making the right planning decisions, by making the right decisions to give the Iraqis what they need to be upfront to keep their own security in that country. You give the Iraqis what they need to make their own determination of what their future is. The time has come for the United States to move into the background and bring our men and women home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), a member of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, September 11 changed our lives forever. But the war on terror started long before that. The year 1979 changed the world. When Iran took our embassy hostage, the seeds of Islamic jihad were spread all over the Middle East.

These seeds planted hatred and contempt for freedom in the souls of men like Osama bin Laden. In 1983, they murdered our marines in Beirut. In 1993, Ramzi Yousef and his al Qaeda associates bombed the World Trade Center. They were supposed to fall that day, but that day would come later.

They struck the Khobar Towers in 1996. They bombed our embassies in Africa. They defeated us in Somalia. And they deliberately attacked the USS *Cole*.

Each time we failed to respond. And then came September 11. It was as if the United States was a sleeping giant. And not until the bloodiest alarm of 9/11 did the giant finally awake. America cannot afford to go back to sleep again.

We are fighting this war in distant lands, and we are winning. Our struggle in Iraq and Afghanistan is the great stand in this war on terror. The terrorists are there. Zarqawi was there before, and we are there. And if we fail, the terrorists will prevail just as they have over the last 30 years.

Behind me is a picture of Sergeant Byron Norwood taken moments before he died for his country in this global war on terror. In Fallujah, Sergeant Norwood helped save seven of his fellow marines in a gun battle with insurgents and gave his own life in the process. Simply put, Byron was a hero.

His story reminds me of the Bible verse found in the Gospel of John: ''Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.''

Some say we should retreat in this war on terror, but to them I say to cut and run now would not only be an insult to those waging this liberating battle but a dishonor to those like Byron who made the ultimate sacrifice because few causes are as worthy, few prices are as great.

I received a letter from Byron's mother expressing her concern that the American people would soon forget about Byron and his sacrifice for freedom. To Janet and all of the other Gold Star Mothers, I say we will never forget Byron, and we will never forget about the other fallen heroes who paid the ultimate sacrifice for freedom.

Whether it is Bill and Janet Norwood or the wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Hospital or the soldiers I met with in Iraq, they all tell me the same thing, Congressman, finish the job. And finish the job we will.

I would like to close with a message that Byron's father gave to me to deliver to this Chamber. Byron's father said, ''Byron understood the meaning of Semper Fidelis, always faithful, as do all marines who were there that day in Fallujah. He willingly gave his life, and others were seriously and permanently wounded as they sacrificed for their band of brothers and their country. He would never have traded honor for political advantage.''

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to indicate to one and all who cannot be here today that our legislative hands are tied. We have no opportunity, even though we pleaded with the Rules Committee to give us an opportunity to be able to speak on alternatives to this resolution.

You have heard that this resolution is in support of the troops. It is not. You have heard that this resolution is in support of the war on terrorism. It is not. And I will tell you why it is not, and I will tell you why we have to have an alternative and why we need to vote ''no'' on this resolution, because it doesn't support the troops, and it does not support the war on terrorism.

The people in this resolution that are referred to, the honored sacrifice that has been made by the Armed Forces of the United States, is supposedly on behalf of somebody called Prime Minister Nouri al Maliki, a man who today said he was going to engage in conversations with terrorists who have murdered Americans to give them amnesty. This is the amnesty resolution.

To vote for this resolution is to vote for those who support amnesty for those who kill American troops. This is the government we are supposed to be standing up and defending, the very freedom that gives that prime minister the possibility of speaking to the terrorists has been won by the blood and sacrifice of American troops. This is the amnesty bill. This is the amnesty resolution.

There are people on this floor who will not grant amnesty to people who cut their lawns, who wash the dishes in the restaurants they eat in; but they are willing to vote for a resolution that says that they support a government that is willing to give amnesty to people who murder the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I am not going to do that. And if you disagree with that interpretation, give me the right to put it on the floor for a vote and let's see who wins the hearts and minds of the American people, not the Iraqi people, as to who is really supporting the troops and who is really willing to fight a war on terror.

This is nothing but a resolution confirming the existing administration policies. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, you deserve the opportunity on the floor of the people's House to have a real debate, not a discussion, not to echo sentiments, but to have substantive words on the floor that allow the American people to understand what direction do we want to take this country.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to clarify for the record that this resolution honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders, protecting the homeland, as servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, and in other roles.

And further, it honors the sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces and of partners in the coalition, and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside them, especially those who have fallen or have been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and of others who risk their lives to help defend freedom. This is a resolution to honor their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), a member of the House International Relations Committees.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this strong, proactive defense of our liberties and freedoms from the preying forces of Islamic radicals in their jihad against the core values of our Western Civilization.

We did not choose this war. They picked the fight. The events of September 11 represented the final moment of spending our days as bystanders.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about the choices which precipitated the war in Iraq. The choice we face today, and Americans will face in November, is between two visions: full commitment to protect our Nation and prosecute the global war against terrorists, or complete surrender to Islamic extremists who want to destroy us. There is no middle ground.

Without maintaining pressure upon this global war, we face the grave risk of producing homegrown terrorism. These radical Islamists would rather take their fight to our streets, our communities, our neighborhoods.

The necessity of a proactive, robust strategy recently was reiterated by an ally too well-acquainted with the threat posed by radicalized forces.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair said: ''We have to act, not react; we have to do so on the basis of prediction, not certainty; and such an action will often, usually indeed, be outside our own territory.''

America has acted. Our troops have responded honorably and successfully.

Are we safe for today? Absolutely. Should we cut and run from Iraq? Never.

As Winston Churchill said: ''We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long-drawn trial of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job.''

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This afternoon, regrettably, we are talking about the cost of this war, the cost of the commitment of the American people: the cost in money, and the cost in lives, over 2,500 to date; the cost in wounded, over 18,000, with very little or no oversight, very little or no accountability, and certainly very little or no shared sacrifice in this country.

□ 1815

This resolution that we are discussing, because it is not even a debate, is more about politics than about practical solutions. Anyone that doubts that, all you have got to do is read the article in today's paper that sets out the political strategy by the majority leader in terms of this resolution.

Oversight, oversight, oversight. Where was our armor, both body armor and vehicle armor? What was our plan post ''Mission Accomplished'' press conference? Where were we during the issue of Abu Ghraib rendition and so many other things that have come up?

In fact, last night I went home and I switched on the TV and I just happened, by chance, to catch the program on HBO, Last Letters Home: The Families. And it occurs to me this afternoon that we owe those families from that HBO program, and the 2,500 other families, an apology, because they have made the sacrifice. They understand the cost of this war. And they must be wondering where the accountability and where the oversight is. We need to apologize to them and to the American people for not doing our job.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT), who has traveled to Iraq and has witnessed the progress firsthand.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about facts and figures tonight. We have talked about whether we have got the right number of forces and how much money we are spending. But we can talk about facts and figures all the time. This is more than that.

This is about faces. This is about faces in the fight on global terror. This is about the faces of leaders like Maliki and Karzai, guys that are worried whether the United States is going to keep its pledge and its word to be with them to the bitter end.

This is about the faces of citizens who want to raise their families, who want to live and worship in a country that is free, where they can walk down the street without the fear of being blown up.

This is about the faces of families who are concerned about whether we are going to do everything we need to do to make sure our soldiers, sailors and airmen have everything they need in this fight.

This is about the faces of the enemy, cold blooded murderers with red eyes who have only one mission in life, death or victory.

And this is about the faces of soldiers, dirty, tired, hungry, scared sometimes, but soldiers with a resolute mission, a mission of victory.

Mr. Speaker, every day I thank God that we have men and women worldwide willing to do something bigger than any of us here today, willing to fight for freedom and justice and to keep America safe and strong.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution contains phrases such as ''we will prevail,'' words like ''determination,'' ''resolve,'' ''we are committed to the completion of the mission.'' It is a good, well written pep talk. But where is the discussion of how?

As Mr. GILCHREST, our colleague from Maryland and a decorated Vietnam war veteran said, where is the urgency in figuring out how we are going to do those things?

We should be having a debate and a discussion on how we will prevail, not just that want to prevail.

Specifically, how are we going to equip a very poorly equipped Iraqi army? How are we going to set up a system of support and supply and repair for the Iraqi army? How are we going to ensure that more Iraqis are employed and develop the economy? How are we going to increase electricity production, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to increase access to potable water and sanitation, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to increase oil production and the oil production sector, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to finish putting together the provincial reconstruction teams? How are we going to increase and improve the training of police? How are we going to help create and improve local courts and the judicial system? How are we going to improve the refining capacity? Iraq is an importer of gasoline. How are we going to improve the accountability for contractors? That means how are we going to quit wasting billions of U.S. tax dollars? How are we going to find more allies to share in this burden? How are we going to keep our Army, our military from breaking down? How are we going to strengthen our Reserve component, our blessed Guard and Reserve people? How are we going to preserve our all volunteer Army? How are we going to increase our public diplomacy, so that people will quit hating America all around the world? How are we going to make our troops safer?

Those are the kinds of discussions we should be having. But what are we doing? We are rehashing the past. We are talking about the 1990s. We are talking about the war resolution. Let us look ahead. How are we going to prevail? How are we going to keep this commitment to the completion of this mission?

Specifically, I think we need to do far better oversight. I am a member of the House Arms Services Committee. We are abysmal in our oversight, abysmal.

Years ago when the Republicans took over, and maybe it was a good move at that time, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations was eliminated. It has not worked to do that.

I see friends over here. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to bring back the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations so we can ask these kind of questions. How are we going to do the things? How are we going to achieve this pep talk that is going to be voted on today or tomorrow?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the International Relations Committee, who has traveled to Iraq, has met with our U.S. coalition, and Iraqi troops.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I went to Iraq in 2005. I was one of two Members of this Congress to view the first free elections in their history, and I watched in awe and admiration as more than 8 million people went to the polls and elected a government. Men and women, young and old, courageously cast their ballots in the face of the violent terrorists.

I spoke to many Iraqis and they showed great defiance against those outlaws that wished to disrupt those elections. Despite facing 300 attacks across the nation that day, more than 60 percent of the Iraqis went out to vote. Not even 44 murders by the terrorists could remove the resolve of those people.

Men and women waited in line to cast their vote. They took the historic ballots, entered a cardboard booth and made their choice. With that simple but noble action, they pushed tyrants and terrorists aside and set Iraq on a path to freedom. Then they marched down the street holding their ink stained finger up high in defiance of those terrorists.

I talked to Iraqis. And I talked to a woman who came up to me with tears in her eyes after she voted and said how grateful she and her family were for the America that we live in, for giving their sons for her family's freedom.

She went on to relate to me how her husband and her brother had been murdered by the devil of the desert, Saddam Hussein.

There have been more successful elections since the first, and the skeptics and the critics get it wrong with each new free and successful election.

Democracy is the enemy of terrorists. They hate democracies as much as

they hate the human life of the innocents that they murder.

We cannot give in to these madmen. The insurgents have discovered that the United States and her allies cannot be defeated on the battlefield. They have also found that the steely resolve of the Iraqi people to create a free and fair and inclusive government cannot be broken. Liberty and freedom are overcoming treachery and tyranny and violence. We will not fear nor flee nor flinch in this absolute resolve.

And our mission statement was stated 40 years ago by President John F. Kennedy when he said, ''Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.''

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity, in light of the gentleman from Arkansas' comments, Dr. Snyder, to remind the body, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Investigation Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that produced the all important legislation we now call Goldwater-Nickels, which brought about jointness within the armed services.

And I also might mention that all 29 Democrats sent a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, from which we have not received an answer, recommending and asking that the Investigations Or Oversight Subcommittee be reestablished.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this debate on this resolution, and the resolution itself, continues two very dangerous patterns that have sort of governed all of our actions in Iraq for far, far too long.

First of all, there are no specifics, as Congressman SNYDER said quite articulately, as to how we are going to achieve this victory.

When this debate was billed, we were told this was going to be the floor of the House, the People's House talking about how to deal with the very tough challenges that now present themselves in Iraq. Even the President admits that things have not gone the way we had planned, and we need to step up and figure out how to fix the problems.

And yet, this resolution doesn't say a thing about that. It says, terrorism is bad, our troops are good, and we want to win.

This House is failing in its mission with such an open statement that does not get at the how of winning. How are we going to deal with an open-ended commitment to Iraq? How are we going to pay the price for that? Is it even in the best interest of our goal of a stable and peaceful Iraq to say that our troops will stay there for as long as is necessary?

Those questions are not answered. Unless we in this House are willing to step up and put policy forward, we shouldn't say that this is a debate about the future of Iraq. It is not. We have many hard questions that need to be answered. This resolution does not do that.

And the second dangerous trend is the pattern of the President and the majority in this Congress to say anyone who disagrees with them is somehow unpatriotic and defeatist, which to my mind means that we all need a refresher course on why democracy is important. We are all very good at saying that it is important. It is important so that we hear all the voices, not just those who disagree with us. That way we can learn from our mistakes, which we desperately need to do in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in disappointment—though I must say, not in surprise—about the exercise the House is engaged in today. This is not a true debate about our policy in Iraq. A real debate on Iraq would allow us to consider alternative proposals and vote on meaningful amendments that could help us improve the very difficult situation there. Instead we have before us an un-amendable, rhetorical document about the war on terrorism that barely focuses on Iraq itself, and certainly doesn't deal with the real challenges we face there. This process is an offense to our democracy.

What is even more troubling, Mr. Speaker, is that this kind of undemocratic approach is precisely what led to the Bush administration's many costly mistakes in Iraq. Americans have seen how the administration's stubborn single-mindedness and refusal to consider alternative views and dissenting opinions have cost us dearly in Iraq. The facts are all-too-well-known:

When General Shinseki said that far more troops would be needed to secure the peace in Iraq, he was ignored and soon retired—and the result was that the troops we did send struggled unnecessarily to prevent and control a massive insurgency.

When advisors warned the administration not to de-Baathify and disband the Iraqi military and security forces, they were ignored. As Prime Minister Tony Blair has publicly admitted, this was a grave mistake that effectively pushed thousands of military-trained, disempowered Sunnis into the streets, fueling the post-war insurgency.

And the administration's refusal to heed dissenting views on Iraq continues to this day. Now that the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction has brought to light massive amounts of waste, fraud, and abuse in the reconstruction contracting, I understand that the administration and the Republicans in Congress are trying to prematurely end his mandate.

This is a clear pattern, Mr. Speaker, and the consequences of this arrogant, undemocratic approach are real. It has cost us dearly in American lives and resources, undermined our efforts to build peace and stability in Iraq, and delayed our departure from the country.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the use-of-force authorization in October 2002 in order to give the President the leverage to hold Saddam Hussein accountable for his threatening behavior and refusal to submit to weapons inspections. And that is what makes it all the more frustrating that the President misused that authority by rushing to war and committing so many grave and costly mistakes in Iraq.

So no, Mr. Speaker, this is not a real debate. A real debate would allow us to consider the important questions in Iraq: Can we afford to make an open-ended commitment to staying in Iraq? Has our troop presence there reached the point where it is inhibiting a successful transition to full Iraqi sovereignty? Can our strained military and ballooning national deficit handle it?

How can we accelerate the transition to Iraqi sovereignty and responsibility for their own country? How best can we engage in more robust diplomacy with our allies and key regional players who can help bolster the new Iraqi government and contribute to its reconstruction?

How can we improve Congressional oversight so that we can identify and rectify the enormous mistakes the administration has made in Iraq?

These are the questions we should be debating, Mr. Speaker, because they directly affect our ability to achieve success in Iraq. We owe it to our brave men and women in uniform and to the American people to ask these questions. But instead, we have a resolution before us today that is basically irrelevant when it comes to the real issues in Iraq. It says, essentially, that we support fighting terrorism and that we are committed to achieving success in Iraq. I agree with that, but that doesn't say anything about how we get there. That is the important question.

Mr. Speaker, today Congress is continuing to utterly abdicate its oversight responsibility. Since the outbreak of war, this Congress has done little more than endorse the administration's policy in Iraq, instead of asking the tough questions and scrutinizing that policy, as the Constitution requires us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, despite this Congress' refusal to conduct oversight, that we can be honest today as we look ahead in Iraq. We all want to see an Iraq that is stable, secure, and free. Our troops are doing an outstanding job, and they deserve our full support and respect. But the fact is that success or failure in Iraq increasingly depends on the decisions of Iraqi leaders, and they must understand that. In order to achieve success in Iraq we must accelerate the transition to Iraqi sovereignty.

I believe that significantly reducing our military footprint is critical for making that happen. While we cannot simply abandon Iraq at this point, drawing down our forces levels in a responsible way in the coming months will force the Iraqis to take greater responsibility for their own security and reduce their dependence on U.S. forces. It will also send an important message to the Iraqi people that Americans are not there to occupy the country, but rather seek to begin leaving as Iraqis take control of their own country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as we move forward in Iraq, both the future and the past matter. We must make the best of a difficult situation by working diligently to help Iraqis take full responsibility for running their country so that our overburdened troops can come home. And we must do so in a manner that does not give the violent Islamic terrorists in the world any greater strength. Yet we must also be willing to acknowledge and learn from our mistakes

so that we can chart a new path forward. That requires holding the Bush administration and this rubber-stamp Congress accountable for their failures.''

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I would like to give myself such time right now as I might consume.

We have a strategy, and it is a strategy for success, Mr. Speaker. Every day in Iraq and in Afghanistan is proof positive that we are making progress and that we will prevail.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we need to have a debate on how to win. And I would point them to the Intelligence, to the Armed Services Committee, our own International Relations Committee, the countless hearings and meetings we have held to address the issues that have been raised here. And while I will let Armed Services discuss their oversight, I would like to read just briefly some of the sessions held by our International Relations Committee on Oversight.

Full committee hearings in the 109th Congress, in the 108th Congress, full committee Members only meeting, subcommittee hearings in the 109th Congress, subcommittee hearings in the 108th Congress, classified briefings in the 108th and 109th Congresses, as well as a total of 9 resolutions of inquiry on Iraq referred to our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. Terrorism, as a method of achieving political goals and settling political differences, is intolerable to the civilized world. Inevitably, terrorists will gain access to chemical, biological and even nuclear weapons. Never has a non-government organization been able to deliver weapons of mass destruction. That will be unprecedented, and it is truly intolerable. So terrorism, as an organized system of political action, must be defeated.

Within the Palestinian Authority, for the first time, the issue of terrorism as a means of political action is now the issue between Mr. Abbas and the Prime Minister. And in Iraq, the same issue is being joined. The new Prime Minister recognizes that there can be no government if political organizations are to each have their own armies.

Iraqis had the courage to vote for the adoption of an interim government, for a constitution, for a permanent government, and the Prime Minister, as well as communities throughout Iraq, get it, that governing themselves is what they want.

Our forces have distinguished themselves in Iraq, both as skilled military units and model citizens, and I salute them. They have won the war we had to win, and are now training thousands of Iraqis and transferring authorities to Iraqi units to win the war only they can win.

□ 1830

Our impatience to leave is matched by their impatience to take the reins of their destiny. The reins are being transferred. Patience, hope, perseverance. Our children will inherit a safer world.

My heartfelt gratitude for those who have given their lives to our Nation, and for their families.

America salutes you.

I have a picture on my desk and letters in my files from families of talented young men and women killed in Iraq. I am proud of their commitment to our country of their service of the values they held dear. But I am unendingly sad—for the sacrifice they and their families have had to make.

Let us be clear—terrorism as a method of achieving political goals and settling political differences is intolerable to the civilized world.

Terrorism maximizes the killing of the innocent. Terrorism glorifies the brutality of torture and murder. Terrorism knows no diplomats and rejects negotiations as a means of resolving differences.

In our world, weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological, and nuclear—will be increasingly available to terrorist organizations espousing terrorism as a means of political action.

That is unprecedented. Never has a non-nation organization been able to deliver weapons of mass destruction. That is unprecedented, unacceptable and intolerable.

Yet terrorism as an organized system of political action has developed to new heights in the Middle East and it is there that it must be defeated.

Within the Palestinian Authority, for the first time, the issue of terrorism as a method of political action is now the issue between Mr. Abbas and the Prime Minister. Very specifically, they are debating not the legitimacy of a national army or diplomacy, but the legitimacy of political armies, factional armies and terrorist action—that is, violence ungoverned by national interest or law.

And in Iraq, the same issue is being joined. The new Prime Minister recognizes that there can be no government if political organizations (even if reflecting religious and ethnic differences) are to each have their own armies governed only by the unlimited rights of terrorists to kill others and terrorize those committed to public service.

Iraqis had the courage to vote to adopt an interim government, to adopt a constitution, and to elect their first democratic government. The prime minister, as well as communities throughout Iraq, get it, that governing themselves is what they want, and they are in varying degrees.

We as a people know the power of freedom under law. And our forces have distinguished themselves in Iraq, both as skilled military units and as model citizens respecting others and supporting and encouraging the local processes of governance.

I salute our men and women of the U.S. military. They have won the war we had to win and are now training thousands of Iraqis and transferring authority to Iraqi units, to win the war only they can win.

Ultimately, the Iraqi units will defeat terrorism as a method of political action and the people all over the world will triumph. Our impatience to leave is matched by their impatience to take the reins of their destiny.

The reins are being transferred. Patience. Hope. Perseverance. Our children will inherit a safer world as a consequence of our success.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to commend our friends, the Iraqi people, for their success in forming a unity government and, most importantly, to send a message that the United States does not back down from its commitments.

Six months ago I visited Iraq following their national elections which set up a truly representative and united government. Since then, the Iraqi Government has made significant advances. Just last week we saw the completion of the prime minister's cabinet, most notably the key positions of the ministers of defense and interior. It is important for the new Iraqi Government to fully understand our level of commitment to them during this time of transition.

Let it never be said that the United States backed away from its commitment to peace, security, and stability of this region.

A half century ago, Winston Churchill addressed this body to urge the United States to not lose patience and not lose hope in our commitment to rebuild a stronger, united Europe following World War II facing the specter of communism. Mr. Speaker, Churchill's words still ring true today. From the Berlin Airlift to the rebuilding of Japan, from the DMZ in Korea to the mountains of Afghanistan, and now to the streets of Baghdad, the world has come to learn that America does not back down from its commitments.

Today we affirm our commitment not only to the Iraqi people but to the cause of liberty throughout the world.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I rise today to give voice to a few of those outside views about Iraq, those of several former general officers who have the courage to speak out about how this war has been mishandled by the President and this Republican Congress.

Take, for example, General Anthony Zinni, former commander of the U.S. Central Command. He says, ''We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan. Ten years' worth of planning were thrown away, troop levels dismissed out of hand . . . these were strategic mistakes, mistake of policy.''

Or how about Major General Paul Eaton, who led the initial effort to create the Iraqi Army. He says that the ''failure to build coalitions with our allies . . . has imposed far greater demands and risks on our soldiers in Iraq than necessary.''

The list goes on and on. These generals have served our country with

honor and distinction, and we would be foolish not to heed their counsel. But this administration and this majority refuse to listen to any views other than their own.

I agree with many of my colleagues who say that the failure in Iraq is not an option. But unless we take a long, honest look at how we got where we are right now and demand some kind of accountability for the mistakes that were made and learn from those mistakes, there can be no success.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for House Resolution 861.

Answering questions at a September 27 Pentagon press conference, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Myers, said, ''If we are not successful in the global war on terrorism, then our way of life is, indeed, at stake. My view is, if terrorism wins in Iraq, the next 9/11 is right around the corner. It's just that simple,'' he said.

This is the sober reality we face. Our safety at home and the cause of freedom abroad is largely contingent upon our success in Iraq. Our enemies would like nothing better than to seize upon the unrest in Iraq, drive coalition forces away, and take refuge in another autocratic regime like the former Taliban and Baathist Parties, from which they could have greater wherewithal to kill Americans and our allies. We must fight and win the battle against terror overseas so we never have to fight it here at home.

As we have moved to restore order and stability to the region, our temporary presence has drawn thousands of al Qaeda disciples to Iraq to capitalize on what began as a small and anticipated homegrown insurgency by Saddam Hussein's fiercest loyalists. Now Iraq is al Qaeda's center of gravity, and we must do all that we can to secure and stabilize Iraq and its promising new government, defeating agents of terror on fronts abroad so they never again strike us here at home.

We must also remember that it is not a war of our choosing. al Qaeda declared war against the United States more than a decade ago and launched tactical strikes against Americans and our interests throughout the 1990s. Whether or not Iraq was directly involved in the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States, our operations in that nation have become a war against terrorists who have already attacked this country.

It is essential to the security of the American people and to the world's security that the United States together with its allies take the battle to the terrorists and to those who provide them assistance.

Therefore, I do not believe it is in our national interest to arbitrarily set a date for withdrawal until our mission is complete. House Resolution 861 makes it clear that the American people are determined to prevail in Iraq and other fronts to protect our freedom and defeat terrorist enemies. To achieve this goal, we must remain engaged, patient, and persistent.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, our men and women in uniform have shouldered the enormous tasks we have asked of them; and they should be commended for it, especially considering the careless way this war was planned and conducted.

Our soldiers would never complain about the mistakes of their Commander in Chief. The military just does not work that way. We all know that. Without any second guessing, they will always do the jobs assigned to them.

But we are the Congress. It is our job to raise questions about how our troops are used and cared for. It is our job to identify and to look into mistakes that are made by the executive branch. It is our job to consider and learn from the lessons of Iraq. But what have we learned today? Recycling words and we are not fixing problems.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, just does not cut it. Our soldiers are doing their jobs. They have earned and deserve a Congress that does its job.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS), who has been to Iraq four times, to Afghanistan twice, and I had the honor of traveling to both places with him as well.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 861.

The debate we are having today serves as an important reminder to all Americans that we are a nation at war. This war is against an enemy that embraces hate and intolerance over liberty and justice. Like other wars in our history, the human and financial costs are high. We mourn the loss of each and every American who has made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation. All Americans are forever indebted to these courageous citizens and their families.

It is understandable that Americans worry for the safety of our troops and have doubts as reports of suicide bombings and other attacks air regularly on television. But as in the war against fascism in the 20th century and as demonstrated by the tragic attacks of 9/11, the stakes for our Nation and our democratic allies throughout the world could not be higher.

In place of the regimes of terror and torture in Iraq and Afghanistan, we now have duly elected constitutional governments, governments that are working to promote democracy in a region of the world that has rarely embraced it. The citizens of these nations have demonstrated their intense desire for freedom through their willingness to face down threats of violence and death in casting their votes in numerous national elections in both countries.

The global war on terrorism in the broad sense and the specific battles in Iraq and Afghanistan will not be won according to a specified timetable, and our enemy cannot be appeased. But we can and we will win this war because our cause is just and right. And winning this war will ensure that the democratic gains made in Iraq and Afghanistan are not lost.

The security of our Nation and its citizens, along with the defense of the ideals of freedom, democracy, and justice, is what is at stake in this global struggle of good over evil. This struggle requires us to go beyond Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative, just as previous generations did to defeat the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century. And in the words of President Roosevelt at the beginning of World War II, it means going forward with ''confidence in our Armed Forces, with the unbounding determination of our people'' in order to ''gain the inevitable triumph.''

May God watch over our troops serving in harm's way, and may God continue to bless our great Nation, the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 861 and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The debate we are having today serves as an important reminder to all Americans that we are a nation at war. This war is against an enemy that embraces hate and intolerance over life and liberty. Like other wars in our history, the human and financial costs are high. We mourn the loss of each and every American who has made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our nation. All Americans are forever indebted to these courageous citizens and their families.

It is understandable that Americans worry for the safety of our troops and have doubts as reports of suicide bombings and other attacks air regularly on television. But, as in the war against fascism in the 20th century, and as demonstrated by the tragic attacks of 9–11, the stakes for our nation and our democratic allies throughout the world could not be higher.

I have traveled to Afghanistan twice and Iraq four times over the past four and one-half years. During these visits, there have been two constants that have instilled confidence in me about our mission and progress in these countries.

First is the professionalism, courage, and sense of duty displayed by our men and women in uniform. Whenever you thank our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen for their service, they humbly reply, ''I'm just doing my job.''

Their job, of course, is to protect our way of life. To protect the lives of our nation's citizens and the principles for which our great nation stands.

Our troops have removed truly brutal regimes from power in Afghanistan and Iraq.

They have denied terrorists two safe havens. They have eliminated the threat that a murderous dictator who used weapons of mass destruction on his own people—a dictator who continued to defy United Nations resolutions and shoot at American planes enforcing the no-fly zones in northern and southern Iraq—would again produce and brandish such weapons once international support for sanctions broke down.

Our men and women in uniform are building schools and roads, training police and soldiers, and hunting down terrorists. They are fighting al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Iraq so we don't have to fight them here at home. They are helping the Iraqi security forces stand up so we can stand down.

In place of the regimes of terror and torture in Iraq and Afghanistan, we now have duly elected constitutional governments. Governments that are working to promote democracy in a region of the world that has rarely embraced it. The citizens of these nations have demonstrated their intense desire for freedom through their willingness to face down threats of violence and death in casting their votes in numerous national elections in both countries.

The devotion to duty of our men and women in uniform is truly inspiring. The sacrifices of these patriotic Americans on the front lines of the Global War on Terrorism, as well as the sacrifices of their family members on the home front, have earned the respect, admiration, and eternal gratitude of all Americans, as well as that of 50 million Afghani and Iraqi citizens who are free today because of the troops' successes.

The second constant in my visits to Afghanistan and Iraq is the genuine gratefulness expressed by the Iraqi and Afghani people for our nation's actions in liberating them and giving them a chance at freedom. Again and again, what I heard was simply: ''Thank you for liberating our citizens.''

On my first visit to Iraq, I met with the Mayor of Kirkuk, Abdul Rehman Mustafa, and other Kirkuk city leaders. Mayor Mustafa specifically asked my colleagues and me, upon our return home, to thank our nation's mothers and fathers for their willingness to support their children, our troops, in going into harm's way to defeat Saddam Hussein and thus liberate Iraq and its citizens. In the words of Dr. Kemal Kirkuki, one of Mayor Mustafa's colleagues on the Kirkuk City Council, ''This was not a war against Iraq. It was a war to liberate Iraq.''

On another trip, I met with a group of Iraqi women leaders, including Safia Taleb al-Suhail. This group of female government and private sector leaders exemplifies the transformation of Iraq from a nation ruled by terror and torture to one in which men and women alike have constitutional rights and opportunities. Safia shared with me how her late father, an opponent of Saddam Hussein, was killed in 1994 while living in exile in Lebanon by Saddam's intelligence service. Ten years later, Safia was named Iraq's Ambassador to Egypt.

The general consensus of these Iraqi women leaders was that they couldn't wait for the day when our and all Coalition troops could return home and Iraq did not need the military assistance of other nations. These Iraqi women leaders emphasized, however, how glad they were that our and the other Coalition troops were there ensuring the freedom of all Iraqis.

On my most recent trip to Iraq, I observed and met with Iraqi soldiers undergoing basic training. There are now over 260,000 Iraqis trained and equipped to fight the insurgency. Iraqis like those I met with at the East Fallujah training camp continue to stand in line and volunteer for service in Iraqi military and police units, even though they know that said service makes them a likely target for the insurgents. The Iraqi soldiers I met expressed their deep thanks for what our troops have done in their country.

The Global War on Terrorism in the broad sense and the specific battles in Iraq and Afghanistan will not be won according to a specified timetable, and our enemy cannot be appeased. But we can and will win this war because our cause is just and right. And winning this war will ensure the democratic gains made in Afghanistan and Iraq are not lost. Winning this war will also have a far-reaching and critically important impact in other Middle East countries.

The security of our nation and its citizens, along with the defense of the ideals of freedom, democracy, and justice, is what is at stake in this global struggle of good over evil. This struggle requires us to go beyond Democrat and Republican, Liberal and Conservative—just as previous generations did to defeat the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century. And, in the words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the beginning of the Second World War, it means going forward, ''with confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people,'' in order to ''gain the inevitable triumph.''

May God watch over our troops serving in harm's way, and may God continue to bless our great nation—the United States of America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I know that it is Congress's responsibility to give our troops the resources needed to accomplish their mission. It is a responsibility that I take very seriously. It is precisely that support for the troops that motivates me to warn that we may be doing irreparable harm to our military if we do not alter our mission in Iraq quickly.

General Barry McCaffrey recently shared his frank assessment of operations in Iraq. He said we should know by year's end whether the new Iraqi Government can effectively control the insurgency. He has argued 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 6 months away from a point of no return that could have long-ranging effects on our military and the stability of the Middle East and on our ability to defend this Nation.

So what is our strategy to prevent the worst case scenario? Where is the oversight and accountability? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you one thing. It is not in the resolution that we are debating today. The Republican leadership prefers to embrace the status quo and ignore the very difficult decisions this Congress needs to make.

We deserve better. Our men and women in uniform deserve better, and the American people deserve better.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this resolution declares to the world the resolve of America to fight and to win the global war on terror, including in its central front in Iraq.

We have heard a great deal during this debate about mistakes that may have been made in the lead up to the war and during its execution, and they may be somewhat correct.

But the facts that cannot be debated are that Saddam Hussein had brutally repressed his own people, that he had used chemical weapons against his own people, that he had sanctioned the rape and murder of his own citizens with rape rooms and mass graves standing as a testament to that fact, that he had harbored terrorists within his borders and supported terrorist organizations throughout the region and the entire world, that he defied the world continually by violating 17 United Nations Security Council resolutions. Saddam Hussein was a threat to world peace and security, and it was a correct decision to go in and remove him from power.

And now we must complete the mission to bring freedom to the Iraqi people. And freedom is taking root. We have seen recently the completion of the freely elected Iraqi unity government serving under a Constitution written by the Iraqi people and approved by the Iraqi people. And last week American forces, with the cooperation of Iraqi citizens and security forces, eliminated al Zarqawi, the terrorist leader. And according to the Iraqi national security advisor, the elimination of Zarqawi has delivered his government, he said, a huge treasure of information on the terrorist operation. And we have already seen the results with raids across Iraq where hundreds of terrorists have been killed or captured. The Iraqi national security advisor also said that he thought the security situation in the country was improving enough to allow a large number of U.S. forces to leave Iraq by the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House, every American, we all want our troops to come home. Lord knows our troops have performed brilliantly and have sacrificed greatly, as American soldiers have done throughout our history when defending our freedom. But they do not want to come home before their mission is complete.

And simply put, you cannot say that you support the troops without allowing them to complete their mission.

This resolution declares the United States is committed to the completion

of that mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

□ 1845

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

Mr. Speaker, in light of the comments made by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), I reflect on an article from The Washington Post. And it is sad and disturbing that on the very day that we announced and learned that 2,500 American troops have been killed in Iraq, that the prime minister, Maliki, proposes a limited amnesty, a plan likely to include pardons for those who had attacked only U.S. troops. That is very disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have the privilege of working closely with our troops, the best fighting force the world has ever known.

And I am proud to support this resolution, because if people will just sit down and read it calmly, you will see that it expresses the strong support for our troops and for victory. Now, it is being used here today as some sort of political Rorschach test. I regret that, because the great leaders in American history have used our times of war to unite our country instead of divide our country.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are probably wondering why we are debating the Iraq war now 3 years after the beginning of that conflict. We should have had a good debate at the start of the war. I was not serving in Congress then. But it has gone down in history as one of the worst debates in American history.

There are many other flaws in the process. But today all Members of this body support our troops. All Members of this body support our troops. Democrat, Republican, Independent, you name it, we support our troops.

Now we should all question how the war is being run because that is our patriotic duty. I for one trust our military. I wish our Republican friends trusted our military before, because few times in American history has military wisdom been overridden as with this administration.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) who has been to Iraq four times to visit with our troops.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I spent many years in coaching. Every Monday morning after a Saturday game, I got lots of mail telling me what I should have done. None of those letters helped me very much, because the game was over; hindsight was always perfect. And the was not what we should have done, but rather, what do we do now.

And the same is true I think in regard to Iraq. We need to be proactive, not reactive. Like many Members of Congress, I have traveled to Iraq multiple times, and I met on one of these visits a young captain from Nebraska. This is what he said. He said that if we pull out prematurely, if we do not see this thing through, three things are going to happen.

Number one, every soldier we have lost will have died in vain. I think what he says is true. I called a mother this morning whose son had just been killed. She was proud of her son. She was proud of the sense of mission he had. And I really hate to tell her that we are leaving, that he died in vain.

Number two, tens of thousands of Iraqis will die as the nation implodes. This is what he said. And there may be hundreds of thousands. We will have broken our promise. We told them we would not pull out until we were ready and they were ready. And we cannot break our promise.

And, third, we will put a huge bulls eye on our backs, because as terrorists feel that terrorism works, and that we will retreat in the face of terrorism, only more terrorism will result.

We have seen many examples, Beirut, Kenya, USS *Cole*, World Trade Center bombing number one, and Bali. One of my All-American football players was killed in that bombing. Three hundred people lost their lives. And so inaction has led to only more terrorism, including 9/11.

The lack of resolve and willingness to see this through will only result in the spread of terrorism and greater loss of life than anything we have experienced so far.

Many of the soldiers I have met in Iraq are on their third and fourth tours of duty. They volunteered because they see progress. They have a sense of mission and purpose. And the one thing they ask me and tell me is that they are committed to completion of their mission. We should allow them to do so.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman who has been to Iraq some nine times, former Army Ranger, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL).

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as I thought about today's debate, Tom Paine's words in the crisis came to mind: these are the times that try men's souls.

It is not that the Army is in tatters. Our Army in the Revolutionary War was in tatters at the time; it was just before the Battle of Princeton and Trenton, which were successful and pulled us back together.

It is that we seem to be in tatters. I am extremely disappointed that this resolution, the process for the resolution, and some of the whereases in the resolution have invited Members of this House to become angry and to oppose the resolution.

The resolution is something that we all should be supporting. I support the resolution. The ''resolved'' part of the resolution is quite reasonable. And it expresses the sense of this Congress and this country that we will be resolved with regard to this engagement. We cannot afford to do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, it is with disappointment that I participate in the debate today, a debate that is designed intentionally to divide us, when in fact we ought to be showing a great deal of unity as a country in support of our troops and in support of the effort in Iraq.

We are making progress there. It is a slow go. These kinds of insurgencies typically take 9 to 14 years to deal with. If we hang in there, the Iraqi people ultimately will get control of the security situation in that country.

If we fail, our security situation gets worse. Theirs is awful. It is a huge threat to Israel. It is a threat to Europe, and a threat to the world. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the resolution, even though they may be disappointed in the process that has been offered us today, in the ''whereas'' clauses in the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous speaker for the vote of confidence. I am sure that the troops are very happy with that support as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, my Florida colleague, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, who has been to both Iraq and Afghanistan and has spent Thanksgiving with our troops and our coalition forces.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is fighting bloodthirsty monsters like al Zarqawi, monsters that behead civilian hostages and that blow up innocent women and children.

And if many of our Democratic colleagues across the aisle have their way, we would already have cut and run from Iraq and Zarqawi would still be alive beheading innocent people. Thankfully, our brave troops understood the kind of enemy that we are facing.

This is an enemy, Mr. Speaker, that kidnaps and beheads hostages. This is an enemy that walks into a mall full of innocent people and explodes bombs. This is an enemy that declared war on the United States decades ago, Mr. Speaker, and refuses to stop until liberty has been snuffed out.

But the United States cannot and will not allow that to happen. Hard work remains in Afghanistan and Iraq. The stakes are high. The Afghani people understand that. The Iraqi people understand this as well. So do the terrorists who murder on a daily basis.

But we are steadily working towards success, not defeat. Because, you see, this is more than just about helping people over there. This is about protecting our country from rogue states and terrorists over here.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes it clear that the American people are determined to prevail in protecting our freedom from terrorist. We will not cower to these thugs. We will continue to support our honorable troops and prevail over this evil, Mr. Speaker.

As long as we maintain our resolve, Mr. Speaker, and do not cut and run, we will win, we will defeat the terrorists.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, in response to pressure from both sides of the aisle, the Republican leadership promised a full debate on Iraq. What we are getting today is certainly a long debate, but it is far from full.

A full debate would mean that Members would be able to offer alternatives to this resolution. We would then be able to debate the merits of all of the resolutions offered. I had hoped to offer a bipartisan resolution I had introduced with my colleague, JOE SCHWARZ of Michigan, that recognizes political progress in Iraq, including the establishment of a national unity government, but also recognizes that more progress is needed, and that the Iraqis must meet their own deadlines for modifications to their Constitution.

As it is, today's debate has been tightly controlled, and our only choice is to vote up or down on a ''status quo'' resolution that does not focus on Iraq and does not reflect reality on the ground. This resolution does not bring us together, Mr. Speaker. And I regret that this debate is driving us further apart.

We were led into war as a divided Nation, and today we are even more divided. A successful conclusion in Iraq can only happen, it can only happen if Congress and the Bush administration work to bring unity at home.

If this were a real debate on Iraq, we would focus on where we are versus where we thought we would be, and look at the options 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 admit that Iraq is a distinct issue, only 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 be honest about how continuous deployment in Iraq hurts our military personnel and their families, strains recruiting and retention, and damages readiness.

This resolution talks about how much we honor our troops and the sacrifices they and their families have made to help defend freedom. No matter how 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 themes that we should be debating in a resolution today, not the ''feel good'' messages included in the Republican resolution. We all want to feel good about Iraq and believe that progress is possible. But we can't want progress so much that we blind ourselves to the reality on the ground.

This debate is driving us further apart.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman, my colleague from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who has traveled multiple times to Iraq to meet with our forces.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in the days after 9/11, the United States took the last action that our enemies thought we would take, we took the fight to them. They believed that our partisan bickering would provide them with the protection they needed to continue to operate. But they were dead wrong.

Today, we have them on the run. Saddam Hussein has been captured, and Zarqawi is dead. In their place stands the very thing our enemies fear the most, democracy. Instead of a fascist dictator is a newly elected prime minister. And fear and oppression have been replaced with an emerging economy.

But our enemies continue to fight. Why is that? Does their resolve stem from some military, political, or strategic error on our part? No. To the contrary, it is our doubt that gives them strength. al Qaeda has declared Iraq as the battleground between democracy and their hatred of our way of life.

But they know that their war cannot be won on the battlefield. And I look forward to the day when our friends in the Middle East can stand on their own. They have already proven to be allies, and the future of our friendship still hangs in the balance.

Some would rather abandon our friends and everything we have accomplished, hoping this act of good faith would somehow appease a foe proven to be without mercy. But I know our borders and our communities should not be our front lines. It is our job to keep our Nation safe, and we will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes left, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 8 minutes left.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, this administration speaks of patriotism, yet cuts health care for wounded soldiers, now numbering over 18,000. It wraps itself in the flag, the same flag draping the coffins of our dead, numbering over 2,500 as of today.

Yet now there are revelations of $12 billion missing from the Treasury, shipped to Iraq in $100 bills and distributed in ways we may never learn, bringing a total of unaccounted funds from the Iraq Rebuilding Fund to $21 billion.

Yet the Bush administration has launched no investigation, has imposed no penalties on the corporations involved. The American people have been defrauded of our money, our morality, and the precious lives of our soldiers.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining in our segment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 8 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better person to close our segment of the International Relations Committee, and I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), who served in the United States Air Force from 1951 to 1979, decorated combat veteran with two silver stars, and as all of us know is a living hero, a prisoner of war during the Vietnam War. We welcome him and we thank him for closing up our segment of the debate.

□ 1900

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the question of the day is this, do you support the war against terrorism or don't you? You know, our enemy brutally attacked the World Trade Center in 1993, and we did nothing. In 1998, they attacked two American embassies in East Africa killing 80 people. We did nothing. We were attacked again on USS *Cole*. We did nothing.

Well, now we have a strong President with courage and conviction who is bold enough to say enough is enough. If you are going to attack the United States, then we are going to fight back, and we will not tolerate terror.

You know, I devoted 29 years of my life to the Air Force, flew 62 missions in the Korean War, 25 in Vietnam, and spent 7 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam, more than half of that in solitary confinement. When I say I revere freedom, I mean that with my whole heart. I know what it is like not to have it. Every single day, since I left that God forsaken place, I thank God for my freedom.

Sometimes people here in America take the countless blessings of this Nation for granted. However, freedom is the touchstone of democracy, and America means business when we say we want to help people in Iraq experience the rich taste of freedom. When we say we are with you, our word is golden. It is through the lens of a lifelong fighter pilot that I step back today and marvel at some of the tremendous accomplishments of the last several years in the promising democracy of Iraq. It gives me hope and provides just a glimpse of how the best is yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, we are making great progress in Iraq. I have been there, and I have seen it. What a difference a few years makes. For generations, the people of Iraq only knew hate, fear and death. The former leader of Iraq gassed his own people by the thousands and hanged people in his very own death chambers.

Remember just days ago looking at the image on the television of Zarqawi, the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq? He was cornered and killed. Better yet, from that raid, came a slew of information. We are hunting down terrorists, and they are going to pay.

According to the Associated Press, American and Iraqi forces have carried out 452 raids just since last week's killing of al Zarqawi and 104 insurgents were killed during those raids. They also resulted in the capture of 759 anti-Iraqi elements. As a result, we discovered a treasure trove of al Zarqawi's information, almost ensuring a defeat against the evil forces of al Qaeda.

Americans are training and working with Iraqi forces nationwide. There is over 260,000 Iraqi security forces serving their country. Another exciting facet of the development in Iraq is the budding democracy.

Remember last January we saw the pictures from the first election? The news media predicted gloom and doom. What did we see? We saw bold images of people patiently waiting in lines for hours, defying death threats just to cast a vote.

Today, people are working tirelessly to guarantee their freedoms. Participation in many Sunni areas of Iraq went from as little as 25 percent in January 2005 election to 75 percent in December. That is tremendous. Wouldn't we like that here in the United States?

The people of Iraq have created a framework for their own future, their very own constitution. They have announced a new unity government, and the people of Iraq refused to allow those who rule by hate and fear to stop them from forging ahead for the future.

They are already tasting the fruits of our freedom. Their strong resolve will pay off in the long run. They know what a difference several years of budding democracy makes. This is what democracy looks like in Iraq today.

Schools and hospitals have been renovated, over 3,700 schools. In May, oil production was over 2.1 million barrels a day. In 2003, barely anyone had a cell phone. In Iraq today there are 6.4 million telephone users, and 1 million land-line connections. There are over 100 privately owned newspapers and magazines and more than two dozen radio and television stations. That is just the beginning.

Our men and women in uniform are doing a tremendous job bolstering this new democracy and planting the tree of freedom in tyranny's backyard. Our men and women are making a difference, and making progress. They are lifting up the people of Iraq, so ultimately the people of Iraq can help themselves. We must stay the course and see this through. We must be patient and persevere. I think President Bush said it best, quote, this is going to be freedom's century.

God bless you. God bless America. I salute you one and all and praise the people of Iraq.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes at this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Mr. SCHIFF. With all due respect to my colleagues in the majority, Mr. Speaker, I think the question posed by this resolution is whether you support accountability and oversight by this body of the war in Iraq or whether you do not. This resolution is not a substitute for oversight and accountability.

Our brave men and women in Iraq deserve more than this rhetorical pompom. Even as we celebrate the killing of Abu Musab al Zarqawi and the completion of the Iraqi cabinet, we cannot turn away from the grim reality that the war President Bush declared over in the spring of 2003 has been bloodier, costlier, longer and more difficult than the administration anticipated or planned for.

We need a new way forward in Iraq, a fact that seems glaringly obvious to everybody but the President, his advisers and the majority in this House. Last fall the Senate voted 79–19 for a resolution sponsored by Senator JOHN WARNER, the Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which stated that 2006, quote, should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with full Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq.

At a time when Congress needs to inject itself forcefully into the process of determining what our course of action in Iraq should be, the Republican majority is again prepared to rubber stamp a policy that national security experts across the spectrum recognize as plagued with misjudgment and malfeasance.

We owe our men and women more, and more than any other variable under the control of Congress, our failure to perform oversight has been a major contributing factor to these failures and to the difficult situation we find ourselves in.

Regrettably, I must vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, even as we celebrate the killing of Abu Musab al Zarqawi and the completion of the new Iraqi cabinet we cannot turn away from the grim reality that the war that President Bush declared over in the spring of 2003 has been bloodier, costlier, longer and more difficult than the Administration anticipated or planned for.

We need a new way forward in Iraq—a fact that seems glaringly obvious to everybody but the President, his advisors and the majority in this House. Last fall the Senate voted 79–19 for a resolution sponsored by JOHN WARNER, the Republican Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which stated that 2006 ''should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.''

Earlier this year, House and Senate Democrats unveiled our ''Real Security'' agenda that lays out a blueprint for protecting our nation in the 21st Century. Our plan calls for the establishment of full Iraqi sovereignty during 2006, provides for responsible redeployment of our forces to better protect our troops and facilitates the transfer of authority, and holds the Administration accountable for the terrible mistakes that have been made in the prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of Iraq. In response to our plan and the overwhelming bipartisan majority of our colleagues in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House has tabled a blank-check resolution that endorses the President's ''stay the course'' policy in Iraq—a policy that he has reiterated in recent days.

At a time when Congress needs to inject itself—forcefully—into the process of determining what our course of action in Iraq should be, the Republican majority is again prepared to rubber-stamp a policy that national security experts across the political spectrum recognize as plagued with misjudgment and malfeasance.

I have been to Iraq three times to visit with our troops there and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything that we have asked of them and they have done it magnificently. Whatever success we have had in Iraq—every village that is secured, every public works project that is completed, every school that is reopened—is due to the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

We owe our men and women serving in Iraq lot more than this rhetorical pom-pom.

Most glaringly, this resolution does nothing to hold the administration accountable for its conduct of the war. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, the former commander of the 1st Marine Division. General Newbold is one of a growing number of general officers who have courageously voiced their concerns about Iraq. General Newbold told me what he told Time Magazine in April when he said, ''What we are living with now [in Iraq] is the consequence of successive policy failures.''

More than any other variable under the control of Congress, our failure to perform oversight has been a major contributing factor to these failures and to the difficult situation in which we now find ourselves.

That failure of oversight and the need to hold people accountable has plagued the Iraq war from the beginning. And because this Congress—this Republican-controlled Congress—refuses to hold the President to account, we keep making the same mistakes over and over.

For years the administration and the majority have tried to cow into silence anybody who dared to question the conduct of the war by calling them unpatriotic. That's the subtext of the resolution that we are debating today. It is

not disloyal to ask these questions; oversight is a core responsibility of Congress. The great strength of a democratic system with built-in checks and balances is that mistakes are caught and corrected.

Every member of this House, Republicans and Democrats, wants a stable and representative Iraqi government. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot hope to change course in Iraq until and unless we are willing to acknowledge mistakes and until the administration is held to account and forced to change.

Devising and implementing a successful endgame in Iraq will be difficult, but the President's open-ended commitment to remain in the country is untenable and unwise. The American people want Iraq to succeed, and for representative government there to survive and lead to a better future for the Iraqi people, but that success requires a new direction. This empty resolution fails to provide that and, accordingly, I will oppose it.

Mr. SKELTON. Can the Chair advise the time I have left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying how proud I am of those young men and women in uniform. I know every Member in this body joins me in saying how pleased and proud we are of them.

A sad moment earlier today was when it was announced that 2,500 had given their lives in Iraq. But what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, more than anything is the request that we made for discussion on Iraq and this resolution that before us today was the result. Trying to blend and fudge together the war in Iraq, which is separate and distinct from the war on terrorism, is disingenuous.

Mr. SCHIFF, the gentleman from California, a moment ago, referred to an amendment by Senator WARNER, Armed Services chairman in the Senate. That amendment stayed in the law last year. This is what we should be discussing today about Iraq, as we were told we would.

Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq. That is where we should be today.

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

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

I think it is important to remember the two major provisions in this resolution, one that there is not going to be an arbitrary cutoff, that that would disserve the security interests of the United States to have an arbitrary exit date from Iraq; and, secondly, that we are going to finish the mission, we are going to fulfill this mission, and that we support the mission that is being undertaken by those 130,000 plus troops who are in Iraq right now.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about this question of who should determine when we leave Iraq. Over the last week, we have talked about the bringing to justice of Mr. Zarqawi, and everyone, Democrats and Republicans, have been talking about the extreme competence of the American military.

We have talked about the fact that they are extremely effective, that they know what they are doing, that they may be the best military we have had in decades, that we have great leadership. That is why their judgment on the ground as they stand up and train this Iraqi military should be the determinant of when that Iraqi military is able to carry that load and take that handoff from the American military and handle those security duties themselves. It shouldn't be a Congressman from California, it shouldn't be a Senator from Minnesota, it shouldn't be subject to a committee vote by those of us in Washington, D.C. It should be a function of the collaboration and the discussion and the analysis of the combat commanders on the ground listening to their captains and their majors and their colonels who are training up this Iraqi force. When they say they are ready, that is when we make that handoff.

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for 30 seconds.

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, instead of finding, capturing or killing the man who viciously attacked our country almost 5 years ago, the administration misled our country and sent 150,000 troops to war with a country without any credible link to 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us mentions Iraq 18 times, but it does not mention Osama bin Laden even once. Not only can we not find bin Laden in Afghanistan, we cannot find him in this resolution.

If the other side of the aisle is serious about a resolution on the global war on terror, they would be better served to get their target correct.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent that he control the time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our country is at war. Men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces, Republicans and Democrats, are making the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq to defend our freedom with 2,500 men and women having lost their lives in Iraq alone. They deserve our respect, our gratitude and our admiration, but we do not honor them with this debate today.

Instead of discussing ideas and long overdue course corrections, we are being confronted with slogans. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like this country to believe that their party will stay the course in Iraq, while we want to cut and run. That kind of gross distortion may resonate on right-wing talk radio, but nothing could be further from the truth. We need to make sure the job is done right in Iraq and leave as soon as possible. Our men and women in uniform are striving, sometimes without the necessary troop strength and without adequate equipment to make the effort in Iraq a success. Here the House majority is undermining the democratic process and the very principles that these brave servicemen and women have gone abroad to defend.

□ 1915

The actions of the Republican leadership in the run-up to today would make the Kremlin blush. Having made a decision to conduct a debate, the majority should have enabled full participation, allowing amendments to the proposed resolution on the House floor, and Democrats should have been afforded the opportunity to offer a substitute resolution.

Instead, the resolution before us is a shameless, one-party manifesto. If the debate today were about substance rather than this one-party manifesto, we would focus on what staying the course means. The misguided and mistake-ridden effort in Iraq up to now is absolutely not the course to follow.

I am deeply disturbed by critical issues concerning our efforts in Iraq that this resolution does not address: human rights violations; appalling shortcomings in planning for the post-conflict period; pathetically weak congressional oversight.

Just consider the waste, fraud and abuse of reconstruction efforts in Iraq. The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, Mr. Stuart Bowen, testified before our committee last week. I would like to pay tribute to the exceptional work that Mr. Bowen has done in this area. After serving as a senior member of George Bush's gubernatorial campaign team, as general counsel to then-Governor Bush, deputy counsel to the Bush transition team in 2000, and then associate counsel in the Bush White House, he left for the private sector, only to be brought back into service by the White House to oversee an investigation into mismanagement of funds in Iraq.

The facts from the President's handpicked special Inspector General, Mr. Bowen, are shocking. Billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars have been wasted in Iraq. The executive branch should not have allowed such slipshod management. This Congress should have done its utmost to expose it but it has not, and the American people should not and will not tolerate it.

During the first year of the war, $9 billion, that is $9 billion with a B, moved through Iraqi ministries with little or no accounting for results.

More than 75 percent of oil and gas reconstruction projects, begun with our assistance, remain incomplete. Over half of the electricity reconstruction projects are unfinished. Some 40 percent of water and sanitation reconstruction is incomplete.

Mr. Speaker, the international coalition's ability to exit Iraq responsibly, leaving the Iraqi people in charge of a stable country, is directly related to the success of our reconstruction efforts. These efforts have been severely undermined by waste, fraud and abuse. Our troops have been needlessly exposed to far greater risk because of these failures. We cannot stay the course when it is riddled with mismanagement.

If this debate were about substance, rather than slogans, we would also be talking about the unconscionable punishment that many members of the National Guard and Reserve suffer because of their patriotism. Legislation that I have been advocating for over 3 years to address the gap between these volunteers' salary in their civilian jobs and the often far lower active duty pay in the Guard and the Reserves has met with repeated roadblocks thrown up by the Department of Defense and the Republican leadership of this House, for no legitimate reason.

This pay gap not only affects the soldier but also thousands of families who now have to make ends meet on a significantly reduced income. In addition to their concerns for the safety of a loved one far away, tens of thousands of American families have to worry about meeting mortgage payments or even losing their homes because this House has not responded to their needs.

If we truly cared about our fighting forces in Iraq, we would not merely wile away the hours in a debating society over a symbolic resolution lauding them in the abstract. We would take concrete action to ensure that they and their families are treated fairly. Rather than taking up legislation that would fix this problem, we are debating a divisive political resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let nobody, not in this Chamber and not in this country, let nobody be fooled by the picture that the Republican leadership tries to paint with a debate over this resolution. There is no need to make a choice between ''cut and run'' and ''stay the course.'' What is called for is a long overdue course correction in the way the executive branch manages our country's efforts in Iraq and in the way Congress fulfills its critical constitutional role of oversight.

Since I deeply favor a course correction, I will vote against this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, we have been at this for about 6 hours, I guess, and I think everything that has been said on the subject has been said. Not everybody has said it, and so we will continue for another 6 hours on it.

But I have seen many people today who seem to have used this as an opportunity to insist that the mission in Iraq has been a failure, and that our presence in Iraq has not been properly run, and that we are not winning the peace. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think this is absolutely a wrong assertion and only serves to lower the morale of the men and women fighting in Iraq, while encouraging the terrorists who aim to harm both America and Iraq.

The other day I was rushing to Chair a meeting in the Armed Services Committee. I was running a little late so I was kind of frustrated and in a hurry. Someone stopped me out in the hall and said, Congressman HEFLEY, Congressman HEFLEY, would you like to meet a marine from your district? And, of course, I would like to meet a marine from my district, but I was in a hurry. I did stop, and I went over to this young marine. They introduced him to me, and there he stood in his starched shirt and red and blue striped pants, straight as a string, and strong as could be.

I introduced myself and he introduced himself, and then someone said, Sergeant So and So lost both legs in Iraq. I would never know it from looking at him, but he lost both legs in Iraq. I said, oh, I am sorry to hear that, but thank you. He said oh, no, no, no, since then I have gone to jump school. I would not go to jump school with two good legs. Since then, I have gone to jump school and I am going back to Iraq. The job's not done.

I have been to Germany, as many of you have, to see where we bring the wounded into Germany. There was one young man laying on his bed, and I said, well, when were you wounded? He said about 4:30 this morning. About 4:30 this morning, we had gotten him off the battlefield. We had stabilized him and had him in an airplane and had him to Germany where he had already had successful surgery before the end of the day. The main desire of his heart was to get back with his unit in Iraq. That is good morale.

I talked to another young man that was just coming out of the operating room, and he had his arm up in a cast. I asked him, well, soldier, do you plan to stay in the service? He said, oh, I plan to stay in if they will let me. He said the job is not done.

And the point I make with these stories is that they see that they are doing something important. They see that they are doing something meaningful. They see they are doing something that helps America and they want to continue to do it.

We are fighting the war on terror on our terms, and we are winning.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of the Terrorism Subcommittee.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a freshman, Ronald Reagan was President and I was invited to the White House with a group of people to talk to Ronald Reagan about things we thought were important. We talked for a long time about many issues, and when we finished, the President leaned forward in his chair and said: Let me say something to each of you. All of those things are important. They are all about America but nothing is more important than a system of national security that will protect our right to deal with those issues.

I wish more people had been with me that day because I think of that every morning on my way to work. It appears that there are some who question the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and our coalition partners in Iraq who make every effort to advance the global war on terror, to combat the al Qaeda and the affiliate organizations that work with them.

How misguided. Nothing could be further from the truth. Iraq is a critical front in the global war on terror. Separating Iraq from the global war on terror, in my opinion, is a recipe for disaster.

Do not take my word for it. Listen to the enemy. These are the enemy's words. The leadership of al Qaeda has made Iraq an important part of its goal of spreading and imposing its ideology around the world. According to al Qaeda, defeating the coalition forces in Iraq is the first phase of its stated strategic goal of establishing a Taliban-like rule throughout the Middle East.

In a July 2005 communication from Ayman al Zawahiri, al Qaeda's second-in-command right behind bin Laden, to the now-deceased leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, Zawarhiri explicitly states the centrality of the war in Iraq with a global jihad. Bin Laden's right-hand man laid it out like this. Here are the goals: expel the Americans from Iraq; establish an Islamic authority in Iraq; extend the jihad to the countries neighboring Iraq; and destroy Israel. Those are the goals stated by al Qaeda.

We must not lose sight of the fact that a successful prosecution of the global war on terrorism and defeating al Qaeda and its affiliates require us to pay attention to multiple locations in the world, including Iraq. Though we have made progress, the threat remains global in nature.

Since September 11, al Qaeda has planned, supported, or executed attacks leading to the deaths of innocent

civilians around the world. According to the Defense Intelligence Agency, there are active jihadists, radical terrorist organizations with the goal of taking control of governments and territories in countries across the globe, including Iraq and Afghanistan, of course; Israel; Saudi Arabia; Pakistan; Somalia; Algeria; Chechnya; Kashmir; and the Philippines and others.

The same report states that al Qaeda maintains and plans to expand safe havens throughout the world, throughout the Middle East, in Asia, in central Asia and Europe, in many countries in Africa, and we know of the terrorist presence today in Canada and right here in the U.S.A.

I have spent a career, Mr. Speaker, in Congress studying the threat posed by terrorism. Long before September 11, I came to learn the dangers of ideologically inspired terrorist organizations. As a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, we have made great strides in combating this enemy, but we must remember that this is a long war, and although the challenge is great, our commitment to security and human freedom will ultimately defeat the oppressive ideology that fuels our terrorist enemies.

□ 1930

Let me just close by listing some terrorists acts which occurred and some plots which were uncovered, and then by simply asking my colleagues a question.

In 1993, the first World Trade Center bombing occurred. In 1995, a plot to bomb 11 U.S. airlines was uncovered. In 1996, the Khobar Towers bombing took place. In 1998, the embassies in Tanzania and Kenya were hit. In 2000, the USS *Cole*. In 2001, the 9/11 attack, killing 3,000 Americans and others. In 2002, the Bali bombing. In 2003, the Marriott hotel attack in Jakarta. In 2004, the railroad bombing in Spain. In 2005, the subway bombings in London, and the bombings of the resorts in Egypt. And in 2006, 17 jihadists were arrested in Canada.

The question to those who plan to vote against this resolution, and I will conclude with this: Can we really afford to belittle this threat and question the criticality of our mission in Iraq?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia on the Democratic side, Mr. ACKERMAN of New York.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our troops in the field and the belief that the United States will ultimately prevail in the global war on terror and against this partisan, transparent, cynical, and divisive resolution.

Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in today is not a serious debate about the progress of the war in Iraq or alternatives to achieve the victory there that we all seek. If it were not a sham, Members would be able to offer amendments. We would be able to vote up and down on our future course in Iraq. What we have here, instead, is more unamendable, arrogant, Republican take-it-or-leave-it attitude.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers are fighting and dying, and the American people are spending hundreds of billions of dollars, and we are here patting ourselves on the back instead of doing effective oversight. This Republican Congress has abdicated that responsibility and continues to whitewash an incompetent, dysfunctional Republican administration.

I would like to be clear, Mr. Speaker. Just because I am for oversight doesn't mean that I hate freedom. Just because I am for tracking how billions of dollars have been wasted and misspent or stolen doesn't mean I don't support our troops. And just because people question the competence of the President and his administration doesn't mean that they are not patriots.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can be a patriot if you just rubber stamp, if you turn a blind eye and bury your head in the sand as war profiteers run off with the money needed to protect the troops and to reconstruct a broken country.

Instead of discussing the difficult and costly work necessary to achieve that victory, our Republican friends have simply decided to move directly to this victory party and 10 hours of cheerleading. This resolution begins and ends declaring our ultimate victory against terrorists, and in between we sing our own praises. This is actually a prayer. Prayer is good. But what we need is a plan. All we are doing here is whistling past a growing graveyard.

What is more notable about the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is what it doesn't say. There is no mention of the world class bait-and-switch lie that got us into this mess in the first place. No mention of the lie of the stockpiles of weapons that the Vice President swore were absolutely there. No mention about the lie that the stockpiles of weapons of which Secretary Rumsfeld knew the exact location. No mention of oil. No mention of the intelligence either.

In fact, there is not even the words ''weapons of mass destruction.'' How can you have such a resolution without that? And Osama bin Laden. Not only can't we find him in the region but we can't even find his name hinted at in this resolution.

The debate is a whitewash, and this resolution is a coverup. Vote against this charade. Vote against the premature victory party. Vote against this resolution and let us have a real debate about our policy options and our future course and involvement in Iraq.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the reenlistment rate for the soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division, the 4th Infantry Division, the 1st Marine Division, and the 10th Mountain Division exceeds 130 percent in this last quarter. And a lot of that is the result of the great work by the gentleman of New York (Mr. MCHUGH), who has been the chairman of the Total Force and the Personnel Subcommittee and has presided over a major part of the 41 percent pay increase that we have passed over the last several years.

I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. MCHUGH. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to think this is a good debate, even when I vigorously disagree with some of the statements being said. This is the hall where discussions, concerns, where analysis and counterpoints need to be expressed.

I wanted to start, if I may, Mr. Speaker, with a couple of counterpoints. I have heard my good friends on the other side of the aisle repeatedly refer today to comments and observations made by clearly one of the greatest fighting generals this Nation has known in recent era, General Barry McCaffrey; things he has said about our current involvement and engagement in Iraq. Perhaps as a mere oversight, perhaps conveniently, those good folks omitted the following, and I am quoting directly. I noticed most of those folks quoted from their own notes.

These are from General McCaffrey's own reports after his return, in this case to Iraq. He did similar analysis in Afghanistan. Under the bottom line observations from Iraqi Freedom, written in April of 2006, before Zarqawi, before the appointment and the filling out of the entire permanent government. ''The morale, fighting effectiveness, and confidence of U.S. combat forces continue to be simply awe inspiring. In every sensing session and interaction, I probed for weakness and found courage, belief in the mission. Belief in the mission. Enormous confidence in their sergeants and company-grade commanders, and understanding of the larger mission, a commitment to creating an effective Iraqi army and police, unabashed patriotism, and even a sense of humor.''

He goes on to say, ''Many have reenlisted to stay with their unit on its return to a second Iraq deployment. Many planned to reenlist regardless of how long the war went on.''

He then went on to observe, ''The Iraqi army is real, is growing, and is willing to fight.''

And then on the last page of his analysis, Mr. Speaker, he said, and I quote, ''There is no reason why the United States cannot achieve our objectives in Iraq. Our aim must be to create a viable federal state under the rule of law which does not enslave its own people, threaten its neighbors, or produce weapons of mass destruction.''

The last sentence of General McCaffrey that my friends also failed to

quote: ''The American people are far safer today than we were in the 18 months following the initial intervention.''

I think, in fairness to General McCaffrey, if we are going to quote from him we should quote the entirety.

I heard also some comments about how we are not doing right by our forces in very recent debate. I would refer again to General McCaffrey's observations, but I have here a listing, five pages, bullet points of what this committee and this House and this Congress has done for our men and women in uniform in just the last four National Defense Authorization Acts. There are 51 points, and I won't read all of them, but let me account for some.

In 2001, we provided $500 a month to assist the most economically challenged members, to take them off food stamps. A national disgrace, and we did it. We did it. This Congress.

In 2002, we improved permanent change of station requirements to reduce out-of-cost moving expenses for military families. There is now no out-of-cost expense.

In 2003, we gave them assignment incentive pay, and in 2006 increased that maximum from $1,500 to $3,000 a month. We increased hostile fire and imminent danger pay from $150 to $225 a month. Family separation allowance from $100 to $250 a month. We completed, as I said, that 5-year program to eliminate out-of-cost housing expenses.

We have eliminated the requirement to pay subsistence charges for those brave members of the military who are hospitalized. We now pay an allowance to reimburse for the cost of life insurance. And in the bill we passed this year, that cost will be totally paid for by the Federal Government for the first time in our Nation's history. We authorized a new payment of $430 a month to combat wounded servicemembers who are hospitalized, and on and on and on.

The chairman mentioned that in each of the last 8 years we have increased pay to our military men and women in uniform by more than half a percent over what the civilian sector in this country has received, whether it is TRICARE for every Guard and Reserve member; hospitalization, better coverage. We have cared for these troops.

The chairman noted, and the figures show it, though I have heard about a strained force, and we are concerned about them. We worry about them every day. I know I have in my six trips to Iraq and twice to Afghanistan. But let me read you the recruitment figures we have thus far this year.

The Army, 104.3 percent of goal. The Navy, 100 percent of goal. The Marines, 101.5 percent. The Air Force, 100.5 percent. A DOD total of 102.1 percent. Lastly, retention. Those brave members that General McCaffery talked about. Retention in the Army, 113 percent; Navy, 106 percent; Marines, 145 percent; and Air Force, 109 percent.

My friends on the other side say they support the troops, and I believe them. They are all patriots, some extraordinary patriots on the other side that I have the honor of serving with. But I don't think they are serving the troops in some of this debate tonight like the troops want to be served. They want to see this mission through, because they understand the terrorists believe this is the real deal. This is where they have drawn the line in the sand, and the troops understand if we don't take the commitment they have made there and win this war on terror in Iraq, where will we fight next? It will be right here at home.

It is a proud Army, we have a proud Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. We are doing right by them and we need to do better because they are doing so right by us. I hope all my colleagues will support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. LANTOS and Mr. MURTHA.

Prior to the 2003 invasion, I introduced legislation that would have required the President to report to Congress on the possible consequences. It would have required the administration to provide a full accounting of the implications for homeland security, the war on terrorism, and regional stability in the Middle East. It would have required the administration to tell us the steps that our country and our allies would take to protect United States soldiers, including providing them adequate body armor. It would have required the President to estimate the full cost associated with military action against Iraq. And it would have required the President to provide an exit strategy, a plan for achieving long-term social, economic, and political stabilization of a postwar Iraq so that we and the troops could tell when we had crossed the finish line.

The administration has still not provided answers to the questions many of us asked before the war. Three years later, the Iraq war has cost more than 2,500 American lives and nearly $300 billion, with no end and no plan in sight. Secretary Condoleezza Rice said this war could last for 10 more years.

Today's resolution presents a false choice: Support the administration's flawed war policies or concede defeat on the war on terror. We are asked to support Iraq's new Prime Minister in the amnesty, the amnesty he will offer to the insurgents who have attacked and killed U.S. troops.

Our troops have done everything, everything we have asked them to do in Iraq and more. They have acted heroically. They have done their job and we should honor them today and every day. But this is the second time that a congressional debate on the handling of the war has been replaced with a political stunt. The troops and the American people deserve much better.

Our troops deserve more than a round of applause. They deserve a realistic and forward-thinking plan. They deserve a plan that will bring a successful end to this mission so that they can come home. They deserve what many of us asked the President to give us 3 years ago: An exit strategy for Iraq. An exit strategy in Iraq is a crucial step toward declaring victory on the global war on terror.

□ 1945

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to clear up a point.

There are 340,000 sets of advanced body armor produced and fielded. That is more than two sets for every single person serving in uniform in Iraq.

I have made this statement for the last year, but if anybody has a relative who is serving in Iraq without body armor, please call me personally. I have not yet received a single phone call.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) who does so much for the troops.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, we can't talk about the global war on terror without talking about the 922,000 heroes who have voluntarily served our Nation, going to a land that most have never been to, to liberate a people most have never met.

Before 9/11, I worried if America needed our young people, would they go. And we all know they did. I believe history will remember their courage and name them. But until it does, I call them Freedom Believers.

On my first trip to Iraq, I met a young man on the crew of our C–130. He told me he had a small daughter, yet defending freedom was so important that when he finished his enlistment, he would join his Reserve unit. He said there were so many from that unit who volunteered to go to Iraq; he knew he would not be back soon.

Another soldier said to me: Let me make this simple. In a football game, you want to play at home. But this is not football. This is not a game. This is war. And war must always be played away. We played at home on September 11, and we lost.

My proudest moments in Iraq have been the ones spent seeing their smiles when I told them about the support that they have here at home. Many that I met were on their second and third tours. Their feelings are summed up in a recent letter to the editor, a returning soldier said: ''If the choices are pull out or I go back, I'm going back.''

On the way home from Iraq in Shannon, Ireland, as a Marine unit walked through that terminal, everyone stood and clapped for them. On both of my trips to Iraq, I was asked repeatedly by our troops: When are we going to tell America what they are doing in Iraq, explain the threat to America and the world, and share the successes that they have achieved? The saddest moments were when they quietly asked me: What are Americans thinking and saying?

These are people who show no fear on the battlefield, but it was like they were afraid to ask that question and hear my reply. They are probably referring to stories such as the one from the New York Times, October 26, 2005. They quoted Corporal Jeffrey Starr, who lost his life defending freedom. Here is their quote: ''I kind of predicted this. A third time just seemed like I'm pushing my luck.''

And here's the real quote: ''Obviously if you are reading this, then I have died in Iraq. I kind of predicted this, that's why I am writing this in November. A third time just seemed like I'm pushing my chances. I don't regret going. Everybody dies, but few get to do it for something as important as freedom. It may seem confusing why we are here in Iraq. It's not to me. I'm here helping these people so they can live the way we live, not to worry about tyrants or vicious dictators, to do what they want to do with their lives. To me, that is why I died. Others have died for my freedom, now this is my mark.''

Our military is the most lethal fighting force in the world, not solely because of their training, not solely because of their technology, but because they engage the enemy, our enemy, with the most unequivocal support of the American people. That is the most effective tool in their arsenal and one they cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, they watch our news. They watch C–SPAN. They are watching us right now.

This is your time. What do you want to say to them? Do you want to tell them, you're doing a terrible thing, but we support you?

Well, I want to say: you're doing an honorable and noble thing. We support you and we love you.

There is only one option for Iraq, that's victory. Thank you to our brave American heroes. Thank you to their families. God bless America, and God bless the men and women who keep us free.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in fighting the war on terror. I believe America must stay engaged in the world, but what we have in Iraq today is a quagmire, and what we have on the floor today is a resolution that essentially says stay the course.

You know, sometimes the American people are smarter than the politicians. This resolution would have us believe that everything is hunky-dory in Iraq and everything would be wonderful if we only stayed the course. The American people don't believe that; and, Mr. Speaker, neither do I any more.

We need a new strategy in Iraq, not an open-ended rubber stamp and more of the same. At what point do we reassess our strategy and come to the conclusion that it is not working? But what do we get here from our Republicans friends, a resolution that is a farce, a political document that by the majority leader's own admission was designed to embarrass Democrats and put Democrats in a box.

All of the problems we see in Iraq today, the daily deadly attacks by insurgents, the rise of ethnic militias, the shortage of gas and electricity, the weakness of the economy, can be tied to the complete lack of planning by the administration. It seems they didn't have a clue as to what they would get when they came into Iraq.

Our intelligence was faulty, but what really makes me mad was this war was mishandled from the get-go. First, we didn't send in enough troops. Secondly, we didn't secure the borders. We fired the Baath leaders and created all kinds of antagonisms and unemployed people. We fired the security forces so our people would have to do security, and we fired our own generals that disagreed with the administration.

A former commander of U.S. Central Command, General Zinni, said: ''10 years' worth of planning were thrown away; troop levels were dismissed out of hand. These were not tactical mistakes; these were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.''

But what do we have here from our Republican friends? A resolution that is not bipartisan. We could have had a resolution that all of us could have supported. We treasure our troops. I want us to succeed in Iraq, but what do we have: partisan, political drivel. Democrats had no input. Democrats were not allowed a substitute. Democrats were not consulted so our men and women serving in the military are being reduced to pawns in the Republican's election game.

Shame on this resolution. I wish we could have a resolution that I could vote for, but we do not have one on the floor today.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), a Member who is a leader not only in supporting the troops but in humanitarian efforts in Iraq.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America is first and foremost an ideal. It is an ideal that holds that all of us are created equal, endowed by that Creator with unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Truly, that is what our troops fight for in Iraq.

For their efforts, we now see a country that, although it has been in bondage since it was called Babylon, has a freestanding constitution and hope for freedom. And there is hope that freedom may take root in the Middle East and turn the whole of humanity in a better direction.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that there are other ideals in the world besides America's noble ones, and they have great consequences. I am concerned that this Nation does not understand that we are now at war with an evil ideology. It is an ideology that has the most profound human implications and consequences.

On September 11, terrorists murdered on our own soil 3,000 American citizens. But this ideological war did not begin on 9/11. It began many years ago when certain Muslim extremists embraced a divergent Islamist dogma that dictates that all infidels must die.

Not so long ago, al Zarqawi himself said of America's leaders: ''They are aware that if the Islamic giant wakes up, it will not be satisfied with less than the gates of Rome, Washington, Paris and London.''

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny that we are fighting a war against an ideology that is bent on the destruction of the Western world. They are committed to killing us and would like nothing better than to decapitate this country by detonating a nuclear yield weapon 100 yards from here. To allow Islamist extremists to declare victory in Iraq will only hasten such a day.

These are moments when we must hear the voice of history and remember the words of Winston Churchill when he said in part: ''If you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly, there may come a moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse moment. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is still better to perish than to live as slaves.''

Mr. Speaker, if freedom is to survive, to allow Islamist terrorists to declare victory in Iraq is not an option. We must win. The world has changed since Mr. Churchill warned us all. We are 60 years now into a nuclear age. We must not let terrorists have even the slightest hope of victory ever.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a great member of the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution that we are debating, I would like to focus on point four of the resolution that declares that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.

I think it is helpful for us to look back at some milestones over the last year or so to help us understand how far we have actually come.

We went there to take Saddam Hussein out of power. He is now in jail and on trial for his life. We got that done.

In January of 2005 we held the first election for a transitional government. That got done.

Their job was to write a Constitution. At each and every one of these

steps there was great anxiety that the Iraqi people couldn't get it done. They got their Constitution written in August of 2005.

The next step was a referendum on that Constitution. They got that done.

Then we held national elections under that Constitution in December of 2005. Again, ahead of that election there was grave concern that the Iraqis couldn't do it. But they went to the polls and elected that government.

When I was there in April, the concern at that point in time was that they couldn't pick a prime minister, the next big step to the road to democracy in Iraq. That got done.

Two weeks ago when I was there, the final point was they couldn't find a minister of defense or a minister of interior to lead those very important ministries, but they have gotten that done.

By any evaluation, we have a long stretch of historic milestones that are proof that the Iraqi people are up to the task.

A CODEL I participated in, our job was to go over there and get a sense of whether the Iraqi Army was standing up to the task. We met with a General Bashir at his base at Tajik and found a very professional individual. He was very candid in his remarks on where the Iraqi Army was up to that point in time. As I watched the staffers, his staff in the room, I tried to assess them as best I could. I found professionals with a quiet sense of confidence that they could lead, fight and defend their country.

We are making this happen, and we are completing this mission in Iraq. I support this resolution and I ask that each of my colleagues all support it because a free, sovereign, united Iraq will make the Middle East a safer place to be, and by extension it will make America a safer place to be.

So I rise in support of this resolution and ask my colleagues to vote for it. I, too, like Mrs. DRAKE ask God's blessings on our country and in particular on our fine young men and women who are fighting this fight.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

□ 2000

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, Colin Powell thought Vice President CHENEY was so obsessed with attacking Iraq that he suffered from war fever. The problem is that fever can make you delusional and you can see things that aren't really there, no matter how much you want them to be true.

The Vice President said that we would be greeted as liberators. False. Secretary Rumsfeld said that the war would not last more than 6 weeks. False. Secretary Wolfowitz said that Iraq could pay for its own reconstruction from oil revenues. Again, false. We were told that the administration had a coherent plan for postwar Iraq. False.

The truth is that this administration's incompetence has set back the effort against global terrorism. Don't take my word for it. Simply come to this floor and read the statements of these generals, patriots all.

The administration claimed that there was a link between Iraq and al Qaeda. Again, false. But they are not talking about a link that does exist and should cause us all profound concern. That is the relationship between the new government in Iraq and Iran. The new Iraqi government is full of Iranian allies. They have signed a military cooperation agreement. And the Iraqi Foreign Minister just recently said, Iran has a right to develop nuclear technology and the international community should drop its demands that Iran should prove that it is not trying to build a nuclear weapon.

And we are supposed to believe that our national security has been strengthened, and that we are making progress on the war on terrorism?

The truth is that the war in Iraq has not just simply been a distraction from the global war on terror, it has actually increased the power and influence of the number one state sponsor of terrorism, according to our own Department of State, an original charter member of the axis of evil club, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), a very fine member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to first rise tonight to thank the men and women of our military for their efforts in Iraq, in Afghanistan and other places around the world in the war on terror. Their sacrifice, their families' sacrifice, has value and will never, never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, there are many members of the minority that have forgotten an important lesson of history, and that is you cannot appease tyrants and evil. We need to remember the 1930s, the voice of Winston Churchill that said we must confront Hitler and the Nazis as they began to build up the German military machine. Well, we waited and we waited until they invaded their neighbors. And it was the blood and lives of hundreds of thousands of Europeans and Americans that defeated that evil.

In the 1960s and the 1970s, we failed to confront the growing Soviet threat. We waited and we waited until Ronald Reagan inspired this Nation to have the will to stand up to the Soviets and engage them in an arms buildup that cost Americans billions of dollars, but bankrupted the Soviets, and we defeated that evil.

In the 1990s the terrorists attacked us over and over again. We failed to respond, as President Clinton dismantled our intelligence capabilities. Appeasement does not work. History shows us that over and over again.

President Bush learned this lesson, and he and this Congress did not wait until Saddam had nuclear weapons. We acted on intelligence, not just our intelligence, but intelligence from agencies around the world. We thought it was accurate. Unfortunately, it was wrong. But it took us going into Iraq to find out that he did not have the biological, chemical and nuclear capabilities we thought he might be building. But we removed a tyrant. We freed a people and we focused the war on terror in Iraq. And today we are helping to build a democracy in an Arab world which can be a model to other nations to create liberty, justice and, most importantly, hope, hope for a better tomorrow for millions of Arabs.

We must stay the course, as this resolution states, until Iraq can secure its nation and we defeat terror. This struggle will be as long as it is hard. But in the end, the lesson of history will be reaffirmed that appeasement is a failed strategy, and that sacrifice for freedom is always worthwhile.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution because it represents an unrealistic and disingenuous portrayal of the situation in Iraq. The rhetoric on the other side of the aisle is filled with erroneous assertions of impending victory reminiscent of President Bush's premature ''mission accomplished'' claim.

Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, it is clear that the Iraq war has become an exercise in futility that can no longer be justified with pipe dreams and good intentions. Americans were egregiously misled going into this war without a plan to win the peace. They have been misled about America's progress in Iraq, and today they deserve the truth.

The truth is that President Bush took his eye off the ball in the war on terror, diverted necessary resources from Afghanistan to Iraq, and today Osama bin Laden remains free.

The truth is that victory is not around the corner in Iraq, that the insurgency and sectarian violence continue unabated, and that the death of Zarqawi, while very significant, will not bring security to Iraq.

The truth is that on the day Zarqawi was killed there were five bombings in Baghdad, and the violence continues irrespective of his death.

The truth is that while 265,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained and armed, nearly one-third of the force does not show up for work.

The truth is that our policies have failed to stabilize Iraq, and we must not stay the course. We must change the course.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution blurs the line between reality and fiction by painting a rosy picture of Iraq and ignoring the ongoing insurgency on the ground.

To paraphrase Secretary Rumsfeld, in a war we must deal with the reality we have and not the reality we want.

Please join me in opposing this charade.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 861. I am proud of the progress being made in the global war on terror every day. While there is no quick path to victory, it is absolutely necessary for us to maintain our resolve. Many people forget that terrorists have long waged war against the United States, well before the 9/11 attacks. Americans were bombed in Lebanon in 1983, at the World Trade Center in 1993, at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996, at the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, and on board the USS *Cole* in 2000. Over the years, terrorists have made it their mission to strip us of our freedoms, thinking they could kill innocent Americans unprovoked, without paying a price. It is vital that we continue to stand up to these murderers and show them that the United States will not sit back and tolerate their savage acts. We can either win this global war on terror now, or we can let the terrorists bring the war to us like they did on 9/11. The right choice is clear.

Thanks to the hard work and perseverance of our troops, Abu Musab al Zarqawi was killed last week. Yet, as President Bush said, we must continue to prosecute this global war on terror until our mission is accomplished and until Iraq can defend and govern itself fully.

I am very proud of our troops for their service, selfless attitude and sacrifice. They are making great strides. They are freeing people from oppression so they may enjoy the same freedoms that all Americans cherish. Today our military has liberated the people of Afghanistan from the brutal Taliban regime, and has denied al Qaeda its safe haven of operations. They have crushed Saddam's Hussein's brutal dictatorship and captured thousands of terrorists and terrorist operations. Children in Iraq are returning to school and Iraqi businesses are prospering. Iraq has had several successful elections and has formed their government under a new prime minister. There is undeniable progress and hope in Iraq every day.

Mr. Speaker, I close with a story about a constituent, Sergeant Dale Beatty of Statesville, North Carolina. Sergeant Beatty was severely injured while fighting the global war on terror and lost both legs. Yet Sergeant Beatty is not angry. In fact, his resolve is even stronger today. He knows that he made a great sacrifice for a noble cause. Sergeant Beatty came to visit me while he was at Walter Reed and told me he would gladly go back to the Middle East to fight alongside his comrades if he could. That is a true American hero. Sergeant Beatty's morale and the morale of our troops I have spoken with demonstrate we are doing the right thing.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a very fine member of the committee.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding time. Your commitment to our troops is unmatched.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Mr. Speaker, said we are all entitled to our own opinions, but he went on to say we are not entitled to our own facts.

Facts have been badly set aside today. Oversight? 92 hearings, 42 full committee, 52 subcommittee and others. Anyone that did not have oversight or was not fully informed simply had other priorities. And that is an option in the People's House. But the information was there, publicly exposed. And other information was readily available.

Generals? Six generals have spoken out. In America we are free. We can speak out. But the facts are that in the Army alone there are 11 4-stars, 53 3-stars, in the Air Force 11 4-stars, 38 3-stars and numerous others who take exception to the quotes that have been misstated here tonight.

This is a war against terrorists. Terror is a tactic. Here are 27 pages and 191 incidents since 1961 where Americans have died at the hands, the bombs or other devices of terrorists. Make no mistake about it. Terrorists have a goal, and it is to destroy freedom, America, all of us who live free. That is their goal. This is not about territory. This is not about negotiation.

Our men and women have served us admirably, courageously and well. The progress was well documented by a release from Zarqawi himself this morning. The war for terrorists is going poorly, an incredible sign of progress.

And I have been to Iraq and Afghanistan many, times Mr. Speaker. But on the floor of this House, just last week, I looked into the gallery, right there, and there sat seven members of Parliament from Afghanistan. I went up to speak to them, and as I walked down the steps, they saw me coming and they said, we had dinner with you in Afghanistan last week. Members of Parliament here in America looking at the People's House seeing how freedom, liberty, justice and the rule of law is made and administered. Remarkable, remarkable progress, Mr. Speaker.

I am so proud of the men and women who are making this possible around the world. And I guess I should close by saying redeployment? What is that? It is cut and run. It is snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Sam Adams, several hundred years ago, spoke to this when he said, ''if you love wealth greater than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest for freedom, go from us in peace. We ask not your counsel or your arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you, and may posterity forget that you were our countryman.''

Mr. Speaker, God has blessed this country with men and women who wear the uniform, make us proud and make us free. Our heartfelt thanks and gratitude to them and their families.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

□ 2015

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, by this point just about every point has been made. But believe it or not, I would like to make a point that has not yet been stated on this floor.

I think we all realize that the development of Iraq, its ability to provide water and electricity to its people, will influence the level of casualties that we suffer, may even influence the result of success or failure of this mission. But what is not stated is how the debts of Saddam Hussein now crushing the existing regime in Baghdad are playing a role in preventing that development, a role in killing our soldiers.

Now, most oil rich countries borrow for development. They do not rely chiefly upon aid. Why can't Iraq with enormous oil wealth borrow? The answer is the huge debts incurred during the years of Saddam Hussein. In fact, on this floor many of us thought that half of that $19 billion of aid we gave in 2003 should be a loan, and we were told no, Iraq can't borrow, they have too many debts already.

Now, the well-known debts to Europe and Russia have been 80 percent forgiven. The secret debts, the ones that are never talked about, are the enormous debts claimed by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other Gulf States detailed on this chart, totaling over $64 billion.

Now, much of the European money that was lent to Iraq was used for roads and oil wells, things of continuing value to the Iraqi people. But what did Saudi Arabia and Kuwait lend Saddam money for? To finance his war of aggression and death against Iran. So why does the State Department not have the courage to stand by the new Iraqi government in its declaration that these debts are odious, null and void, and need to be wiped off the balance sheet?

The question before us is whether the blood of Americans will be shed in order to pay the debts Saddam Hussein incurred.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER), who has just welcomed home his old unit, the 116th Armored Cav.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we pause long enough during this important debate tonight to remember back to another time in a place not too far from this place.

During the heated debate and many times rancorous discussions on their efforts to establish a government that would elevate the individual above the crown, above the prince, above the king, and above the head of state, much was said about the doubtfulness of victory and the certainty of failure. Caution was urged, voted on, and rejected. The hope and the promise, the

value for the chance at being free was so strong that our Founding Fathers measured well that the risk was worth the reward.

Now is our opportunity once again to revive that spirit. And in doing so, we demonstrate to ourselves, the people of the United States, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the people of the world that we are worthy of the suggestion that we are the beacon of freedom for the world and we share that light with pride, with honor, and hope.

The Iraqi people who yearn for freedom, I am confident, do so with no less courage and resolve than those who so boldly signed the Declaration of Independence and at that time set this Nation on a destiny of freedom envied by all peoples of the world who suffer under the burden of tyranny.

Our allies throughout the war for independence did not pack up and go home when the going got tough. They believed in us, as I believe that we should believe in the Iraqi people. They stayed the course, as I believe we should.

Mr. Speaker, in his book ''The Glorious Quest,'' James R. Evans gives us all a thought that we should ponder as we approach this freedom-rendering vote. He said, ''No historian of the future will ever be able to prove that the ideas of individual liberty practiced in the United States were a failure. He may be able to prove that we were not yet worthy of them. The choice is ours.''

By our actions here today, we are deciding whether or not the Iraqi people are worthy of living in freedom. This choice is ours. Those of us who will favor or deny this resolution surely decide the worth of the Iraqi people.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) for 2½ minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, even those of us on this side of the aisle sometimes wonder if after 3 years we should still be in Iraq.

I recently traveled there, and like many of my colleagues, we met with soldiers from Florida. We each asked to meet with soldiers from our home State. I will never ever forget this young man. He was not from my district. He actually was from south Florida. And I asked each of them where they were from and if they were married. This young man's name was Joe. And I said to him, ''Joe, are you married?''

He said, Yes, ma'am. I am married and I have five children.''

So right away I said, ''Your wife must be a saint to be home with five children.''

And he looked at me with all of the conviction that you would ever ask for in a soldier, and he said, ''Ma'am, he said, ''my wife who's home with my five children feel exactly the way that I do, and that is until the children in Iraq are safe on the streets, our children won't be safe in Florida or in America.''

Obviously we are very proud of what our soldiers are doing, as are their families. As Members of the Congress, I believe that we have an obligation to honor every person's service to our country. Using words like ''quagmire'' and ''mistaken war'' do not honor our military's service. We can do this by providing our soldiers with the support that they need and the recognition that they deserve. The negacrats and the media do nothing to make our children safer on the streets in America like Joe and his buddies do. This kind of rhetoric not only impacts our soldiers, but as I sat here tonight, I could not help but think about the families of the soldiers who are watching this at home, the children of our very, very brave soldiers who are in harm's way.

In closing, I want to thank Joe and all of our troops and those families, and I want to convey my eternal gratitude for everything that they do. May God bless them all. May God bless our troops, who, together with God, will keep our country safe.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the greatest deliberative body of the world's democracies cannot provide an opportunity to give voice to the concerns that are shared by Americans. Instead, we are given a White House press release against terror and for staying the course. That is not a plan. It is a bumper sticker.

Our troops won the war against Saddam Hussein over a thousand days ago, and they have been paying the price ever since their victory because they were not properly managed, staffed, trained, or equipped. Of course, nobody is in favor of an arbitrary cutoff. On my Web site I detailed an approach that I think ought to be taken to focus our priorities and stop short-changing, for instance, our battle in Afghanistan, slowly spinning outside of control. But it is sad that the Republicans can only think of two choices: stay the course, cut and run.

If the White House and the Republican leadership believed in democracy in America as much as they say they do in Iraq, we would be debating the resolution of Mr. MURTHA's, for example, here. Americans could see their hopes and their concerns not just debated but acted upon.

But, sadly, it is going to take another day and different leadership to give Americans that type of democracy here in Congress. And in the meantime every day our troops will continue to pay the price in Iraq as American prestige is assaulted around the world.

It is sad and it is unnecessary, but it is the hand that we have been dealt.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman who represents Dyess Air Force Base, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have been amused at some of the rhetoric tonight, but one of the questions that has been asked is what is our strategy?

We have a strategy. The strategy is to win. The strategy is to keep America safe.

We are winning the war on terrorism. We have gotten Saddam Hussein. We have gotten Zarqawi. But the problem is are there other Saddams, other Zarqawis out there that would threaten the very fabric of the life that we live in America?

We have a choice. We can fight that war on terrorism in other places around the world or we can fight it here in America. The right choice is to fight those terrorists where they are, where they are beginning to thrive, and keep them contained where they are.

If we get out too quickly, what are we going to tell those families of those young soldiers that paid the ultimate price for the freedom and democracy that we are sewing the seeds for in Iraq today? What are we going to tell the young men and women that are over there today that have volunteered, I repeat, volunteered, to come and serve a noble purpose?

I got a letter from a young marine named Kevin Hester. And Kevin enlisted, Mr. Speaker. He knew exactly what he was getting into when he enlisted in the Marines. And Kevin is in Iraq today. And Kevin wrote me a letter the other day, and he said, The Iraqi people trust us, and they trust us now and they are trying to help us help them by telling us who the bad guys are in their country.

We have been fighting the cause for America and keeping America safe for over 230 years coming this July 4. This is a war on terrorism. This is a different war than we have fought before. This is like the war on drugs. This is like the war on crime. The war on terrorism is a war that we will be fighting for many years to come, but it is a war that we cannot afford to lose. We cannot disgrace those young men and women that are representing and defending our country so greatly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I encourage people to support this resolution in order to say to the young men and women around the world that are defending freedom and democracy, we love you, we appreciate you.

God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of our servicemembers who have worked hard during the global war on terrorism. They are keeping us safe by defeating a very destructive enemy.

I am disappointed, however, that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have lost sight of what our servicemembers are doing and have turned the global war on terror into a cheap political issue. They have forgotten that instead of defeating terrorists on their home turf we could be allowing our citizens to be attacked here at home. I prefer to keep the terrorists outside our borders.

Right now al Qaeda and the insurgents in Iraq are busy attacking our servicemembers and our allies, and they would like nothing better than to bring these attacks to America. Even the terrorists themselves admit Iraq is the front line of the global war on terror. Why should we not continue this fight and keep it from coming to our own backyard?

Fortunately, we are fighting this battle in Iraq and our servicemembers are making real progress in the global war on terror. Not only are we capturing, destroying, and eliminating al Qaeda's most brutal leaders, but we are training law abiding Iraqi citizens to defend their own freedom. In fact, over 250,000 Iraqi citizens have stepped forward and responded to the call of duty to defend their country.

I think there are several obvious reasons why so many Iraqi soldiers and citizens are willing to join the Iraqi security forces. First, they know the enemy they are fighting against because they have endured hardship under this enemy for most of their lives. For years they and their families have been brutalized by ruthless dictators. Many of them have been separated from their families and had not seen them for many years.

Second, they have seen the pain that al Qaeda has inflicted on America and other democracies around the world. They know that what al Qaeda did on 9/11 is just a hint of what could happen. Because of this, Iraqi security forces are seizing this opportunity to root out evil.

Third, they can taste freedom and they want to hold on to it. After being liberated from tyranny and introduced to democracy they cherish the freedom and are willing to fight for it just as our servicemembers have fought for our freedom.

□ 2030

Fourth, they are inspired by the work servicemembers are doing in Iraq. As a result, they are joining the Iraqi security forces in the fight for freedom. Not only are their servicemembers fighting against terrorism, but they are also working alongside our members and the Iraqi security forces to train them how to effectively defeat the enemy.

I want to encourage all of our colleagues today to support our outstanding men and women in uniform. May God continue to bless them and their families. Our prayers are with them. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 861.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with the American people the truth about the war in Iraq. For truly it had nothing to do with 9/11 or the war on terrorism.

We invaded Iraq because Vice President CHENEY erroneously claimed, there is overwhelming evidence that there was a connection between al Qaeda and the Iraq Government.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Secretary of State Colin Powell conceded that he had no smoking gun proof of a link between the Government of Iraq, President Saddam Hussein, and the terrorists of al Qaeda.

We know there were no weapons of mass destruction. The prewar costs estimates were as incorrect as our intelligence on WMDs. The postwar planning was nonexistent. The laundry list of things we did wrong and the deceptions surrounding this war are neverending, and we continue to make mistakes even now.

No, Mr. Speaker, the mission was not accomplished. Instead of invading Iraq, we should have mobilized all of our forces to pursue and apprehend Osama bin Laden, the terrorist who in fact orchestrated 9/11 while we had him pinned down in Tora Bora, in Afghanistan.

At that time we had an opportunity to unite the world and bring people together when we had a true coalition of nations. American families can tell that things are not going well in Iraq.

However, a leader, a true leader, a real leader, needs to have a plan. A plan of engagement. A plan of how to exit. We went into war with neither.

The American people, the families who have lost the loved ones, deserve more than that. They deserve to know that there is indeed a plan, an exit strategy. This Congress, this Congress, must stand up for our troops, for their families, for America, and for the sake of refocusing, to wage a real struggle against terrorism.

No, Mr. Speaker, we must not stay our failed course. We must not be stubborn, because stubbornness does not win wars. Stubbornness really and actually causes us to lose. I tell my children not to be stubborn, because stubborn does not win. Let's do the right thing for the American people and tell them the truth.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think that this debate is helpful. I think that whenever you get into a complicated project, even if you are solving a physics problem, many times it is helpful to just stop, stop right where you are and say to yourself, just using common sense, are we on the right track?

I think we should stand back from the war for just a moment tonight and ask that simple question: Are we on the right track? And we can think about this country that we love so dearly, the flag that we have just celebrated, and all that makes America special.

But what happens if you were to try to condense the goodness that we love in America into a formula, which is, which really states what Americans have been for all time?

If you were like an onion to peel off the outer things of hot dogs and baseball, what would be the core that makes America what we love? I would suggest that the answer to that question is found in your birthday document, the Declaration, that says, we hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

And it goes on to say the job of government is to protect those rights. And that is what we have fought wars all through history, to support that basic idea. And so should it surprise us this evening to find ourselves on the battlefield against terrorists?

Let's see. Terrorists blow up innocent people. We say, innocent people have a life that is given them by God. They say they want to terrorize so that people cannot be free, to compel you to do what you do not want to do.

We say, liberty is a gift of God. And so it should be no surprise, just as we have found ourselves in the War of Independence and the wars against Hitler and the other wars of our history, that we are arrayed against people who have no respect for the formula that has made America so great.

And just as in the past, there is a cost. You know, my own son just came back from Fallujah. They say that the cost of freedom is not free. And the parents all across our country, just as my wife and I did, would look at the local paper in the morning. We would say, oh, three marines killed in Fallujah. I wonder if my son is one of them.

No, freedom is not free. But we were proud that our son, just as other families are proud of their children, can carry on that same tradition that the patriots did. That is what makes us feel so good when we see the flag flying, the heart and soul of America, that there is indeed a God that gives basic rights to people and government should protect those rights. And the terrorists will not stand, because that formula does not apply just to Americans; it applies to people all over the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I support the troops. Yet the debate about the Iraqi war is not about supporting the troops. I knew from the very beginning that there were no weapons of mass destruction. Well, how did I know that? Well, I am from Florida. And I knew back in 2000

that the Bush administration that we were dealing with would say anything and do anything. They were full of lies. Let's look at the evidence.

Since the beginning, the Republican leadership in Congress has outright refused to investigate Vice President CHENEY involving the billions of dollars awarded to Iraq for reconstruction contracts to Halliburton. $9 billion in reconstruction funds have been unaccounted for. I repeat, $9 billion in reconstruction funds have been unaccounted for.

The amount of taxpayers' money spent by Halliburton and the defense contractors audit agents have deemed either excessive or insufficient documentation is $1.7 billion.

Halliburton has received more than $17 billion in no-bid cost-plus contracts for Iraq reconstruction. Folks, I am talking about billions with a B. That is billions and billions of dollars. It amazes me now that these figures contrast with the attention that the media has given to the Katrina mismanagement, while the billions and billions of dollars in unaccounted funds to Halliburton are still largely ignored by the media.

You know, we need checks and balances. The House, the Senate and the administration are all Republicans. There are no checks and balances. No checks, no balances. No checks, zero balance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The Chair will remind Members that although remarks in debate may include criticisms of the President's or the Vice President's official actions or policies, it is a breach of order to question the personal character of the President or the Vice President, whether by actual accusation or by mere insinuation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Air Land Subcommittee.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

I heard one of our colleagues on the other side say that we have two choices tonight: we could stay the course, or we can cut and run. Well, those are not the only choices we have. They were not the choices that we used in the 38 deployments in the 1990s when I supported our Democrat President when we sent troops to Somalia, Haiti, East Timor, Macedonia, Kosovo, Bosnia. You name it we were there.

The decision of when we left those countries was made by our military leaders. It was made by the generals and the commanders, not arm-chair politicians back here who try to do what was done by the Congress during the Vietnam War.

Believe me, I want our troops back home. But there is a process that we can use that I think is very logical. You know, when I have been to the theater, the generals talk about the way that they assess the capability and the readiness of the Iraqi brigades.

They categorize them into four levels. They know how to assess the readiness of the Iraqi brigades. They have perfected it. What we should be doing is what is already happening. We do not tie the removal of our troops to an artificial date. We tie it into the assessment that our generals make of the capability of the readiness of the Iraqi brigades.

Mr Speaker, this morning I went back to my district. I was at the Boeing plant where we rolled out the newest model of the CH–47F, the cutting-edge platform for our Army for the next 50 years. It is a great aircraft.

The speaker there, the keynote speaker for this rollout was an Army colonel. In fact, he was the airwing commander of the 101st Airborne Division. He oversees 167 aircraft in theater right now. He is home for two weeks of R&R. He oversees 3,200 of our troops that are on the cutting edge. He wants to be home with his family. He has been in the service 24 years. This was his second deployment. He is from Edgewater, Maryland; he is not my constituent.

And I said to Colonial Warren Phipps, Colonel, we are debating today in Congress whether or not we should set a date certain. What do you think? You are there. Is that the right thing for us to do? He said, With all due respect, sir, that is the worst thing that our Congress could do for my troops under my command.

That is the worst thing we can do, because it would telegraph and signal the enemy when they can plan their attacks, and when they can do harm to my colleagues.

Well, I will be honest with you, Mr. Speaker. I did not support artificial dates under President Clinton, and I do not support artificial dates under President Bush.

I want the ultimate decision of when the troops come home not to be done by us, but by the field generals in the command situation, command leadership in Iraq, who understand that the safety and security of the troops is their number one priority as well as ours.

What this young colonel said was, Congressman, we are making great success. Today the Iraqis are handling more and more of their own security. That should be the determining criteria on when our troops come home.

As this colonel sees with his own eyes that the Iraqis are engaged and are handling more and more of their own defense. He said, Today, Congressman, they are going out on their own missions. He said, when I have meetings and we are doing planning sessions, if I close my eyes, when I hear the Iraqis planning, it is just as though it were American generals planning for our operations.

He said, Now is not the time to cut and run. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and not cut and run.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight, I have been watching this on TV and listening all day long. I am really kind of saddened by the fact that it seems to be an issue between making excuses for why we are in Iraq, and the other side is cut and run.

I remember being in the Congress before we voted on this resolution. I remember being summoned into a hearing with all of the intelligence agencies there. I remember a colleague asking these intelligence agencies, is Iraq an immediate threat to the United States, yes or no? Every single one of those intelligence agencies represented, every one said no.

And here we are 3 years later with all of the loss of life. Some say, just stay the course. Stay the course for what? There is not even a plan. Mr. WELDON was right, we had a plan in Kosovo, we had a plan in Bosnia, we had plans. Where is the plan?

We have a plan by Mr. MURTHA. There is no cut and run date in it. There are no specifics on it. But it is a plan. Why are we not debating a plan?

□ 2045

It is embarrassing that we are here this far into the war, people watching us and having Congress without the ability to exercise democracy, without the ability to have a vote on the only resolution that is ready for a vote, which is Mr. MURTHA's. I associate myself with the remarks he made about what he saw and what we experienced going into Iraq.

I wish the majority in this House would have allowed a debate on Mr. MURTHA's resolution.

I rise to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MURTHA and to everyone who supports our men and women in uniform. We all support the troops and the sacrifices they and their families have made. But, that's not what this debate is about.

I've been listening all day to this debate and find Members are still making excuses for why we got into Iraq in the first place.

You are not hearing what the intelligence community really told this house.

Before the vote on authorization of the war all the intelligence agencies were gathered together for a Congressional briefing. One of my colleagues asked the question:

"Is Iraq an immediate threat to the United States, tell us Yes . . . or No?"

It was surprising to me that each intelligence community representative said—"No, Iraq is not a threat to our national security."

And even more shocking to see was that so few of my colleagues were listening.

So, why have we been sucked into a war that was not necessary to protect our national security?

And here we are 3 years later. Over 20,000 U.S. military personnel have been killed or wounded in Iraq.

The loss of American lives is tragic and unnecessary.

Especially because Iraq never was a threat to the United States, nor is it now.

So, today, why aren't we discussing an end to wasteful spending, to unnecessary loss of lives and building a stronger America?

We can't because, as you have heard so often today, the majority has stopped listening.

They have made up their minds. They are just as wrong today as they were 3 years ago.

Look—we need a plan. Congressman MURTHA is the only one with a plan. Congressman MURTHA's bill, H.J. Res 73, is doable and its implementation would be respected by the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President is listening to this debate. And more importantly I hope he implements the Murtha plan.

The world would be better off for it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. CALVERT.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, just last week we witnessed American, coalition and Iraqi forces taking the fight to the enemy by eliminating the terrorist leader of al Qaeda in Iraq. During the very same week the Iraqi people looked as their first democratically elected Prime Minister finalized his cabinet by selecting a new Minister of Defense, a new Minister of Interior, a new member of the state for national security.

The two events are clear evidence that Iraqi forces are making progress on two major fronts in the ongoing war. On one front the coalition and Iraqi forces remain in the hunt for insurgents and other groups that threaten a free and democratic Iraq. On the other front the Iraqi government continues to show encouraging signs into developing a much needed stabilizing body the country is longing for.

During my three trips to Iraq I have observed our military engaging the enemy, protecting the innocent citizens, training the Iraqi forces to make and control and support the new elected government. Despite the positive developments on the ground, we continue to hear naysayers around the world questioning the importance of the outcome in Iraq.

On the other hand, al Qaeda leadership and its terrorist network fully understand the consequences of war, calling Iraq the place for the greatest battle of the modern era.

I have a copy of a document captured from the safe House where al Zarqawi met his end. In it al Qaeda leaders lament the fact that their strategy for undermining America's resolve in Iraq is failing. They know that time, time to undermine America's resolve, time to foment a civil war, time to get media on their side, time to spread death and destruction to Iraq's neighbors is running out for them.

Ironically the document notes that al Qaeda originally saw time as being on their side in Iraq. It states time has been an element in affecting negatively the forces of occupying countries due to losses they sustain economically and in human lives which are increasing with time. However, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be a service of the American forces and harmful to the resistance.

Winston Churchill understood the importance of resolve when a nation's interests are on the line. Winston Churchill, quote, I was only the servant of my country and had I, at any moment, failed to express her unflinching resolve to fight and conquer, I should at once have been rightly cast aside.

This body recognized that necessity when we passed the authorization of the use of military force against Iraq. While five pages long, the really vital 10 words are, ''be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.''

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the combat veteran from the 173rd who preceded the gentleman from California in the 173rd, 15½ minutes, and ask unanimous consent that he may yield time to other Members of the Veterans Caucus.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will not secure any success in Iraq. It will not bring our troops home. It will only signal the death of true, honest debate within the walls of this great Chamber.

Today's so-called debate is politics at its worst. We are playing politics while U.S. men and women are being killed, wounded and kept away from their families. I remember laying in an Army hospital bed just home from Vietnam while another Congress played politics.

He was disdainful then, and when I think of those brave men and women I visited at Walter Reed, Bethesda, Ramstein, it makes me sick today. Let's do our job and bring our troops home as soon as possible.

For weeks we have been told, and the American people have been promised by the Republican majority, that there would be a debate on this floor on the Iraq war. Instead we get what the news is calling today Republican election year strategy. This resolution ignores the issues most important to the men and women serving in Iraq, their families and the taxpayers who have already been billed nearly a half trillion dollars.

It ignores the issues raised by some of our most respected generals, and it ignores the lack of accountability and oversight that has led to some of the most egregious and embarrassing examples of waste, fraud and abuse on record. We need to be working nonstop to bring our troops home as soon as possible, not trying to score political points while they are fighting a war.

We need to be working to keep them safe, as safe as possible, until they are home. For starters, we should send a strong, loud message to the insurgents who will not occupy Iraq and will not control Iraq's oil, a message that we want to leave, as bad as they want us to leave.

On my last visit to Iraq, everyone I spoke with said that they want the Iraqis to assume more security responsibility faster. Our military has done its job, often in two, three or four deployments, an unconscionable demand on our troops, an unconscionable demand on their families, and an unconscionable demand on their communities. Make no mistake, it has taken a toll on our military. Stay the course is not a strategy for success, and we are not doing our job by being a rubber stamp for this administration.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't honest debate. While the majority plays politics, our men and women serving in Iraq are in terrible danger.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), a veteran of the Second World War.

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

Mr. DINGELL. ''To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but it is morally treasonable to the American public.'' Teddy Roosevelt.

I remember how proud I was to serve my country in World War II, and I remember how proud I was of the support of Americans, and I remember how proud I am now to be a Member of this body. I know how important it is that we support the troops, and I remind my colleagues over here, we all, everyone in this room, supports our troops without exception. We have honest differences about the policies or how we got where we are. We are not permitted to discuss those under this gag rule.

What this body should do, and I remember how proud I was of the different meaningful debates which we had here, where there was opportunity to amend, to discuss, to have a 5-minute rule, to have a motion to recommit, so that a national policy bringing us together could be forged in a proper legislative forum and a proper legislative fashion.

We are told, either expressly or implicitly, by the administration, and by people on that side of the aisle, that there is something unpatriotic about questioning the behavior of this administration or the policies or the way they are being conducted. Let me not answer that yet. But let me give you

the answer that Teddy Roosevelt, a great patriot, a Republican, a wonderful President, had to say: ''To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but it is morally treasonable to the American people.'' Listen to that. That is what we are supposed to do.

We are not supposed to be a congregation of yes men and lickspittles. We are supposed to be the voice of the people and to hammer out the policies of this Nation in an honorable and open fashion. That is not happening today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a fair and proper procedure nor is it a debate.

H. Res. 861 comes before us under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed. This body is told by the rule, no amendments are allowed. Take it or leave it, we are told.

I say shame. What is there to fear from an open debate and what is there to cause us to lose the right to amend this legislation?

There is much which we can approve in H. Res. 861 and much on which we can arrive at agreement and consensus.

There are things in this resolution which are controversial, and these require, more than ever, honest and frank discussion.

I find the language of paragraph 3 to be a particular problem. We should not foreclose our options on redeployment.

It may well become that there is such a need and such an interest in the United States, and arbitrary pronouncements such as this will actually haunt us.

Like many other Members of this body, I supported the President's father when he came to Congress seeking authorization to liberate Kuwait.

There the process was honest, open, and truthful. The intelligence was clear, the mission was finite, and the world was united. Here the process is closed, the debate filled with hyperbole and half-truths, the world is alienated, and our mission is murky and indefinite.

Here the reasons given for invasion of Iraq were that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons.

Like many others, I did not believe the evidence supported the administration.

I believed we had careless use of intelligence: honest mistake, careless with use of the facts, or willful deceit.

History tells us one or all of these unflattering conclusions are supported by the unfortunate facts of the administration's behavior.

Now for my own position: Like all of us, I support our troops. I consistently vote for more money, more equipment, and more resources to support them in every way I can to win and to bring them home safe and well.

I have not called for withdrawal of our troops. I have suggested no tactics or strategy, but then neither has the administration, which seems to have for its purpose and tactics more of the same, stay the course.

Our failures and mistakes are many, leaving weapons and munitions everywhere uncollected and available to criminals, insurgents, jihadists, and al-Qaeda members.

We disbanded the army police and security services, necessary to keeping order and assisting in husbanding victory and peace.

I am outraged at the fact that this exercise appears to be politically motivated. Charges verging on disloyalty are directed at loyal Americans who criticize the administration failures or suggest better tactics or strategies.

Listen to Republican leadership instructions to their members: ''Democrats on the other hand are prone to waver endlessly about the use of force to protect American ideals. Capitol Hill Democrats' only specific policy proposals are to concede defeat on the battlefield.''

These words are false, deceitful, dishonest, outrageous, and vicious. So here we have today's proceedings: Political attacks on Democrats. Disregard of truth. Disregard of facts, and most importantly, disregard of the need to correct failed policies. I cannot, and will not, support such a phony and arrogant process.

We must deal more fairly with one of the great issues of our day, which has cost us over $450 billion, 2,500 dead Americans, 20,000 casualties, the trust of our people and the respect of the people of the world.

We are losing the equivalent of a battalion a month and spending $1¼ billion a week.

Our troops are performing magnificently, but the administration is functioning without any adequate plans.

The results are disastrous consequenes for our troops, for our country, for our relatIons with our friends and allies, particularly people in the Arab world.

We need a real opportunity to discuss these matters and to provide real congressional input into this situation. That is being denied to the Congress and the country here.

I cannot support this process and I express the thoughts of the people on this war and on a strange, foolish, and irresponsible process.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say earlier the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) rose and talked about what he called a lack of oversight on the Armed Services Committee with respect to Iraq. I want to enter into the RECORD, if I might, the fact of 41 full committee hearings, 21 on the war on terror, two on reconstruction, two on troop rotation, three on the Iraqi forces, four on force protection, four on detainees and five markups on that issue.

I would just point out that the most extensive investigation in the history of detainees was completed by General Taguba, who gave us a voluminous report with something like 116 annexes. I made that available to everybody, Democratic, Republican, on the Armed Services Committee, including Mr. SNYDER, and a total of three members from the Democrat side of the aisle on our committee looked at that the report. It is still available for Mr. SNYDER. When he gets finished reading it we will have more hearings for him.

HASC BREAKDOWN OF IRAQ/GWOT ACTIVITIES

TOTAL COMMITTEE EVENTS—93

Detainees—17
Force Protection—10
ISF—6

FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS—41

General GWOT/Iraq—21
Reconstruction—2
Troop Rotation—2
ISF—3
Force Protection—4
Detainees—4
Mark-Ups—5

FULL COMMITTEE BRIEFINGS, SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS, AND CDR HEARINGS ON IRAQ AND GWOT

10/21/2003:
Readiness Subcommittee
Resetting and Reconstituting the Forces
2/2/2004:
Members Only Force Protection Briefing
3/9/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on Operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Evolving Situation in Haiti
3/31/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on Activities of the Iraq Survey Group
4/1/2004:
Tactical Air and Land Subcommittee Hearing
Land Component Request for FY05—included Force Protection
4/2/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on GWOT
4/28/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan
5/4/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret brief on Iraqi Prisoner Abuse Investigation
5/17/2004:
Issue Forum
Stability Operations by the Iraq Coalition
5/18/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on Iraqi Prisoner Abuse Investigation
5/18/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret/SCI on Iraqi Prisoner Abuse Investigation
6/2/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on DOD Detainee Interrogation Program at GTMO
6/10/2004:
Members only Force Protection Briefing
6/24/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Members Only on ICRC Review of U.S. Detainee Operations
6/24/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on Iranian Nuclear Weapons Deployment Program and Involvement in Iraq
7/8/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on Army Force Protection Programs in Iraq and Afghanistan
7/14/2004:
Member Session
Members Only review of copies of reports from ICRC related to the Iraq Theater of Operations' Detention Facilities
7/21/2004:
Member Session
Members Only review of detainee operations in Iraq and photographs related to a new investigation of Iraqi detainees while in the custody of U.S. forces
9/26/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan
11/18/2004:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword/SCI on Operations in Iraq
1/25/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Top Secret Codeword on Ops and Intel in Support of Tsunami Relief, Iraq, and Afghanistan

1/26/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on Efforts to Train Iraqi Security Forces and the Up-coming Elections
2/2/2005:
Readiness/Tactical Air Land Subcommittees
Ground force vehicle and personnel protection and rotary wing safety of flight issues
2/2/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on OIF and OEF Force Protection Initiative
2/15/2005:
Strategic Forces/TUTC
Able Danger Program
*Followed by a closed briefing
3/16/2005:
Tactical Air and Land Subcommittee Hearing
Future Combat System, Modularity, and Force Protection
6/8/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
TS on Metrics, Trends, and the Iraqi Security Forces
6/16/2005:
Member Session
Members Only review of copies of reports from ICRC related to the Iraq Theater of Operations' Detention Facilities
6/23/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Members only from Gen. Barry McCaffrey (Ret.) on his experiences and observations in Iraq
6/23/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on Iraqi Security Forces
7/14/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on the Schmidt/Furlow Detainee Investigation Report
7/19/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
From TYCO Corp. on Rapid Fielding of the low-cost Warlock Blue Jammer for IED Force Protection
7/21/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
DOD's work in developing and tracking metrics for OIF
7/28/2005:
TUTC/Oversight and Investigation of the Financial Services
Committee Hearing
Financing of the Iraqi Insurgency
10/26/2005:
Radical Islam Gap Panel
Alternative Views on U.S. Counterterrorism Policy—Roles, Missions, and Capabilities
10/27/2005:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret on Activities involving the ICRC and enemy combatants detained by American Forces in Iraq, Afghanistan, and GTMO
11/1/2005:
Terrorism and Radical Islam Gap Panel
DOD Roles, Missions, and Capabilities in Counter-Terrorism
11/13/2005:
Radical Islam Gap Panel
Understanding Aspirations of Radical Islam: Why Mainstream Islam is Radically Different
11/9/2005:
Terrorism and Radical Islam Gap Panel
TS Brief on Counter-Terrorism Intelligence
11/10/2005:
Terrorism and Radical Islam Gap Panel
S Brief from State on Counter-Terrorism Policy
11/17/2005:
Terrorism and Radical Islam Gap Panel
S Brief from DIA on Counter-Terrorism Policy
2/1/2006:
Joint Subcommittee Hearing and Brief on Force Protection
2/16/2006:
TUTC Hearing
Combating al Qaeda and the Militant Jihadist Threat
3/1/2006:
Mark-up for H. Res. 645
Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States.
3/2006:
Full Committee Brief
TS Brief on Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO)
3/8/2006:
Full Committee Briefing
Secret Brief from General George Casey, U.S. Forces Commander in Iraq
3/8/2006:
TUTC Hearing
Special Operations Command: Transforming for the Long War
3/15/2006:
TUTC Hearing
Implementing the GWOT Strategy: Overcoming Interagency Problems
3/30/2006:
Readiness/Tactical Air Land Subcommittees
Army and Marine Corps Reset Strategies for Ground Equipment and Rotorcraft
4/4/2006:
Tactical Air and Land Subcommittee Hearing on Force Protection Initiative
4/6/2006:
Tactical Air and Land Forces Briefing
TS on Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Activities are being used in theater to counter IEDs.

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON IRAQ AND GWOT

Sept. 10, 2002:
The State of the Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction Program and the History of the United Nations Inspections Efforts in Iraq
Sept. 18, 2002:
U.S. Policy Towards Iraq
Sept. 19, 2002:
Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Program and Technology Exports
Sept. 26, 2002:
U.S. Policy Towards Iraq
Oct. 2, 2002:
U.S. Policy Towards Iraq
Apr. 4, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction: Iraq Violations of the Law of Armed Conflict
June 12, 2003:
The State of Reconstruction and Stabilization Operations in Iraq
July 10, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction—Operation Iraqi Freedom: The Commander's Perspective.
Sept. 25, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction—U.S. Policy and Operations in Iraq
Oct. 2, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction—Operational Lessons Learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom
Oct. 8, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction—Iraq: Reconstruction and Rehabilitation
Oct. 21, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction—Operation Iraqi Freedom: Outside Perspectives
Oct. 29, 2003:
Operation Iraqi Freedom: Operations and Reconstruction—Iraq Reconstruction and Stability Operations: The Way Forward
Jan. 28, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Operation Iraqi Freedom Force Rotation Plan
Apr. 21, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Iraq's Transition to Sovereignty
Apr. 21, 2004:
Performance of the DOD Acquisition Process in Support of Force Protection for Combat Forces
May 7, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—The On-Going Investigation into the Abuse of Prisoners within the Central Command Area of Responsibility
May 21, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Conduct and Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom
June 14, 2004:
Mark-up of H. Res. 640—Resolution of Inquiry requesting that the SECDEF transmit to the House any picture, photograph, video, etc. produced in conjunction w/ any completed DOD investigation conducted by MG Taguba relating to allegations of torture or violations of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq or any completed DOD investigation relating to abuse of a prisoner of war or detainee by civilian contractors working for DOD.
June 16, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Status of U.S. Forces in Iraq after June 30, 2004
June 17, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Training of Iraq Security Forces
June 22, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Progress in Iraq
July 7, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Army and Marine Corps Troop Rotations for Operation Iraqi Freedom 3 Operation Enduring Reserve
July 15, 2004:
Mark-up on H. Con. Res. 472—SOC on apprehension, detention, and interrogation of terrorists are fundamental in successful prosecution of GWOT and protection of lives of U.S. citizens at home and abroad.
July 15, 2004:
Mark up of H. Res. 869—Requesting POTUS and directing other federal official to transmit to HOR docs relating to treatment of prisoners or detainees in Iraq, Afghanistan, and GTMO.
Aug. 10, 2004:
Final Report of the National commission on terrorist attacks upon the U.S.
Aug. 10, 2004:
Denying terrorist sanctuaries: policy and operational implications for the U.S. military
Aug. 11, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Implications of the Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission on the Department of Defense
Sept. 8, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—The Performance of U.S. Military Servicemembers in Iraq and Afghanistan
Sept. 9, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Report of the Independent Panel to Review Department of Defense Detention Operations

Sept. 9, 2004:
Operations and Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq—Investigations of Military Activities at Abu Ghraib Prison Facilities
Mar. 17, 2005:
Current Operations and the Political Transition in Iraq
Apr. 6, 2005:
Iraq's Past, Present and Future
May 5, 2005:
Status of Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Armoring Initiatives and IED Jammer Initiatives in OIF
June 21, 2005:
Marine Corps Underbody Armor Kits
June 23, 2005:
Progress of the Iraqi Security Forces
June 29, 2005:
Detainee Operations at GTMO
Sept. 29, 2005:
Operations in Iraq
Oct. 20, 2005:
Army's 4th ID Up-Armor HMMWV Distribution Strategy
Nov. 3, 2005:
Your Troops: Their Story
March 14, 2006:
Mark-up for H. Res. 685
Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any entity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq.
April 4, 2006:
Improving Interagency Coordination for GWOT and Beyond

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time. We have a lot less time than on the other side.

Mr. HUNTER. We have reserved the balance of our time. I think we have got a transition here, Mr. Speaker, with the next committee coming up.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California for the purpose of putting a statement in the RECORD.

(Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, When we made the decision to invade Iraq I said this:

The President is asking us to pass this resolution now, but he has not yet made the case for war.

I cannot support the President's request that we authorize military force against Iraq. I make this very difficult decision for three important reasons: The United States is not acting in self-defense or from an imminent threat from Iraq, the United States should not be pursuing unilateral action without international support, and the President has not stated an exit strategy.

I believe there are times when countries must resort to war, and indeed international law recognizes the rights of nations to defend themselves. I strongly support our campaign against terrorism. But are we voting this week on a case of self-defense? It would certainly be self-defense if Iraq supported the al Qaeda attack on September 11, but the evidence of such support is lacking.

I have listened to the administration and met with top officials. I have yet to see any credible evidence that Iraq is connected with al Qaeda. The experts readily admit that there is no real connection.

I can believe that Iraq is a threat to the region and to some American interests overseas, but I do not believe the threat is imminent or must be handled with a unilateral military strike.

This resolution is an unwise step for America that will in the end weaken America.

How unsatisfactory are the words "I told you so".

We invaded Iraq even though it was not involved with al Queda and, when we diverted our gaze from the War on Terror, we let Osama Bin Laden get away and now his organization has metastasized so that his capture would no longer be the disruptive blow to al Queda that it could have been then. Our soldiers have served bravely but their courage has not been matched by adequate leadership by the brass starting with the Commander in Chief. The problems that face us now in Iraq are not primarily military ones but we are expecting our military to accomplish them anyway.

This entire venture was a mistake, but the question is what do we do now? I think the answer is that it's time for the Iraqi's to take responsibility for their own country. Our American soldiers signed up to defend America. Let the Iraqi's do the same for their country.

We have spent American lives and treasure in Iraq. It is now the obligation of the Commander in Chief to present a strategy for a successful completion of American activities there so that our troops can be removed from Iraq as soon as is practicable.

Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity. It is time for leadership from the Commander in Chief that is more than "stay the course" and more of the same.

The war in Iraq is not the war on terror and never has been. I voted to authorize the use of force in Afghanistan because it was necessary that we disrupt that terrorist hotbed that had helped breed the terrorists who attacked us on September 11th. Now even that necessary endeavor in Afghanistan is faltering because of the diversion into Iraq.

If we are to win the war on terror, we must focus our efforts on the terrorists and not on Iraq. We are spending $8 billion or more a month in Iraq and need to utilize those funds instead effectively in the fight against terrorists and also to protect the United States from the potential of terrorist attacks.

We have other threats around the world and have, tragically, damaged our military readiness to face them through our miscalculations in Iraq. To maintain the strong military might that America needs we need to bring the Iraq misadventure to an end as soon as is practical.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York for the same purpose.

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

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my statement on Tuesday, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with much of the content of House Resolution 861, particularly the expressions of gratitude for the service and sacrifice of our troops.

The language of the resolution, however, includes a commitment to keep our troops in Iraq indefinitely and an outright refusal to set a date for withdrawal. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the resolution.

Eighty-two percent of the Iraqi people want us out of their country, and 47 percent say it is justified to attack American troops. It is simply unacceptable to keep our troops in Iraq indefinitely under these conditions. I continue to call for the withdrawal of American forces from Iraq, and challenge the Iraqi people to stand up and defend their own country.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated the original Iraq war resolution, the administration told us that Iraq was stockpiling weapons of mass destruction, that there were ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and that Iraq was within a year of having a nuclear capability.

Fast-forward to the deliberations of the 9/11 Commission. They concluded that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and no nuclear capability.

Mr. Speaker, these votes weren't 8–4 or 7–5, they were all 12–0 that the very basis for the war did not exist.

When I go back home, Mr. Speaker, and my constituents ask me to summarize where we are in the war on terror, I tell them this: As we approach the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in the history of our country, we have committed hundreds of billions of dollars in Iraq. More important, over 20,000 young Americans have either been killed or seriously wounded going after Saddam Hussein, who did not attack us, while Osama bin Laden, who did attack us, is still alive, free, planning another attack on our country.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the very definition of failure in the war on terror.

We went after the wrong guy.

But after the invasion, did we have a responsibility to help the Iraqi people build a new government and a new way of life? The answer to that question is yes. And we have fulfilled that obligation. We have helped them through not one, not two, but three elections. It is now time for the Iraqi people to stand up and defend themselves.

There is a general rule of military engagement that says that you do not signal to your enemy what you are going to do in advance. But there are exceptions to every rule, and there are two exceptions to this rule.

Number one is that the insurgents in Iraq are using as a recruitment tool the argument that we have no intention of leaving their country, and that we're going to steal their oil—and it is working. It is fueling the insurgency.

As for our friends in Iraq, those who want this new government and new way of life, they seem perfectly content to let our soldiers take all of the enemy fire. The problem with security in Iraq is not the system of training; it's the fact that the Iraqis are not stepping forward to defend their own government.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, my basic disagreement with the President is this: He says that we should stay in Iraq until the Iraqis declare that they are ready to defend their own country; and I propose that we announce a timetable for withdrawal, start withdrawing our troops, and make our position very clear to the Iraqis: If they want this new government and this new way of life, they have to come forward, volunteer, stand up, and defend it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring our troops home.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am manager of the bill for the Judiciary Committee for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

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

I want to initially present an update as to where we have been and where we are in Iraq. Many months ago an Iraqi citizen said to me, you all must remove Saddam. We can't do it, he said, because we know what he is capable of doing to us in retaliation. I said to him if we do remove him, will you embrace us or will you kick us? He said, I don't know.

I responded, that is my concern. I don't know either. I believe his anti-Saddam remarks at that time represented a majority view in Iraq, but my concern proved prophetic. Our exercise in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, has not been without mistakes. Our entry strategy was superb. Our post-entry strategy was tentative at best, inept at worst.

A better response to the looting that ensued in the early days should have been in place. The disestablishment of the Army, without an alternative plan, in my opinion, was premature. Some would blame the United States for the delayed political development, but after all, our forefathers were deliberate in forming our country's operational apparatus, so I think the political complaint is probably unfounded.

Was Saddam an evil, brutal murderer, a flagrant violator of human rights? You bet. Was he involved in international terrorism? You bet. Was he directly or indirectly involved in the 9/11 attack? I don't know. I can neither confirm nor reject that theory. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that intelligence was flawed. Mistakes were made. But the cause for freedom is a noble one, and progress has, indeed, been realized.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, about the lack of objectivity in reporting the war on terrorism. Some liberal talk show host reports imply that no good has been accomplished. Conversely, some conservative talk show hosts portray Baghdad as moonlight and roses. Clearly these two slanted versions are inaccurate and unfair.

□ 2100

Let me say a word about the PATRIOT Act, Mr. Speaker, and this will be discussed in more detail subsequently.

But the PATRIOT Act was reported in the full House by the Judiciary Committee, and it addressed the nexus of the sale of illicit narcotics and terrorist financing. These two shadowy worlds of narcotics trafficking and terrorism is an element of terrorism that I think is lost on many Americans. They are joined at the hip, and I am particularly pleased that the PATRIOT Act did respond to that end.

Seventeen months ago, Mr. Speaker, I publicly indicated that troop withdrawal was conspicuously absent when the war on terrorism was discussed. Oh, we spoke of appropriating more funds, we spoke of dispatching additional troops, but virtually no one ever even remotely included troop withdrawal in their discussions.

Now, I am not suggesting troop withdrawal tomorrow, but I want our armed servicemen and -women home sooner rather than later. Some may declare, oh, we cannot cut and run. Cut and run? We have had a presence in Iraq in excess of 3 years. 2,500 armed services Americans have given the ultimate sacrifice to the cause of freedom, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of permanent and disabling injuries have been inflicted upon members of our armed services in addition to the spending of billions of dollars.

I do not know what constitutes cutting and running, but I do know that when we have logged a wartime duration of 3 years, when 2,500 Americans have given their lives for freedom, and Lord only knows how many Americans have been injured, this does not constitute cutting and running.

The time has come, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to pass the baton to the Iraqi Government. Now, this decision will ultimately be made militarily, and properly so, by the commanders on the ground; but I do not want this matter of withdrawal to be lost in the shuffle.

If freedom and peace prevail in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, history will be generous in its praise to President Bush and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) who chairs the judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this global war on terror resolution. The war on terror is being fought on two fronts, both abroad and here at home. We applaud the diplomatic and military achievements overseas, but we also need to remain vigilant here in our own country.

Until the terrorists are defeated, Americans will continue to be their targets as long as we stand for freedom and democracy.

One of our weapons in the war on terror is the USA PATRIOT Act. That bill, which originated in the Judiciary Committee, gives law enforcement officials and intelligence officials the ability to cooperate during investigations.

More than 250 people in the United States have been charged with crimes tied to international terrorist investigations and have been convicted or have pled guilty because of the USA PATRIOT Act.

In response to the events of September 11, 2001, we also passed legislation that created a Director of National Intelligence so that all of our intelligence capabilities would be coordinated by one official.

We passed the REAL ID Act which contains several antiterrorism provisions, including one that makes certain foreign nationals deportable because of their ties to terrorism.

We must continue to pass legislation that makes it more difficult for terrorists to enter the United States. That means enacting meaningful border security legislation like the bill that the House passed last December.

Those who would do us harm, Mr. Speaker, respect no borders. Potential terrorists and thousands of others continue to enter our country illegally every day.

In America, we are blessed to have the freedom that others only dream about, but freedom is never free. It must be nurtured and protected, sometimes at great cost in lives; but we will not surrender to terrorists. That only empowers them. We will fight them today so we can enjoy a better tomorrow. Any other course only resigns us to an uncertain future.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me pay tribute to the brave men and women of the 21st Congressional District of Texas who are fighting this war overseas. The most difficult action I have ever taken as an elected official is to call the families of the 14 servicemembers from my district who have made the ultimate sacrifice. Their families' patriotism and love of country is almost indescribable. Their faith is great because they know our cause is great.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad this resolution has been brought to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who fought in the Korean War and was awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the majority has seen fit to bring to this floor a political statement where if you vote against it, you are voting against our troops; and if you vote for it, of course you are supporting the President's policy. But being a politician, I can understand that.

We cannot say enough about the courage and the dedication of our young people, the volunteers and the

National Guards people that are putting their lives on the line each and every day. Tragically, we reached a point that we passed the 2,500 mark in terms of loss of life, and tens of thousands are permanently maimed.

When we laud them, as we have heard, as supporting the President's policy, I really think this is so unfair, and why? Because with our fighting men and women, when that flag goes up, they salute it not because of a President's policy, but because of respecting their oath to the Commander in Chief.

When I was in Korea, I do not remember any of the soldiers that were in combat questioning the wisdom of Commander in Chief President Truman. They never asked did the Congress declare war. They never asked why were we involved in a civil war between the North Koreans and the South Koreans. They never thought that the North Koreans were going to invade our communities.

I tell you that our fighting men and women today are not saying that they challenge the Commander in Chief. They do not ask whether there were weapons of mass destruction. They do not ask whether or not Saddam Hussein was a part of al Qaeda. They do not ask those political questions, and neither did I when I was a sergeant in the infantry.

But I am not a sergeant in the infantry now. I am a Member of the United States Congress, a Member of this House of Representatives, and each one of us has the right to challenge any direction, not of the Commander in Chief, but the President of the United States. That is the most patriotic thing we can do because, in doing that, whether it is Vietnam, whether it is Korea, or whether it is Iraq, we are protecting as best we see it, the lives and the safety of the men and women that have volunteered.

Let us face it, they did not volunteer to knock off Saddam Hussein. They volunteered because they were looking for a better way of life, the same way I did when I volunteered in 1948, and you can see where they come from. It does not take away from their patriotism, but they did not take a poli-sci course in terms of how do you bring peace in the Middle East. I mean, they were not there looking for Saddam Hussein. They were looking for a better opportunity, which I guess they received. They come from our inner cities. They come from our rural areas. They come from the areas of high unemployment. But when they get in the military, they are patriots who do not challenge the policies of a President or Commander in Chief. So they are not advocates. They are patriots.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) who sits as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Coble for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. I witnessed the impact of Zarqawi up close and personal. I have seen the damage Zarqawi inflicted. I visited the areas where Zarqawi lived and terrorized people, and I met the brave soldiers who ultimately tracked him down and killed him.

It was Sunday evening, May 28, 2006, and I was in Amman, Jordan, with a small delegation of six Congressmen. As I walked through the metal detector to enter the hotel's lobby, I thought of Zarqawi. It was here, in Amman, Jordan, that Zarqawi, a native of Jordan, killed 60 people by bombing three hotels on November 9, 2005.

The next day was Memorial Day, Monday, May 29, and I was in Iraq visiting with our troops. Once again, my thoughts turned to Zarqawi. I toured the Special Operations Command Center with General Stan McCrystal, a three-star general in charge of tracking down Zarqawi. All over the walls of the command center were posters of Zarqawi. General McCrystal and his team were confident that they would get Zarqawi, and they briefed us on their efforts.

That same day I flew in a Blackhawk helicopter around the area of Ba'Qubah where Zarqawi was ultimately located. I also toured Baghdad, where Zarqawi intimidated the U.N. by bombing their headquarters and where al Jazeera TV once broadcast a videotape showing Zarqawi personally beheading an American citizen.

A week later, on Wednesday, June 7, I was at the White House with a few other Members of Congress to brief President Bush about what we saw in Iraq. At exactly 3:57 p.m., National Security Advisor Stephen Hadley slipped a note to President Bush, Vice President CHENEY and Secretary of State Condi Rice. President Bush read the note, smiled and winked at Condi Rice. Zarqawi was dead.

General McCrystal later personally went to the scene and determined for himself that Zarqawi had officially been killed. President Bush already called General McCrystal to thank him and his troops, and today Congress thanks them as well.

Mr. Speaker, Amman, Jordan, is a long way from my hometown of Orlando, Florida. Tonight, thousands of people in Orlando will walk into hotel lobbies without having to go through a metal detector, unlike the hotels in Amman, Jordan. Why? Because our soldiers are taking the fight to the terrorists, like Zarqawi in the Middle East, so the rest of us can live freely in the United States.

However one feels about the war in Iraq, realize that our troops deserve our support 100 percent. God knows they have earned it.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on House Resolution 861.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 62½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. And the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 57 minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) who chairs the Subcommittee on the Constitution on the House Judiciary Committee.

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

No one can honestly say that everything has gone just as planned in the war on terror. As with any war, we continue to face many challenges, some predictable, others unforeseen.

□ 2115

But I have no doubt that we will ultimately prevail and we will prevail because of the bravery and sacrifice and commitment to excellence of so many of our courageous men and women in uniform who have selflessly answered the call to duty.

Because of these patriots, Saddam Hussein is on trial for his life, for his crimes against humanity. His evil sons, Uday and Qusay, are no doubt roasting in hell. There are no more mass graves in Iraq being filled with the bodies of the innocent. And 25 million Iraqis, instead of fearing torture and execution for such crimes as insulting the President, can now, instead, actually vote for their leaders. And Iraq now has an elected government under a new constitution. And because of the skill and professionalism of our troops and our allies in the war on terror, terrorist kingpin, Abu Musab al Zarqawi is dead, and al Qaeda is left without its mastermind in Iraq. And in Afghanistan, in the face of extremely difficult conditions, our courageous men and women have overcome al Qaeda and the Taliban, allowing for free elections and the first democratically elected President, President Karzai, in that nation's history.

The job done by our soldiers and our sailors, our airmen and marines has been nothing short of superb. It is because of them that we will ultimately prevail in the war on terror. Of that I have no doubt. Like many of my colleagues, I have had the opportunity to visit with our troops in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and I have returned home with even more respect and admiration for the great work our servicemembers do each and every day. And like many of my colleagues, I have attended funeral services for too many of our heroes who have given their lives on the battlefield in the service of their Nation. May God bless them and the families that they have left behind.

Mr. Speaker, these sacrifices remind us that ultimately the people of Iraq must control their own destiny. Many of us have supported the important mission of training Iraqi troops to take

responsibility for the security of Iraq. Ultimately, the Iraqi people, the troops, the police officers there have to be responsible for the security of Iraq. There is only so much that our troops can do. This must continue to be a primary focus so that our brave men and women can return home as soon as possible.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), a combat veteran of the Korea war.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, General Anthony Zinni and other retired generals have been outspoken in their opposition to the planning and execution of our occupation of Iraq. But our administration rejected their sound recommendations which predicted exactly what would happen if we didn't plan for the occupation. These generals explained that our forces were not provided enough resources to do the job; that we alienated allies that could have helped in rebuilding Iraq; and that the Defense Department ignored planning for the postwar occupation, unaware of the growing insurgency there.

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

Back home I have met many times with Lila Lipscomb, a proud mother from Flint, Michigan, who lost her son Michael in Iraq. Initially, Mrs. Lipscomb supported the war, on the assumption that the government knew best. A week after finding out her son had died, she received a letter from her son in which he forcefully argued that we should not be in Iraq because there was no connection between Iraq and Osama bin Laden.

Cindy Sheehan lost her son Casey in Iraq and became a voice for mothers of soldiers who oppose the war. Cindy's loss motivated her to unite with other grieving mothers in opposition to the war. And her willingness to speak truth to power has drawn attention to the misconduct of the war and the terrible price that service men and women and their families have paid.

Let me tell you this: We need to encourage our friends and allies around the globe to help with Iraqi reconstruction and peacekeeping. We just don't have sufficient resources to manage this work on our own. We haven't learned from the first gulf war. If we can bring the international community into Iraq to help establish a democracy, protect its citizens, and rebuild its infrastructure, it will free American forces and resources to address the real problem we face: Terrorism.

Let's heed the advice of our colleague, Mr. MURTHA, and redeploy our troops to find Osama bin Laden and fight terrorists. If we can shatter the myth that occupying Iraq is the same thing as fighting terrorism, then these 10 hours of debate tonight will have been worth something after all.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who sits as a member of the Judiciary, 3 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I appreciate the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker, and also this Chamber.

If we take ourselves back to September 11, 2001, we had a lot of small problems then that we thought were big problems, and all of a sudden we had a great big problem. We were attacked by an enemy that most of us hadn't paid much attention to, if indeed we had ever heard of that enemy. We believed that that day wouldn't be over before on top of the attacks we knew about there would be other attacks on top of that. We believed in the following days there would be more and more attacks in this country because of an organized effort that would be continuing with suicide bomber attacks that would continue to cost the lives of Americans.

We mobilized this. The President stepped up in New York at ground zero and took a leadership role. He said if you're not with us, you're against us. If you harbor terrorists, you are a terrorist. And he carried that out.

And as we began to get mobilized to go to Afghanistan, there were those on the other side of the political equation that said you can't go in there and successfully invade and occupy a nation like that; that has never happened in the history of the world. The terrain is too difficult, the fighters are too tenacious, and it is a fool's errand to go into Afghanistan and think you can succeed in there militarily. But in fact that is what happened.

They said it would be another Vietnam, but it wasn't another Vietnam. The Afghani people voted on that soil for the first time in the history of the world, and American troops were there to see to it that they were able to do that. They have chosen their own leaders and directed their own national destiny, 25 million people.

And the advisers that put that together, both civilian and military, were the same advisers that advised President Bush on Iraq. The similarities are almost identical: Difficult country, 25 million people, you can't go there and succeed. The same advisers. And because some people can find one or two generals that had a different idea, they seem to believe that the President hasn't used the best wisdom possible.

In the shortest time in the history of the world, an armored column went across the desert and invaded and occupied the largest city ever in the history of the world to be invaded and occupied, and that is Baghdad, successfully, 25 million people. Even though we had some people who have spoken on this floor tonight that were inclined to surrender before the operation ever began. And now we have an operation going over there that has freed 25 million more people. And Afghanistan and Iraq are the lodestars for the Arab people in the Arab world.

When the Berlin Wall came down on November 9 of 1989, many in this place did not predict that freedom would echo across Eastern Europe for hundreds of millions of people, but it did. And freedom can echo across the Arab world for tens and hundreds of millions of people the same way that it echoed across Europe. That is the Bush doctrine. That is the vision: To free people. Because free people never go to war against other free people. We don't, at least.

And to the extent that the world is a freer place, it is a safer place, especially a safer place for Americans. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and I stand with our military.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to correct some disinformation that the previous speaker put out.

It should be noted that this Chamber was near united on going into Afghanistan. Moreover, we believed strongly that is where we should have been. So it wasn't anywhere close to what he explained.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), who served 4 years active duty in the U.S. Navy and retired as a full bird colonel after 26 years with the Tennessee National Guard.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, our country was founded and bases itself on civilian control of the military. And when I wore the uniform of our country, I, like all other military people in uniform, followed orders. I obeyed my commanders and I tried to do whatever the mission was that was set before us. That is what you do in the military of the United States under civilian control.

But I am not in uniform any more. I am a civilian now, and part of that civilian authority. And it is our patriotic duty as part of that civilian authority to ask questions, to constantly reexamine the strategy, to constantly reexamine the policy of this country, to do everything we can to, one, accomplish our mission; and, secondly, and more importantly, protect the men and women who are actually doing the fighting for us now.

That is why this debate, I would have hoped, would have been more broad; that we would have had more opportunity, because this debate in this country has to take place in this building on this floor here and in the Senate Chamber. It is the patriotic obligation and duty of civilian authority to do that, and I am proud to be here tonight.

Now, I have supported resolutions like this in the past, but I want to ask

Mr. COBLE a question, sir. There was a news report this morning that the new Iraqi government is negotiating with some of the elements there in Iraq that are insurgents who have been murdering Americans, and this was what one of the Iraqi government officials said this morning, according to these news reports, and I quote: ''There is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that these attacks on Americans are legitimate acts of resistance in defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned, definitely, I believe.''

Now, unless that can be cleared up, I am not prepared to vote for a resolution which says in part that the United States and its coalition partners will continue to support Iraq. If this government in Iraq is going to grant amnesty to people who kill Americans because they feel it is their patriotic duty and they are defending their homeland, then we have got to reassess where we are with these people.

Do you know whether or not this has been cleared up?

Mr. COBLE. Mr. TANNER, I do not know. I am told that it was announced that it was a mistake. But I cannot verify that, and this is a case of first impression with me, what you have just shared with me.

Mr. TANNER. Well, I don't want to catch you off guard, but we need to clear this up before we vote on this resolution. I do not think the American people will support a government that grants amnesty to people who kill American soldiers.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who, by the way, is the founder and chairman of the bipartisan, bicameral Anti-terrorist Funding Task Force.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly about one aspect of our fight against terrorism that is often overlooked, and that is our efforts to detect and eradicate terrorist funding networks around the world. The fight against terror finance goes hand in hand with the war on terror.

□ 2130

Terrorists infiltrate our financial systems to distribute the money that they need to support their evil activities around the globe. They exploit a wide variety of alternative funding networks that range from charities to commonplace criminal activity like drug peddling and illegal cigarette sales.

My colleagues would likely agree that while we may have targeted the financial resources of terrorists networks at times prior to 9/11, the fight against terror finance didn't begin in earnest until after the 9/11 attacks.

The 9/11 hijackers used U.S. and foreign banks to transfer the roughly half-million dollars necessary to the plan to execute their attacks on America.

We fought back against terror financiers with people like Dennis Lormel, a veteran FBI agent who was tasked with tracking down the financial lifelines that enabled the 9/11 hijackers to operate.

We fought back with people like David Aufhauser, who was then general counsel at the Treasury Department who was put in charge of a small interagency terror finance group which met regularly at the White House after 9/11.

And we fought back here in this House. Chairman OXLEY and the ranking member, Mr. FRANK, convened a Financial Services Committee hearing on terror finance just 3 weeks after the attacks. Shortly thereafter, this body passed the PATRIOT Act, which provided critical new terror finance tools.

We have held numerous hearings since to improve the government's antiterror finance efforts and to identify which foreign countries need to do more to stop terror financing within their borders.

And we have created the bipartisan Congressional Anti-Terrorist Financing Task Force to bring a stronger focus on bolstering our fight against terror financiers.

In just a few years, we have made significant progress in combating terror-funding networks. We still have a long way to go, but we are on the right track.

Last December, the 9/11 Commission came out with a report card grading the government's response to 9/11. The government's efforts against terror finance got the highest grade of them all, an A minus.

Just last week, an al Qaeda planning document was found in al Zarqawi's hideout which laments our successes in restricting the al Qaeda financial outlets. This House has played an important role in this effort, and it has been approached in a bipartisan way even when dealing with terror finance in Iraq. Continued progress on this complex issue requires a sustained commitment from our Congress.

Last year, members from both sides of the aisle joined me in a letter pressing Syria for more action in stopping the flow of fighters and finances into Iraq.

Members from both sides of the aisle joined me in asking the government of Italy to crack down on open fundraising efforts for Iraqi terrorists in their country.

As we move forward, our challenges continue to grow more daunting as terrorists perpetually adapt to our methods to stop them. They are constantly finding new ways to raise and distribute money.

So we must work even harder to keep up with terrorists' ever-changing financing techniques. We must continue pressing foreign governments to do the same.

Continued progress on this complex issue requires a sustained commitment from Congress. By stopping the flow of terrorist money, we can diminish the ability of terrorists to attack our citizens and our country. Fighting terror finance must remain a critical component of the War on Terror.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time for some of the veterans on the Democratic side of the aisle to have the opportunity to speak out against this sham resolution, and I yield back to him the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

I rise to oppose this resolution and to call for a significant reduction of U.S. forces this year and an end to the occupation in 2007.

I voted against the invasion in 2002 because I believed the war would be a strategic blunder of historic proportions. And it has been.

We owe the men and women we sent to Iraq and their loved ones more than a few hours of grandstanding on this floor and an empty resolution of support.

We must work toward a national consensus to end this war, a war born in deception and managed under a delusion. Today's news that the American death toll has surpassed 2,500 is the grim reminder of the danger and sacrifice our Armed Forces face daily in Iraq. We need to end our occupation of Iraq so America can rebuild our economy at home and regain respect abroad.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who sits on the House Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, again we return to the people's House to discuss the people's business and the central question that cuts to the very core of our existence: free men and women engaged in an armed struggle to advance freedom elsewhere in the world; our all-volunteer military, standing in the breach against Islamofascism and terror in Afghanistan and in innumerable other places around the globe. But the central front for our discussion this evening in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, in support of the troops, in support of this mission, as I often recall the words of Mark Twain that history does not repeat it, but it rhymes.

I review the debate that has gone on in the people's House today, so many willing to compare this to Vietnam. So many coming to this floor using the term ''quagmire,'' and yet any dispassionate, objective evaluation of what has transpired would be remiss if we did not include not one, not two, but three elections where we have seen turnout by the Iraqi people exceed on each occasion what had gone on before.

We see a nation being born, fighting terror, and we see American troops, volunteers, stepping forward.

Others have made the point, Mr. Speaker, that there is no more solemn and sacred obligation than casting a

vote to put our military into harm's way. I have been at Walter Reed with one of my constituents prior to surgery. I had that young man say to me: Congressman, I am a cav scout. That's my job; that's my profession. Help me do all I can to get back with my unit.

The men and women of our military are professionals doing a tough job. I don't doubt the sincerity and intent of those who oppose this resolution, but I do respectfully take issue with their judgment.

If not us, who? If not now, when? We have no choice. Failure is not an option, and to those for whatever reason eager to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory, al Zarqawi is dead. A democracy is being born. Freedom is on the march. This remains an imperfect world with mistakes and challenges that likewise remain, but let us stand steadfast, true to the course, true to the cause, true to freedom. Vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), a Vietnam veteran and the recipient of two Bronze Stars.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the resolution. There is much in the resolution to like. It honors those Americans who fought in the global war on terror, and especially those who have been wounded and died; and it expresses a commitment to a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq. And it urges we protect freedom.

But the resolution fails to address a key question that most Americans are asking: When are the troops coming home? Let me be clear, I have long opposed setting a date certain for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam veteran, I believe every unconventional conflict has a tipping point where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counterproductive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders. And I believe this tipping point is fast approaching.

We must patiently but firmly insist that the new Iraqi Government assume these responsibilities, and we must also be systematic in bringing home those American soldiers who have so bravely served us on the ground in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I observe in this great Chamber two portraits: one of George Washington, a revolutionary leader; the other is France's General Lafayette who helped us with our revolution from 1777 to 1781. It is instructive to note that General Lafayette did not stay here forever, nor did we want him to go. Good friends know when to come; good friends know when to go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for the troops. But it is also time to send a clear message that our commitment is conditional on their successes, and our days in their country are not indefinite.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the Resolution. There is much in this resolution to like.

After all, it honors those Americans who have fought in the Global War on Terror, and especially those who have been wounded or died.

It expresses a commitment to a ''sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq.'' And it urges that we ''protect freedom.''

But this resolution fails to fully address a key question that most Americans are asking: ''When are the troops coming home?''

Now let me be clear—I have long opposed setting a ''date certain'' for ''immediate withdrawal'' of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam Veteran, I believe that every unconventional conflict has a ''tipping point'' where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive.

I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that this ''tipping point'' is fast approaching in Iraq. We must patiently, but firmly, insist that the new Iraqi Government assume these responsibilities.

We must also be systematic in bringing home those American soldiers who have so bravely served us on the ground in Iraq.

President Bush and this Congress must clearly tell our partners in Iraq—particularly, the new government—that they must step up to the plate and assume their solemn responsibilities for securing their country.

The new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it's time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring.

It is time for Iraq to come together and show the American people that it is ready to defend itself, govern itself and sustain itself.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I observe in this great chamber two large portraits. One is of George Washington, our revolutionary leader. The other is of France's General Lafayette, who helped us with our revolution from 1777 to 1781.

It is instructive to note, that General Lafayette did not stay here forever; nor did we want him to. Good friends know when to come—and when to go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for our troops and their important mission. But it is also time to send a clear message to our friends in Iraq, that our commitment is conditional on their own successes, and that our days in their country are not indefinite.

And although I wish this resolution could have made this point more clearly, I will support the resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. MURTHA, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to close this very grim and dark chapter in American history, a chapter that is leaving a dark stain on the moral fabric of our Nation and compromising our credibility among the communities nations.

As Gandhi once said: ''Liberty and democracy become unholy when their hands are dyed with innocent red blood.''

Mr. Speaker, we have buried 2,500 of our Nation's mothers, fathers, daughters, sons, husbands, wives, brothers and sisters. The lives of 18,000 men and women have been changed forever. Some have lost their arms, their legs, and their sight in this unnecessary conflict.

Mr. Speaker, war is messy. War is bloody. It tends not only to hide the truth, but to sacrifice the truth. While we may have won some military victories, those do not erase the mistake of a preemptive war.

They will not silence the questions that are troubling the minds of the American people. They know today that Iraq did not pose an immediate threat. There were no weapons of mass destruction, and they see that we are deeply involved in a misguided conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply believe that the American people want us to bring our children home. We are not safer today than we were before we went to war. This war is not the answer, so we must find a way out of no way to bring our young men and our young women home. Bring them home.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the next speaker, could you tell me how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 49 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 54½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) who sits on the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this resolution.

Over a quarter of a century ago when I served in my first term during my first period of service in Congress, I remember making a very difficult phone call. That phone call was to the parents of a young man in uniform who had died in our failed attempt in the desert to attempt to rescue our hostages in Iran.

I recall the feeling of helplessness we had at that moment, not understanding what we were doing, not having a strategy as to how we respond to what was, very simply put, a terrorist attack.

I recall being awakened one morning to learn that we had suffered the loss of our marines in Beirut. I recall the attack on the USS *Cole*. And then, of course, I recall with all of us the terrible tragedy of 9/11.

Say what you will about the President's policies and say what you will about the imperfections involved, the fact of the matter is since 9/11 this President, this administration, has embarked on a strategy that says we will not wait to be attacked. We will not wait to respond exactly where they attacked us. We will change the rules of the game, and we will decide where and when we will attack.

We understand that this is a global war on terror. Those who suggest that the war in Iraq is not essential to our defense in the war on terror should only listen to the words of Mr. Zarqawi and the correspondence that he had last October where he suggested one of the very first objectives of al Qaeda was to make sure we were defeated in Iraq.

□ 2145

We should understand that we have done great things in response to this, on a bipartisan basis. We have given the President the tools to use, the PATRIOT Act, intelligence gathering that he did not have the capacity for before. And let me just mention a number of plots that have been deterred.

The West coast airliner plot in mid-2002. The U.S. disrupted a plot to attack targets on the West coast of United States using hijacked airplanes.

The East Coast airliner plot in mid-2003,

The Jose Padilla plot to blow up apartment buildings in the United States in May of 2002.

The 2004 U.K. urban targets plot where the U.S. and partners disrupted a plot that involved urban targets in the United Kingdom.

The 2003 Karachi plot.

The Heathrow Airport plot in 2003.

The 2004 U.K. plot.

The 2002 Arabian Gulf shipping plot.

The 2002 Straits of Hormuz plot,

The 2003 tourist site plot where the U.S. and a partner nation disrupted a plot to attack a tourist site outside the United States.

We are making progress precisely because we are playing away games, not home games. Let's not forget that as we debate this important resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, our job is to protect our Nation. We have thousands of young men and women who are doing it today.

I believed in early 2003 we should do more to capture or eliminate the people who caused the 9/11 attacks. They were predominantly in Afghanistan, not in Iraq.

Today it seems we have a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan and increasing attacks in Iraq on our troops and Iraqi citizens.

We have seen success in capturing Saddam and eliminating al Zarqawi. I have never doubted the ability of our young men and women in our Armed Forces. We saw what they were capable of doing in the first days of the war when they stormed Iraq and Baghdad within days, overwhelming the Iraqi forces.

The accomplishments we have seen in Iraq can be attributed directly to these troops' discipline and persistence in fighting the insurgency.

Mistakes have been made, and the most experienced members of our Armed Forces have pointed that out. One of the individuals who spoke out was retired Marine General, Former Chief of U.S. Central Command Anthony Zinni, who said, ''We grow up in a culture where accountability, learning to accept responsibility, admitting mistakes and learning from them was critical to us. When we don't see that happening, it worries us. Poor military judgments has been used throughout this mission.''

As this war has gone on, the lack of planning and poor judgment by this administration has become more apparent.

I have here the May 1, 2003 press release from the White House in which President Bush, on board the U.S. Abraham Lincoln, declared all major combat operations have ended. We now know that this was one miscalculation among many.

Since that time, seven young men from our 29th Congressional district in Texas have lost their lives in Iraq. Across this Nation, 2,300 service personnel, men and women have lost their lives since the President made these remarks.

Reading over these remarks, it is clear that the administration had no clear plan for securing Iraq after the invasion and no clue about what was to follow the next 3 years.

Given the size and the strength and the effectiveness of the insurgency, the administration's intelligence should have given some indication that there would be problems down the road and done a better job of preparing both our public and, more importantly, our troops on what was to come the following month and the following years.

It is clear that we did not have enough troops on the ground immediately after the invasion, and that shortage continues.

Congress doesn't direct troops on the ground. We are not the Commander in Chief. But we are charged with sending our sons and daughters into battle, and therefore we need an honest and open debate about what is occurring in Iraq.

I strongly disagree with the way the administration planned and carried out this war. I will continue, though, to vote for the defense appropriations and the supplemental dollars because we have to give our troops protections that they need, and we learn every day that they need even more.

Many brave men and women have given their lives in Baghdad and all across Iraq. We honor those families for their sacrifice, their ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, this war is not the one we anticipated fighting or the war we were led to believe we were getting into, but I believe we must leave a secure Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol for democracy to prosper.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the question came up previously from a colleague about did Iraq intend to give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers, and I want to clarify that. The National Security Adviser said just earlier regarding alleged comments from the Prime Minister that supposedly amnesty would be given to some who have killed Americans. He said, ''This is not the case. I am sorry to say the Prime Minister of Iraq has been misquoted and misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed Americans.'' So that should clarify that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are those who have said it is a quagmire in Iraq. It is a mistake for us to be there. Some made these statements from personal heartache. Some, on the other hand, were made from partisan political motivation, and some from disdain for our President and a desire to see his efforts fail, even though it risks world stability and national security.

But our soldiers are there. They know they have done great things and will continue to accomplish more. They have seen the admiring faces of Iraqi children that were never present in Vietnam. They have heard gratitude from many there in Iraq that was never heard in Vietnam.

Our valiant soldiers not only fight, protect and defend, they also see the frantic efforts of terrorists who are terrified that democracy and the people will begin to rule over them and their oppressive dictatorial ways. They keep many terrorists occupied there rather than here in America.

Mr. Speaker, as legislators, we get to ask a question that I didn't get to ask as a judge. It was inappropriate because of the separation of powers. And that is, who will be hurt or helped by the actions and, in my case as a judge, by the ruling?

Well, here in this debate as legislators we get to ask that question. Who will be hurt by pulling out? Those yearning for freedom who have it within their grasp will be hurt. And ultimately America will be hurt because of terrorist activities that would resume and multiply unabated in Iraq, and bin Laden would have been proven right, that we didn't have the stomach to go all the way to victory.

Who would be helped by our pulling out? Well, there are some families that would not endure the heartache from losing or having a wounded soldier in

their family. But the price in lost lives might be far more expensive in the future. Who would really be helped would be ruthless, heartless, finger detaching, hand removing, throat slashing, decapitating, women raping and abusing, child misusing, corpse abusing, merciless, calloused, deranged, religious zealot, murderers who think they are going to get virgins in the next life, but may find they are the virgins with what happens to them.

Let me just close by saying, some have not had nice things to say about our colleague, Mr. MURTHA, and others wanting to pull out of Iraq quickly. But I understand the faithful visitation that he does routinely. So I say thank God for his big heart. I say thank God for his compassion. Thank God for his visits to the wounded. Thank God for his ministering to grieving families. But thank God he was not here and prevailed after the bloodbaths at Normandy and in the Pacific, or we would be here speaking Japanese or German.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask the Speaker, was the gentleman at any of those locations? Was the gentleman at either Normandy or any of those locations?

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield?

You want to know which locations?

Mr. MURTHA. Yes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Normandy was a horrible bloodbath.

Mr. MURTHA. I said were you there?

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, no, I wasn't.

Mr. MURTHA. Were you in Vietnam?

Mr. GOHMERT. No, sir, I wasn't.

Mr. MURTHA. Were you in Iraq?

Mr. GOHMERT. I have been over there. I haven't been fighting.

Mr. MURTHA. Boots on the ground?

Mr. GOHMERT. And I do admire the gentleman's compassion, and I do appreciate all that he has done for our wounded. He has done a great service, and that would be you, Mr. MURTHA. Thank you for your work.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the process that we are dealing with this evening is nothing less than an outrage. The idea that on an issue of this great importance those of us in the minority are not being allowed to offer a resolution of our own is an insult to the democratic process and tells us why we have to end one party government in America.

The Republican resolution talks about democracy in Iraq. I am all for that. But I would also like to see some democracy on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Three and a half years ago, when we were asked to give the President the authority to go to war in Iraq, I voted against that resolution, and I think history will indicate that that was the right vote.

Three and a half years ago President Bush told us that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq was likely to attack us, and that it was necessary to wage a preemptive war against them. President Bush was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were told that there was a link between Iraq and al Qaeda. That was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were shown all of those aluminum tubes which allegedly told us about a nuclear weapons program in Iraq. That was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were told that Iraq was importing depleted uranium from Niger. That was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism is a major problem for our country and the world. Unfortunately, in many respects, the war in Iraq has created more terrorists than it has stopped, and has deflected our attention away from the fight against Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, let us bring our troops home as soon as possible. Let us mount a focused campaign against terrorism with military force, with improved intelligence capabilities and with an understanding that we need to work with the entire world.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

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

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is a part of the global war on terrorism, and a strong democratic Iraq means a safer America.

Rather than debate the past, I choose to look at where we are today and where we will be tomorrow. In the days and weeks and months ahead, the global war on terrorism will come to a turning point. Today the question is, do we continue to fight and defeat the terrorists who will stop at nothing to destroy Iraq's democracy?

Ultimately, the success of democracy in Iraq will be decided by the Iraqis themselves, for it is they who must take their country back.

Like many of our colleagues, I have traveled to Iraq. I have visited with its leaders, including the new Prime Minister. I have also visited with our troops, including from my home State of New Jersey. I have met with members of the Signal Battalion from Westfield and our Finance Battalion in Flemington before their deployments. Their courage in the face of danger and willingness to serve inspire us all.

Difficult days still lie ahead. We acknowledge the sacrifices of our Armed Forces and their families here at home. For those Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice, 2,500 as of today, their sacrifice is immeasurable, and America extends our hands and our hearts to their families.

Looking forward, not backwards, I believe we must stand with the Iraqis who are fighting for their country, because a strong democratic Iraq means a safer America. There can be no alternative to winning the global war on terrorism. There can be no alternative to a democratic Iraq, lest it return to tyranny and a breeding ground for international terrorists who would then seek to fight us far closer to our own shores.

Let us choose a democratic Iraq and a safer America. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, how did this happen? We have lost 2,500 American servicemen and women. They have been killed in Iraq. 18,000 U.S. soldiers grievously wounded. We have spent over one-third of a trillion dollars in Iraq on this war, so far. Yet, 80 percent of the Iraqi people want us to leave. 80 percent of the Iraqi people want us to leave. They are shooting at our soldiers, blowing up our soldiers with improvised explosive devices.

How did we get here? Oh, yeah. I remember. President Bush said that Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat to the United States and had weapons of mass destruction. So many of us voted to send our troops to Iraq to eliminate this threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction and this imminent threat to our national security.

□ 2200

It turned out not to be true. There were no weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein was no imminent threat to the United States. Well, we deposed him and that is a good thing. But there was a huge power vacuum and many of us felt, even though we were misled going into war, that we had a moral obligation to help the Iraqi people stabilize their country and bring democracy there, and we have been there now 3 years, 2,500 dead, 18,000 of our young men and women wounded, a third of $1 trillion spent, and 80 percent of the Iraqis want us to leave.

I support the Murtha resolution, which says that we should withdraw most of the U.S. troops back to the United States and leave a quick reaction force in friendly countries around the region.

Some say Iraq is part of the war on terror. Nonsense. There are 25 million people in Iraq, 25 million people in Iraq, less than 1,000 foreign fighters. This is a civil war. The Iraqi Shiias, Sunnis, and Kurds cannot agree how to divide up Iraq now that we got rid of Saddam. Well, it is 3 years later. All of this American loss of life. President Bush says stay the course, and in fact, it will not be President Bush who gets rid of this war. It will be the next President. Well, you know what? Americans do not want this war without end. Deploy most of our troops back to America within 6 months. Redeploy a significant number in friendly countries around the horizon in case other countries want to meddle.

War without end is not the American way. We met our moral obligation to

the people of Iraq. Now it is up to the Shiias, Sunnis, and Kurds in Iraq to decide whether they want to live in peace with one another or not.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), who sits on the Financial Services and Transportation Committees.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, for our families and country to truly be secure, we must prevail in the war on terror. Iraq is a central front in that war.

Mistakes have been made, but so have corrections. But the fundamental fact remains that John F. Kennedy's words have never been more true: ''If men and women are in chains anywhere in the world, then freedom is in endangered everywhere.''

Men and women in the chains of tyranny, without hope, provide the breeding grounds for terrorists that endanger America and the entire civilized world. Terrorism can only be defeated by bringing hope to harsh places.

America has always found that the best way to make our families secure is to confront tyranny and expand the frontiers of freedom. That is our mission in Iraq. And with a democratically elected government and Iraqi troops increasingly taking over for our troops, we are on a path to success.

Others offer a different path, a path that says get out now no matter what the commanders in the field say; get out now, whether or not milestones have been achieved; get out now, whether or not Iraq becomes a sanctuary for terrorists to regroup and attack America again; get out now no matter what signal that sends to Iran.

Let me be clear. Cutting and running is one path, but it is the wrong path. The only path for security for our families is victory in the war on terror.

The troops that I visited in Iraq in each of the last 3 years have told me that they should come home as soon as possible, after we have defeated the terrorist threat and set out a lasting peace.

I support this proposal and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois, a man who has spent his life as a tireless advocate for freedom and respect for the fundamental dignity of all human life.

It cannot be overstated how important it is that we are here for today's debate. There is no more important issue facing this Congress or this country than winning the War on Terror.

Our mission in Iraq is a central front in that war.

At stake is not only the safety of our families and our country but also the resolve of this great Nation to stand up and oppose the forces of terror wherever they may appear.

Make no mistake about it: there is more at stake in our mission in Iraq than helping rebuild a country decimated by a despot for decades. We must defeat the terrorists overseas, so we don't have to fight them here at home.

Mistakes have been made, so have corrections, but the fundamental fact remains that John F. Kennedy's words have never been more true: ''If men and women are in chains anywhere in the world, then freedom is endangered everywhere.''

People in the chains of tyranny without hope are the breeding ground for terrorists that endanger America and the entire civilized world. Terrorism can only be defeated by bringing hope to harsh places.

We must also remember our own proud historical tradition: America has always found that the best way to provide for our security at home is to confront tyranny and expand the frontiers of freedom.

That is our mission in Iraq.

And with a democratically elected government and an Iraqi army and police force increasingly taking over for our troops, we are on a path to success, and a path to bringing our troops home.

Others offer a different path, a path that says, get out now, no matter what the commanders on the ground think; get out now whether or not milestones are achieved; get out now, whether or not Iraq becomes a sanctuary for terrorists to regroup and attack America again; get out now, no matter what signal it sends to Iran and other countries that would endanger our security.

Cutting and running is one path. But it is the wrong path.

The only path that makes our families secure is victory in the War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the lessons of history, I look to what the soldiers on the ground are saying.

The soldiers I have spoken to on the ground in Iraq, at places like Camp Victory in Baghdad, many of them men and women from the Minnesota Army National Guard, want to come home as soon as possible.

However, they realize better than most that if they come home before they have defeated the terrorist threat, there will be no lasting peace—there will be no victory in the War on Terror. They know that if we don't finish the job in Iraq, we'll have to finish it someplace else.

Like them, I want to finish the job in Iraq, because if we don't finish it there, the horror of 9/11 should inform us that the war will be brought to us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember in our thoughts and prayers those who have sacrificed, as well as those who continue to stand in harm's way around the world fighting the War on Terror. Let us deserve the bravery and selflessness of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people are increasingly aware of where things stand in Iraq, despite the glib assurances and political spin we get from sources like the whereas clauses of the resolution before us and the Pentagon's most recent quarterly report, which has been so devastatingly refuted by Middle East expert Anthony Cordesman of the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

The real question before us and the question most Americans are asking is, how long must our troops stay in Iraq? Our military's valiant efforts have clearly facilitated such important steps as such as the formation of a democratically elected government in Iraq. But the troubling reality is that our continued presence also makes success more elusive. It serves as a disincentive for Iraqi military and political leaders to take courageous risks to stabilize their country and assume responsibility for their government. Equally important, our presence is a magnet for international terrorism and an incitement for the insurgency.

In order to jump-start progress, our troops must begin to come home. We must leave in a way that maximizes Iraq's chances to govern and defend itself. At the same time, we cannot become hostages to the failures of administration policy, prolonging or staying in a situation where our very presence is a continuing provocation. How we leave does matter, but we must leave.

That is why Representative BRAD MILLER and I introduced a resolution last fall, H.J. Res. 70, which would require the President to deliver an exit strategy for Iraq. Tonight I am renewing that call. Let me explain briefly in clear terms what a responsible exit strategy means.

First, we need to hear that the President has a plan for reducing our presence in Iraq within a reasonable time frame. ''As they stand up, we will stand down'' is not a strategy. It is a slogan. Secondly, we need to hear that such a plan would begin with an initial near-term drawdown of U.S. forces to send a clear message to the Iraqis that our presence is coming to an end. We also need to hear a pledge from the President that we will not establish long-term bases on Iraqi soil.

And, finally, we need to hear that there is a plan for filling the void left behind when our troops depart, to mobilize resources within the international community, to ensure that Iraq's neighbors do not interfere in internal Iraqi affairs, and to support the ongoing development of the Iraqi Government and security forces.

These are the elements of a responsible exit strategy. This is the type of leadership that the President owes our troops and the American people.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), who sits on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, proved that our enemy is determined to kill Americans. Instead of sitting idle, our Nation went on the offense. We removed the Taliban from power in Afghanistan. We removed the regime in Iraq that had invaded neighbors and financed terrorism. And we have kept terrorists on

the run, limiting their avenues of attack, disrupting their finances and eliminating safehouses around the globe. Mr. Speaker, it is not by coincidence that our Nation has not suffered another attack here at home.

Some have doubts about our mission in Iraq. But I believe Americans can find solace in the midst of sacrifice and hope in the midst of hardship. The reason is simple: we are clearly on the road to victory and success in Iraq, and our Nation is safer today because of it.

Since the fall of Saddam's regime, 70 percent of eligible Iraqis for the first time in history elected a national unity government. They have ratified a democratic Constitution for the first time ever, and they helped us eliminate al Qaeda's mastermind, Zarqawi.

Mr. Speaker, progress in Iraq makes America safer. Terrorists are being pursued, not harbored. We have seen movement toward democracy in neighboring countries. Work remains, but freedom is making progress. And freedom, Mr. Speaker, lays the foundation for a more secure future for America.

Mr. Speaker, I have also had the privilege of visiting our troops in Iraq. They are outstanding young men and women, and they overwhelmingly believe in their mission. I urge my colleagues to offer their unqualified support to our troops abroad until their mission is complete.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the current administration has gotten too many things wrong in Iraq and has totally misrepresented the lessons of the post-9/11 world. It is now up to Democrats to get things right in Iraq so we can focus our military efforts to fighting terrorists around the world who want to harm us.

Today I ask my colleagues: Will we realistically confront terrorists and terrorism with all the elements of our national power, or will we continue to ignore a proven approach in order to follow a shop-worn, idealistic approach that drains our military of its resources and America of its goodwill with the very partners we need to fight terrorists? That is the choice that our country faces in Iraq and in our national security.

Democrats must speak out against this administration's tendency to overlook problems and push for a policy that centers on oversight of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, we do not practice oversight. This Congress practices ''overlook.'' We must respond to public frustrations by creating a secure future for our military and reestablish a foundation for American efforts to fight terrorists and terrorism across the globe. Congress must confront the legacy of the waste, fraud, and abuse that plagues our efforts in Iraq.

As Democrats, we must continue our efforts, in spite of the current opposition, to bring this waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq to light.

Some talk about cutting and running. But I say we must confront the legacy of cutting and running from veterans health care. Just as the next generation of combat veterans return home, the long-term veterans health care budget falls $8.6 billion short from projected needs. We must reject that legacy of Iraq.

And, finally, I join my colleagues in commending our U.S. military working in conjunction with Iraqi security and Iraqis themselves for locating and eliminating Abu Musad al Zarqawi. His terrorist violence is gone. But we have learned in Iraq that fighting a classic guerrilla-type war means that a victory like killing Zarqawi cannot be celebrated too long. Much remains to be done in Iraq, and Democrats have to make right where the administration has gone wrong. Our obligations compel us to ask the tough questions that are currently ignored.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who sits on the Ways and Means, Budget, and Joint Economic Committees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just recently read a lecture from the most highly respected scholar on Middle East affairs and Islam in America, Bernard Lewis. He went through Osama bin Laden's original fatwa. He went through a lot of writings of al Qaeda back in the early to mid-1990s, and what they declared is very chilling. They declared that their war was going to be against the two superpowers at the time: the Soviet Union and America. They believed they defeated the USSR in Afghanistan. I would like to think peace through strength is what beat it here and the fact that communism did not work. But they think they beat it.

Now they think they have one last enemy to beat before they can reach their caliphate from Spain to Indonesia: America.

Mr. Speaker, the war on terror did not begin on 9/11. It began on 2/26. February 26, 1993, when they first hit us at the World Trade Center. Then in 1996, the Khobar Towers. Then in 1998 at our two embassies in Africa. Then in 2000, the USS *Cole*. Then in 2001, 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. They have declared this war against us long ago. The sooner we realize it, the better we are. The best way to win this war is to play away games and not home games.

The good news on this front is we have not had another 9/11 since 9/11. We have not had a major terrorist attack here in America.

If Iraq becomes democratic, if Iraq becomes free, they lose. They cannot win and manifest their distorted belief. They want to have a world like what we saw on display in Afghanistan, the Taliban, throughout the entire Middle East. If democracy and freedom can persist, if it can take root, if it can succeed, as it is succeeding in many parts of the Arab world, the terrorists lose.

And the most important thing in all of this that all of us should have in the front of our minds is will our children grow up in America with the fear of terrorism in the front of their mind or will it be a distant memory in history? I grew up in Jamesville, Wisconsin, as a happy kid. I want my kids to grow up in Jamesville, Wisconsin, with the same kind of happiness, not with the fear of terrorism.

This is a global war, a war we have to win, a war that only America through its leadership can win for the rest of the world. The sooner we wake up to that, the better off we are and the more peaceful life we can leave to our children.

□ 2215

That is why our troops overseas are doing a great job. That is why we have to see this thing through. The terrorists think we are weak because of our freedoms. They think that we do not have the stomach. They think they can turn our public opinion. That is not true.

Let's prove that that is not true, and let's win this war on terror.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution because its words honor our troops, but its deeds do not. It is not at all controversial that we honor and respect the heroism of those who serve us.

But they deserve so much more than the hollow words of this resolution. They deserve a plan that for the first time would achieve an intelligence alliance, it would make strikes like the one against Zarqawi on a regular basis against the leaders of the resistance.

But this resolution has no plan. They deserve a real plan to fortify and improve the Iraqi security forces so as they step forward, our troops can come home. But this resolution offers no such plan. They deserve a clear path to political stability and broadening political participation so the government of Iraq is viewed as an Iraqi Government and not a tool of any outside forces. This resolution has no such plan.

We are in the problems that we are in today because the administration has given us slogans, not solutions. This resolution is very much in that sorry tradition. This debate is a sham, Mr. Speaker. It is a pep rally. It is not a discussion of the alternatives before the country.

So although I join the words of the resolution in praising our troops, let's move beyond the words to the deeds.

The way to honor those who fight for this country is to match their sacrifice with our own wisdom. This resolution falls far short of that objective and we should oppose it.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), a 25-year veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps, a Vietnam veteran who sits on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution today. I have enjoyed the debate immensely. The rhetoric has been sometimes heated, the facts sometimes obscured. But I think it is healthy for the American people to see this debate. I am sorry that the gentleman from New York is not here. I wanted to have a discussion about what buck sergeants know and what they do not know in today's Army. But I suppose we will have to let that one slide by.

But I will tell you that my son, serving in Iraq today, and his colleagues and his soldiers in the 101st and the other soldiers and marines that I have talked to, they know why they are in Iraq. They know what they are doing. They know what their mission is. And they understand that not everyone here does, that Iraq is the front line in the war against Islamist extremists in the words of the 9/11 Commission.

But I am here this evening to talk about a trip that I took to Iraq a week ago at the request of the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee to assess the progress of the Iraqi armed forces. I am pleased to report that I was very heartened by what I found. I think all of us now understand that the Iraqi Army is progressing with amazing speed. We know the numbers. Over 260,000 Iraqi security forces, over 100 Iraqi Army battalions, almost 30 Iraqi police battalions, either leading the fight or serving with their coalition partners.

But it is not the numbers that count; it is the quality of the troops. It is what they are able to do. In a previous trip to Iraq in November of 2005, I had the opportunity to meet with and assess the progress of the Iraqi counterterrorism forces. These are special forces trained by our Special Operations Command, and they are impressive.

The Iraqi special forces have proved their mettle in combat and in training. Last month, last month a young captain became the first Iraqi to graduate from the United States Army Ranger School, an exceptional feat achieved by only 35 percent of any foreign military personnel who try.

Over Memorial Day weekend, my confidence was further boosted when I visited with Major General Bashar Ayoub, commander of the Iraqi 9th Mechanized Division, and Major General Jamal Khalid, Commander of the Iraqi Second Division. Both commanders expressed their frustration with the bureaucracy in the interim ministry of defense but both generals demonstrated a quite confidence and professionalism exhibited by seasoned battle-hardened commanders.

These two commanders demonstrated the will and the ability of the Iraqi security forces to battle the terrorists and the insurgents who plague their country.

In our discussions, Mr. Speaker, they were blunt. They were proud of their accomplishments. They were confident in their ability to move forward, but they recognize that they continue to rely on U.S. logistical and medical assistance, that they cannot move forward by themselves. Not now.

We have made a commitment, Mr. Speaker, not only to our American forces, but to these Iraqi forces. We have got to stay with them and help them achieve their freedom and their independence.

We have made a commitment—not only to the American men and women of our Armed Forces—but to those who wear the uniform of the Iraqi Security Forces. They have shed their blood alongside our soldiers and Marines in pursuit of a stable and peaceful Iraq.

Now is not the time to abandon them, now is the time to stand firm with those who defend freedom in a land that has known only tyranny.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the rule this morning, our Republican colleagues suggested something pretty revolutionary, that is, that we do something we do not normally do often around here, and that is read the resolution. They said they encouraged us to review it, and vote based on whether we agree or disagree with the content of the resolution.

So I reviewed the resolution. And as our colleagues suggested, I intend to vote against it based on the fact that there are several things in the resolution that I strongly disagree with.

First, on page 2 of the resolution, it states as follows: ''Whereas by early 2003, Saddam Hussein and his criminal Ba'athist regime in Iraq constituted a threat to global peace and security.''

I think the only way one could conclude this would be to conclude that there were, in fact, weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I did not vote for the war resolution because I never believed the President when he asserted that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in the first place. I did not believe it then. It was subsequently proven not to be the case. And I most certainly cannot support a resolution that asserts it now.

Second, the resolution asserts that: ''The terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorist's aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East.'' There is probably some truth to that.

However, what is probably a lot more true is that the war in Iraq has increased, not decreased, terrorism and the resolve of the terrorists. It has created conditions in Iraq that allow terrorism to thrive.

Finally, the Resolution asserts that ''Iraqi forces are, over time, taking over from United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight to secure Iraq.'' If that were true, we would have started bringing our troops home by now. At some point we've got to make Iraq assume responsibility for itself and its own people. I just don't believe they or we have come to grips with that.

There obviously are a number of things in the Resolution with which I agree. But we were given no opportunity to amend the Resolution to strip out the things that are untrue and/or offensive or, for that matter, to add to the things with which we agree. My Republican colleagues have, once again, chosen to politicize a matter that should be above partisan politics. I cannot vote for the Resolution in this form and will, therefore, vote ''no.''

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair the amount of time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 31 minutes, and gentleman from Pennsylvania has 37½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a veteran of the U.S. Army, who sits on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution for many reasons. But one is that I know we are achieving real progress in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know this not from government reports or media sources, but from two fine Pennsylvanians. I want to quote from an e-mail I received this morning from a constituent, an Army officer in northwest Iraq commanding the military transition team.

And he writes, ''There are many positive things going on over here that the American public never hear about. My little 10-man team contributed over 150 boxes of school supplies to the schools in my area. Other units purchased grain to give out to small villages. I am very proud of the accomplishments of U.S. and Iraqi forces and it truly is a shame that all of the news tends to be negative towards the activities of the soldiers, both American and Iraqi who are working very hard every day to make this country safe.''

I am very pleased and honored this summer to have an intern, Mike Wright, who is a soldier in the 82nd Airborne. When he arrived in Afghanistan in July 2002, the people had nothing: no schools, no healthcare, no paved roads. But in 7 months his unit helped build the first school and health clinic. When his unit came back to Afghanistan in late 2004, it was a different place. New facilities, factories, more electricity, and miles of paved roads.

When arriving in the village, he tells me his unit would be greeted by small

children, smiling youngsters throwing colorful plastic flowers at them. These examples are among many that illustrate real progress, laying a foundation for future peace, shaping the world where the terrorist message will fall on deaf ears.

Mike told me this also, ''The Afghani war veterans, the old-timers have asked him, why did you abandon us when the Soviets left?''

Today their biggest fear is that we will leave before the mission is done and allow the Taliban or other tyrants to take over. We must know that the Iraqi civilians remember 1991 and fear the same thing. We must complete this mission.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, their side of the aisle, your side of the aisle, has a major problem. Yesterday, Prime Minister Nouri al Maliki suggested that they would provide amnesty for those people who killed or who wounded our soldiers. We are going to see who are the patriots here in the future.

In a speech that JACK MURTHA gave on April 20 this year, he started off by talking about President Teddy Roosevelt. He said, ''There must be no criticism of the President or that we have to stand by the President right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public.''

You are going to have to explain that. You made a very big mistake. I voted for the war, for the efforts of the President, the Chief, the Commander in Chief in December of 2002. And here we are a few years later, looking back at what that decision was based upon.

Talk about impunity, we have had people come on the floor in the last 2 years to impugn this gentleman's character. The CIA impugned the very facts that the administration has tried to provide. Every day a former CIA agent says that this administration failed to listen to the advice and counsel of those folks who have boots on the ground. That is a shame.

And the other side, the other side has simply provided a rubber stamp, a rubber stamp to all of the policies. You have mindlessly rubber-stamped the mismanagement that has cost our sons, and you may laugh, these are our sons and daughters, our sons and daughters their lives.

And now, here we are today—considering a partisan, political resolution that ultimately means nothing; a resolution that won't assist our troops on the ground; a resolution that does not help us move forward in bringing our men and women home.

This is just another shameful example that the leadership of this body is not fit to serve. This Congress has failed to fulfill its most basic of duties. Shame should permeate every hallway and every hearing room.

If we were serious—truly serious—about helping our men and women in the military, we would not waste our time on this resolution.

Instead we would delve into the deception, the intelligence failures, the scapegoating of the C.I.A., and the mismanagement that has placed us where we are today. The generals, the men and women of our Armed Forces have done their job. We have voted time and time again in budgets and supplements supported their protection, yet we have had the real culprit come to this floor and demean, undermine, those who ask questions or may criticize. Teddy Roosevelt turned over from the clownish gyrations of the Congressmen or women from Ohio.

And we'd also take up H.J. Res. 73—Congressman JOHN MURTHA's well-reasoned, essential call to redeploy our troops from Iraq.

We are faced with a choice—more of the same from the Bush administration, or JACK's way. I believe that rapid turnover of Iraq to the Iraqi people is essential and that our troops need to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date. That is why I am proud to cosponsor my friend's resolution.

Today is just another sham in the House of Representatives, but that is what we've come to expect.

Our troops deserve better.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who sits on the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, our colleagues across the aisle are asking the American people to divorce our mission in Iraq from the global war on terrorism. I think it is impossible. I think it is irresponsible, and it is bad policy.

If only terrorism were as clear cut a problem as they want us to believe, and if only elimination of the Taliban would have been sufficient to free us from the threat of terrorism. Mr. Speaker, have we not learned anything from September 11? It should be crystal clear that terrorism went far deeper than one rogue regime in Afghanistan.

But that is where they are in this debate. They are ignoring reality. Our troops, my folks from the 101st and the National Guard, know that if we are going to be free of terrorism, if the goal is to prevent terrorism from killing 2,000 Americans on our soil tomorrow or forevermore, then we must bring major change to the Middle East.

□ 2230

It is an unpleasant reality, but it is a reality. That is where we are in Afghanistan. That is where we are in Iraq. Progress is being made. Libya has changed, the Taliban is basically gone now, al Qaeda has significantly weakened and bin Laden is on the run.

Pakistan is an ally in the war on terrorism. Iraq, despite a 24/7 massive media campaign of negative news, is making progress, and we have eliminated al-Zarqawi. On this issue of amnesty, the Iraq National Security Adviser corrected the record and, for the record, stated that the Prime Minister was misquoted.

I have that entire interview and the transcript for the record, and I would like to quote for my colleague's benefit another portion, and I quote, he, as a matter of fact, if you were there, and this is the Iraqi National Security Adviser speaking, if you were there in this meeting with President Bush a couple of days ago, he looked the President in the eye and he said, thank you very, very much for liberating our country. I thank the American wives, the women, the American mothers for the treasure and the blood that they have invested in this country. It is worth investing for liberating 30 million people, and we are ever so grateful.

Mr. Speaker, we all stand grateful. We stand grateful.

From CNN Interview:

KAGAN. Doctor, I know there's a big effort by your government in your country to try to prevent civil war. And as part of that, The Washington Post reports today that your prime minister is considering offering amnesty to Sunnis or to others who perhaps attacked only U.S. troops. This, not surprisingly, causing great consternation here in the U.S., even talking about it and being raised on the floor the U.S. Senate today. Is this, indeed, the case? Is your government thinking about offering amnesty to those that attacked only U.S. military?

RUBAIE. This is not the case. I'm sorry to say that the prime minister of Iraq has been misquoted and misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed the Americans.

Aa matter of fact, if you were there in his meeting with President Bush a couple of days ago, he looked the president in the eye and he said, thank you very, very much for liberating our country. Please thank the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in this country. It's well worth investing, of liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful.

And we will—the blood of the Iraqi soldier and blood of Iraqi civilian soldier is as sacred to us as the American soldier. We are fighting the same war, we are fighting together, and this is a joined responsibility. And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldier or civilian.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me ask the gentleman, my good friend, how many more speakers he has?

Mr. COBLE. I say to my good friend from Pennsylvania, I have two more speakers, Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MURTHA. I will be the last speaker.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who is the chairman of the National Security Subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee, and who has been to Iraq 12 times.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been listening to this debate all day. The argument I am hearing most from the opponents of this resolution is we shouldn't have gone into Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein in spite of the fact that many of them voted to go into Iraq.

I am hearing from opponents that there was and is no connection between Islamist terrorists and the war in Iraq,

in spite of the fact that the prince of al Qaeda, al Zarqawi, did his gross handiwork in Iraq. Fortunately, he is dead.

I am hearing from opponents of this resolution that we have made many mistakes in Iraq, as if that is justification for arguing that we need to leave. We have made a number of mistakes. We permitted the looting of government buildings. We didn't secure the munitions depot. We disbanded their army, their border patrol and police, and then asked the 150,000 coalition forces, mostly brave American soldiers, to protect and defend 26 million Iraqis living in a country the size of California.

These were mistakes, but mistakes do not justify leaving prematurely. They help explain why things could be better, and why, because we learn from our mistakes, we are doing better.

Since the transfer of power to Iraq in June of 2004, we have seen considerable progress, three free elections that put our elections in the United States to shame, the training of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Iraqi security forces, the establishment of a government chosen by a national assembly comprised of 30 percent women.

I am not afraid we will lose the war in Iraq. I am deeply concerned we will lose the war in Iraq here at home. Our efforts to remove Saddam Hussein from power and help bring democracy to the most troubled part of the world is truly a dear and noble effort that must succeed.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I was just out to a hospital a week or so ago, and a young woman whose husband was in the bed right next to her, and she said, I didn't join the Army to fight for Iraq. He joined to fight for the United States.

We don't send people to fight for other countries. We send them to fight for the United States' national security. That is the first lesson we learn, and then we send them with overwhelm force and then we have an exit strategy.

What we are looking for is all the same thing. All of us want the same thing. We want a resolution. We want a positive resolution to what is going on in Iraq. We want a plan. We want a plan that we can live with. It is not enough to say stay the course. We need somebody to tell us exactly how we are going to do this.

When you talk about the amount of money this is costing us per month, and I think about $8 billion, which almost as long as I have been on the Defense Subcommittee, and all of the money that I have seen in the Defense Subcommittee, and I can't recognize what $1 billion is, $450 billion at the end of this year.

Then I think how long did it take us to pay for the Vietnam War? It took us almost 18 years at 18 percent interest rates to pay for the Vietnam War. There were a lot more people, a lot more of a cross-section of people fighting in the Vietnam War, and yet a plurality of people still supported the Vietnam War to the very end.

Let me read something. People say they don't want a time schedule. Nobody has said they don't want a time. Let me read these comments from some of the people that traveled back from the President from Iraq recently. She says in her news release, here is Bush Tuesday night on the way home on Air Force One discussing his conversation with Iraqi leaders. There are concerns about our commitment and keeping our troops there. They are worried almost to a person that we will leave before they are capable of defending themselves. I assured them they didn't need to worry.

That is what we hear back here all the time. But apparently what he says almost to a person, not including the President and the Vice President, the President and Vice President of Iraq.

The Associated Press reports this morning, Iraq's Vice President has asked President Bush for a timeline for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq. The Iraqi President's office said, the Vice President, a Sunni, made the request during his meeting with Bush on Tuesday when the U.S. President made a surprise visit to Iraq.

I supported him in this. This is the President of Iraq. I supported them, said the President, in a statement released Wednesday. Now, 80 percent of the Iraqis want us out of there, 62 percent of the people in the United States want us out of there.

It is not surprising to me that they are going to offer amnesty to some of the Iraqis who are killing Americans, because 47 percent of the Iraqis think it is all right to kill Americans.

We have diverted ourselves away from the war of terrorism. All of us agree about the war on terrorism. All of us have the same goals in the war on terrorism. What we are concerned about is we are caught in a civil war in Iraq. There is only 1,000 al Qaeda or less in Iraq. We destroyed the leader of al Qaeda.

What we are worried about is the Sunnis and the Shiias. The Shiias are 100,000, and there are 2,000 Sunnis fighting with each other. The way we have to do it is one of the biggest problems we have. When you fight a military operation, you have to destroy everything. Fallujah, for instance. We put 300,000 people outside their homes and only 100,000 came back. That is nation building. Yet we are trying to make friends in that country. You can't make friends if you operate the way the military does.

And I agree with the military. To protect American lives, we have to go in with overwhelming force. When you go in with overwhelming force, you are going to inadvertently kill civilians.

Then when you send in people who are untrained and they go into a country, into a job like a prison and they don't know what they are doing, they don't know how to handle it, untrained people that caused us a terrible public relations disaster.

So you have this combination of untrained troops, inadequate forces, and then on top of that, you have no plan to remove the military. Every military leader I have talked to has said the same thing to me. They have said, we can't win this militarily.

All of us want the same thing. We want a resolution to this thing. We want to not only bring our troops home. Internationally it is important we have stability in the Middle East. There is no question. All of us want the same thing. It is how we get it. And we have to have international cooperation.

As I had mentioned, and I will end with this, in the first war we had international cooperation. We had 160,000 international troops and 400,000 American troops. And $60 billion came from the international community and we paid between 4 and $5 billion.

In this particular war so far, we have spent $450 billion and not only the financial treasure but the human treasure that we have lost in the United States.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, our final speaker from this side tonight is the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who sits on the Armed Services Committee, vice chairman of the Special Forces Subcommittee and is a leader on the bipartisan congressional delegation to Iraq and Afghanistan, Mr. HAYES. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding and I rise today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don't think this is solely a discussion on Iraq because what happens in Iraq will have far-sweeping ramifications across the Middle East and around the world.

When I am asked about a time line for removing our troops, my answer is not a day more than we need to ensure victory. We could leave tomorrow. We could set an arbitrary deadline, 6 months, a year, and tell the terrorists how long they need to stick it out before we leave. But what would the ramifications of that be?

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people, and we are not. Iraqis and their new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence.

I don't think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the new government formed. While the violence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked firsthand to our soldiers in Iraq.

One of the most compelling changes made since last year is that Iraqi security forces are coming online and are more involved in planning and executing missions to stop terrorist activity. In a briefing with Special Forces

leaders, we learned that more than 30 percent of all day-to-day missions are planned and carried out by the Iraqis themselves. This is significant because it frees our soldiers to focus on capturing and eliminating key figureheads, as evidenced by the recent death of Abu Musab al Zarqawi.

There was so much attention on al Zarqawi that the appointment of three security ministers to complete the new Iraqi cabinet was all but missed. The fulfillment of the new government and these three posts in particular is a critical development in securing their nation from internal and external terrorist factions.

Mr. Speaker, the key to victory in Iraq is the Iraqi people. As their government forms, as it gains influence, as their military is able to defend the people and the infrastructure, we can continue to pull back. And we should. But we have to ask ourselves what legacy we want to leave behind in this region, because that is the fundamental question we are asking today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don't think this is solely a discussion on Iraq, because what happens in Iraq will have far-sweeping ramifications across the Middle East and around the world.

When I am asked about a timeline for removing our troops, my answer is not a day more than we need to ensure victory.

We could leave tomorrow. We could set an arbitrary deadline—six months, a year—and tell the terrorists how long they need to stick it out before we leave. But what would be the ramifications of that?

I recently returned from leading a bipartisan Congressional Delegation trip to Iraq and Afghanistan, where I met with Special Forces troops to assess the training progress of Iraqi security forces as well as met with top Iraqi government leaders to discuss their commitment to building a coalition government and securing their own country.

It's been a year since I was last in Iraq. Since that time, I have attended many briefings and received many reports, but seeing our troops and talking with leaders was the most telling status report of all.

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people—and we are not. The Iraqis and their new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence.

There has been and continues to be a very small but determined portion of the population in Iraq combined with al Qaeda who are determined to stop freedom at any cost. They will kill indiscriminately and there is no target off limits—coalition forces, police, women, and children.

Their goal is to break our resolve with these barbaric acts of terror. The Iraqis who profited under Saddam's regime do not want a free and stable Iraq. Al Qaeda does not want a free and stable Iraq. Freedom is not conducive to their long term goals. Accountability is not conducive to their long term goals. Democracy is not conducive to their long-term goals. Saddam's former loyalists and al Qaeda thrive on poverty, despair, violence and fear. The bottom line is that they cannot afford for freedom to succeed.

Conversely, we cannot afford freedom to fail. How detrimental would it be if we wave the white flag to al Qaeda and the Sunni terrorists? Do you think they will allow the people of Iraq to live in freedom and peace? Do you think they will allow the democratic process to continue?

A while back, some of my colleagues on the other side of the isle raised a good point—we walked away from Afghanistan following the Soviet withdrawal. What emerged from that void were the Taliban and a safe haven for al Qaeda. Is that what we want the legacy of Iraq to be? If you think we made a mistake in the past, why would we repeat it?

If we walk away prematurely, how can we deal with Iran? How can we deal with North Korea?

As I said in the beginning, what we do in Iraq will have ramifications across the world for many years.

I don't think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the new government formed. While the violence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked first-hand to our soldiers serving in Iraq.

One of the most compelling changes made since last year is that Iraqi security forces are coming online and more involved in planning and executing missions to stop terrorist activity. In a briefing with Special Forces leaders, we learned that more than 30 percent of all day-to-day missions are planned and carried out by the Iraqis themselves. This is significant because it frees our soldiers to focus on capturing and eliminating key figureheads, as evidenced by the recent death of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

Zarqawi was an important leader for al Qaeda and a powerful figure for terrorists around the world—both tactically and symbolically. He was responsible for orchestrating the death of many civilians and coalition soldiers. I don't believe his death will end all violence in Iraq, but his demise is an important psychological boost to the Iraqi people and a blow to those across the world who sympathize with militant extremists and terrorists.

The end of one of the most notorious terrorists in the world was a great day for our military forces, but I would point out that our special and regular forces have had many victories that didn't gain media attention or just could not be brought to light due to their sensitive nature—and we all owe our troops a great deal of gratitude for all they do.

There was so much attention on Zarqawi that the appointment of three security ministers to complete the new Iraqi cabinet was all but missed. The fulfillment of the new government and these three posts in particular is a critical development to securing their nation from internal and external terrorist factions.

Mr. Speaker, the key to victory in Iraq is the Iraqi people. As their government forms; as it gains influence; as their military is able to defend the people and the infrastructure, we can continue to pull back. And we should. But we have to ask ourselves, what legacy we want to leave behind in this region, because that is fundamental question we are asking today.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is our job to protect our Nation and we have thousands of young men and women doing that today. I believed in early 2003 that we should do more to capture or eliminate the people who caused the 9/11 attacks. They were predominately in Afghanistan. Today it seems we have a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan, and increasing attacks in Iraq on our troops and Iraqi citizens.

We have seen success in capturing Saddam and eliminating Al-Zarqawi. I have never doubted the ability of the men and women of our Armed Forces—we saw what they were capable of in the first days of the war when they stormed Iraq and Baghdad within days, overwhelming the Iraqi forces. The accomplishments we have seen in Iraq can be attributed directly to the troops' discipline and persistence in fighting the insurgency.

Mistakes have been made, and some of the most experienced members of our Armed Forces have pointed that out. One of the individuals who spoke out was retired Marine General and former chief of U.S. Central Command Anthony Zinni who said:

> We grow up in a culture where accountability, learning to accept responsibility, admitting mistakes and learning from them was critical to us. When we don't see that happening it worries us. Poor military judgment has been used throughout this mission.

As this war has gone on, the lack of planning and poor judgment by this administration has become more apparent. I have here the May 1, 2003 press release here from the White House in which President Bush—on board USS *Abraham Lincoln*—declared all major combat operations have ended. We now know that this was one miscalculation among many. Since that time seven young men from our 29th Congressional District in Texas have lost their lives; across our nation over 2,300 servicemen and women have lost their lives since the President made those remarks. Reading over these remarks it is clear that the administration had no clear plan for securing Iraq after the invasion, and had no clue about what was to follow for the next three years.

Given the size, strength and effectiveness of the insurgency, the administration's intelligence should have given some indication that there would be problems down the road and done a better job of preparing the public and more importantly our troops for what was to come in the following month and years. It is clear that we did not have enough troops on the ground immediately after the invasion, and that shortage continues. Fortunately, thanks to the relentless efforts by our Armed Forces, progress is being made.

Congress does not direct troops on the ground and we are not the Commander-in-Chief, but we are charged with sending our sons and daughters into battle and therefore we must debate what is occurring in Iraq. While I disagree with the way the administration planned and carried out this war, I support our troops and will continue to vote for Defense appropriations and supplemental dollars.

Many brave men and women have given their lives in Baghdad, Fallujah, Ramadi, Mosul and across Iraq to bring peace and democracy to that country. We honor them, their families, and the ultimate sacrifice they made serving their country. I want our troops to come home soon.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the war we anticipated fighting or the war we were led to believe we were getting into, but I believe we

must finish our mission to leave a secure Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol that democracy can prosper in the Muslim world.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of America. I rise in support of our active troops and those who have given their lives and 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. Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have attacked our families, neighbors and friends numerous times over the last three decades. What has been the response? For the most part, there has not been an adequate response. And Mr. Speaker, that is hard to admit. Some would tell you we didn't respond due to lack of political will, others would say America just didn't have the stomach. From the killing of 241 U.S. service members in Beirut in 1983 to the attack on the USS *Cole* in 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. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give strong support to H. Res. 861. For more than three years, the man Osama bin Laden called ''the prince of al-Qaeda'' orchestrated terror attacks that killed thousands of Iraqis, American troops and coalition forces. Now, thanks to hard work and dedication of the U.S. military and our coalition partners, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's reign of terror is over.

Since the U.S. and our coalition partners liberated Iraq, bin Laden has sought to defeat the efforts of the people of Iraq to transform their nation into a peace-loving democracy so he can turn it into a radical Islamic state where al-Qaeda calls the shots. The air strike that killed Zarqawi has dealt bin Laden's organization a crucial blow by eliminating the man he trusted to wage his jihad in Iraq. It is a major victory in the War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the House VA Economic Opportunities Subcommittee, I feel strongly about coming to the floor today to honor our brave servicemen and women who are defending our homeland in the Global War on Terror. They have fought valiantly since the vicious unprovoked attacks of 9/11. They liberated the people of Afghanistan from the Taliban, an abusive regime that once harbored Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda leadership. The terrorists no longer have a safe haven and are on the run. Their hopes of creating a new Taliban-like state in Iraq has suffered a major setback with our military's latest success in getting Zarqawi.

Since the end of the initial operation in Iraq, many of my Democratic colleagues have called for a full withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. When the attacks on U.S. troops and Iraqi civilians intensified, so did their calls for us to pull out. If we had heeded those calls and not allowed our military to complete their mission, Zarqawi would still be alive and be making further strides toward turning Iraq into al-Qaeda's new home base.

Whether or not you supported the initial operation in Iraq, the fact of the matter is we have to see this through. Our troops deserve our support and all the resources they need to get the job done. And I am committed to giving them both.

Since the liberation of Afghanistan and Iraq, we have captured or killed thousands of suspected terrorists. Our servicemen and women have rooted terrorists out of hiding all over the globe. They deserve our utmost support and praise for keeping us safe and making the world a better place as they continue to fight the global war on terror.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our country's effort in the global war on terror. This war takes many forms and is waged on many different fronts. It involves the vigilance of our citizens in their neighborhoods to the first responders who patrol our cities. It courses through every state in the union. It must stand vigilant along our southern border and face the difficult challenges along the even lengthier and more remote terrain of the northern border. And yes, the global war on terror takes place across the vast oceans that no longer offer our homeland the protective barriers they once did.

As Americans view on their television sets the hatred spewed by the likes of Ahmadinejad of Iran and whoever is the face of al Qaeda, we stand resolute in our beliefs of freedom and democracy. We carry emotions with us that are equal to those who wish us and our allies harm. But our emotions are not bent on creating destruction but preventing it, not on crying out for the annihilation of an entire nation but on rebuilding and helping those who choose to enter the civilized world community. To those who wish to be our friends, there is no more generous nation than that of the United States of America and to those who wish us harm no more determined of a nation when our values and safety are threatened.

In order to win this war, we must support our troops who are deployed around the world. They protect and defend our nation and our allies everyday. These young men and women carry the patch of our flag on their arms and the spirit of our nation in their hearts.

We also must continue to rebuild our intelligence agencies so they do not fall into the lackluster conditions they did before and work with others in the world community to stop threats before they reach our shores. There is still a great deal more work to do, but we will pursue until the job is finished.

While we fight this battle across the world, others may wonder where we draw our energy from. It is important that our friends and enemies realize one important and crucial fact: the war on terror is spurred on by the hearts and minds of every American who will not let the world forget what happened on that tragic day in September.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today we come to the floor to debate the merits of H. Res. 841, legislation honoring the men and women of our armed forces and declaring our commitment to a sovereign, free, and united Iraq. As our country continues to engage Al Qaeda and other international terrorist organizations around the globe, it is important that we convey the depth of our resolve. We cannot allow Osama Bin Laden and his lieutenants to succeed in their attempt to drive our forces from Iraq and topple that country's democratically elected government.

Today, we are engaged in what I hope will be the first of many public debates on our national strategy to combat the growth and development of global terrorist networks. In Iraq and Afghanistan, as was clearly described by the 9/11 commission, we must stand for a better future by working with the international community to give the citizens of these countries a fighting chance to develop secure democratic institutions. These countries must never again be allowed to descend into the lawlessness that gives sanctuary to international criminals and terrorists.

Last week, coalition and Iraqi forces scored a major victory over foreign terrorists working to foment a civil war between the Sunni and Shia peoples of Iraq. Our cooperative efforts to eliminate Jordanian terrorist leader Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi should stand as a landmark along the road to independent security in Iraq. It should also serve as an opportunity for this Congress to publicly expand its oversight activities to include the Iraqi Governments ability to maintain security and expand reconstruction activities absent the direct assistance of our forces on the ground.

Over the last few months we have seen momentous changes in Iraq. Prime Minister Maliki's freely elected government has announced plans to expand reconstruction efforts, begin the national reconciliation process, and put an end to independent military forces

in the country. Last month, Iraqi security forces played an active role in 90 percent of security operations and acted independent of coalition support in nearly 40 percent of those missions.

These successes have given us the opportunity to consider the eventual withdrawal of our forces and those of the 28 coalition allies who continue to support the development of a free and stable Iraq. However, in doing so, we have a responsibility to do so based on conditions on the ground, and should not be bound by an arbitrary timeline for withdrawal that could only strengthen our enemies resolve. Doing so would do a grave injustice to the brave men and women of our armed services, who have already sacrificed so much in the cause of freedom.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 861. Calling this a true debate on Iraq is a joke, and the Republican majority knows it. The Majority Leader has admitted the true motive—to use this issue in the fall elections against the Democrats. Shame on him and shame on the Republican majority for callously restricting what should be a full debate about the most important issue facing our country. Shame on them for trying to set a political trap and not allowing amendments or a full debate. If we were allowed a fair process, the facts would be revealed. And the facts are not pretty.

After the tragedy and horror of September 11, 2001, everyone saw the threat posed by Al Qaeda. I voted for the authorization for President George W. Bush to use force against the Taliban in Afghanistan who were harboring Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. I am a strong supporter of the war on terrorism.

When President Bush came to Congress and asked for authorization to invade Iraq, he made no case that that country was an imminent threat to the United States, or, in fact, related to our international fight against terrorism. So, I opposed the authorization for President Bush to use military force against Iraq in 2002, and that vote was the proudest vote I have taken in nearly 10 years in Congress.

Despite the paucity of evidence to invade a sovereign nation, Congress authorized President Bush to go forward and we invaded Iraq. Instead of remaining focused on combating terrorists, the true imminent threat to our country, we got detoured into Iraq. Our courageous men and women in uniform did a tremendous job in the effort to defeat Saddam Hussein. I have supported them every step of the way and continue to support them as I stand here today.

Having toppled its government, I felt we had an obligation to see Iraq transition to a new democracy. Like most Americans I was patient as Iraq struggled to establish a new civil society and government after years of oppression.

In the three years since the invasion, Americans have provided security and rebuilding assistance. Despite the gross mistakes, mismanagement, and misjudgments of our civilian leadership, Iraq is now a sovereign, free country, a country with a new constitution and a new government. At this point in time, we have done what we can. We've given the Iraqi people an opportunity. It is now their opportunity to grab freedom. It is now their country to lose.

Unfortunately our efforts have come at a tremendous cost. Major General John Batiste, a commander in Iraq and military aide to Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, noted that ''Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.'' 2,500 of our best and brightest young people have paid the ultimate sacrifice to our country. About 18,000 have been wounded. All Americans are forever in their debt. In addition to the heartbreaking human toll, there is a financial one as well. We have now spent or appropriated, according to the Congressional Research Service, about $320 billion on the war in Iraq.

Enough is enough. Enough devastation for mothers and fathers who have lost children in Iraq; enough heartache for their loved ones and friends; enough young lives cut short; enough being forced to shortchange domestic priorities like health care and homeland security because billions are being spent on Iraq. We have given the Iraqis a chance. That is all they can ask of us and that is all we can ask of ourselves. As such, it is time to shift troops to the periphery of the conflict and redirect some resources currently being used in Iraq back to America.

Despite what the Republican majority suggests through this Resolution, saying it is now time to begin redeploying troops and that President Bush needs to develop a plan to do so is not arbitrary. It is, in fact, a reasonable calculation that the cost of Iraq is no longer worth any benefit we may achieve by continuing our armed presence there. The majority of the American people have made it clear they feel it is simply not worth more blood to achieve perfection in Iraq. They are right. It is time we in Congress listened.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution to affirm the United States of America will ultimately achieve victory in the Global War on Terror.

On September 11, 2001, 3,000 of our fellow Americans were brutally killed by Islamic terrorists under the leadership of Osama bin Laden. President Bush responded by declaring war against terrorism and its strongholds throughout the world. He said we would fight the enemy on their ground to prevent terrorists from once again attacking our citizens on U.S. soil.

The Bush Doctrine stated: ''Any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.'' U.S. and Coalition forces have verified his words with irrefutable action. The state-sponsored ''safe harbor'' Al Qaeda enjoyed in Afghanistan ended when U.S. and Northern Alliance forces routed the Taliban in a decisive military victory.

Afghanistan now has a newly elected parliament, a market economy, equality for women, and millions of children attending school for the first time. We still face challenges in this nation, but it is on its way to becoming a stable and secure democracy, freed from the oppression of the Taliban extremists. Most importantly, Al Qaeda can no longer use this nation as a launching ground from which to attack the United States.

In Iraq, Saddam Hussein repeatedly refused to comply with U.N. weapons inspection. Sovereignty was turned over to Iraqis a year and a half ago; a Constitution was drafted last summer and ratified in October; and a new government is being established. The seeds of democracy are beginning to take root, and a major threat of state-sponsored terrorism against the U.S. was removed.

Despite the danger of violent retaliation from radical extremists, 59 percent of Iraqi citizens exercised their right to vote in January, and approximately 70 percent in December. Iraq is on its way to fully assuming responsibility for its own security and governance.

The challenges we face are undeniable and difficult. President Bush was correct when he said this war would come at great cost in blood and treasure. However, the cost would be much higher—intolerably high—had we not decisively acted to protect the security and interests of the United States.

Who can forget the cheering of Iraqi citizens in the streets as Baghdad was liberated and the statue of Saddam Hussein toppled to the ground? Who can forget the courage of the Iraqi's who proudly displayed the purple ink on their index finger after exercising their right to vote? Who can forget the sight of Saddam Hussein cowering like a cornered rat when U.S. soldiers forced him from hiding? Above all, who can forget the sight of the North and South Towers of the World Trade Center collapsing, the burning embers of the attack on the Pentagon, or the scorched field in Pennsylvania that will forever stand as a testament to heroism and self-sacrifice. Our successes in the Global War on Terror have prevented additional horrifying images from filling our TV screens, saving untold innocent American lives.

We may never know what catastrophes have been averted by the dedication and vigilance of U.S. servicemen and women. Nearly 2,500 Americans have nobly given their lives in exchange for the peace that we have enjoyed here at home these past four and one-half years. The very fact that we have not endured another terrorist attack on U.S. soil proves their lives were not given in vain. We have not seen additional attacks such as those in London and Madrid, or experienced the fear Israelis face on a daily basis. We owe our safety and security to the soldiers who are giving their all to protect our families, communities, lives and liberties.

Al Qaeda remains a persistent danger to the United States. This terrorist network operates in over 60 countries around the world. It brainwashes men and women into becoming suicide bombers; destroys religious sites; bombs and beheads innocent civilians; and seeks the destruction and overthrow of America, our values, our people, our freedoms and our way of life.

We cannot allow Al Qaeda the opportunity to establish a permanent base in Iraq from which to attack the United States. The collapse of Iraq's new democratic government would be a huge victory for Al Qaeda, drawing additional recruits for bin Laden's brand of terrorism from the ranks of young Muslims. It is well-known that bin Laden seeks nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction to inflict severe casualties on the United States and allied countries.

Al Qaeda conducted poison gas experiments on dogs in Afghanistan, and the governments of Britain, France, and Jordan have each foiled plans by Al Qaeda to use chemical weapons. U.S. intelligence sources have documented repeated attempts by Al Qaeda to purchase nuclear material, including weapons grade uranium. Nations such as Iran and North Korea are a potential risk for transferring nuclear capabilities to terrorist insurgents.

We must not fall into a sense of complacency. The continued threat from Al Qaeda to

our citizens at home and abroad is real. Thankfully, U.S. and Coalition forces have captured or killed more than three-fourths of Al Qaeda's known pre–9ll leaders. These include senior field commanders, masterminds of the September 11th attacks, communications coordinators, and other key operational leaders. Just last week, the leader of Al Qaeda in Iraq was killed by U.S. forces.

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi had repeatedly attacked religious shrines and Iraqi political leaders to destabilize Iraq, provoke a civil war, and create a haven for terrorism. The February bombing of the Askariya shrine in Samarra—one of Iraq's holiest religious sites—ignited a firestorm of reprisals that led to the deaths of over 130 Iraqis. Killing the man who incited this violence was a resounding victory toward building a safe, secure, stable Iraq.

More than 4,000 suspected Al Qaeda members have been arrested worldwide since 9/11, and Al Qaeda cells have been identified and dismantled in Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa. Over $140 million in terrorist financial assets have been confiscated or seized from over 1,400 bank accounts worldwide.

Mistakes have been made in the War on Terror, but the Bush Doctrine of dissuasion and deterrence is working. Pakistan broke its state-sponsored ties to Al Qaeda and the Taliban, and Libya surrendered its WMD and disavowed terrorism. Until recently, Iran had frozen its uranium enrichment program, but is now threatening our country amid the perceived weakness that we will pull our forces out of Iraq before that nation is able to govern and protect itself from terror. This dangerous situation underscores the fact that we must finish the job we began to ensure the continued safety and security of the American people. We must not give in to terrorism by pulling out of Iraq too early.

Fortunately, the talents and capabilities of our U.S. servicemen and women are protecting our nation well. Air Force Chief of Staff, General T. Michael Moseley, told reporters in February that Air Force satellites can locate activities and individuals on a global scale, and targets can be held at risk or struck down with the lethality of a weapon that detonates within several feet of the target. Al-Zarqawi learned this lesson the hard way.

General Moseley continued: ''It must be a bit disturbing [to terrorists] to know that if you act against the United States or its Coalition partners, the U. S. Air Force will find you and strike you. And there's nothing you can do about it. We may never know what has not happened because of this capability.''

General Ronald Keyes, head of the Air Force's Air Combat Command, rightly said: ''If you're a terrorist and you've got static on your phone, that's me . . . That shadow passing over you, that's me. That computer that will not boot, that's me. That noise you thought you heard until it's too late, that is me. And it will continue to be me until our children and grandchildren and those of freedom-loving nations everywhere emerge from this plight of terrorism.''

We can and we must improve our intelligence and military capabilities to ultimately eradicate terrorism worldwide. This war has not been waged perfectly, but it has in arguably succeeded in preventing additional terrorist attacks on U.S. soil, protecting American lives and liberty, and forcing terrorists to spend their time running rather than plotting additional ways to murder innocent citizens and spread darkness and destruction.

Voting ''yes'' for this resolution today will send the clear message to Al Qaeda that the United States is truly united in defeating terrorism and promoting a strong and stable Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking our U.S. soldiers, sailors and airmen for their incredible sacrifices, and in supporting this resolution to protect our citizens from terrorism at home and abroad.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. U.S. policy toward Iraq should be focused on bringing home U.S. troops as soon as possible while minimizing chaos in Iraq and maximizing Middle Eastern stability. I believe that 2006 must be a year of significant transition toward full Iraqi sovereignty both politically and militarily and with the responsible redeployment of U.S. forces.

Americans deserve a serious discussion in Congress about the future of U.S. involvement in Iraq. Instead, the Republican resolution before Congress today fails to address the road forward. A resolution to achieve a sovereign, free, and united Iraq is not a strategy.

This resolution is a partisan attempt to avoid the debate that the American people are demanding. It blurs the line between the War on Terror and the war in Iraq in an effort to legitimize Bush Administration mistakes, and fails to deal with key issues such as the effect of our 'stay-the-course-at-any-cost' policy on other threats to our national security and military recruitment and the lack of oversight and accountability over the billions of dollars wasted or stolen in the war and reconstruction effort.

I am a strong supporter of our troops, and I have voted consistently to give them the funding and equipment they need to carry out their missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our courageous men and women in uniform have met their challenges with skill, bravery, and selfless dedication. We mourn the loss of the 2,500 who have died in Iraq, and offer our support and prayers to the 8,501 who have been injured so gravely they cannot return to duty.

While this resolution expresses our gratitude toward the troops, it fails to acknowledge the missteps, misrepresentations, and misjudgments that have fatally flawed our involvement in Iraq from the very beginning, making the mission of our troops more perilous. The President rushed to war based on false and faulty intelligence against the protests of the majority of our allies. Warnings from U.S. commanders about troop levels and equipment went unheeded, and shortsighted decisions were made which seriously damaged our efforts to establish peace and security in Iraq.

The Administration's horrendous miscalculations have damaged our ability to aggressively confront other emerging threats around the world and have endangered the stability of the Middle East. To make matters worse, the Administration has consistently rejected calls for accountability for some of its worst mistakes, including the squandering of billions of dollars in reconstruction funds, torture at Abu Ghraib and the provision of inadequate equipment for our troops. The sham resolution before us today is intended to avoid an honest discussion of these issues.

The American people deserve better than today's partisan grandstanding and the contempt of the Republican leadership for their genuine concern about U.S. policy toward Iraq. For this reason, I will oppose the resolution.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the current state of affairs in this country and around the world. We are in the midst of a global fight against terrorism, and cannot allow partisan politics to undermine our efforts to root out this disease.

I rise today in strong support of the brave, young men and women in our military for their sacrifice, dedication and hard work on behalf of all Americans and people fighting for freedom worldwide. Our courageous soldiers have removed a tyrannical dictator from power and are helping eliminate the ability of thousands of terrorists to harm innocent civilians.

The war in Iraq has been difficult, but progress is being made. Last week, al-Zarqawi, the terrorist leader in Iraq, was killed. Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds are working through their differences. Women are now allowed to get an education.

Iraqi units are taking the lead on missions to root out insurgents. And we have already brought 30,000 troops home and turned bases over to the Iraqis; but we cannot leave Iraq and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchildren. And we must always remember—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorists overseas to try and prevent them from reaching our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the path that is right. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so anywhere we are threatened. We must also secure our borders. There is no doubt that our porous borders are vulnerable to people who want to do us harm. Since the deployment of the National Guard to the border, we have already seen improvements in border security. In the first ten days of June, there has been a 21 percent decline in illegal border crossings compared to the same time period last year.

Let us not forget—Terrorism is not an ideology; it is a tactic to make people fearful. Throughout history, terrorism has failed and it will do so again. People in repressive societies yearn for freedom because it is a natural right of humankind. The challenge facing our generation is to help those that seek to be free. This goal is being realized in Iraq and the effects are being felt around the world. We will win the War on Terror.

As we debate this war, let's remember that we are fighting an enemy who wants us dead. This leaves no room for partisan politics. It requires a united America.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our efforts to secure Iraq in the ongoing Global War on Terror and to honor the brave work our servicemen and women are doing to protect our freedoms at home and to promote democracy abroad.

Iraq is the central front in the Global War on Terror. Al-Qaeda views Iraq as the main battleground to spread their ideology of hate and violence against the Iraqi people and the civilized world. The simple fact is we are fighting terrorists in Iraq so we don't have to fight them here on our homeland.

I have visited Iraq and have seen firsthand the atrocities brought on the Iraqi people and their infrastructure by Saddam Hussein's regime. I stood in the spider hole that Saddam Hussein was cowering in before his capture and was able to meet many of the brave men and women in uniform who are serving there. Now, the ''Butcher of Baghdad'' is behind bars and is on trial for brutal crimes against his own people, and democracy is slowly coming to fruition in a Nation and a region of the world that has never known it.

It has been an exciting week in Iraq, with the completion of Iraq's National Unity Government and the death of Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi, a terrorist and ally of Osama bin Laden. This week was capped off by President Bush's surprise trip to Baghdad Tuesday to reaffirm our Nation's commitment to securing a peaceful Iraq.

Only with our continued presence and coalition support will Iraq be able to make the transition to a peacful and prosperous democracy. It is imperative that we remain patient and vigilant as we continue our missions in Iraq and in the Global War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless our brave men and women serving to protect our homeland.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 861, which, above all, honors our brave men and women prosecuting the Global War on Terror and declares that the United States will prevail. I am pleased we are debating this resolution today, because it is imperative that Congress confirm to the world that Americans stand united in support of our troops. It's also imperative to leave no doubt that the U.S. has the unity and resolve to defeat the terrorists and win the War on Terror.

U.S. and coalition forces have made great strides in these efforts to date. We have liberated Afghanistan from the brutal Taliban and continue to support the democratically elected government of President Hamid Karzai.

We have overthrown the world's most depraved genocidal maniac in Saddam Hussein, who now sits in a jail cell awaiting judgment before the people who not long ago suffered greatly under his brutality. And we have significantly disrupted al Qaeda's terrorist network by systematically hunting down its leaders, its financiers and its footsoldiers. Our brave troops deserve great credit for killing the murderous head of al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

Now we are engaged in the difficult task of rebuilding Iraq and training Iraqi security forces and police officers. We need to expedite the training of Iraqi security forces so they can secure their country, and our troops can come home with their mission completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an overwhelming ''yes'' vote on this resolution to show our brave troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere in the War on Terror that they continue to have strong, bipartisan support in Congress. Our prayers are with all our brave troops. More than 2,600 Minnesota National Guard troops are serving in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. An additional 367 are serving in Afghanistan and elsewhere. All our brave troops are in my daily prayers, along with their families who are making great sacrifices at home. We also pay tribute to our brave troops who made the ultimate sacrifice in the defense of freedom. May these American heroes rest in peace and may God comfort their grieving families.

Mr. Speaker, great moments and triumphs in American history require bravery, valor and selfless service. The men and women of our Armed Forces personify these values. Moreover, our troops have the skills, dedication and full support of the American people to prevail in the War on Terror. Today, the Congress can demonstrate our continuing strong support, as well.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us and the courageous servicemen and women that are currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is unfortunate that today's debate was limited since this is such a serious issue facing our Nation.

In addition to combating terrorism throughout these two countries, it is essential that two key components are met to achieve success in Iraq—security and stability. The Iraqis must continue to move toward self-governance and fulfilling their own destiny, which will increase stability in this new democracy. And, as our American troops continue to train the Iraqi Army and Special Police, the Iraqis can move toward taking control of their own security. Lessening the American footprint in Iraq and bringing our troops home is the goal, and it will be met because of the success our troops have already had in stabilizing Iraq provinces (14 out of 18) and by training Iraqi forces.

Having been to Iraq and having met with both the military brass and our enlisted men and women in the war zone, I am optimistic that we can continue moving toward a successful conclusion of this mission. However, I have real concerns that setting an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal of U.S. troops would be a detriment to our national security and the security of our troops. It is essential that we not publicize our plan for withdrawal which would make our servicemen and women vulnerable to attacks. In doing so, we would defeat our purpose and jeopardize their safety. Terrorists are patient and calculating, with some cells waiting years to be activated. We must not back down on our right to defend ourselves.

While I am clear on my record for not allowing for a specific timetable for withdrawal, I have been supportive of denying funding to be used for constructing permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq. We should not have permanent American bases there. In addition, I supported the FY 2006 Defense Authorization bill which requires quarterly reports on conditions for withdrawing from Iraq and the progress being made toward achieving such conditions.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and a strong supporter of our men and women in uniform, I am committed to honoring those who have served and are currently serving our country in the Armed Services. So many men and women and their families have made so many sacrifices, and some have paid the ultimate sacrifice. We must make sure that their efforts have not been in vain.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I know that we are achieving real progress in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know this not only from government and media sources, but from two Pennsylvanians.

I want to quote from an email I received this morning from a constituent, an Army officer in Northwest Iraq commanding a Military Transition Team:

''There are many positive things going on over here that the American public never hears about . . . My little 10-man team contributed over 150 boxes of school supplies to the many schools in my area . . . Other units took up a collection and purchased grain to give out to one very small, poor village. I am very proud of the accomplishments of U.S. and Iraqi forces and it truly is a shame that all the news tends to be negative toward the activities of the soldiers (American and Iraqi) who are working very hard every day to make this country safe.''

My summer intern was a soldier in the 82nd Airborne Division. When he arrived in Afghanistan in July, 2002, the people had nothing—no schools, no health care, no paved roads. But in seven months, his unit helped build the first school and health clinic.

When his unit went back to Afghanistan in late 2004, it was a different place—new facilities and factories, more electricity, and miles of paved roads. When arriving in a village, his unit was greeted by smiling youngsters mobbing them, throwing plastic flowers.

These examples are among many that illustrate real progress—laying a foundation for future peace, shaping a world where the terrorist message will fall on deaf ears.

My intern from the 82nd also told me this: Afghani war veterans, the ''old-timers,'' asked, ''Why did you abandon us when the Soviets pulled out?'' Today their biggest fear is that we will leave before the mission is done, and allow the Taliban or other tyrants to take over. Iraqi civilians remember 1991 and fear the same thing.

We must complete the mission.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and in strong support of our troops. They are far away, waging the war on terror so that we can be safe here at home. In particular, I want to congratulate not only those who directly were involved in the demise of Al-Zarqawi, but all of those troops whose mission each and every day is heroic and brave and appreciated by us all.

Every building they secure, every Iraqi troop they train, every vehicle they service, potato they peel, or small mission they accomplish is a blow against terrorism and a boost for our freedom.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for this war. But within months they started dissembling, claiming they'd been misled and clamoring for troop withdrawal.

President Bush always warned that the war on terror would not be won easily or overnight. He asked for patience.

We are an impatient people, always in a hurry, often seeking the quick success. But our troops do not work on the 24-hour news cycle or a two-year campaign cycle or any timetable other than to execute each mission as it builds toward the larger objective.

That patience is paying off. Already we have seen in the information seized at Al-Zarqawi's hideout that the terrorists feared that time was working against them. I shudder to think if those on the other side of the aisle had their way where Al-Zarqawi would be today.

In closing, let me just say that when I visited Iraq with my colleagues to thank our troops for all they are doing, it was they who thanked us for caring enough to visit them over there. We owe them such a debt of gratitude, and yet their spirit of service and commitment to their mission led them to thank us.

Mr. Speaker, no American troop should ever have to thank a member of Congress. They should know that we are with them, that we support them, and that our support and thanks are there for them and with them always.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, a free and prosperous Iraq is one which is no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a wealth of support for radical Islam, no longer a source of destabilization in the Middle East. The simple truth is that an Iraqi people with hope for the future is an Iraqi people with whom we can work for peace.

And, nobody knows this better than the terrorists themselves.

They know they win only if they can maintain a strong, divisive, bloody insurgency in Iraq. They know they only win if they can keep the Iraqi people feeling despondent for their future.

Let me be clear: The litmus test for whether or troops should stay or withdraw or on what timetable is not about nation-building. The U.S. should not be in the business of nation-building, now or ever. There is nothing in the Constitution which grants this Congress the authority to engage in nation-building, nor does the American public wish that we do so. Instead, the nation which we must always remain steadfast engaged in protecting and building up is this nation—America.

The future of the Iraqi people is in their hands and left to their imagination.

But, the truth of the matter is that life for the Iraqi people—despite the ongoing war on their soil, has been more hopeful than it was before wasting away in the shackles of Saddam Hussein's tyranny. And, it is only getting better.

For those Iraqis who survived Saddam's policies of genocide, political imprisonment, and near-constant state of war, they went without jobs, food, and medicine. All the while Saddam and his cronies pocketed billions in illicit oil profits and grew fat from Oil-for-Food program kickbacks.

The Iraqis have had increasingly broad and successful elections. They have developed a constitution and established a government. Just last week, the Iraqis appointed key ministers for defense, national security, and interior. Now that the Iraqi people are free to direct their own economy, their own policies, and their own destiny, there is hope for a brighter future.

Just last year, in 2005, the Iraqi economy grow by 3 percent. This year economists predict that the economy will grow by 10 percent, with a GDP that will have almost doubled since the fall of Saddam Hussein. As freely elected economic officials begin to work for the benefit of all Iraqis, the future of the Iraqi economy is bright.

The Iraqi people are rebuilding their capability to care for their own medical needs. Last year, 98 percent of children under the age of three were vaccinated against measles, mumps, and rubella. Basic care has been provided for 1.5 million new mothers and their children, ensuring that a new generation of Iraqis will grow up strong and healthy.

Over 110 medical facilities have been renovated and 600 centers have been equipped with basic clinical and lab equipment. By providing training for 2,500 health care workers, Iraqis will build a structure for living longer, healthier lives far into the future.

Iraq once boasted one of the most educated female populations in the Middle East. Under Saddam Hussein's iron fist, they fell to near perfect illiteracy. Working together, we have helped the Iraqis provide for 2,800 rehabilitated schools and 8.7 million math and science textbooks. And, young girls can look forward to careers as engineers and scientists, instead of looking forward to legalized honor killings.

The preamble of the Iraqi constitution reads: ''We the people of Iraq . . . are determined to respect the rule of law, reject the policy of aggression, pay attention to women and their rights, the elderly and their cares, the children and their affairs, spread the culture of diversity and defuse terrorism.''

This is a statement rarely seen in the history of Middle Eastern nations. Iraqi legislators are determined to create a free society on par with our own. The future of Iraq is one in which men and women are free to practice their religion and speak their mind without fear of imprisonment or death.

Every one of us feels for the parents and loved ones of the brave men and women who are serving in Iraq. Every one of us wants to see those young heroes quickly and safely return home.

I would like to read from a message I received from one of those brave young men who is serving in Iraq. He said: ''There is a tough war going on here, but we can either fight the enemy here or back at home. If we were to withdraw, there would be a bloodbath of epic proportions that would only encourage the enemies of civilization.''

Now is the time that the Iraqi people may build a bright future of freedom, opportunity, and peace upon their rich cultural heritage.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our Nation's continuing dedication to the War on Terror and this resolution we are debating today. When we think of the War on Terror, we immediately think of the frontlines in Iraq and Afghanistan where our soldiers are bravely fighting for the hope and promise of freedom. But this debate today should not be limited to debating the fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. This resolution is about freedom and our dedication to eliminating terror globally. This resolution puts in writing that we, the Congress of the United States of America, will honor all Americans who have supported the war on terror as well as our international partners in the struggle to defend freedom.

The War on Terror is not only being fought overseas. This war is being fought, and fought successfully, everyday on our own soil by our own law enforcement agencies and the law enforcement agencies of our allies. We have great partners working with us around the globe to win this fight for freedom and, fortunately, one of these great allies is also one of our closest neighbors.

On June 2nd and 3rd a series of counter-terrorism raids by Canadian law enforcement teams successfully thwarted possible attacks planned by seventeen Al Qaeda inspired terrorists, terrorists who have been found to have ties not only in Canada, but in many other countries as well.

These terrorists took actions to obtain three tons of ammonium nitrate and were allegedly planning to use it against the Government of Canada and the Canadian people. This is more than three times the amount of ammonium nitrate used in the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995.

This successful raid on behalf of the Canadian law enforcement bodies, including the Integrated National Security Enforcement Team which coordinated the efforts of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Ontario Provincial Police, and other local police forces, illustrates both the strength of local law enforcement as well as the growing weaknesses of the Islamist militant network.

Their achievement has made our hemisphere safer and brings optimism that other nations around the world will have similar triumphs over terror. We all salute Canada for its unwavering commitment in the global war on terror.

Their success only emphasizes that we must continue the fight against terror on all fronts: foreign and domestic. We must continue to promote peace, security, and the promotion and protection of liberty, while being vigilant against those extremists who want to do harm to freedom-loving countries. We must continue to support our armed forces, first responders, and our international allies in this war and we must continue to work with our close friends, such as Canada, to promote the principles of a free and democratic society. I urge strong support for this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter for the RECORD.

MAY 31, 2006.

Representative JOHN P. MURTHA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURTHA: I am a Florida Democrat who feels deeply in your debt for the campaign you are pursuing to get our troops out of Iraq ASAP. When a new Democratic Congress convenes early next year I hope its first order of business will be to present you with a well-deserved Congressional Gold Medal.

I share your heartfelt concern over the situation in Iraq. It is a national disaster that is robbing our nation of the best of our youth and billions of our national treasure. In this regard I stand squarely behind you and your views of the war. In support of those views I have prepared a piece called Iraq: We Need a Strategy, Not Empty Slogans. It is based on your irrefutable arguments. Its thrust is to demolish the President's position that we must stay the course. (How I hate that phrase!)

I believe I have made a cohesive, persuasive argument. Please take a few minutes to read this paper and hopefully have it inserted in The Congressional Record. In my judgment, it warrants the attention of every Member of Congress. Accomplishing this is my main purpose in life at the moment. Earlier I sent a copy of the enclosed piece to Senator Bill Nelson, my home-state senator, but subsequently learned he does not favor early departure.

Here are my bonafides: I am an 85 year-old retired Army lieutenant colonel with 22 years of active service as an Infantry officer. I saw combat in World War II as a rifle platoon leader in the Pacific. I received the following decorations in the course of my military career: Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with oak leaf cluster, Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster, Army Commendation Medal, and the Combat Infantryman Badge. So you don't have to accept these claims at face value alone, I enclose a copy of my DD 214.

I am confident that God will grant you the strength to carry on your fight. But all Americans should rise to your support. They need to cast aside complacency and lassitude. They need to stand up to an Administration hellbent on destroying the underpinnings of our democracy. In short, we must sound off.

With admiration and respect,

SANFORD H. WINSTON,
LTC, USARet.

IRAQ: WE NEED A STRATEGY, NOT EMPTY SLOGANS

God bless Representative John Murtha, the Pennsylvania Democrat. He is the only Member of Congress with the guts to tell the American people the truth about the Iraq war. He does not spin this story. He calls for the removal of our forces from Iraq ASAP on the basis that only the Iraqis themselves can heal the divisions that thwart their progress toward a viable government. He describes bluntly the irreconcilable mess that is Iraq with its three obdurate and competing factions—Kurds, Shiites and Sunnis. He emphasizes the failure of the U.S.-led efforts to provide essential services to the Iraqi people such as electricity and oil production that are below the levels existing prior to our preemptive invasion. He makes it clear that the Iraqi people really don't want us there.

Congressman Murtha asserts that most of our more than 2,450 dead and 17,500 wounded—many of them amputations, spinal cord and head injuries—have been caused by improvised explosive devices. IED's continue to extract a great toll on our people even after three years of war and ceaseless effort to neutralize them. Still, we have had more than enough time to devise a practical, achievable strategy for extracting our troops. There is none. Joining Mr. Murtha in the class of great American patriots are the seven retired Army and Marine generals who view the Administration's conduct of the war as deplorable and had the guts to call for the removal of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld.

President Bush has stated our objective in Iraq is establishing ''a democracy which can defend itself, sustain itself—a country which is an ally in the war on terror and a country which serves as a powerful example for others who desire to be free.'' Religion, culture and customs combine to pose impenetrable barriers toward reaching this goal. Iraq is actually in a state of civil war now even though the Administration won't acknowledge that fact. American-trained Iraqi soldiers and police have yet to prove that they are capable, loyal and trustworthy. The Parliament, to this point, has refused to agree on Ministers of Defense, Interior and National Security. Without solid political backing behind appointees to these three ministries the prospects for success are remote.

The President promotes support of his war by spreading public fear. He refers to our Iraq campaign as a part of a ''global war on terror.'' Is there really an ongoing global war? Are all the Muslims in the world preparing to take on the United States? This thought by the President acts to promote public anxiety, but not enough for him to call for a military draft and marshal the forces we need to prevail in a global war. If he tried to do that the Congress would revolt and his approval numbers in the polls would sag to zero. Administration scare tactics are reinforced by the Vice President who warns that the Muslims are working to establish caliphates that extend from the coast of Spain to the tip of Indonesia. Does this vast conglomerate of caliphates in the offing intend to attack us? If so, our country is not prepared to confront this awesome threat. Hopefully we are summoning aggressive diplomatic activity and the active support of the United Nations, the countries of Mr. Rumsfeld's Old Europe, and other peace-loving allies in readying our defenses.

Let's make one thing clear. Iraq is our national disaster. It is diluting the resources we need to defend ourselves. It is a tragic sideshow that is bleeding us of our finest young men and women and costing billions of our national treasure which are desperately needed for domestic purposes.

Bombarded with fear-inducing messages, much of the country appears docile and uninvolved in Iraq. It's business as usual. The only people with a real stake in the war are apparently our men and women in uniform and their families. They represent about one percent of a population nearing 300 million. There are few signs of spontaneous patriotism other than Support Our Troops bumper stickers. While the long war continues, the Army is being torn to shreds courtesy of Mr. Rumsfeld. It is forced to pay incentives of up to $40,000 to recruit soldiers and still can't meet its personnel quotas. It promotes unqualified officers to fill its ranks. The Marine Corps is no better off. The National Guard has been worked beyond reason with its people being sent to Iraq on multiple tours. All this in the face of generals on the ground in Iraq saying that our involvement may last 10 years.

Our people are being fed slogans in lieu of a strategy for the termination of our operations in Iraq. Some examples:

Stay the course. No mention is made of the price that must be paid to stay the course. The President does not say how many American lives he is willing to sacrifice in such a feckless pursuit. He visualizes a lengthy stay in Iraq if one takes at face value his assertion that he is prepared to hand off the war to his successor if victory has not been attained during his term in office. As Commander-in-Chief, the President must think long and hard about our casualty rate now and in the future. Early in the war, when Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz was asked by a reporter how many of our troops had been killed in action, he had no idea of the actual number. This kind of leadership will not do. To me, stay the course is meaningless rhetoric, not a substitute for a real strategy.

General Tommy Franks, author of the war plan that propelled us into Baghdad, but who left a big planning void beyond our conquest of the capital city, declared in a recent speech to the National Rifle Association, that our KIAs in Iraq have made the U.S. a safer place by virtue of their sacrifice. Sadly, there is no discernible truth to that claim. It is this general's way of telling us we must stay the course.

If you break it, you own it. This is General Colin Powell's unrealistic contribution, guaranteed to extend our stay in Iraq until the President's objective becomes a reality. Taken literally, it does not compute. When we broke Germany, did we own it? When we broke Japan, did we own it? When we broke Italy, did we own it? Of course not. We gave them postwar guidance and assistance. Those former enemies repaired the breakage on their own and have since become valued allies. There is no reason why the Iraqi people, with our non-military help, can't do the same.

When the Iraqis stand up, we'll stand down. Empty rhetoric. With the intractable hostility marking relations among Kurds, Shiites and Sunnis, and the unchecked operations of many hostile local militias, it will be a long time before the Iraqis can stand up.

''I'll leave when the generals on the ground tell me it's time to leave, not some Washington politician.''—President Bush. Who is the decider anyway, the generals or the President? Besides, isn't he the Number One Washington politician? This is a sorry expression of policy.

We can't cut and run. This phrase is used carelessly. I recall a first-term Congresswoman from Ohio having the gall to admonish Congressman Murtha, retired Marine colonel, decorated and wounded veteran of Vietnam, with the reminder that Marines do not cut and run. I define cut and run as people taking purposeful action to avoid hazardous duty in time of war. It may sound insensitive to say so, but to me the two most prominent examples of cut and run are the President and Vice President during the Vietnam War. Why don't we just eliminate cut and run from our lexicon? It is Hollywood/John Wayne talk, not real world political talk.

The media does not report the positive things we do. Hogwash! The American press has done more to build and preserve our democracy than any other national institution including our armed forces. Blaming the media is the last resort of knownothings. Government must learn to tell the truth when dealing with the media.

There is a way out of the quagmire. To disengage in Iraq we need a new Congress sworn to this end—a Congress in the Murtha mold, a Congress with guts. It is up to the American people to see that we get one come this November. The new Congress can vote to cut off funds that support our operations in Iraq as soon as it convenes. or it can send leaders representing both parties to stand before the Iraq Parliament and announce that Iraq has 90 days to assume responsibility for its own fate.

To paraphrase General of the Army Omar Bradley's warning on Vietnam, the war in Iraq is the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place.

When the time comes, vote Americans, vote! Only you can end this war.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are having this debate today. Frankly, I think it is shameful it has taken us three years to have an ''open'' debate on the war while our soldiers are dying, their family members are praying for their safe return, and the American public is questioning what, exactly, is our policy over there. I just wish the debate were actually open. The lack of debate is even more shameful when you consider the fact we have been fighting in Iraq longer than we fought in World War I, the European Theater of World War II, and Korea. The American people deserve better, and you can bet your life the American soldier definitely deserves better than that. The American soldier deserves more than ten hours of debate on a policy that affects their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I want everyone in America to know the Leadership of this House of Representatives wants to stifle debate and control what you hear from your government. Every single American citizen should ask themselves this, ''What are they trying to hide? What are they afraid of? If a policy decision is so sound, you would think they would let it be debated until everyone was blue in the face.'' I think the lack of confidence the Majority has in the ability of their policies to face challenges and amendments should be eye opening to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed the Majority Leader of the House abandoned his earlier talk of a ''civil'' debate on policy and instead decided to turn something as serious as a war into a rhetoric filled partisan political tool with

the goal to make Democrats look ''sheepish.'' In my opinion, war and the deaths of American soldiers is too serious to be used as a political tool. Don't our soldiers deserve more respect from Congress than this? Additionally, anyone who would accuse a Member of Congress of not supporting our troops has no shame and those individuals should ask themselves whether anything is sacred to them anymore. They should ask themselves whether or not there is any depth to which they won't sink in order to score political points?

Mr. Speaker, I was not a Member of Congress when the resolution passed giving the President the authority to send our fighting men and women to war. However, since I've been a Member of Congress I have continued my lifelong support for our troops. I have voted for every spending request, and I have been to Iraq to visit our soldiers four times. Every Member of Congress should have gone to Iraq by now, and if you haven't, go. Whether or not you support this war you need to show your support for our soldiers, and they deserve to talk to us face to face and let us know what is really happening over there.

Mr. Speaker, how we got to Iraq should not be the point at this time. Historians, politicians, and the American public will debate that for years on end, and you can bet they will draw conclusions and hold people responsible in the history books and the public opinion of the future. However, right now we should focus on how we stabilize the country, allowing for a new, free, democratic Iraq to rein, and how we get our troops home safe as soon as possible while ensuring our future is more stable and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I support our troops. The Congress and the American public support our troops. And I think we should reaffirm our support for the troops by giving them every tool they need, like additional armor and padding in their helmets to protect them from IEDs, rather than forking over taxpayers' dollars hand over fist to Halliburton and other defense contractors with little to no accountability. That, I think, would be a stronger sign of support for our troops, or the war, than any politically motivated resolution brought to the House floor as the Majority has admitted in their inter-conference memo of talking points of how ''We must conduct this debate as a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats'' according to Majority Leader Boehner's memo. I don't know about you, but I believe our country and our troops deserve better than these political tactics.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is time for both political parties to figure out that our base is America, and the American people, not the ideologues of the political fringe.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the number of U.S. military deaths in Iraq reaching 2,500, it's disappointing that the best the GOP leadership can do is demand more of the same. That's exactly what this resolution does by calling for a vague open-ended military commitment in Iraq. This resolution reaffirms a policy that simply isn't working.

Instead of acknowledging the difficulties our troops face by offering clear alternatives to the President's ''business as usual'' approach, this resolution tries to cloud the debate by focusing on the ''war on terror.'' Indeed, Iraq isn't even mentioned until the eighth paragraph.

The real issue at hand is whether this particular U.S. military-led effort that we've been following under Secretary Rumsfeld will achieve lasting peace and democracy in Iraq. I can understand why the GOP would want to divert attention from this critical question—it is precisely because of the Administration's policy that Iraq has become a terrorist haven where none existed before.

Since President Bush landed on an aircraft carrier and declared ''mission accomplished'', the estimated number of insurgents in Iraq has quadrupled from 5,000 to 20,000. As a result, the average number of daily attacks by insurgents has climbed from 53 to 75, from May 2004 to May 2006.

This war is an expensive quagmire that's weakening the federal government's ability to meet our domestic needs. We have spent over $300 billion so far on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which is costing us about $8 billion a month on average, according to the Department of Defense. It's no wonder that this Congress was recently asked to vote on a budget that cuts education, freezes funding for health care research, and shortchanges medical care for our nation's veterans.

The massive deployment of National Guard and Reserve units overseas has undermined our capacity to confront terrorist attacks or natural disasters here at home. We know that state officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their states in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Despite these grim realities, politicians on the other side of the aisle are stubbornly restating that—no matter what—we must ''stay the course.'' I strongly disagree. The President and his allies in Congress should heed the words of military and diplomatic leaders who have warned that a continuing presence in Iraq will neither calm the violence nor lead to stability.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on this body to offer and debate real strategies for the redeployment of American forces. Instead, this resolution allows only a phony debate on the ''war on terror'' which will not allow amendments that would offer alternatives to the Bush administration's policy in Iraq.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the lessons of history demonstrate that threats, left unchecked, become more dangerous over time. In the long-term isolationism is not an effective solution for peace-keeping nations.

Osama bin Laden, and the al Qaeda terrorist network he founded, were at war with the United States throughout the 1990s.

1993: The first attack on the World Trade Center

1996: Bin Laden calls on Muslims to harm U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf.

1998: Bin Laden claims: Muslims should kill Americans any where—including civilians.

May 1998: Bin Laden foreshadows the future. He warns the battle will ''move to American soil.''

June 1998, a grand jury investigation issued an indictment against bin Laden

On the 8th anniversary of the UN sanctions against Iraq, two simultaneous explosions occurred at the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The bomb in Kenya kills 213 people, including 12 American, injuring more than 4,500. In Tanzania, 11 are dead—85 injured.

August 20, 1998 President Clinton orders cruise missile attacks at suspected terrorist training camps in Afghanistan and a pharmaceutical plant in the Sudan.

Soon after a new indictment was issued against bin Laden.

However, Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda were left virtually unchecked despite these and other terrorist attacks throughout the 1990s and up until 9/11.

Recently I visited Kenya, including the former site of the American Embassy in Nairobi. Today that site has been replaced by a park with a fountain, a memorial wall that has all the victim's names on it, and a memorial building. During past wars memorials to the victims of conflicts and those who served bravely to win them, have usually waited until the hostilities ended. In the name of all those who died at the sites of all the terrorist attacks, as well as those who have given the ultimate sacrifice to fight terrorism, we must ensure those memorials future by winning the war on terror.

Every event from bin Laden's first bomb in 1992 through today has been part of one long coordinating al-Qaeda war. The coordinated attacks in 1998 should have been a clear warning signal that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were determined, willing and able to attack Americans.

While Osama bin Laden had declared war on all Americans in 1998, the US didn't declare war on terror until September 12, 2001.

The opportunity to stop bin Laden before 9/11 came and went. The lessons of history assure us that left unchecked the forces of evil will grow stronger and will seek to harm us again. Today's discussion is about a simple choice; do we fight terrorism tomorrow or do we stop it with our actions today?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 861 and believe many of my colleagues on the other side of the isle have said that the war in Iraq has nothing to do with the Global War on Terrorism. I could not disagree more with their assessment. Iraq is the central front in the overall Global War on Terrorism. An immediate withdrawal would merely embolden our terrorist enemies and lead to open season on America and our allies. We cannot allow this to happen. We must prevail in Iraq. The stakes are too high to fail.

Coalition forces are having a great deal of success in Iraq. The recent killing of terrorist leader Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi, along with seven of his aides, is a serious blow to al-Qaeda's operation. The man Osama bin Laden called ''the prince of al Qaeda in Iraq'' arguably had more innocent blood on his hands in the last few years than any other terrorist. Zarqawi led one of the most deadly insurgent groups in Iraq in a bloody campaign of bombings, shootings, beheadings, and kidnappings aimed at killing Iraqi Shi'as to incite sectarian violence and derail democracy in Iraq.

Furthermore, after receiving confirmation of Zarqawi's death, Coalition and Iraqi Security Forces conducted 17 simultaneous raids in the Baghdad area, yielding a treasure trove of information and intelligence that is being analyzed for future use.

Iraq's National Security Adviser Mouwafak al-Rubaie said today that these documents and computer records would give the Iraqi government the upper hand in its fight against al-Qaeda in Iraq.

''We believe that this is the beginning of the end of al-Qaeda in Iraq,'' al-Rubaie said, adding that the documents showed al-Qaeda is in ''pretty bad shape,'' politically and in terms of training, weapons and media.

"Now we have the upper hand," he said. "We feel that we know their locations, the names of their leaders, their whereabouts, their movements, through the documents we found during the last few days."

He also said that he believed the security situation in the country would improve enough to allow a large number of U.S.-led forces to leave Iraq by the end of this year, and a majority to depart by the end of next year. "And maybe the last soldier will leave Iraq by mid–2008," he said.

Throughout American history, we have been tested in times of war. But virtually every time, we stayed the course and prevailed.

We did not experience quick victory in the American Revolution. In fact, it took our Founding Fathers years to win our hard-fought independence. We were defeated at the Battles of Long Island, Harlem Heights, White Plains and others, and we will never forget the dark days at Valley Forge, yet we did not give up our desire for freedom.

And let's not forget in World War II, where we suffered rapid and repeated defeats at Guam, Wake Island, the Philippines and Kasserine Pass.

We must also remember that the terrorists were at war with us long before we were at war with them. In April 1983, 63 people, including the CIA's Middle East director, were killed in a suicide truck-bomb attack on the U.S. Embassy in Beirut. Later on that year, simultaneous suicide truck-bomb attacks on the American and French compounds in Beirut killed 242 Americans and 58 French. In 1988, all 259 people on board Pan Am Flight 103 were killed when a bomb believed to have been placed on the aircraft by Libyan terrorists exploded. These are just a few examples. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker there are others.

Noted Islamic scholar Bernard Lewis has written that the sources of Islamic antagonism toward the West stems from the belief that the American way of life is a direct threat to Islamic values. But it is basic Western democracy that especially threatens Islamic extremist because within its own community more and more Muslims are coming to value the freedom that political democracy allows. Lewis has also written that attitudes toward the West have evolved through contacts with first the Eastern Empire in Constantinople, then Spain, Portugal and France, and through years of direct conflict in the Crusades and the colonial wars of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we can see, the War on Terrorism did not begin on September 11, 2001

The Global War on Terrorism will not be won next week, next year, or even in the next 10 years. Like the Cold War, this struggle is a generational conflict, potentially spanning decades. The Cold War stretched from Asia to Africa to the very heart of Europe, just as our struggle today reaches from the Philippines to the mountains of Afghanistan to, as we recently saw, our neighbor Canada. Terrorism knows no bounds and will strike wherever freedom reigns, from London to Madrid, to a quiet field in Pennsylvania.

Victory cannot be found on a single battlefield or a single treaty signing. Our enemy does wear a uniform and is not governed by international rules of war. They have one goal: kill as many Americans as possible and establish tyrannical regimes that rule according to a violent and intolerant distortion of Islam.

The War on Terror will be a long war. Yet we have mobilized to win other long wars, and we can and will win this one.

Last year, I traveled to Iraq and everybody I met was enthusiastic about doing their job and helping the Iraqi people. We found our troops have high morale and a commitment to their mission. The troops told us that we are winning the war.

Because of our intervention, a murderous dictator and a totalitarian regime have been overthrown, free elections have been held, a new constitution has been drafted and ratified, and a new national unity government has been completed.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is only one theater in the overall Global War on Terror and success in Iraq is vital to victory. Much has been accomplished but much is left to be done. The question for all of us here is do we have the will to stay the course and leave with honor I believe we do. We must finish the job. The stakes are too high to fail.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to have this debate. I first of all want to say how proud I am of our brave soldiers deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other regions of the world. Throughout our history, our freedom and our way of life have been preserved by the grave sacrifices made by the men and women of our military. We cannot thank them enough for their service.

I want to specifically thank the many Reserve and National Guard units from my home state of Iowa serving overseas. Throughout the War on Terror, Iowa has had one of the highest overseas deployment rates of any state.

Recently, I had the opportunity to welcome back a battalion of Marine reservists from Waterloo, Iowa, in my district. I was very impressed by the brave soldiers of Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 14th Marines who risked their lives conducting vital security operations throughout the Al Anbar province of Iraq in the dangerous areas of Ramadi, Al Asad and Falluja. They left their families and loved ones behind to serve a cause greater than themselves—the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, our mission in Iraq is a vital part of the Global War on Terror. Removing Saddam Hussein from power was a difficult but necessary step to eliminate the threat that his regime had posed for so long to the United States and the international community.

We should take this opportunity to reflect on our many accomplishments in Iraq over the past three years.

Saddam Hussein's reign of terror is over, his sons have been killed, and just last week we learned the good news that the leader of the Iraqi insurgency, the brutal terrorist Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi, has been eliminated.

The Iraqi people have taken historic strides towards establishing a free and stable democracy. They have participated in free elections for the first time, drafted a new constitution, and newly elected Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Miliki just announced the formation of his cabinet. In addition, the Iraqi security forces continue to increase in number and have taken a larger role in the defense their country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it is necessary to stay the course and follow the path to a lasting peace in Iraq. We will continue to provide for our troops and ensure that they have the best training, equipment, and technology available. And we must not waver in our commitment to win the Global War on Terror and protect our homeland from brutal terrorists who wish to attack our homeland and our very way of life.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our continued mission in Iraq as part of the Global War on Terror.

I am proud to say that throughout the Global War on Terror, thousands of Idahoans have fought valiantly side-by-side with their fellow countrymen and newly freed citizens of Iraq and Afghanistan. During a visit to Iraq in May 2005, I had the opportunity to visit with the brave men and women of the 116th Cavalry Brigade. I was amazed at their level of professionalism and their enthusiasm for the mission. They took great pride in their contributions and were fully committed to finishing the job. I have been similarly impressed by our nation's military as a whole.

When I consider what action should be taken in Iraq I look to the advice of the experts, those who are on the ground fighting the war. The message I continually hear from our soldiers and generals is: Finish the job, complete the mission.

I know there have been many calls in the United States lately to withdraw our troops from Iraq or set some kind of artificial deadline for withdrawal. Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with this defeatist attitude. In fact, a premature withdrawal from Iraq would be disastrous for America.

In an interview with Osama bin Laden just prior to the 1998 terrorist attacks on the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, bin Laden referred to the United States as a "paper tiger" because of our withdrawal from Somalia after the tragic loss of 18 U.S. soldiers. Al-Qaeda learned from this, and similar events, that the United States would retreat rather than fight. During the War on Terror, Al-Qaeda has counted on Americans to similarly become demoralized and once again withdraw from the fight. It is the cornerstone of their strategy.

If we lose heart and withdraw from Iraq before the mission is complete, Iraq will become a permanent breeding ground of hate and terror instead of the stable mid-east democracy it is becoming. Our enemies will become further emboldened by their perceived victory. A premature withdrawal from Iraq would only strengthen their resolve to use cowardly and barbarous terrorist attacks to achieve their ends. An artificial timeline for a withdrawal would only have similar results. The enemy need only sit back, wait, and then step forward to declare victory once U.S. forces have left. As a consequence, Americans and democratic societies throughout the world will be in greater danger than ever before.

We simply cannot afford to back down, return home, and hope this threat will dissipate on its own. The terrorists must be confronted and must be defeated. We cannot pass this mission on to another generation. This is our job and the time is now. By stepping up and completing this mission we will give the gift of greater peace and stability to future generations.

I can understand why so many want to cut and run, it would be the easy thing to do. I do not hesitate to say that the mission in Iraq is a difficult one and it has been costly. The price for freedom is all too often painfully high. I, for one, do not ever want to receive another notice that a fellow Idahoan, or any American,

has fallen or been wounded in this war. However, quitting now would only prolong bloodshed in the long run, not end it.

Once again Mr. Speaker, I support America's efforts to complete the mission in Iraq, and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to commit to its completion. At such a perilous time in our nation's history let us stand united.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the leadership allowing this important discussion on the war in Iraq and the ongoing global war on terror.

We can all regret the faulty intelligence that overestimated the presence of WMDs. We can focus on the need to press the new Iraqi government to meet speedy and attainable goals for the responsibility for their own security. But, we should never underestimate what's at stake in Iraq for their people or ours.

Nor should we ever permit the use of propaganda or terrorist barbarism to signal to the brave men and women serving this Nation in uniform that the resolve of our country is wavering.

There are many thoughts that I could lay upon the record of this body about the war on terrorism, but sometimes it's better to shut up and listen to the voices of those who know much more than you or I. One of the casualties of war in my district was a great Marine—Lance Cpl. Andy ''Ace'' Nowacki. Andy, 24, was a member of the Grand River Police Department and was killed by an IED in Iraq on February 26, 2005. His family, though filled with grief, determined that Andy's spirit would live on in many ways. One way will come through the establishment of a scholarship fund at Lakeland Community College.

On March 31st of this year, friends, comrades and family gathered to honor Andy's memory and raise funds for the scholarship. One of the people to speak that evening was Lt. Col. Mark A. Smith, the former battalion commander of Andy's unit—the 2nd Battalion, 24th Marines. Lt. Col. Smith's remarks, which I ask through unanimous consent to appear in the Record immediately following my own, centered on the question of ''Why.'' He stated in part: ''. . . think the part that's most lost in public discourse in the ongoing global war on terror is really the ''Why.'' We all know how Andy died . . . I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about why Andy died.''

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. Mark A. Smith, with the eloquence of a soldier, said it better than I could ever hope to, and I commend his words to the House:

I got a call last Saturday when I was on duty from Sheila Nowacki, Andy's mom. And she told me a part of the ceremony was going to be a pretty moving video, and she had a slight task for me. She asked me if I'd speak for a few minutes after the video, and to be positive.

Now, as the commanding officer of 2/24th, I don't get the option of saying no to the families of my KIAs for whom I was responsible, but in Sheila's and Dennis's case, I was honored that they even asked me to, so I immediately rogered up to the mission. So, here we go.

The only way I know to be positive in talking about Andy is to talk about—from my perspective and from the Marines' perspective in this room who shared time with him in combat—why Andy died. Because I think that the thing that's most lost in public discourse about the ongoing global war on terror is really the ''Why.'' We all know how Andy died. Unfortunately, he was struck by an improvised explosive device while on an ASR in our zone. I'd like to spend just a few minutes talking about why Andy died.

Andy died because he was out engaging the enemy. The single most misunderstood aspect of this war is the enemy. And a professional war-fighter focuses on one thing and one thing only—the enemy. He doesn't focus on time-lines, he doesn't focus on how fast he can stand up Iraqi battalions. He focuses on the enemy, and there's a particular reason why we need to focus on this enemy. Because this enemy is real, this enemy is vile, this enemy is evil. And this enemy has a 100-year plan to destroy the United States of America—a one hundred year plan. We think in terms of the next football season and they're thinking in terms of 100 years from now and how they're going to destroy this Nation.

Can this enemy win this war against us? Unfortunately, I'm here to tell you absolutely he can. He can if he continues to focus on two things which he focuses on every day. The first thing this enemy focuses on is breaking the will of the American people. He does that through videos, he does that through propaganda, and he does that through information. The second way he can win this war is to continue to recruit future generations of jihadists. It's for these reasons, and because of this enemy, that Andy was in Iraq. And while so many still fail to get it, the enemy doesn't. The enemy understands Iraq is the focus of effort, because he understands that as long as Marines and warriors like Andy are in Iraq that the will of the American people is foremost and in his face. He also understands that that is a will that can and does, at every opportunity of battle, destroy this enemy. And then the second thing is what us being there does to this enemy. Contrary to some popular opinion, is it does not create jihadists by us being there. Quite frankly, we deprive them of the next generation of jihadists because no one is more helped and/or more impressed with the Gentle Giants of America than the kids of the Arab world. If you'll just let me tell you two very quick stories, I'll explain why that is.

One day we were going out to conduct a raid to arrest the Sgt. Major and the operations officer of the Iraqi Army battalion that we were training. Upon moving into our cordoned positions in the raid force—hitting the objective and seizing the Sgt. Major of the Iraqi Army battalion—his very children, the children of the Sgt. Major that we had in flex cuffs and blindfolded, were running around their front yard acting as if they were holding weapons and shooting at the Marines. One of the Marines went up to them, and he took the interpreter with him, and he said, ''Ask these kids what they're doing.'' And the interpreter asked them, and the kids said, in English, ''Mistah, we play U.S. Marines, Mistah. We U.S. Marines.''

I don't think those kids are going to grow up to be jihadists. I think those kids are going to grow up to be the honorable people that they saw the U.S. Marines in their zone to be. Further proof of that was mentioned by your emcee tonight when she showed you that picture of Andy and those two Iraqi kids. They say a picture tells a thousand stories . . . that's not a staged picture. That is honest respect for an American Marine, who in this case was Andy Nowacki. And there are thousands of them out there affecting those Iraqi kids every day.

The second story I want to tell you about is the election—the very first Iraqi election that occurred in our zone. In order to truly understand it, you have to back up to December of 2004. The election was scheduled for 31 January of 2005. Exactly two weeks before the election was to be held, the Iraqi government said there was no way an election would be held in our zone because in that point in time there were two triangles that were famous in Iraq. One was the Sunni Triangle and one was the Triangle of Death. The Triangle of Death was our zone and it was so named because for four months at that time, on a daily basis, we had gone forward, we had seized terrain, we had lived the misery of the Iraqi people. We had become their neighbors and, in so doing, we had slung steel and harsh language with this enemy on a daily basis, and they did not like that. They did not like the fact that these Marines were forward—living and earning the respect of the Iraqi people. But we were able to convince the Iraqi government that as a result of the efforts of Marines like Andy, the Iraqi people would come out and vote. We couldn't guarantee them that it wouldn't be violent, but we guaranteed them they would come out and vote.

Now I ask you to picture, in two weeks, having to put together eight polling places. That meant that we had to tactically go out 48 hours prior and we had to seize the locations. We had to set up all the force protection that would allow the Marines to protect the Iraqis from what we knew would be constant and sure attacks on election day. And then most importantly, we had to transport 500 workers from the city of Baghdad to down to our Battalion FOB, house them for two days, and then move them safely to those eight polling sites. You can rest assured that was one big, juicy target that the terrorist wanted to hit. We were able to accomplish all that, but the most telling time in all of that is where we housed these 500 election workers was in our battalion chow hall. My battalion major . . . had a section of our chow hall that was dedicated to our fallen Marines. At that time, there were 12 of them. He had their pictures, and we had an American and a Marine Corps flag. Now for those of you who've never been to Iraq, who've never spent time with the Iraqi people, when you get two of them together, the noise level, the amount of smoking and the amount of drinking that goes on is pretty mind-numbing. When you put 500 of them in a facility, it borders on chaos. Now we accepted that that was going to have to be the cost—that our chow hall was probably going to get pretty torn up. And it did, except for one spot.

Any time any of those Iraqi election workers got anywhere near the Sgt. Major's memorial, absolute, utter respectful, solemn silence. They respected the Marines and what they were doing for them, and that was a sight that I will take with me to my grave, and that makes me challenge those who say we're creating jihadists. I argue we are doing just the opposite. On that very election day, the mortars flew, the mortars flew intently. All eight of our sites started getting mortared and rocketed about 30 minutes before the polls were supposed to open. I was sitting in my COC thinking, ''Well, there's the end of my career. I just convinced the whole world that we could

have an election and they're blowing us up before they've even started.'' But an amazing thing happened. In spite of all the mortars, in spite of all those rockets, in spite of the Marines providing security, telling the Iraqi people to seek cover, they refused, and in broken English constantly reminded the Marines, ''You will protect us. You have brought us democracy. And we will vote.''

To conclude, one story from south of our zone where one young man pushed his 70-year-old father four miles under enemy fire in a shopping cart. When asked by the Marines, ''What on God's green earth did he think he was doing?'' He said: ''My father has but one wish before he dies, to show you the respect of voting as a free man.''

One hundred years. That's the enemy's plan. He is prepared. Are we? As long as we have warriors, gentle warriors like Andy, the unbelievable support of parents like Dennis and Sheila who do things like this despite having sacrificed what they have sacrificed, and the support of Americans like you, we cannot lose. Sheila asked me to be positive. I don't know how I can be anything but. If it weren't for warriors like Andy and the other ones you see in this room here tonight, we would not be able to gather tonight to laugh, to cry and to celebrate.

Sheila asked me to be positive, I don't know how to be anything else. I know now something I didn't know a few years ago: Being positive does not make the world the way you wish it would be, it's accepting the world the way it is and going out and doing what you can do to change it. I used to tell my young daughters when they'd see something on TV or read a fairy tale, I used to tell them there's no such thing as dragons. I don't tell them that anymore. There are dragons. There are fire-breathing, evil dragons that inhabit this world. But I tell them don't be afraid, because for every dragon that is out there, there are 10 knights in shining armor that will go forth and suffer great hardship to protect you. And I've seen them, and I've worked with them and they're called United States Marines. So be positive. I will be positive, Sheila, and I will be thankful and humbled that you asked me to speak tonight. And I will forever thank God Almighty for Andy and all the warriors like Andy, and your amazing family, and this blessed land.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Iraq, a failure built on the lies of this Administration.

I am opposed to H. Res. 861, because contrary to what it states in this resolution, I believe that it is in the best interest of the United States to bring our troops home now.

I voted against our involvement in Iraq, and I have opposed funding the conflict. For years, I have been calling for the return of our soldiers. This war has been a mistake, and our continued participation will not change this basic fact.

I have the utmost respect for our former Secretary of State Colin Powell. He was a truly outstanding Secretary of State: However, I will never forget how this great American was sent to the United Nations to sell a fabrication and to convince the world that this was a just endeavor with what we all now know was deliberately falsified evidence. This was just one part of a continuous effort to deceive the American public into believing that a conflict, that even many in our military had misgivings about, was the right thing for our nation to do.

The image of our President standing on the aircraft carrier and proclaiming ''mission accomplished'' is one that I continue to associate with this failed effort. Since that fabricated public relations moment, both our nation and the nation of Iraq have suffered great personal loss.

The American public no longer supports our involvement in Iraq, and we as their representatives, must respect their wishes and bring our troops home.

I am saddened and heartbroken when I think about how many brave young men and women have died in this conflict that was never in our nation's interest. Many of these courageous young soldiers who have lost'' their lives came from the Bronx, from my own community, and so it is partly on their behalf that I believe I am now speaking. Too many American soldiers have died, too many innocent Iraqi civilians have suffered and lost their lives, and too many reporters have been killed—all as a result of this failed policy.

As I thought about what I wanted to say on the floor today, I went back to the remarks that I spoke on this floor on October 9, 2002, when this House was voting on the authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. At that time I certainly couldn't anticipate what the conditions would be now in June of 2006. However, I said at the time, ''When we engage as a nation in a unilateral military action against an Arab Nation, an action that our allies are cautioning against, how will the United States be viewed in the Arab world? Perhaps the result will be an increase in Al Qaeda 's membership and a renewed hatred toward Americans.'' I think that this has come true and that our image as a nation has certainly been tarnished as a result of this conflict. I regret that—because I know that we live in a nation that does not want to be seen as an enemy by those who live in Arab nations.

What has also come true is that Al Qaeda continues to flourish and to find new recruits as a direct result of our nation's actions in Iraq. Although Al Qaeda had at most a negligible presence in Iraq before this conflict, it is now a well established force there. For every terrorist that our nation works so hard to capture, another one is motivated to join out of hate for our nation's involvement in Iraq.

This conflict has resulted in worldwide images that I doubt our nation can ever overcome. The pictures associated with the Abu Ghraib prison scandal are firmly etched on the minds of our next generation of youth around the world. Although soldiers of low rank were prosecuted for these atrocities, our leaders at the top never took responsibility.

Now an investigation is being conducted into our activities at Haditha, where it seems as though innocent civilians died. These actions are all a direct result of a failed policy and have come at great cost to our image in the world. No longer do nations look at us as the ultimate protector of human rights.

As everyone here knows, I am a part of the city that was a target on September 11th. When this Congress was debating the resolution on the use of force against Iraq, I did not believe at the time that in attacking Iraq our country was taking the right course, and I didn't know what words to use that would change the step towards war that our nation seemed so determined to take. I was filled with emotion and I ended my speech that night by saying, ''I cannot agree with the course that our great nation is embarking on, one that brings the threat of war closer and the goal of peace further away.''

So now once again we in Congress are debating this war. However, now we have the perspective of time and we can look at all that happened in Iraq, the suffering and the failures, as an unfortunate part of our nation's history. As I once again struggle to find the words that can bring this conflict to an end—I am again filled with emotion. Let us bring our brave American soldiers home now and let us once again embrace the goal of peace.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, a war we did not start or choose. But to use that war as either justification for a war in Iraq, or a reason for staying, is wrong.

A lesson I've learned in life is you finish what you start. This Administration took us off-track from the war on terror and chose the war in Iraq. The torch of the war on terror should, and shall be, passed to future generations, but the war in Iraq was started by this Administration and should be finished by this Administration.

This Administration decided to launch the Iraq war based on, at best, shaky intelligence. Until that time, this country had historically set a high threshold in its decisions to go to war. We have done so because outcomes are sometimes uncertain, and the cost in human lives is frequently high.

We who question this Administration's decisions have faced the charge that to be candid about this war would upset military morale or even be unpatriotic. Now is the time for this President to be honest and forthright with the American people about its ill-conceived war. In candor, the Administration should say to the American people that no matter what course we choose now, the future in Iraq will be bloody and costly.

That is why democracies enter war as a last resort, with solid evidence and a united nation.

I have listened to our generals about their view of the future. General Casey has personally said to me that he needs until the summer of 2007 to fully train Iraqi forces. I am willing to allow General Casey the time to complete this task, but we should begin an immediate redeployment of troops.

General Casey's projection might place Iraq on a course to embrace a self-governing democracy. However, the single most important action the newly elected Iraqi government can take to give that government legitimacy, is to ask Americans to leave and have Iraqis fight for Iraqis rather than have Americans fight for Iraqis.

Seldom mentioned these days is our original mission in Afghanistan, the frontline of the real war on terror. We still have time for a complete success, but unfortunately we now do not have adequate resources in Afghanistan. In order to win, the immediate redeployment of troops from Iraq must include sending some troops to Afghanistan as well as bringing some directly home from Iraq. It is time to return our attention and resources to hunting down Osama Bin Laden and ensuring Afghanistan does not again become a breeding ground for terrorism.

A little over sixty years ago, we fought a great war after Pearl Harbor. By this Thanksgiving, the Iraq war will have lasted longer than World War II. 4 long years ago many in

this Chamber voted to go to war in Iraq. How many would do so today, knowing they are committing us to a war longer than World War II?

Let us commit to a final push for an end to the bloodshed and violence in Iraq. Let us return to our original mission to fight the global war on terror that this Administration sidelined in Iraq.

I support our troops in Iraq. I support them all the way home—soon.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, while the war in Iraq has been grossly mismanaged, the United States has a moral obligation to the 2,500 American military men and women who have given their lives in the fight for freedom to allow the newly established government to develop, stabilize, and to provide for that nation's people.

Perhaps the current Administration does not want to openly discuss Iraq policy because they feel it is a black and white issue, either we stay the course or we withdraw our troops. I disagree; I believe that the war in Iraq is anything but black and white. Immediate troop withdrawal would result in an Iraq so destabilized that our homeland security would be more threatened than before the war even began. Staying the course would be equally senseless, as the course we are currently on has done nothing to stabilize Iraq, nor has it quelled the raging insurgency.

We recently passed the third anniversary of the date when President Bush declared ''mission accomplished'' regarding Iraq. What we have really accomplished in Iraq is yet to be seen, what is clear is that we need to change our course. We must set a new path towards a unified Iraq with a realistic exit strategy for our troops. We must disarm militias. We must help the new government provide electric power and economic and social services. We must convey to the Iraqis how important it is to the United States that they come together politically and make necessary amendments to their Constitution to achieve functional unity, we must make them see that whether or not a peaceful, democratic Iraq can succeed is ultimately in their hands. If we allow the Iraqis to think that we will be in Iraq indefinitely, there is no incentive for them to make the compromises necessary to unite their country under one stable government.

The outcome in Iraq will have a major impact both in the region and on our security here at home for decades to come. We cannot move forward in Iraq without a full debate about the war here at home, without an end to the level of secrecy that the administration and the Department of Defense have built up regarding the war, without an end to the corruption in contracting and profiteering, and without a real plan from the President that sets specific goals, achieves them, and then provides our troops a way out, an exit strategy.

I intend to support the resolution on the House floor today because I agree that we cannot simply pull out and leave Iraq; to do so would make that region less stable, less peaceful, and more of a threat to U.S. security. We must prevail in the War on Terror; but let me be clear, I do not support staying the course in Iraq.

I will continue to push the Administration and the military to develop a clear plan for Iraq, based on the creation of a national unity government, that will require the new government to live up to its commitments, transfer responsibility for Iraq to Iraqis, and that will bring our troops home as soon as possible.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave men and women of our Armed Forces for their service and dedication to winning the Global War on Terror.

On September 11, 2001 a group of 19 hijackers commandeered 4 commercial aircraft and crashed them into the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., with the intent on destroying our economy and way of life. Over 3,052 innocent men, women, and children lost their lives in this unprecedented attack. Sadly, the events that transpired on September 11th were the result of years of training and preparation by an enemy that does not value human life, liberty, equality, or religious freedom.

Our great Nation lost 473 American lives both civilian and military to the hands of terrorist from 1983 to 2001 for a total of 3,525 victims. With each passing decade our enemies have become more sophisticated and desperate to accomplish their aims of a global jihad. Individuals such as, Osama bin Laden, the founder of al Qaeda, have declared war on the Untied States and created worldwide networks of hate to accomplish their aims.

On several occasions, bin Laden has explained, that it should be every jihadists mission to obtain nuclear weapons and use them against the United States and its allies. The last 26 years have taught us that we must remain diligent and take every opportunity possible to find and destroy these ruthless killers wherever they reside. In order to accomplish this mission, the brave men and women of America's Armed Forces have answered the call with honor and an intense dedication to the mission of preserving our way of life.

One of our most important responsibilities as members of Congress is to make sure our troops have every resource they need while advancing democracy overseas. By visiting these heroes where they serve, we're able to get a much better understanding of what we can do to make their jobs as safe as possible. With this in mind, I decided to lead a Congressional delegation to the Middle East that traveled to Kuwait, Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Germany.

The leaders of these nations understood the importance of ensuring that we remain vigilant in fighting the Global War on Terror and expressed confidence in the abilities of the coalition forces. In Iraq, Kuwait, and Germany I had the special privilege of visiting with members of our Armed Forces and I found their moral to be high and their dedication to the cause unyielding. Soldiers like Sgt. Mark Gregory, Thomas W.. Rigaey, 1st Lt. Marathana Loddy, Lt. Mike Schilling and Staff Sgt. Leonard Campbe1.Vall from my home state of Nevada expressed their determination to see the mission through and understood that it will take time to achieve.

Since toppling Saddam Hussein's ruthless government, the people of Iraq have created a 275 member parliament, confirmed the selection of the top seven posts for a national unity government, and laid a foundation for democracy. Now more than ever we must stay the course and support our Iraqi friends as they continue to strengthen the infrastructure of their government.

Last week on June 7, 2006 Coalition forces killed Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and his top lieutenant and spiritual advisor Sheik Abd al-Rahman. Zarqawi was the operational commander of the terrorist movement in Iraq and was personally responsible for the deaths of many American forces and thousands of innocent Iraqis. The killing of Zarqawi is a testament to the notion that we must stay the course and remain committed to the mission and the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and heartfelt gratitude that I salute the men and women of our Armed Forces and thank them for their service and dedication to our great nation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the out of Iraq Caucus I rise in opposition to this resolution. We would not even be debating this bill if the American people were not disillusioned by this war and did not want to bring our troops home.

I was among those who opposed the tragic decision to launch this war. I warned that the invasion and occupation of Iraq would plunge us into a bloody quagmire of violence that would only intensify the instability in the Middle East and leave this nation less secure and less able to protect our own national interests.

The sad truth is that all the grimmest predictions have now come true and today—

The Taliban are mounting a major comeback in Afghanistan;

Iran is on the verge of producing a nuclear weapon;

Somalia is dominated by an al Queda-inspired militia;

And, here at home, our Nation is at risk. The fundamental recommendations of the 911 Commission are still waiting.

Those who still support the Iraq war often claim it has made this Nation a safer place. That it has kept away the terrorists and stopped another 911 tragedy. Unfortunately, such wishful thinking is only a way to justify the horrendous human suffering that we have caused by our misguided mission, an effort to justify a war that was never properly planned and executed and that has wounded thousands and cost the lives of two thousand five hundred American soldiers.

The toll of this war is still climbing and throughout the world terrorism is on the rise.

The administration talks a lot about National security but those in Congress knows the war in Iraq has not made America a safer nation.

We are appropriating millions and millions of dollars, at a time of skyrocketing Federal deficits, to fortify security in the U.S. Capitol Complex and at all other Federal facilities across this Nation. If Members of Congress believed this Nation is safer than it was before we captured Saddam Hussein, then why would we allow a single lost airplane to trigger the evacuation of the U.S. Capitol? Why does a single suspicious noise cause the lock down of the house office buildings? And just yesterday, why did the leadership of Congress upgrade our supplies of escape hoods?

No one in the leadership of Congress is behaving like we have diminished the terrorist threat. We know the war has made U.S. more vulnerable to terrorism.

Our National security is still in danger. Democracy is not flourishing in the Middle East. It is time to bring our troops home and to devote our resources to our own national security.

I commend my courageous colleague, Mr. MURTHA who has displayed tremendous patriotism on the battlefield, and in this chamber.

I support his call to implement a strategic redeployment from Iraq and implore the Members of this body to have the good sense to listen to the people of this Nation and to support the call to redeploy our U.S. troops in Iraq.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my concerns over the Bush administration's mismanagement of the war in Iraq.

First and foremost, I am disappointed that the President still refuses to put forward a strategy for a successful transition in Iraq and a timetable for the withdrawal of American troops.

Almost 2,500 of America's military personnel have lost their lives in this conflict, and thousands more of our troops have been injured and disabled. Among the most recent casualties was a young man from my district and hometown of Rialto, California. U.S. Army Spc. Luis Daniel Santos was just 20 years old and due to come home to his loving family—his parents Irma and Carlos and siblings Carlos Jr., Amy and Eric—next week. Luis was engaged to his sweetheart from Fontana High School and was looking forward to a family barbeque his mother was preparing for him. Tragically, he was killed one week ago in a roadside bombing while maneuvering his Humvee in combat.

I offer my condolences to the Santos family and join in mourning the death of this patriotic young man.

Military families especially, and Americans generally, understand the sacrifice that service entails and the dangers involved. And we are united in supporting our troops and honoring their sacrifice.

However, the American public has lost confidence in President Bush's leadership. The President has chosen to risk the lives of our Armed Forces without providing a coherent exit strategy, a realistic timetable, or the equipment required to complete the mission.

The American people want—and our military forces deserve—a clear plan for completing the Iraq transition and bringing our troops home!

As if the loss of life weren't overwhelming enough, the war in Iraq has cost American taxpayers more than 300 billion dollars. Americans have other needs and priorities, and 300 billion dollars could help solve some of the challenges we have here at home. That same money could have paid for 5 million additional teachers in our schools, or 14 million four-year college scholarships, or 2.5 million new affordable housing units across the country. Think about how much money that is and how much of a difference it could have made for working families like those I represent in San Bernardino County, California.

So I reiterate my call for the Bush administration to plan for an orderly withdrawal of American forces in Iraq. We must begin to transfer security responsibilities to the Iraqi people and allow the international community to step in and help.

Our brave men and women in the Armed Forces have sacrificed enough. They have completed their mission and accomplished what was needed. Their families have waited for them long enough. Now it is time to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, American forces are at great risk as they remain in Iraq without a clear objective. Their mission was to be a liberating force, not an occupation force. We cannot allow our troops to become targets of resentment and terrorism while the administration tries to figure out a plan.

American forces in Iraq have gone above and beyond the call of duty. Their heroism and compassion in the most trying of circumstances require us to act in their best interest. Despite inadequate equipment, despite shifting priorities, despite sweltering heat, our military has delivered time and again. The recent success in removing the threat posed by terrorist al-Zarqawi is a testament to their tenacity and grit in the field.

But the President must not take their commitment for granted and cannot expect them to serve indefinitely. Military forces in Iraq already are serving longer and longer deployments and a high percentage of returning troops are falling prey to mental health disorders and financial difficulty. We need a real solution, Mr. Speaker.

I stand with my Democratic colleagues in asking the President to provide a real solution for peace and security in Iraq and ask my colleagues in Congress to recommit themselves to providing adequate funding for our Armed Forces, both at home and abroad, and our veterans.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 861. Today's debate is about more than just the nations of Iraq and Afghanistan, this debate is about freedom and democracy worldwide and the fight against terror and injustice. Our great nation is doing what we have always done—fighting for the values we hold dear and helping to spread those values to other nations. We also have a choice to make; do we want to fight the terrorists in the streets of America or in Iraq and Afghanistan where al-Qaida has claimed as its battle ground to kill Americans?

The Global War on Terror hits home for me because I have the distinct privilege of representing the brave men and women stationed at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. These courageous Americans have been leading the way in the Global War on Terror since September 11, 2001. In Afghanistan, these soldiers liberated the country from the oppressive Taliban regime. They helped stabilize the country and their efforts as well as those of other units laid the foundation for the democratic elections of Afghanistan's president, parliament, and provincial councils.

In Iraq, the 101st was deployed before the war began in 2003 and were instrumental in the success of dismantling the regime of the criminal dictator Saddam Hussein. They were also responsible for the location and death of Saddam's two sons. They liberated and rebuilt the town of Mosel, including the reconstruction of the city's infrastructure. The 101st is now on its second deployment to Iraq and is involved in the securing of the city of Ramadi where some of the most violent fighting in Iraq still exists. I have personally met with many of the soldiers that have been involved in this fight and they have my utmost admiration and respect. After meeting with the soldiers of Fort Campbell, I am convinced that they understand what they are fighting for in Iraq and are committed to the very end in order to preserve the democracy we have helped create and to ensure the safety of the Iraqi people.

One of the largest newspapers in my state, the Louisville Courier-Journal recently published an article entitled ''Wounded soldiers refuse to leave Iraq.'' I'd like to share a couple of stories from that article about soldiers from Fort Campbell who are completely committed to their mission in the Global War on Terror:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal] S0634

Specialist Steven Clark from Fitzgerald, Georgia is a soldier in the 502nd Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne. He is a 25 year old young man with more courage than people twice his age. In his time in Iraq, he has been shot three times and has been wounded by shrapnel from a grenade that tore into his legs and back. He has been awarded three Purple Hearts, with another on the way, as well as a Bronze Star with Valor. His Army buddies have nicknamed him ''Bullet Magnet.'' You may ask why he is still in Iraq and the answer is because he wants to be. He says that his wounds are not as important as the mission and he insists on staying.

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Kunk is a commander in the 502nd Infantry Regiment. One of his duties as an officer is to decide which of his wounded soldiers can return to duty and which soldiers get to go home. He says this task is tougher than it should be because his soldiers research Army Regulations and argue endlessly in an effort to stay. Colonel Kunk's story doesn't end there, he was caught in the effects of a roadside bomb that damaged the nerves and muscles in his legs causing his legs to swell and throb from pain by the end of every day. But Colonel Kunk wouldn't think of leaving, he says he's a father and a grandfather and he wants to do right by them. So Colonel Kunk stays and he fights because he knows it's the right thing to do.

Specialist Clark and Lieutenant Colonel Kunk's commitment is without compromise and their dedication to duty should be commended. Their stories are unique, but their actions are not.

There are many soldiers that refuse to leave when they have incurred wounds that would allow them to come home. These service members understand what they are fighting for and they stay to see the mission through to the end.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should follow the example of our men and women in uniform and stay committed to completing our mission and winning the Global War on Terror. If our soldiers, like Specialist Clark and Lieutenant Colonel Kunk, can make the commitment to stay then we owe it to them to provide our support to stay and get the mission done, to do otherwise would undermine our soldiers' efforts.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this simple-minded resolution. President Bush and Republicans in Congress would have you believe that the War on Terror and the War in Iraq are one and the same. But terrorism is not exclusive to a geographic or political entity.

Terrorism is the result of an accidental or intentional trauma inflicted on humanity. Numerous examples exist within our own borders.

My son is terrorized by the threat of destruction posed by the ignorance, of President Bush in his steadfast opposition to addressing the very real threat of global warming.

Parents are terrorized by the lack of treatment for children born with diabetes, leukemia, and multiple sclerosis. Yet right-wing evangelical Pharisees dictate prohibitions on stem cell research that could cure these and other diseases, saving lives.

Middle-class Americans are terrorized by the outsourcing of jobs. elimination of pensions and health benefits, and expansion of

predatory lending. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce promotes these terrifying practices, driving working families to fear for their financial future.

All Americans are terrorized by more than 30,000 handgun deaths each year. This trauma is condoned and promoted by the National Rifle Association, a bipartisan terrorist organization.

Our brave servicemen and women in uniform are terrorized by the Iraqi insurgency and civil war. Though 2,500 American soldiers and countless Iraqi citizens have died, the right wing noise machine encourages additional deaths by coloring as pro-terrorist those of us who dare to acknowledge the futility of the President's War in Iraq.

Terrorism is a very real threat, but it comes in many forms other than those found in Iraq and, as I've outlined here today, we are doing precious little to combat it in America.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and to join me in a call to redirect our attention, our federal dollars, and our lives to our needs here at home.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, we are on the floor today debating a most serious issue. However, rather than truly addressing solutions, the resolution before us is filled with platitudes which seek to vindicate the ill advised policies of the President's war on Iraq. Rather than allowing a meaningful and constructive debate on Iraq, the Republican Leadership decided not to allow any amendments to their resolution. It is a travesty that the elected representatives of the American people are prevented today from offering policy alternatives that might actually affect the shape of U.S. policy in Iraq.

This debate had the potential to mark a turning point to the current vacuum of congressional oversight over the Bush Administration as it pursues its misguided and incompetently planned war in Iraq. Rather than offering real solutions, the Republican Majority in Congress has decided to rubber stamp the President's campaign in Iraq.

The American people know what has happened, and demand more than just a rubber stamp from their representatives in Congress. Just as in the case of Vietnam, they see a White House which misled our country into war. Using shoddy evidence and insinuations about the connections between Iraq and al Qaeda, the Bush Administration took our country to war to face the ''imminent threat'' of an Iraq with nuclear weapons.

Despite claims by the Republicans and the Bush Administration, there was no significant relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction, a fact which Hans Blix, the head of the UN weapons inspection team, recently stated would have become clear had President Bush not ignored our allies' requests that we give the inspectors a few more months before invading. After its claims about the weapons of mass destruction were proven to be incorrect, the Administration has continually shifted its rationale for the invasion.

As though it were not bad enough that we went into a war in an incompetent and deceptive manner, it is unforgivable that our troops were sent into this war without adequate planning and equipment. Our troops are out there putting their lives on the line, yet the President decided to follow the advice of misguided ideologues in overruling the plans developed by experts before the war. One former commander of U.S. Central command, General Anthony Zinni, said that ''ten years worth of planning were thrown away; troop levels dismissed out of hand . . . these were not tactical mistakes, these were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.''

There are better ways to support our troops than to send more of them to their death in a poorly planned war. It's time to shift our approach from the ineffectual policies of a President who only listens to advisors with pre-determined hawkish mindsets. As a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I stand with my colleagues in urging Congress to urgently re-evaluate the failed policies of the President. Representative JACK MURTHA has drafted a resolution that encourages the Iraqi people to take charge of their own security and lays the groundwork for bringing our troops home.

These are the sort of options we should be debating today if we truly want to demonstrate our support for our troops. Instead, the Republican Leadership has put forth this political ploy. Congress should fulfill their Constitutional responsibility to exercise oversight instead of continuing to place blind faith in the President as he pursues the war in Iraq.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not support this shameful attempt to provide an illusion of oversight.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, America and its allies are engaged in a war against a terrorist movement that spans all comers 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 AI-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 every day.'' 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. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I salute Congressman MURTHA and I salute the servicemen and women in the field, at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and those waiting to serve.

I rise today to oppose the resolution before us today because it does nothing to ensure a more stable and secure Iraq nor does it do anything to bring our troops home from Iraq.

My constituents have asked me when Congress will get serious and have an open discussion about our future plans and polices in

Iraq. Today, we begin to answer their calls. But we cannot stop today. We should debate the war in Iraq everyday on the House floor.

Yet rather than seriously and substantially debating the issues at hand, the Majority has presented self-congratulatory resolutions that intentionally seek to divide the House. Today is no exception.

Earlier today, I meet with a group of 7th and 8th graders from my Central New Jersey district. I asked them what I should say to put the Iraq War in perspective. The students offered a number of observations. One said that too many lives have been lost already. Another said that the reasons for going to war were wrong, maybe even deceptive. A third said that the Iraqi people are worse-off today.

They are right. Ther longer U.S. troops remain in Iraq the worse the conditions on the ground get for the Iraqi people.

I spoke with Senator BYRD (D–WV) the other day, who was here for the deceptive Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. He says that is one vote he would like to take back. I am not saying that Iraq is another Vietnam, because the two are different. But we should ask ourselves how will posterity regard Congress for giving President Bush everything he asked for without any oversight or accountability.

The shifting rationales for the war in Iraq have led to the lack of a clear understanding of why we are there, or how we achieve victory. Our mission cannot be accomplished because there is no clear mission. There have been a number of rotating rationales offered for the war. One was Weapons of Mass Destruction and the threat of a terrorist attack on one of our cities. Then it was Saddam's human rights abuses. Another was the argument that the United Nation's disarmament and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then it was to stand up a democracy to be emulated across the Middle East. Another was to protect America's strategic oil interest in the region. And as we have heard over and over today, it was to fight terrorism and a response to the terrible attacks on September 11th.

No it is not about Khobar Towers, or the USS *Cole* or even the terrible attacks on the World Trade Center. Today's debate is about Iraq, and this is a resolution that says ''stay the course.''

This is all classic misdirection. We need to remember that there were no terrorists in Iraq involved in the September 11th attacks. In fact, there were no terrorists threatening us from Iraq before we invaded. The War in Iraq is not about terrorism, except to the extent that Iraq has become a haven and a training ground for terrorists.

We must also recognize that our country was propelled into the conflict under false pretenses. That has implications not only for how we got into Iraq, but for why we need to get out, and how we should view future claims of threats to America based on questionable intelligence and even more questionable assumptions.

The war in Iraq has warped American priorities, and cost us dearly in terms of lives, money, and lost opportunities for progress at home and abroad. It has hurt our international standing and our ability to counter terrorism abroad. Numerous powder kegs around the world, have been ignored. Here at home, Hurricane Katrina crystallized for the American people the fact that the President and this Congress were willing to place our attention and resources in Iraq, at great cost to our ability to help our own citizens here at home. This includes the short-changing of homeland security measures for our ports, railroads, and chemical plants. Repeatedly, Democrats have tried to get the Congress to invest in these areas, and repeatedly we've been told there is not enough money. And yet, we pay for the war in Iraq—to the tune of $11 million per hour.

History will remember this war in Iraq as a colossal blunder. When we leave Iraq—as I hope we will, starting immediately—no one will wish that we'd stayed a little longer. No one will look back and think the current course could have ever been successful.

To their credit, our troops have done everything we have asked them. They are heroes. But we have placed them in the middle of a budding civil war. The President's failed strategy has made their jobs impossible, and his refusal to change course has continued to make them targets on the ground.

It is time for a more sensible course of action in Iraq. Only a negotiated settlement with broad international help will prevent civil war between the Sunnis and Shiites. We need to ensure that we work together with the community of nations and the United Nations to have any hope for peace, security, and prosperity in Iraq. We have tried to do this almost single handedly for too long and it is time to work with the international community to reconstruct Iraq.

I have said for almost a year now that the United States must redeploy our troops from Iraq. I am a cosponsor of Congressman Murtha's legislation, H.J Res. 73, which would redeploy the current forces in Iraq at the earliest practicable date. That is because the presence of our troops, who are serving valiantly and ably, is improving neither our security nor that of the Iraqis. In fact, our presence itself is unifying Saddam Hussein loyalists, al Qaeda sympathizers, and many civilians against us. Our presence is fueling the insurgency.

Redeploying our forces does not mean walking away from Iraq. Iraq's security forces and government will need our continued moral, political, intelligence and in some cases, financial support. But the hard work of securing the country and building a new society is one that only the Iraqis can do. Reducing and refining our military and political presence in Iraq is the necessary first step in that process.

If we are to defend America and our allies from the global jihadist threat, our continued presence in Iraq defeats that purpose. It has been and remains a deadly and unnecessary misadventure that has compromised our ability to advance our interests around the world and at home to defeat the larger threat we face. To get back on course in the global war against al Qaeda, we must change course in Iraq, and now.

This war is simply not making us or the Iraqi people safer. The generals understand that. A majority of Iraqis understand that. The majority of the American people understand that. Seventh graders from New Jersey understand it, as well. Let's begin our redeployment immediately so that we can refocus our efforts where they belong: on rallying the world to the cause of defeating Osama bin Laden and those who follow him.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Resolution.

The Resolution before this House today engages in a rhetorical fiction. The Republican Leadership has grafted into this Resolution language which confuses the War in Iraq with the War Against Terror. Iraq did not have anything to do with the September 11th attacks. We did not invade Iraq because of 9–11. We invaded Iraq because the Bush Administration convinced Congress and the American people that Saddam Hussein had acquired nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and might use them.

The terrorism now taking place in Iraq is the direct result of the war, not its cause. To suggest otherwise is to ignore the facts.

The fact is, this war was a very bad mistake. The Administration launched an invasion into Iraq in March of 2003 even though the Administration knew from the reports it was getting back from the IAEA and the UN inspectors that there where no nuclear or other WMDs at the sites identified by the CIA, by British Intelligence, and by other sources.

Now we are bogged down in a quagmire with no end in sight.

In February of this year, the President was asked when we could expect all American troops to be out of Iraq, and he replied that this was a decision for a future President and a future Iraqi government to make. In other words, if we continue to pursue the Bush Administration's policies, we will likely have troops deployed in Iraq until at least January of 2009—that's nearly three years from now!

What has been the cost of this war in terms of blood?

2,500 U.S. troops killed.

More than 18,400 American troops wounded.

An estimated 38,000 Iraqi civilians killed.

What has been the cost of this war in terms of treasure?

Nearly $320 billion so far . . .

Just think of all the good we could have done in this world or in this country if we had devoted $320 billion for health care, for education, for fighting poverty or creating jobs.

What has been the cost in terms of America's influence around the world?

It has been severely compromised.

We ''cried wolf' over non-existent Iraqi WMDs, over alleged connections between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda;

We failed to deploy enough troops to suppress the insurgency;

We put inadequately trained troops in charge of Abu Ghraib prison;

It's time to pursue a new direction.

The Iraqis are standing up, but we are standing still, staying the course. It is time to redeploy an increasing percentage of our forces to an over-the-horizon presence, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (MR. MURTHA) has suggested in the legislation he introduced last year.

We should not be planning on maintaining any military bases in Iraq or any long-term troop presence in that country.

It is time for us to bring this war to an end, and to bring our troops home.

Vote NO on this resolution because it is as much a fraud as the reasons the Bush Administration gave for invading Iraq in the first place.

I urge defeat of the Resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 868, further proceedings on the resolution will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE HONORABLE SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Aaron Sporck, Legislative Director for the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil deposition subpoena, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents and testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

AARON SPORCK,
Legislative Director.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to with an amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of his Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand.

□ 2245

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). 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 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.)

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.)

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

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

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

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

THERE MUST BE A NEW DIRECTION IN IRAQ

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been a day of great importance, and tomorrow, we will conclude this debate on Iraq.

When I spoke earlier today, I mentioned that the dilemma that we have is that although there has been a debate, one would wonder, with such an important topic, why the process did not allow the American people to have alternatives to the present resolution on the floor and why we were so constrained that there could not be a definitive plan that speaks to the concern of the American people, the families of soldiers and veterans, and that is, to discuss fully, without partisan rhetoric, the idea of redeployment and the opportunity for our soldiers to return home.

Now, 2 years or so ago, I had, and offered, to this administration a concept that I believe would not have placed us where we are today. I rose today to say that I support the Murtha plan and resolution, which clearly provides an opportunity for redeployment as soon as practicable. It is not the cut-and-run theory. It is a theory that we respect the idea of the military fighting for our freedom and respect the fact that the military's mission has been completed.

Having just come back from Iraq myself, and been there three times and as well to Afghanistan, I know that the boots on the ground, the leadership on the ground is, by any means, any definition, the most excellent military in the world. We thank them. We thank their families. We thank the enlisted. We thank the Reservists, we thank the National Guard and any others, civilians who are serving on those front lines.

But we are the policy-makers, and we owe them not just a debt of gratitude. So, tomorrow, in protest for no plan, I will be voting ''no'' on the resolution. I do so without any shame or any conceding to accusations of not being patriotic. My patriotism is exhibited by my dissent and the dissent of the American people asking us to do something, to create a plan that tracks the sovereignty of Iraq, gives them the opportunity to move toward their own freedom, to protect themselves through the Iraqi National Army and the Iraqi National Police.

Let me just simply say to the American people that what we are discussing today are these soldiers who have been willing to put their lives on the front line. These are husbands and wives and aunts and uncles and cousins. These are mothers and fathers. These are our neighbors. These are, in fact, our brothers and sisters. These are Americans, individuals who have put themselves on the front line. We, as policymakers, should not cut and run on them.

I would just say to my colleagues that if we are to be patriotic, then we should do it by words and not by deeds.

So I would argue that what we have done to the soldier is to talk and not act. We have, in fact, devastated the United States Army, therefore, disallowing or at least causing them to be diminished and taking and causing us to put them in a position where it will take years for them to rebuild themselves.

We have undermined the military by not equipping the troops. When asked by a soldier in the field why U.S. troops did not have the right armor for their vehicles, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, as you know, you have to go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you want. What a callous, senseless thing to say, to throw our Army into harm's way, and careless about whether they are protected or have the armor to protect themselves, allowing families and parents to get their hard-earned pennies to send flak jackets to their children and then not taking care of our troops when they come home.

The Bush administration has not developed policies to take care of the thousands, 19,000 casualties who are injured, 2,500 of course who died, the 2,500 today.

Health care has proven inadequate, and wounded veterans have been hounded by debt collectors because of inefficiencies in the Pentagon's administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this is not long enough for the catastrophic and necessity of the debate or the changes that are needed in order to change the direction of Iraq.

I, too, applaud the ending of Zarqawi's leadership of terrorism in the world, but that is not the end of the story, and we know that insurgency in Iraq is only 10 percent of the violence. The violence is between Shiite and Sunni and those young people who believe they can kill Americans with impunity and with immunity.

So I would simply say that I hope tomorrow there will be a metamorphical change. I hope someone will shine the light on this body. I hope we will rise with courage to say that there must be a new direction. I hope we will discard this senseless resolution that simply wants to make partisan or make a partisan battle about who supports the troops and who does not.

We cannot stay the course. Richard Nixon knew that we could not stay the

course in Vietnam, and he changed the course of direction.

It is not anti-patriotic to be able to stand up against the wind of the majority, to be able to say that the dissenting Americans need to be heard, and if we are heard, it will be for the betterment of this Nation and the betterment of this world. Then we can begin to fight the global war on terror. Then we can be more successful. Then we can form the coalition that we need to weed out the terrorists and to truly create for our children a better world.

I hope tomorrow we will shed the light on this place and change direction in the Iraq War.

GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 we commemorated D Day, the day that American military forces stormed the coast of France 62 years ago to turn the tide in one of the most brutal conflicts the world has ever known. The United States sustained 6,603 casualties that day, yet the final victory over the forces of fascism remained nearly a year away.

Rows of silent graves at the American Military Cemetery in Normandy bear witness to the high price of freedom. They solemnly remind us that there is no substitute for perseverance and sacrifice if we are to prevail over the threats which challenge this Nation and the world today.

The global war on terror is a different war from the wars of the past. This is not a war of uniformed armies on clearly defined battlefields. It is a war that invades tranquil space and time without warning, carried out by those who hide among and behind civilian populations, seeking to exploit the vulnerable for ruthless purposes.

While we have endured the sacrifice of global wars during the past, we have never waged a war in an age of globalization, in an age when technology eviscerates the concept of distance, magnifies our losses, trivializes our accomplishments, and places our adversaries in a far better position to leverage the freedoms of our society against us.

In seeking to prevent another 9/11, the President and the United States Congress would have been utterly irresponsible to ignore the threat posed by Saddam Hussein in Iraq. It is important to note that in 1998 President Clinton ordered U.S. Armed Forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq because Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs posed a credible and serious threat.

But I am not here to argue the case for war today. The United States and our coalition partners made judgments to enter Iraq based upon the best available evidence, and now the commitment is ours to complete. We are all in this together, and the successful progression of our commitment in Iraq, from which I remain convinced that an abrupt withdrawal of U.S. troops would do more harm than good, is vital to achieving national security for America, stability and hope for all peoples of the Middle East, and establishing the prospects for civil reforms and long-term peace throughout the entire world.

While our mission continues to be dangerous and costly, it continues to make strong progress as well. The recent establishment of democratic institutions in Iraq is without cultural or historical precedent. This fact, combined with rapid progress in the deployment of Iraqi security forces, gives us realistic hope of diminishing conflict and a stable foundation for the prospects of long-term peace.

As we proceed with our obligation, may each one of us endeavor to discharge our responsibilities in a manner that is worthy of the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces.

And may each of us recall that this obligation is ultimately connected to the mantle of leadership that has fallen to the United States, not only for our own welfare, but for the welfare of the entire world.

IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

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. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 2002, this Congress voted to give the President of the United States broad powers to engage in a unilateral first strike war against Iraq without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States.

Our oath of office as Members of Congress, our constitutional charge, the mandate laid upon us by the people, does not permit us to delegate the responsibility of engaging the awesome military power of the United States.

Our oath of office does not permit us to delegate our responsibilities in placing our fighting men and women in the field of battle, and I commend each and every one of them for the sacrifices they are making for freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Our Constitution places the power to declare war squarely and solely in the Congress. This issue rises far above partisan politics.

President Lincoln put our congressional responsibility this way, when he said: ''We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation.''

I opposed that initial resolution, and I would later oppose because after all of the information I have seen, and after all I have heard, neither I nor a majority of the residents of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, are convinced that the war is our only, our best or was our most immediate option.

I was not convinced, and I am still not convinced, that the resolution would properly guide us to act cooperatively and legally through the United Nations with the agreement and the involvement of the international community. In fact, it led us to pursue risky, unilateral actions in defiance of international law and the United Nations Charter.

As the American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation, it is the duty of Congress to ask some hard questions.

What are we accomplishing by keeping our troops in immediate danger in Iraq? In my judgment, the answer is not much.

□ 2300

In my judgment, commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflict is an important part of what our democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand continuous military presence in Iraq.

I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and we need to prepare for an honorable way out. It is my profound hope that as we press forward, we will press forward towards the mark of a high calling; that we will take the high road; that we will take the road that leads to peace and not to war, the road to peace based on mutual security and international cooperation.

Let us walk the road to peace knowing that it is also the road to the rights we have defined in the United Nations Charter for all humankind. Let us walk the road to peace not because it is the easiest road or the smoothest road or the shortest road, but knowing that it is the right road for the American people.

Sometimes in the pursuit of noble and inescapable goals it takes more courage and more vision not to fight or to fight in a different way. We can fight by arming, training, and equipping the Iraqi military and civilian police forces to provide security and protection for the Iraqi people in their country. We can fight by providing clean water, food, and medicine to the Iraqis.

This is one of those times when we must take the road that leads to peace and not down the path to continuous destruction. Let us have the courage and the vision to find a permanent peace and security, to remove the presence of terrorism and not just drive it underground. Surely, if America has a destiny, it is a responsibility to lead the world to such peace.

This is a time of testing for all of us. Let us not fail this great test. Let us pursue peace, and not war.

TURKEY'S EU MEMBERSHIP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, next week the European Union will begin conducting membership negotiations with Turkey. As this process begins, it is important that the EU not allow Turkey to take any shortcuts. I am confident the European Union will insist Turkey follow all the proper steps and make the substantial changes necessary in many areas before the nation could ever be accepted.

To date, I do not believe Turkey has made substantial and meaningful progress in many of the areas that are of concern to members of the European Union. Despite making commitments for its membership negotiations, Turkey's lack of progress in adhering to essential democratic principles is of great concern. It continues to be in breach of the pace and standards set forth under initial agreements with the EU. In fact, the EU has prepared a report criticizing Turkey's reform process.

During next week's meetings, the European Union must demand answers from the Turkish government as to why the nation is not meeting benchmarks it agreed to in order to receive EU consideration. The EU must also begin to seriously explore Turkey's continued disregard for improving fundamental freedoms within its boundaries, freedoms that are commonplace throughout the European Union.

There is no question Turkey is going to be forced and should be forced to make dramatic improvements in these areas before it can ever be considered for EU membership. The EU must also consider Turkey's relations with its neighbors. I remain a vocal critic of Turkey's treatment of both Armenia and Cyprus, and believe that these issues must also be addressed during next week's discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about Turkey's lack of progress in the diplomatic recognition of Armenia, the removal of its blockade against Armenia, and ending its official policy of denial of the Armenian genocide by coming to terms with it, an irrefutable historical fact affirmed by an increasing number of EU member states and European institutions.

Turkey's refusal to acknowledge the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenians has no limits. Just last month, Turkey pulled out of a NATO exercise because the Canadian Prime Minister used the term ''genocide'' in reference to the massacre. Prior to that, the Turkish Ambassador to France was temporarily removed from the country as an act of protest against a French law making it illegal to deny the Armenian genocide.

This type of behavior goes on and on. Five journalists who criticized a court's decision to cancel a conference on the genocide were arrested. A leading Turkish novelist, Orhan Pamuk, was also arrested and charged with insulting Turkey's identity for referring to the Armenian genocide. Clearly, Turkey's protection of the fundamental freedoms of a democracy is simply inadequate.

Now, meanwhile, Turkey continues to illegally occupy the northern third of Cyprus. In 2001, the European Court of Human Rights rebuked the Turkish government when the court overwhelmingly found Turkey guilty of massive human rights violations in a scathing 146-page decision. The court concluded Turkey has not done enough to investigate the whereabouts of Greek-Cypriot missing persons who disappeared during life-threatening situations after the occupation.

The findings of the European Court of Human Rights should be taken very seriously by the EU, and the Turkish government should be forced to respond to these devastating charges before even being considered for membership. Turkey must also agree to once again come to the table and negotiate in good faith with Cyprus. Turkey simply cannot be admitted to the European Union if Cyprus remains divided and Turkish troops are still there.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in adding their support to a letter I am circulating with my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY of New York. We will soon send a letter to Jose Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, to express many of these same concerns. I also strongly urge President Bush to personally raise these concerns with President Barroso.

It is imperative Turkey's progress is measured on the basis of its complete accomplishment of all necessary criteria set forth by the European Union.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was September 26, 2002, I was sitting in the cabinet room of the White House with Condoleezza Rice, Andy Card, and President Bush, and the President explained to us that day, and I took notes and still have them, that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction; that Saddam Hussein was training terrorists on weapons of mass destruction; and that if military force was used, in President Bush's words, it would be swift. September 26, 2002.

It is now June 15, 2006, some 2,500 soldiers have died and more than 18,000 injured, many like Kevin Pannel, from Glenwood, Arkansas, who have been injured in ways that will forever change his life and so many others.

One thing we know for sure, Mr. Speaker, is that our intelligence failed us. There is not a more difficult decision that Members of Congress are asked to make than whether or not to send our men and women in uniform into harm's way. And when we are faced with making that decision, we must know our intelligence is right.

This has been a war that has touched most families, and mine is no different. My brother-in-law spent Christmas in the Middle East supporting a mission to refuel Air Force aircraft over Afghanistan. My first cousin was in Iraq serving our country when his wife gave birth to their first child.

We all have a story like that. We all know someone who has been there. I escorted a young woman and her two children to the White House this morning for a tour of the White House. They are in Washington, D.C. with her mom and dad on vacation. Her husband was in Iraq when she gave birth to their second child, and he is in Iraq today on his third mission in 4½ years.

I want you to know that our men and women in uniform and their service to our country is much greater, much greater than that of any Member of Congress or any President could ever be, and tonight I honor them.

There has been a lot of talk about this resolution that we will be voting on tomorrow. I have read it three times. It says that we support our troops, and I do. It says that we are against terrorists, and I am. It says that we are against a date certain for withdrawal from Iraq, and I agree with that, and so I plan to vote for this resolution tomorrow. But here is where I disagree with this President.

This President is spending $279 million of your tax money in Iraq every 24 hours. And yet if you ask him to be accountable for it, if you ask him how he is spending that $279 million of your tax money in Iraq every day, he will tell you that you are unpatriotic. I disagree with that. I believe in accountability. I believe that this President, this administration and this Republican Congress, must be held accountable for the $279 million of your tax money that they are spending in Iraq every 24 hours.

I also believe that this President lacks a plan. This resolution is full of saying things like, we support our troops, and I certainly do. It is full of things like saying, we are against terrorists, and I would hope we all are. But there is nothing in the resolution about how we are going to win, how we are going to win, and it is time for this President to give us a plan on how we can win in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Iraq. We had some 3,000 Arkansas National Guard troops there August 11, 2004, and I went to let them know we support them and to make sure some of this money was being spent on them and the equipment they need to get the job done. I visited with young soldiers from my hometown, soldiers I had taught in Sunday school, soldiers I had duck hunted with.

And so I said to them, what do we need to be doing differently? They said we need to be hiring Iraqis to rebuild

their nation's infrastructure. The insurgents are hiring them and they are accepting the money and lobbing cheap bombs at us. Why? Because they need to feed their family. And they also told me we need to be training a lot more Iraqis to take control of their military and police force. August 11, 2004.

February 2006, as a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly I was in Brussels visiting the Ambassador to NATO, the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, at his home. I visited with the Iraqi Ambassador there, and I asked him the same question. And you know what? Some 2 years later, he gave me the same answer.

It is time for this President, this Congress, to give us a plan to establish a democracy, to win the peace, a plan that will eventually allow us to bring our men and women in uniform home.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am going to take the full 5 minutes, but I have been in this House Chamber almost all day and I hear these arguments that we don't have a plan to end the war in Iraq and succeed, and that is just simply not true. It is not true at all.

The fact is the plan was wrong in the sense that there was the anticipation that it would happen more easily. But the plan is very clear. It is not simple. It requires that the Iraqis have their own police, their own border patrol, and their own army in order to secure themselves. And since we did not allow for their police to be restood, we had to start from scratch and train them.

And it is simply not possible to train a police and border patrol, an army, in 1 year or 2 or 3. There are 26 million Iraqis in a country the size of California. But every day we train more and more of them, so that now they control about 42 percent of the land that includes 42 percent of the population.

So as we continue with our plan, as we continue to train more and more Iraqis, we are able to move our troops out and move their troops in. We are able to move their police in and our troops out. We are able to move their border patrol in and our troops out.

Now, it is clear that they do not have the logistics, so we will still have to be there later, but not in the numbers that we have now. That is all part of the plan; to train their troops, train their border patrol, train their army, and allow them to take our place.

What we object to is leaving prematurely. And if you ask an Iraqi what their biggest fear is, and having been there 12 times I have spoken to a lot of them, it is basically the same thing, it is that you will leave us; that you will leave us before we can take hold of democracy and before we can defend ourselves. That is their biggest fear. Some of them even say, like you did in Vietnam. And some of them will make reference to what they hear on CNN or what they hear about elected officials who say we need to get out, we need to have some kind of artificial timetable.

□ 2315

Thank goodness George Washington didn't have Congress telling him he had to have a timetable to beat the Brits. Thank goodness when all the generals criticized Abraham Lincoln, we didn't say, well, the generals are against Abraham Lincoln, he doesn't have a plan, we better just fold our tent. Thank goodness that didn't happen.

The bottom line for me is very clear. We may have been wrong about weapons of mass destruction, and for that the President loses credibility, and people like me do, and people on the other side of the aisle who voted for going into Iraq, and now pretend like they didn't, we all lose our credibility there. But we don't lose our credibility with this: Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. He used these weapons on his own people and neighbors. He didn't abide by the agreement that stopped us from going into Baghdad. He has now been removed. Thank God.

The Iraqi people have a democracy that is flourishing and is extraordinarily impressive. Three elections have allowed the Iraqis to form a government that created a Constitution, adopt a Constitution, and then elect a government under that Constitution.

All the Iraqis are asking from this Congress is you came in, you removed our security people, you have given us a taste of democracy, let us live that democracy and let us have the capability to protect ourselves before you leave. That's our plan.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IRAQ WAR

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I come before you tonight after listening to the presentations that have been taking place all day, not only as a Member of this body but as a parent who has lost a child. My son, B.J., who passed away a little more than 6 years ago, would have turned 24 tomorrow. Every time I learn about loss of life in Iraq, another son or daughter, mother or father, brother or sister, I can't help but think about my son B.J. and the profound pain and loss that will remain with us for the rest of our lives.

That intense pain that we feel over the loss of B.J. is being felt every day by those families here in America who have suffered a loss in Iraq, and that is one of the reasons why I oppose this war and one of the reasons why I plan to oppose this resolution.

But one of the other reasons I oppose this resolution deals with honesty and truth. Boake Carter is credited with saying that ''in time of war, the first casualty is truth.''

Mr. Carter's statement is applicable to the resolution before us today. Like the one-sided resolution presented to the House last December, the Republican majority has refused to allow a true debate on the war on Iraq. The truth is 2,500 servicemen and -women have died in Iraq. The truth is the so-called coalition countries, including Great Britain, are drawing down their troops in Iraq. The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth, that the cause and purpose of the war in Iraq is the same as the war in Afghanistan.

The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth that the cause and purpose of the war in Iraq is justified by the terrorist attacks of September 11.

The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth saying that we who oppose this war in Iraq are not as patriotic as those who support the war.

The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth saying that those who do not support Resolution 861 do not support our troops in Iraq.

Resolution 861 continues the open-ended commitment of U.S. troops in Iraq and embodies President Bush's latest attempt to justify the U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Last December the President and his congressional allies claimed the Iraqi parliamentarian elections were a ''crucial victory'' in establishing a democracy in Iraq. Thus, through this election, ''victory'' was inevitable in Iraq. Even Vice President CHENEY declared the insurgency was ''in their final throes.''

America has heard this type of reasoning before from President Johnson during the Vietnam War. In 1967, the South Vietnamese freely elected their government. President Johnson then declared the Vietnamese election had established a democracy supported by the Vietnamese people. Even our Vietnam military leaders declared the war would be over soon as there was ''light at the end of the tunnel.''

After this Vietnamese election, and the light at the end of the tunnel, 3,800 more Americans would die in Southeast Asia.

Since May 1, 2003, when the President declared ''mission accomplished'' in Iraq, over 2,300 troops have died in Iraq. What is the victory that the President and his congressional supporters envision in Iraq for the U.S.? What is the strategy for the Iraqi war mission to be accomplished?

This is not a war like our grandparents fought. This is an insurgency. There is no country to hoist a white flag of surrender. There is no recognized political entity that America can

sign a peace agreement with. There is only an insurgency of fanatics who have no desire to reach peace with the United States.

Our brave men and women in the military are trying to build a democracy in a country that views U.S. troops as occupiers. Almost one-half of the Iraqi people believe it is justifiable to kill our U.S. troops. The U.S. military has been used to prop up a government being threatened by a guerrilla insurgency.

With this Iraqi insurgency, I cannot envision an event, a goal or a date when victory in Iraq can indisputably be achieved.

What has President Bush said about achieving victory in Iraq? The President said the United States will stay the course and the next President will have to withdraw our troops from Iraq. It will be 2½ years, or 30 months, before this President leaves office. Does this mean America will spend another $300 billion on the war in Iraq? Does it mean America will suffer 18,000 more young people to war wounds and another 2,500 killed?

In October 2002, I warned that this administration would open a Pandora's box if the United States unilaterally went to war in Iraq. Mr. President, you opened Pandora's box with all its death and destruction of American and Iraqi lives. You cannot simply wash your hands of this war and leave it to the next President to withdraw our troops from Iraq.

It is time for America to demand accountability from the President and the Iraqi Government. It is time for an Iraqi accountability plan to bring this war to an end.

Because of America's sacrifice, the people of Iraq have been able to participate in a democracy by electing the leaders who will shape their young government and institute laws to protect them. This is a giant step towards accountability.

The formation of a new government in Iraq is more than just filling out a cabinet. It is an opportunity for the people of Iraq to accept responsibility for governing their country. This responsibility extends beyond voting or forming a new government or killing Abu Musab al Zarqawi. Now, is the time for Iraqis to be accountable for themselves and their developing country.

I believe that in order for the principles of democracy to take hold in Iraq, the target of the insurgency, our U.S. troops, must be removed as soon as possible!

The President must develop a strategy to bring our troops home. I believe America should demand from the Bush administration an Iraq Accountability Plan that will set clear and measurable goals. The United States has provided the Iraqis with an opportunity for freedom, democracy and self-governance. But it is the responsibility of the Iraqi people to seize the opportunity and set forth these principles in their land.

In this war; the truth lies in today's The Washington Post headline which states ''Iraq Amnesty Plan May Cover Attacks on U.S. Military.'' The war in Iraq has boiled down to amnesty for insurgents who attack and kill U.S. soldiers but no amnesty for the insurgents who kill Iraqi citizens. This amnesty proposal appears to have the tacit agreement of the Bush Administration for Iraqi government Officials stated, ''There's some sort of understanding between us and the UNF–I [The U.S.-led Multi-National Force-Iraq] that there is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks [on U.S. military personnel] are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely, I believe.''

If you vote ''yes'' on this Resolution, you are supporting the Iraqi Government's belief that it is ''ok'' to give Iraqi's amnesty for attacking and killing U.S. troops!

I cannot, and I will not support Resolution 861 which supports a government that pardons and justifies killing of 2,500 American personnel as Iraqi patriotism!

I will not support a resolution that leaves our commitment in Iraqi ''open-ended''; or which allows this President to hand over the Iraq war to the next President, 30 months from now; nor a resolution that does not have a strategy to end the war in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution!

H. RES. 861, IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution on the Iraqi war.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss what to do now, we must first acknowledge the fact that we cannot discuss an exit strategy for leaving Iraq without first stating what the entry strategy was, and then stating what we are trying to accomplish now.

We were originally told we invaded Iraq because they had weapons of mass destruction. That turned out not to be true. We were then told that we invaded Iraq because the Iraqi leaders were connected with the 9/11 attacks. That turned out not to be true. The rationale that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States was exposed as untrue even before the invasion.

A letter from the Director of the CIA to the Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee dated October 7, 2002, specifically stated that the CIA believed that Iraq and Saddam Hussein did not pose a terrorist threat to the United States and would not be expected to pose such a threat unless we attacked.

Mr. Speaker, after it became clear that there were no weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11, and that Iraq posed no terrorist threat to the United States, we have been subjected to the excuse of the week for being in Iraq.

We were told that we needed to capture Saddam Hussein for our safety. He has been in jail for over a year, and yet we are still in Iraq.

Then the rationale changed that we needed to capture al Zarqawi. We did that, and we are still in Iraq with no apparent plan to leave.

The rationale for this week is we are still in Iraq in order to establish a democracy. We have to recognize that the nature of a democracy is that it cannot be imposed on anyone. Further, if the purpose is to establish a democracy in Iraq, it is ironic that the citizens right here in Washington, D.C. cannot elect a representative to vote on this very resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that we made a mistake and the only sensible rationale for still being there is because we made a mess and we have a moral responsibility to clean up that mess. And so we have to acknowledge that we are in quagmire, and it will become clear that there are no good results that can occur.

Cut and run, bad result. Stay the course to prove we have resolve, bad result. Don't worry, be happy, bad result. Continue to pretend that success is around the corner, bad result. I use ''quagmire'' lightly because this administration's poor planning has strained our troops with many units in their second and third tours. Attacks on the United States are increasing, not decreasing. During the course of our occupation, the number of insurgents has dramatically increased, and our presence in Iraq has been counterproductive, just as the CIA predicted. As of today, 2,500 servicemembers have been killed and many more wounded.

Our military equipment is wearing out much faster than normal. Emergency reserve stocks have been stripped. We have endured the embarrassment of torture at Abu Ghraib prison and questionable detention policies at Guantanamo Bay, and we have not begun to effectively deal with the issue of corruption in private contracts.

Despite spending billions of dollars on electricity and reconstruction, over half of the Iraqi households lack clean water, and 85 percent lack reliable electricity.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be reminded when we first invaded Iraq the administration instructed the Budget Committee not to even budget for the war because it would cost so little. But now we have appropriated almost $400 billion, not including future medical costs for injured troops, and that has to be compared with the $7.4 billion that it cost us to defeat Iraq in the Persian Gulf war.

Meanwhile, we have problems at home. There are shortfalls in the Department of Veterans Affairs, cuts in first responder grants, only 5 percent of our containers in our ports are being screened, and the administration has failed to adequately implement the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, we are not more secure. We are less secure as a result of the war.

Many experts have concluded that the military has done as much as it can, and so our exit strategy must include the use of diplomacy and politics

using the lessons we have learned from our mistakes.

But today, instead of honestly assessing what we are going to do in Iraq, we are considering this resolution which repeats all of the disparaged reasons for the invasion and proclaims its success, not a civil war is just around the corner, and that we should follow the strategy of don't worry, be happy.

In contrast, any real debate would have us start with an honest assessment of our situation. But without articulating why we invaded in the first place and what we want to accomplish now that we are there, we cannot have an exit strategy. There can be no coherent discussion of an exit strategy while we are being directed by this resolution to accept the smiling face, don't worry be happy description of our situation in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IRAQ RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the time here tonight. There has been so much discussion today about the resolution on which we will vote tomorrow that we wanted to address that. And I have a friend with whom I went to Iraq in April, Congressman SHAYS from Connecticut, who will also be assisting in this hour.

I would just like to clarify for those who are interested what this resolution involves. Because the time is short remaining, I won't read all of the whereases, but I will go straight to what is normally referred to as wherefores.

Resolved that the House of Representatives honors all of those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders protecting the homeland, as servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, or in other roles.

□ 2330

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

Number 3, declares that it is not in the national security interests of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

Number 4, declares that the United States is committed to the completion the mission to create a sovereign, free secure and United Iraq.

Five, congratulates Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating, in increasing millions, in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq's new Constitution.

Number 6, calls upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other coalition partners to support the efforts of the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom.

And 7, declares that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

And I think that last point, Mr. Speaker, is the one on which there is so much dissension from the other side and there are a few Members on our side that are concerned, but it declares, we actually believe, and a positive vote tomorrow will indicate, we believe we are going to prevail in the global war on terror. And the truth of the matter is we don't have a choice. It is either prevail on the global war on terror, or be prepared to give up so many freedoms that I do not want to see this Nation give up. Far too many people have given their lives to get us what we have.

Now, one note I would like to address that has been brought up time and time again, well, the President lied to us about WMDs. There are no weapons of mass destruction. Well, we know there were at one time. But to hear it said over and over, and hear again today, during the day today, over and over, well, the President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. The President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. His administration lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. And I think the jury is still out. We are finding documents that apparently refer to things that were taken to Syria. There may be things that turn up that we haven't yet found.

But let's say, for argument purposes, that there are no weapons of mass destruction. You know, being a Christian

is part of who I am. We have been taught to forgive. I think it is high time, if the President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction, then let's forgive President Clinton for all those lies. Let's forgive his administration, people like Madeleine Albright that lied, and let's move on. Let's put that behind us and just get on down the road.

And I would like to say, I do appreciate the visitation that Congressman MURTHA makes to those who have been injured and harmed and to the grieving families. He is very devoted in his visitation. And it obviously, as I have talked to him, it obviously affects him, as it would any of us that see people suffer.

There in East Texas, in my district, we had a Private First Class Steven Wright who is 19 years old. Was killed, he was from Kilgore, Texas. And, you know, some us, this was before I got elected to Congress. But having spent 4 years in the Army, I have been to funerals enough, back in the days when people didn't come to service members' funerals. And they present the flag to the deceased family and say, on behalf of a grateful Nation and they would look around, go where is the grateful Nation. There is nobody here. Just a few friends. Where is the grateful Nation?

And so out of concern that there might not be many show up to that young man's funeral, this hero, Steven Wright from Kilgore, many of us showed up from around east Texas that have been in the service before. And I am telling you, that little rural church was a few miles from the cemetery there on Highway 31. And I ended up at the back, and I checked the mileage. There were cars creeping along three solid miles to have their opportunity at the cemetery to pay tribute to that young man and his family. And I saw them again Memorial Day, his family. They know what the price is. They are not ready for us to cut and run. They know that to do that would diminish the value of what Private Wyatt fought and died for.

We had a Marine that I visited 2 or 3 weeks ago from Marshall, Tony Flynn. He took a mortar round in the chest. And I think through the prayers and the grace of God, he is doing well. And his mom was there with him. He is doing well. I tell you, there have been so many sacrifices. How tragic if we were to cut and run and leave all that has been done. So close. I mean, democracy is right there within their grasp. And when I was with Congressman SHAYS and Congressman MARSHALL over there, we had a meeting, the leader of the Kurdish party, Shiia party, Sunni party, and in talking with them, one of the things I mentioned to them was that it is within their grasp. Just get the Prime Minister appointed. Get the cabinet appointed; that they can let this opportunity pass them by and they will be forgotten, or they can grasp it and they would be the George Washingtons and the John Adams and the Patrick Henrys of this next, well, of the next generations to come, as well as in the Middle East itself.

I couldn't help but note, my good friend Mr. SCOTT said there is no good result that can occur from what we are doing there. Well, I have got good news. There have already been good results. You took a country that had never experienced democracy, never knew democracy, and yet in 2005, that first election, there were fliers all over the country, little fliers, had two sentences in their language that simply said, you vote, you die. Despite those all over the countryside, people turned out in millions to vote. They did it again for a constitution, and they came out in even greater numbers, and the Sunnis participated in the election in December. I am so proud of the courage of those people.

And I would like, at this time, to yield to my friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS). As far I know, I don't believe there is any other Member of Congress that has been more times to Iraq to ensure that we are doing the right thing, that our money is being spent appropriately, that we are giving our troops the things they deserve because of his heartfelt desire, and he is a big hearted man. But his heartfelt desire to make sure that our people are protected, our guys in harm's way are getting what they need and we are doing the right thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in hearing from my good friend, Mr. SHAYS from Connecticut, on this subject at this time. I yield to Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And just to say that I appreciate the opportunity to appear with him and to have some dialogue.

Being to Iraq 12 times has been very interesting for me because what I have been able to do, I go every 3 or 4 months and I am able to kind of graph out how well we are doing or how well we are not doing and to have a sense of where we are headed.

If you were to just take April 2003 when I was there, and now, in June of 2006, you would say, well, we are not, things aren't as good as they were way back in April when everyone was euphoric. And if you are tempted to draw those two points you see a downward slope. But if you were an economist or anyone else looking at a graph you would say, well, what happened in between? Is the trend line up or is it down? Well, it has clearly been up. And the reason it has been up is that we saw a serious decline in what happened in Iraq shortly after we took over. We, unfortunately, allowed for the looting. We, unfortunately, didn't take charge of the munitions depots. So Iraqis got in there and took out a lot of armaments. And then we, and I think this was the biggest mistake. We allowed their army, their border patrol and their police to be disbanded.

Now, what we basically said to 26 million Iraqis is, you have no police, no border patrol and army. And then what we said to 150,000 troops, mostly Americans, is you have to be their army, their police and their border patrol. Really, an impossible task. And I say that with a lot of regret, but also with the recognition that explains why things really started to decline. And what you then saw is the fact that you saw the Iraqis have real concerns about the United States. We had said, you lay down your arms, don't fight, and we will work with you. And the Iraqis would say to me, why are you putting my brother and my father and my uncle, my cousin, my son, particularly my husband out of work? That was their argument. And they said, why can't they at least guard a hospital?

Well, those were very poignant words for me because the first death we had was Wilfredo Perez from Norwalk, a young man who was guarding a hospital. We had another death Tyanna Avery Felder, this young woman from Bridgeport. And then we lost another American, Jack Dempsey, a very young man who graduated from high school and wanted to be in the Marines, and he went in the Marines instead of going on to college. These three fine Americans from my district lost their lives. I can look their families in the eye and say, without any hesitation whatsoever, that they did not die in vain. I can say that so long as we don't abandon Iraq, leave prematurely.

When we dug this hole with no army, no police and border patrol, and asked our military, we saw the problems that we have seen. But then what did we do to turn this corner and head in the right direction? We started to train their police, their border patrol and their army. That is what we did. And we saw in 2005, extraordinary elections. I was there for the first election. It was one of the most thrilling things that I have ever seen in my entire life. We were in a Kurdish area, in Irbil, and we saw Iraqi women bringing their husbands and family members to vote. They were so excited that after they voted they celebrated. And I was so excited watching these brave people as they voted. And what I saw was something pretty extraordinary. What I saw were Iraqis thrilled with the opportunity to vote. And I asked if I could put my finger in that ink jar. And they looked at me and said, with some astonishment, no. You are not an Iraqi. And I thought, she could have said I wasn't a Kurd. But she said I wasn't an Iraqi. She didn't think of Sunni, Shiia and Kurd. In fact, when I go to Iraq and I will ask someone, are you a Kurd or a Shiia or a Sunni, they will say I am a Shiia, but I am married to a Sunni, or I will ask someone the same question. They will say, I am a Kurd. But sir, Kurds are Sunnis.

For me, it is an amazing thing to go to that country and to see the absolute conviction that Iraqis have that they can have a better future. And I think as I am seeing this, back here at home we are saying we need to leave. Again,

when I ask the Iraqis what is their biggest fear, their biggest fear is this, that you will leave us, that you will leave us before we can take hold of democracy and own it.

And I know my colleague made reference to the concept of lying. There is no question in my mind that anyone lied about weapons of mass destruction, not a scintilla of doubt about that issue. And I could confirm it in a whole host of ways. One is, we didn't let our troops go into Iraq until every one of them had protective chemical gear.

□ 2345

If we didn't think they had chemicals, if we didn't think they would use it, we sure as heck would not have spent our time doing that. What we should have made sure of was that they had body armor. So they did not have body armor. They had exactly what we thought they needed: protective gear against chemicals.

When I went to the Brits, the French, the Turks, the Jordanians, and the Iraqis, they all said this to me: He has weapons of mass destruction. Only the French said he wouldn't use it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time for the majority has expired.

Is there anyone from the minority that claims the additional time?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the remainder of the time being there is no one here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed until midnight.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. I am almost done for this part, and I would encourage the gentleman to stand up so we could have a little bit of a dialogue about this.

But when I read what he read in the resolution, declares that it is not in the national security interest of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, I think it is a very clear statement. If people think it is in the national interest to have an arbitrary date, they can vote ''no'' against this resolution and hold their head up high. If like you, Mr. GOHMERT, and I feel that it would be an absolute huge mistake, and, in fact, I am not aware of any war that has been won by setting arbitrary dates, then we would want this statement to stand and we would support it. This declares that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq. I believe the war in Iraq is a noble effort. I believe this describes exactly how I feel. If there are those who feel that we should not complete the mission to create a sovereign, free, and secure and united Iraq, they have the ability with their heads held high to vote against it.

I appreciate the opportunity we have had to debate these two very important points.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, you brought up the point about an arbitrary date earlier tonight and then again just now, and for illustration purposes I can't help but think about World War II. And here you had Hitler basically hunkered down trying to withstand the onslaught as Patton and the 3rd Army and Montgomery moved forward. What if Congress had demanded a date at that time or before then and said if we do not win by, say, December 1 of 1945, it is hard to imagine but you know good and well Hitler would never have killed himself. He would have been in a bunker saying if we can just hold out, if I can stay on the run and stay alive until December 1, I win and I will be alive and can carry on some other day and continue with basically guerrilla tactics.

As the gentleman from Connecticut has said, no war has ever been won by setting an arbitrary date beyond which we were not willing to fight. Once the enemy knows that there is a date and that is all they have to get by, then it is just a matter of their surviving until that date and then they win.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman will allow me to comment, I think the gentleman makes a very good point. I love to just think of the Revolutionary War and, being somewhat a student of history and loving history, thinking of when my professors would tell me that one-third of the American people supported the war against Great Britain, one-third opposed it, and one-third didn't care or didn't even know there was a war. But we were pretty divided. In fact, the war during that time we had families absolutely divided. And Benjamin Franklin's son was the governor of a State, did not want to give up that authority given to him by the crown, and opposed the war. Even among their own family, there was division.

But what I think about that Revolutionary War that just blows me away is George Washington had one failure after another after another. In fact, they said if the wind had been blowing the other way, he would have been captured in Manhattan. Thank goodness there was not the press that said we have made all these terrible mistakes, we need to leave. And it gets me to this point. We have made mistakes, but they do not justify leaving. What is justified is to stop making those mistakes and doing it the right way.

And if the gentleman would just indulge me a little longer, I am well aware that Abraham Lincoln was constantly criticized because his generals were not winning. In fact, his generals started criticizing him. In fact, a general ran against him in his reelection because they thought he was not fighting the war properly. So thank goodness we did not set an arbitrary date on either George Washington or Abraham Lincoln. Thank goodness we did not say because you have made mistakes, we have got to just stop.

Mr. GOHMERT. Of course, being a history major at Texas A&M, I also am a great fan of history and do believe the adage those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it. And then, of course, the follow-up to that is those who do learn from history will find new ways to mess up.

But going back to the Revolutionary War, the gentleman from Connecticut gives a great example. As history indicates, and McCullough did a great job of documenting this in his book 1776, before the victory December 24, 1776, where Washington crossed the Delaware, there was not much to really crow about. And as the gentleman well knows, that retreat from over to Manhattan with the superior British forces there could have been a disaster and would have been if the wind had been blowing the other way. But I think it was providential that fog came in and covered their retreat. But I believe it was on December 27, not only did the Congress not set an arbitrary date by which he had to win, they were so committed to victory, they passed a resolution that basically gave Washington whatever power he needed, whatever authority to spend money he needed to get the job done, to get the troops reassigned so that they could fight until they won the war. That is how committed they were. And in the cover letter, as I recall, and this is a testimonial to Washington's being the man for the time, it went along the lines of basically we submit a copy of the resolution and knowing that neither man nor his liberty will be in jeopardy with your having all this power, and then when it is no longer necessary, you will return it back, as well he did. But what a contrast to the discussion today to say, you know what, let us set an arbitrary date over here and then just pull out after that. We would not have had a successful conclusion to the American Revolution.

I would like to address something here. This is taken off-line from USA Today. And it says ''Text of a Document Discovered in Zarqawi's Safe House,'' and then it has updated June 15, 2006, 2:31 am, the Associated Press. And it says ''Text of a document discovered in terror leader Abu Musab al Zarqawi's hideout. The document was provided in English by Iraqi National security adviser Mouwafak al Rubaie. And this is supposedly from these guys, that it was discovered in a safe house. And it documents exactly the things that so many on the other side and a few on our side have been saying is not the case. Our own enemies have documented what Mr. SCOTT will be glad to know are good results that have been occurring.

And it goes on to say, and these are the terrorists writing this: ''As an overall picture, time has been an element in affecting negatively the forces of the occupying countries due to the losses they sustain economically and

human lives, which are increasing with time. However, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be of service to the American forces and harmful to the resistance.'' The terrorists call themselves resisters.

''For the following reasons:

Number one, ''By allowing the American forces to form the forces of the National Guard, to reinforce them and enable them to undertake military operations against the resistance.'' The resistance being the terrorists, which is just what the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) was saying earlier. We have been there. They are training them. Some opponents are saying we have not been able to train people, that they cannot protect themselves. Well, the terrorists are saying in this document that our forces have been able to form them and train them and reinforce them and enable them to undertake military operations.

Mr. SHAYS. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GOHMERT. I certainly will yield.

Mr. SHAYS. What is important in your dialogue is the terrorists. And there was this argument: Well, the terrorists are not in Iraq. I am not going to argue whether they were there before we went in, but no one can argue that they are not there now. In fact, the prince of the terrorists, al Zarqawi, was killed. He was killed operating and doing his handiwork in Iraq.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming the time, it is such a great point. He was killed.

I will tell you, I do not know if the gentleman has been hearing some of the ridiculous reports. One thing we have seen from this administration is they cannot keep secrets too well. The President went to Iraq without but a handful of people knowing. But if they try to keep a secret very long, somebody leaks from all over the place. And so there were some reports, and I couldn't help but shake my head, that said, We think they had Zarqawi on ice in a freezer somewhere and they just brought him out. And some have said he was beaten to death, that a bomb did not do that. Do you want to know how absurd that is? Can you imagine this administration having Zarqawi in a freezer somewhere for weeks and somebody not leaking that? I am sorry. That could not happen. That would have been leaked by somebody that they have got Zarqawi on ice.

Mr. SHAYS. I do not know, if that is the kind dialogue that has been happened in Texas. Most of my folks have recognized that we got him and it was due to good intelligence. But if I could, you are talking about this administration. Let me just talk briefly about what a former administration said, in other words, what Bill Clinton said, according to John A. Torres from the Florida Today on June 13 in a meeting he had on the 12th. He wrote, ''Former President Bill Clinton told Florida Democrats on Monday that Iraq's fledgling government would falter if the United States were to withdraw its troops. He also said more terrorists could emerge from that region without an American military presence.''

So he is arguing that without a presence it would be worse. Then he said, and this is a quote: '' 'The representative government there in Iraq is a hopeful sign,' '' Clinton said at a fundraising reception for the Florida Democratic Party at the Orlando Marriott downtown. 'But we need to stay there long enough for the politics to get worked out,' he said. 'If we withdrew tomorrow, that government couldn't survive.'

''Clinton said he didn't agree with the original decision to invade Iraq before finishing military operations in Afghanistan. However he said the focus now needs to be on stabilizing Iraq and he warned that occupying Iraq for too long would backfire.'' Too long it would backfire, but he is very clear: We cannot leave until we stabilize Iraq.

Mr. GOHMERT. Those are important words from our former President Clinton, who had said himself numerous times that they did have weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, that Saddam did, and I am glad to hear that he is recognizing that an arbitrary withdrawal would be devastating.

There are numerous other things here in this document. If I could just touch on a couple very briefly as our time comes to a conclusion. He goes through about how the picture is bleak, and he goes on to say: ''Based on the above points,'' and there were seven of them, ''it became necessary that these matters should be treated one by one.'' And he has a strategy. The strategy is to use the media for spreading an effective and creative image of the resistance, or otherwise the terrorists. Another point was to create division and strife between America and other countries and among the elements disagreeing with it. And then after seven more points, he says: ''In general and despite the current bleak situation, we think that the best suggestions in order to get out of this crisis,'' he calls it a crisis, ''is to entangle the American forces into another war . . . ''

Mr. SHAYS. This is al Qaeda that is saying that; correct?

Mr. GOHMERT. This would be al Qaeda that is saying this. They realize that they are in a crisis, they are big trouble, and that we are prevailing and that the situation looks bleak.

We believe the United States will prevail in the global war on terror and the noble struggle to protect freedom from terrorist adversaries will be all worthwhile.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 12, 13 and 14 on account of a family emergency.

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. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BALDWIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOHMERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 22.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, June 20.

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHAYS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4939. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Friday, June 16, 2006, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8088. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Importation of Small Lots of Seed Without Phytosanitary Certificates [Docket No. 02-119-2] (RIN: 0579-AB78) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8089. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standards for Privately Owned Quarantine Facilities for Ruminants [Docket No. 00-022-2] received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8090. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Baby Corn and Baby Carrots From Zambia [Docket No. 05-059-2] received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8091. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantined Areas; Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0046] received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8092. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Captive Cervids; Extend Interval for Conducting Reaccreditation Test [Docket No. 04-094-2] received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8093. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Suspension of Container Regulations [Docket No. FV06-922-1 IFR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8094. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Removal of Container Regulations [Docket No. FV06-923-1 IFR] received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8095. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV06-916/917-1 IFR] received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8096. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility Requirements for USDA Graded Shell Eggs [Docket No. PY-98-006] (RIN: 0581-AC50) received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8097. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Modifying Procedures and Establishing Regulations to Limit Shipments of Small Sizes of Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV05-905-2 FIR] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8098. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Terbacil; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0215; FRL-8057-9] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8099. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Minimal Risk Tolerance Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0487; FRL-8062-3] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8100. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Michigan [EPA-R05-OAR-2004-MI-0001; FRL-8167-2] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8101. 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; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County [R06-OAR-2005-NM-0003; FRL-8175-6] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8102. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2006-0261, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2006-0263, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2006-0264, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2006-0265, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2006-0266, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2006-0267; FRL-8159-5] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8103. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority of Louisiana [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-LA-0004; FRL-8159-1] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of intent to obligate funds for purposes of Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund (NDF) activities; to the Committee on International Relations.

8105. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental consolidated report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to keep Congress informed about the deployments of U.S. combat-equipped armed forces in support of the global war on terrorism, Kosovo, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, pursuant to Public Law 93-148; (H. Doc. No. 109–114); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

8106. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of State Acquisition Regulation (RIN: 1400-AB90) received June 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8107. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8108. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Sentancing Commission, transmitting a copy of the 2004 Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentancing Statistics, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(w)(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8109. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Grant and Cooperative Agreement Handbook — Patent Rights and Rights in Data, CSC Programs (RIN: 2700-AD24) received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

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. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 5136. A bill to establish a National Integrated Drought Information System within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to improve drought monitoring and forecasting capabilities; with an amendment (Rept. 109–503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 5622. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 5624. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Men's Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 5625. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to expand the scope of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, and House Administration, 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. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE, Mr. REYES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 5626. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 802 South Carrier Parkway in Grand Prairie, Texas, as the ''Alexander McRae Dechman Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 5627. A bill to prohibit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from providing insurance or financing to countries that subsidize their steel industries and for projects producing goods subject to antidumping duties, to require the United States to oppose the provision by the International Monetary Fund of assistance to countries which subsidize their steel industries, and to ban assistance by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to countries that subsidize their steel industries; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5628. A bill to provide for an initial period of admission of 36 months for aliens employed as diary workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 5629. A bill to provide for the same treatment of all individuals notified of possible qualification for low-income subsidies for purposes of enrollment and the waiver of late enrollment penalties under the Medicare part D program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 5630. A bill to enhance congressional oversight by requiring the President to transmit periodically to Congress a consolidated, comprehensive report on the implementation of the National Strategy for Victory in Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H. Res. 871. A resolution recognizing Sam Hornish, Jr. for winning the 90th running of the Indianapolis 500; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 111: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 414: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.

H.R. 615: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 952: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 997: Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1249: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1298: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1384: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1498: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1548: Mr. WYNN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1652: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1898: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2047: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 2061: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 2088: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2121: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2231: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 2423: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2567: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2828: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2869: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2962: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3063: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3198: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3427: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 3476: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3753: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 3762: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3950: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 4217: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 4229: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 4239: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 4318: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 4341: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 4366: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 4409: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4435: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4547: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 4560: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 4562: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LEE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BASS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. OTTER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LINDER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 4720: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 4725: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 4747: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4749: Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 4924: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4925: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 4994: Ms. HART.

H.R. 4997: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 5005: Mr. TERRY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 5023: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 5052: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 5088: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 5092: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HALL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HERGER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5146: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.

H.R. 5148: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 5150: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 5151: Ms. CARSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5159: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 5185: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 5188: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5189: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. HART.

H.R. 5198: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 5200: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 5201: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 5206: Mr. HERGER and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 5290: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 5312: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 5316: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 5322: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5325: Mr. GOODE and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 5396: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 5409: Ms. FOXX, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5453: Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 5464: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 5465: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5483: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 5494: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 5501: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 5507: Ms. FOXX and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5526: Mr. WAMP and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 5533: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 5538: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 5558: Mr. HAYES, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5560: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 5575: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 5588: Mr. BERRY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 5609: Mr. MACK.

H.R. 5611: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 5615: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.J. Res. 88: Mr. LINDER.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. LINDER.

H. Con. Res. 380: Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 384: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 415: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 419: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. Con. Res. 424: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 425: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 498: Mr. GILCHREST.

H. Res. 723: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H. Res. 765: Mr.SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 776: Mr. REHBERG and Mrs. CUBIN.

H. Res. 780: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H. Res. 786: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H. Res. 787: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 793: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BAKER, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. BACHUS.

H. Res. 800: Ms. HART.

H. Res. 838: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs.

BONO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Res. 845: Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 852: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Res. 858: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 863: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 867: Mr. WU and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 870: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *109th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006 *No. 77*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rev. H. Kenneth Dutille of Swans Island Atlantic Baptist Church in Swans Island, ME.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God of grace and glory, we turn to Thee today for motivation, guidance, and inspiration. Before we turn to today's challenges and opportunities, we would thank You for these few moments of prayer and meditations of heart.

Grant us greatness of spirit, to see Your all-encompassing view of the many traditions and customs from which we come.

The task before us is daunting; we need always to look upon the Almighty for understanding, wisdom, knowledge, and strength. May we be granted this day and in the days that lie ahead clear insight into the many problems and troubles that our great Nation faces.

Bless, O God, our Senators. They serve our Nation with poise and pride. Empower each to fulfill today's manifold responsibilities with courage and grace.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and forever. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thank you very much, Reverend Dutille.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this morning, at 10 a.m., the Senate will vote on the supplemental appropriations conference report. Following the vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the Defense authorization bill. The two managers have made substantial progress, but we will need to work through a number of amendments today in order to complete the bill in a timely fashion.

Those Senators who have amendments should be working with Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN to get in the queue. The Santorum amendment on Iran is the pending business and we will need to schedule a vote on that today. The majority leader has announced that Members should stay close to the floor so that we can make significant progress during today's session.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted that our opening prayer this morning was so eloquently delivered by the Reverend Ken Dutille of Swans Island Atlantic Baptist Church in my home State of Maine. It is a great pleasure to welcome him to the Senate today. In fact, as he offered the invocation in this Chamber 11 years ago, on October 18, 1995, it is a pleasure to welcome him back to the Senate today.

Pastor Dutille's words give direction and purpose to our work. His actions also inspire us; they are a vivid reminder of the commitment and compassion that exists among people of faith throughout our Nation.

His ministry is truly unique. His church is joined with churches on three other islands to form the Maine Sea Coast Mission. This nondenominational organization was founded more than a century ago to provide spiritual guidance and educational opportunities to the remote seafaring communities of Downeast Maine. In its early years, the mission's boat, which was called *Hope*, would deliver a minister to isolated island communities where there were no churches and books where there were no libraries.

Today, the *Sunbeam V* not only continues that vital work, but it also serves as a mobile health clinic bringing medical services—including screenings, inoculations, and telemedicine—to four islands that otherwise would not have access to medical services.

Pastor Dutille is the founder of another outstanding mission project, the Bread of Life Food Pantry on Swans Island. The food pantry is often all that stands between the pangs of hunger and a healthy meal for some people in this disadvantaged area of my State. Although the demands upon the food pantry are always considerable, they increased exponentially this last July when the only grocery store on Swans Island was destroyed by fire. The pastor and the rest of the mission community immediately rose to the challenge with a major fundraising campaign. The power of God was evident in their strength of purpose as they responded to this crisis.

The pastor is a fisher of people and a person of many accomplishments. He is a graduate of the Baptist Bible College in Springfield, MO, as well as of the University of Maine. He holds a master's degree from the California Graduate School of Theology. He has served in churches throughout Maine and has

Printed on recycled paper.

preached throughout New England. He is a published author, too, and a successful small business owner. He has also had experience that all of us can relate to. In a previous community, he served as a town selectman, so he has a keen understanding of the challenges of public service, as his opening prayer demonstrated today.

It is a great pleasure to have such a dedicated spiritual and civic leader with us today and giving the opening prayer. I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues in extending him a warm welcome and in giving thanks for his inspiring prayer.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 10 a.m., with the first half of the time under the control of the majority leader or his designee and the second half of the time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I just got word that the 2,500th soldier was killed in Iraq. It is a milestone, obviously, that we all mourn deeply in this country. And that is what I rise to talk about, as a few of those who have died in the line of duty were from my State.

Mr. President, May was an especially difficult month for our home State of Nevada. We mourn the loss of four soldiers and marines who were killed in action in Iraq and Afghanistan. One soldier was killed during training. And just last week, another soldier from Winnemucca, NV, was killed. While there is incomparable grief following these deaths, there is also strength and pride that never ceases to amaze me.

I had the opportunity to attend two of the recent funerals: the funeral of 1SG Carlos Saenz at Arlington National Cemetery and the funeral of SGT John Griffith at the Southern Nevada Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Boulder City. Each funeral I have attended and each family who grieves finds a very special place in my heart, and they will always stay with me.

1SG Sergeant Carlos Saenz was born in Mexico. He became a naturalized citizen and considered himself extremely lucky and proud to have been an American, as we all should. And for more than 25 years, he dedicated himself to serving this country. His wife Nanette is a woman of great strength who understood her husband's determination and commitment to our country. They actually met during the first Persian Gulf war. She is proud of him, and we are all blessed that he came to the United States and was willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for his new Nation.

SGT John Griffith lived in Las Vegas most of his life. He told his wife Christa that he was fighting this war so their son would not have to. I will never forget the image of his two young daughters, just as the funeral had ended and they were taking the coffin out. As they were putting it into the hearse, I heard his two young daughters crying, and I heard one of them say: Don't let them take daddy.

That is the real pain of war coming home to a family, and we should all remember the sacrifices that not only the men and women in uniform who have died have made but also the sacrifices and the pain their families go through.

I also had the opportunity to speak with Victoria Legaspi, the mother of SSG Emmanuel Legaspi. Manny was born in the Philippines and signed up in the Army at the age of 32, after living in the United States for only 1 year. He wanted to give back to this country, and he wanted to show his appreciation. Manny should make all of us a little more proud to be Americans.

We live in the greatest country in the world—where brave Americans such as Carlos, John, and Manny, and so many others believe so deeply in our freedom that they are willing to sacrifice their lives so that we can all live safe and free. These men follow a distinguished line of courageous men and women who have paid that ultimate price for this Nation.

They are not the only ones who have made this sacrifice. As I mentioned before, the families, and one woman in particular, Helena Lukac, have touched my heart. Helena Lukac moved to the United States in 1983 from the former Communist Czechoslovakia. Her son John was killed by a roadside bomb attack in Iraq. He was just 19 years old. Helena knows what it means to be free better than most of us. On Memorial Day, just a few weeks ago, Helena said:

> I'm really grateful that we are here, even with this loss. I miss him so much, I feel it on my own skin. This freedom is not free.

Mr. President, freedom is not free. The brave men and women in our military and their families sacrifice greatly for us, and we can never thank them enough, but we can express our gratitude to them.

So today I again say thank you to the men and women who stand tall in defense of this Nation and in support of our freedom. You make us proud. And with a very heavy heart, I thank the families across America and across my State whose pain I cannot even begin to imagine. Your loss is our Nation's loss. God bless you all, and God bless this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senate is going to be considering in just a few minutes the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. I do want to be clear that like most of my colleagues, I will be voting for this bill because it does provide the funding for our troops that is critically needed to carry out their mission and because it supports recovery efforts along the coast. I do wish to express three concerns I have with the conference report.

First, this bill continues the charade that this war should be funded off budget. Instead of including the money our troops need in the regular budget as requested by the President and sent to us, we keep getting sent emergency supplemental requests. It is clear to me, having been here for 13½ years, that emergency spending bills used to be for emergencies, things we could not foresee such as natural disasters. The need for funding for the war in Iraq is not a surprise. It is not like responding to an earthquake or tornado. By funding the war off budget, I fear we continue to hide the true cost of the war. It is imperative that the Senate and the House get a budget from the President that gives us the true cost of what we need to be funding.

In addition, the administration should not have the sole authority to decide what is worthy of emergency funding and what is not. We have emergencies in our backyard as well as overseas. We should not hand over to the President the final authority on what deserves emergency funding.

The second concern I have is that this bill leaves out very critical funding for areas we considered and adopted in the Senate. They were removed once the bill went to conference. Funding for health care, for port security, emergency transportation assistance in the gulf coast—much of the progress we made in the Senate was thrown out. Why? To meet an arbitrary limit set by the President. That is going to hurt many of our communities in the coming months.

Part of what we did in the Senate in April was to overwhelmingly pass the Murray-Akaka amendment that ensured our veterans would get the help they need. That amendment had broad bipartisan support on the Senate floor. It was removed in conference in the middle of the night. That is a huge setback for the men and women who are coming home from the war today and entering a VA system that is overwhelmed and underfunded. In March, the VA told us they are seeing 38 percent more Iraqi war veterans than they budgeted for. Veterans now have to wait a year to get the specialty care they deserve. Some are waiting more than 18 months before they get the benefits they have been promised. On top of that, we have waiting lists that are thousands of names long at major VA hospitals. I am frustrated that the

funding we secured for America's veterans is no longer in the bill before us. Our veterans deserve better.

Funding was also removed for emergency transportation relief in the gulf. In the Senate, we passed $200 million in emergency assistance for transit authorities in the gulf region. FEMA, which is helping to fund transit service in New Orleans, is going to stop the funding for that at the end of this month. That is going to force New Orleans to cut back transit service even more. Cutting off transit routes is not going to help our gulf coast cities recover. Throwing busdrivers on unemployment lines is not going to help them recover.

Another item cut from the legislation was tenant-based rental assistance for the gulf. That funding was intended to serve about 44,000 families, including families that received HUD funding prior to Katrina and many homeless families. The bill we passed in the Senate expanded the purposes of that money to include the reconstruction and repair of HUD projects in the afflicted region, many of them damaged considerably. It provided vouchers for about 4,500 needy citizens in the region, particularly the disabled and homeless. That funding is now gone, and we are going to see some pretty vulnerable families in the gulf coast without any ability to stay in the homes in which they currently are trying to stay.

Finally, this bill improperly includes a budget ceiling that is going to affect every single spending bill we do this year. I believe the supplemental emergency spending bill is the wrong place to enact a budget that never passed the Senate floor. It is going to be hard enough to produce appropriations bills this year that will get broad bipartisan support at the levels the Senate approved back in March. It will be almost impossible to do so if we ignore amendments adopted on the Senate floor and impose the spending ceiling proposed by the President that is now included in the bill.

I am frustrated that the administration keeps funding this war off budget. I am frustrated that critical investments which we approved in the Senate were removed from the bill. I am very frustrated that this bill is now going to result in our hands being tied throughout the appropriations process. I hope in the future we can do much better.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006—CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I intend to vote for this emergency supplemental appropriations conference agreement because of the critical funding it will provide to our troops. Our men and women in uniform, and their families, deserve our support, not just in words but with deeds. This bill also provides important support to our fellow Americans in the gulf coast region who continue to rebuild their communities after the devastation of the 2005 hurricane season.

But I am disappointed that important provisions included in the Senate bill were stripped out in conference. With nearly 150,000 U.S. troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is shameful that this conference report stripped out $430 million for veterans health care. And I am concerned that this bill short changes the U.S. Coast Guard and important port security measures. Through the regular appropriations process, I will continue to fight for our veterans, and to ensure the security of our coast and our ports.

In this bill, we have provided over $15 billion to fix or replace equipment that has been damaged during combat operations and to buy additional force protection equipment desperately needed by our brave men and women on the battlefield.

To help protect our troops from deadly improvised explosive devices, IEDs, this bill creates the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund and provides the fund with nearly $2 billion to develop and field the necessary tactics, equipment, and training to defeat these deadly weapons.

To ensure that we do all we can to care for soldiers when they are injured, this bill includes an additional $1 billion for the Defense Health program. This money ensures that we can continue to provide world-class services including rapid aero-medical evacuation to our most severely wounded soldiers.

The veterans health care system is stretched to the limit at a time when more and more veterans are turning to VA. That is why I cosponsored an amendment by Senator AKAKA to increase veterans funding by $430 million to meet the health care needs of soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan and other war veterans. I am very disappointed that this funding was removed in conference but will continue to fight for our veterans to ensure they have the funding needed to receive the care they deserve.

The rank-and-file employees of the Federal Government are the unsung heroes of this country. Unfortunately, they are often required to work in substandard or often hazardous conditions. It was recently reported that employees within this very building are forced to enter tunnels full of asbestos and on the verge of collapse. That is why I cosponsored an amendment by Senator ALLARD that provides over $27 million for critical emergency structural repairs to the Capitol Complex utilities tunnels. I will continue to fight for our Federal workforce to ensure they have safe working environments and proper safety equipment.

We know that nearly 40 percent of the soldiers deployed today in Iraq and Afghanistan are citizen soldiers who come from the National Guard and Reserves. More than half of these will suffer a loss of income when they are mobilized because their military pay is less than the pay from their civilian job. Many patriotic employers and State governments eliminate this pay gap by continuing to pay them the difference between their civilian and military pay. The reservist pay security amendment, which I worked on with Senator DURBIN, was designed to ensure that the U.S. Government also makes up for this pay gap for Federal employees who are activated in the Guard and Reserves. Again, this important piece of legislation was removed from the bill during conference, but it is not dead with me. I will continue to push for equitable treatment for our Guard and Reserve troops who selflessly serve their Nation.

After 9/11, we realized that our borders were not secure. Since then, we have waged the war on terror and made great strides in protecting our homeland. We have made significant investments in law enforcement and security; however, the infrastructure that supports our border security has been allowed to crumble.

To counter this, I supported an amendment proposed by Senators GREGG and BYRD to add $1.9 billion for border security initiatives to include buying additional vehicles, airplanes, helicopters, and ships. This amendment also provided $600 million for the U.S. Coast Guard, the border protector of our waters. Of this amount, $12 million was for the Mission Effectiveness Program at the U.S. Coast Guard Yard at Curtis Bay, MD. This project is designed to extend the service life and increase the mission performance of the Coast Guard's aging fleet of medium endurance cutters. I regret that in conference the House and Senate agreed to

the President's border security proposal which solely focuses on beefing up the National Guard and border agents along the Nation's southwest border.

I am also disappointed that $648 million for additional port security initiatives was stripped from the final conference agreement. The Port of Baltimore, in my hometown, recently celebrated its 300th anniversary. It is my responsibility to see to it that the Baltimore community celebrates the port's 400th anniversary. We must continue to provide adequate funding for our ports in the manner we are for our borders.

We have all seen the devastating effects of natural disasters and terrorism and are working hard to prevent future occurrences from affecting our Nation and the world. We have recently learned of another potential threat: a worldwide flu epidemic that could cost millions of lives if we are unprepared. In response to this threat, this bill provides $2.3 billion to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic. Making this money available now will help expand the domestic production capacity of influenza vaccine and will help develop and stockpile the right vaccines, antivirals, and other medical supplies necessary to protect and preserve lives in the event of an outbreak.

Mr. President, this bill is a Federal investment in supporting our troops and their families and providing relief for those impacted by the devastating hurricanes.

We support our troops by getting them the best equipment and the best protection we can provide. We support them by making it easier for our citizen soldiers in the National Guard and Reserves to serve their country. And we support them by ensuring they are cared for with the best possible medical system when they are injured or ill.

With this bill, we are also helping our neighbors rebuild their homes, their communities, and their lives, and I am proud to give it my support.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the conference report we have before us contains $94.5 billion in funding for the war on terror, hurricane recovery in the gulf coast, pandemic flu preparation, and border security.

We have to fund our troops. Therefore, I will support passage of this conference report. But I do so with reservations, mainly because resources for the training and equipping of the Iraqi army have been funded well below the level requested by the President. As all of my colleagues know, training and equipping the Iraqi army is imperative to the ultimate success of our mission there. The security of the Iraqi people, ensured by a properly trained and equipped Iraqi army, is our exit strategy.

Unfortunately, the must-pass nature of this bill has led to the inclusion of hundreds of millions of dollars in unrequested, nonemergency spending and typical run-of-the-mill earmarks. Examples of unrequested and nonemergency additions to this emergency spending bill include three Marine Corps V–22 tilt rotor aircraft, two KC–130J tanker aircraft, four C–130J cargo aircraft, the advance procurement of seven C–17 cargo aircraft, and one Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, UAV. It also includes $975 million for SINCGARS tactical radios, $675 million in Army tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle upgrades, $130 million for Army STRYKER vehicles above combat losses, and $567 million for Army trucks. None of these were requested by the administration, and they are not critically needed to aid in the war on terror.

Let's take a closer look at just one of these add-ons. The conference report includes $230 million to buy three Marine Corps V–22s. The President did not request any money for the V–22 Osprey, which is still in the development and testing stage. In fact, the V–22 has not even been deployed to an operational squadron yet. If continued development and testing goes well, the Marine Corps will send the V–22 to an operational squadron in the summer or fall of 2007. I have to question why funding for a nonoperational aircraft that is still in the development stages is considered to be an emergency in this bill. The answer is that there is no emergency need for this aircraft—if there was, I am more than confident that the President would have requested the appropriate funding in the emergency supplemental submitted last February.

Additionally, the conference report contains a provision which authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse shipbuilding contractors for ''business disruptions'' that were incurred during and after Hurricane Katrina. This provision may increase Navy shipbuilding costs by $140 million over what the administration had requested. The provision is expected to primarily benefit Northrop Grumman's shipyard in Pascagoula, MS. This language substitutes Government funding for what insurers would pay to shipbuilders. Northrop Grumman is suing its insurer, Factory Mutual, for those costs associated with Hurricane Katrina. However, in the near term, the appropriators have decided the best course is to arrange a giveaway to an insurance company and a shipbuilder.

Furthermore, the explanatory statement accompanying this conference report contains language stating that the conferees agree with House and Senate language delaying the Department of Transportation, DOT, rulemaking which proposes to give domestic air carriers with foreign investors more control over business matters. Yet this legislative language does not include any related provisions, and rightly so, in my view. This greater control would only be granted for business matters that do not relate to safety or security and only when the investors' home countries provide our airlines with investment and market access. I assure my colleagues this statement was not included by accident, and its intent seems to be to signal to DOT that Congress does not approve of its proposed rulemaking.

Here are some other notable projects funded as ''emergencies'' in this measure: $16 million for hurricane repair in the State of Pennsylvania; $40 million for sugar and sugarcane disaster assistance in Florida, which was not requested; $40 million for sugar and sugarcane disaster assistance in Louisiana, which was not requested by the President; $400,000 for disaster assistance to sugar cooperatives in Texas, which was not requested by the President. $400,000 to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Demonstration barrier, which was not requested by the President; $9 million in drought emergency assistance to communities in Nevada and New Mexico; $225,000 to the Missouri Soybean Association for the purchase of a building for use as an incubation center in the Kansas City metropolitan statistical area; $100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Washington in Silver Spring, MD for renovation of Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater Washington Clubhouse No. 2, Clubhouse No. 4, Clubhouse No. 10, Clubhouse No. 11, and Clubhouse No. 14 in the District of Columbia; $100,000 to Wesleyan College in Macon, GA, for facility renovation, buildout, and construction; $125,000 to Craig County, VA, for purchase, renovation, buildout, and upgrade of a library.

I think we can fund this war—and indeed win this war—while also budgeting for this war. We know the war is going to cost more than the over $400 billion we will have appropriated to date upon enactment of this conference report, and we know that the war is not going to end as quickly as most of us would prefer. But we need to continue our military operations until the job is done. Withdrawing our military presence prematurely is not an option in my view, the view of many of my colleagues, nor the view of the President or his advisers. We are in it to win.

Instead of fixing the problem, and fixing it will not be easy, we have only succeeded in making it bigger, more unstable, more complicated, and much more expensive. And adding hundreds of billions of dollars that are more conveniently designated as emergency expenditures—so that they don't have to be budgeted for along with other national priorities—is only making the fiscal problem that much greater.

Again, Mr. President, it is unfortunate that, at a time of war and with such a huge deficit and burgeoning debt, we continue to fund unnecessary projects and load up emergency supplemental appropriations bills with nonemergency items. We need to concentrate on providing the resources necessary for our young men and women swerving in Iraq to successfully complete their mission, so that they

can return safely to their families, and a grateful Nation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the conference report provides needed funds to meet a number of our national security needs. It includes $65.8 billion of funding for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, to give our troops the armored vehicles, ammunition, medical supplies, and other materials essential for their operations.

The legislation also provides funds for the Commander's Emergency Response Program, which enables commanders on the ground to pay for urgently needed infrastructure, and also to make condolence payments to Iraqi civilians who are injured or killed. That program is intended to build good will with the Iraqis, and I commend the Appropriations Committee for taking such a strong interest in it.

During consideration of the bill, we had a strong debate about whether the nondefense items in the bill were truly emergencies and belonged in this legislation. Most of us believe they do because the budget process does not allow us to respond quickly to urgent needs, and the emergency supplemental process is the only way we can address them.

It is clear that border security, hurricane relief, and pandemic flu preparations all affect our national security. The need for these funds cannot easily be assessed in advance and made part of the regular budget. But no one can disagree that each has a profound impact on our Nation and has to be addressed.

I commend Senator HARKIN for his leadership on the needed funding to prepare for a pandemic flu. Those of us on the authorizing committee look forward to continuing to work with Senator BURR to see that these funds are used effectively to increase the Nation's readiness for this major disease threat.

I am disappointed that the conference report rejected our Senate amendment to compensate first responders injured by experimental flu vaccines. If pandemic flu reaches our shores, Americans will have to rely heavily on nurses, paramedics, emergency technicians, and other first responders. The question is whether these first responders will risk taking an experimental vaccine so that they can stay on the job and protect us all. The least these brave first responders deserve is fair compensation if they are harmed by the vaccine. We know from past experience that without such a compensation program, first responders will be reluctant to take experimental vaccines. The Senate did the right thing, to fund a compensation program, but Republican leaders inexplicably allowed the House conferees to reject the funds. The message we are sending to first responders is obvious—''You're on your own'' and a pandemic will be even more disastrous if it hits.

I am very pleased, however, that our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee included critical funding to provide relief to elementary and secondary schools in the gulf region and to schools across the country that generously opened their doors to young students whose lives were turned upside down by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. This additional funding will help ensure that the schools that educated displaced students are reimbursed for the additional costs incurred during this school year so that they can continue to provide good education for all the children they serve.

The schools, colleges, and universities are a cornerstone of the gulf communities, and their recovery is essential to the successful rebuilding of the region. I am disappointed that the conferees rejected a Senate provision that would have leveraged hundreds of millions of dollars of low-cost loans for these colleges and universities. I am pleased, however, that the conferees increased the grant aid in the bill to help these colleges and universities rebuild. These funds are a step in the right direction to enable these institutions to remain a vital part of the gulf coast.

On the issue of education, we know that countless families across America are struggling to put their children through college. The last thing they need is an increase in interest rates on student loans. I commend the Appropriations Committee for expanding loan consolidation options and resisting efforts by lenders to increase the burden of college debt. Last February, Congress perpetrated the biggest raid on college aid in the history of the program, cutting $12 billion from student loan programs to help pay for tax giveaways to the wealthy. We need to do more to help struggling families afford college, and the committee's action on this bill is a step in the right direction.

This bill includes an important provision to support our objective of promoting democracy in Iraq. It includes $50 million for American nongovernmental organizations helping Iraqis to create the essential building blocks of democracy. The funds will go to seven nongovernmental organizations doing excellent work in Iraq on democracy and reconciliation under extremely difficult and dangerous conditions. We must be clear in our commitment to stand by these organizations that are serving on the front lines in the struggle for democracy in Iraq every day. We need to demonstrate to the Iraqi people that we are committed to Iraq's long-term democratic development. We must have a long-term strategy backed by appropriate resources, and this bill is a start toward achieving our goal.

While this bill contains much that is positive, I strongly oppose the decision of our Republican colleagues to include a deeming resolution in this conference report that will impose an unreasonably low limit on discretionary spending for next year. This cap means that critical domestic programs will be cut. It is a sorry substitute for a real budget.

The deeming resolution completely ignores the Senate-passed budget. It sets a spending cap $16 billion below the level approved by a bipartisan majority of Senators in the Senate budget resolution. It wipes out an amendment passed by the Senate to add $7 billion for urgent health and education needs. It cuts funding for vital medical research by the National Institutes of Health. It underfunds the No Child Left Behind education initiative by $55.7 billion over the next 5 years. It sets the wrong priorities for America.

This deeming resolution indicates a willingness on the part of Republicans in Congress to blindly follow the Bush administration's reckless strategy of cutting essential domestic programs American families depend upon while providing more and more tax breaks for the wealthiest taxpayers in the country. It is outrageous. It is one more failure for a Republican leadership that consistently takes the country in the wrong direction.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to acknowledge a tangible result of our Federal Government's investment in preparing for a possible flu pandemic. This week, the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, in partnership with the Wildlife Conservation Society launched the Global Avian Influenza Network for the Surveillance of wild birds, or the GAINS program.

GAINS systematically tests and monitors wild and dead birds to identify the viral strains they carry, to share the virus samples in order to continually update vaccine production options, and to disseminate lab results on a map-based publicly accessible database. Major flyways around the world will be monitored including those running north-south through the Americas.

I wish to recognize Chairman COCHRAN from Mississippi and Senator BYRD from West Virginia, along with my colleagues, Senator HARKIN from Iowa, Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania, and Senator BROWNBACK from Kansas, for their commitment to avian flu preparedness and for putting in place an effective system for the surveillance of wild birds. GAINS is instrumental to our capacity to prepare communities in the wake of wild birds moving with the virus for a potential outbreak.

At the same time we work to develop a vaccine and procure antivirals, we can also track the movement of the virus in wild birds. GAINS can track wild birds in the same way the National Hurricane Center tracks hurricanes. By analyzing, storing, and reporting using a real-time computerized data mapping system and interface, we can see the viral strains wild birds carry, where they are carrying the virus along migratory routes, and how the virus is genetically evolving. This will make it possible for us to develop

vaccines more quickly using the most recent strain available and will help us warn vulnerable populations in wild bird flightpaths should the avian flu strain turn deadly.

I am happy to report that the GAINS program and Dr. William Karesh at the Wildlife Conservation Society have already contributed vital disease samples of the highly pathogenic H5N1 virus from Mongolian swans to the efforts currently under way to develop a human vaccine for avian influenza.

The Wildlife Conservation Society has partnered with USAID and the CDC to spearhead this effort. They are an international conservation organization headquartered at the Bronx Zoo in New York and have offices across the world, including my home State of Connecticut. With more than 3,000 full-time staff working in 60 countries around the world on more than 400 field conservation projects, the Wildlife Conservation Society is well positioned to lead the global efforts to monitor the disease in birds and provide key information to local communities to mitigate the effects of future outbreaks. Our Government's capacity to build partnerships such as this one and continue to fund them with nongovernmental organizations with tremendous expertise and others in the private sector is key to effectively fighting a potential pandemic.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, this supplemental appropriation provides funds that are urgently needed by our Armed Forces to sustain the global war on terror and our operations to stabilize Iraq and Afghanistan. The $70 billion provided in this appropriation for military operations brings America's investment in this fight to over $445 billion since September 11, 2001. Included in this appropriation are funds necessary to keep our Guard strong and ready and to ensure that our reservists have access to essential medical coverage for themselves and their families.

With respect to domestic assistance in this bill, while it is not perfect, because it removed funding for port security and veterans' health care, and greatly reduced the amount of agriculture assistance that was originally included in the Senate passed bill, it does provide immediate aid to the people of the gulf coast to help in their continuing effort to recover from last year's hurricanes.

I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator COCHRAN of Mississippi and Senator BYRD of West Virginia, for their leadership and even handedness in crafting this supplemental measure. They have been very kind towards my constituents and I am most appreciative of their efforts. This supplemental addresses three areas critical to the continued recovery and vitality of Florida.

Florida was hit by eight hurricanes in 15 months and the recovery continues, even as Tropical Storm Alberto traversed the State yesterday. I know that my colleagues from the gulf coast are also well aware of the long-term challenges facing their States and are bracing themselves for another active hurricane season. We all learned valuable lessons from the disasters of the past 2 years and we will face the coming months together.

I am pleased that this supplemental includes some relief for the State of Florida's hard hit agriculture industry. In 2005 as in 2004, the Florida agriculture industry sustained more than $2 billion in losses. One of the hardest hit industries was the sugar industry, so the $40 million in assistance this bill provides to the sugar producers will be critical. Our specialty crops and nursery growers also will receive a much-needed share of the $95 million provided in the bill.

The measure also provides the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, with emergency funding. I cannot emphasize how important the work of this agency is to Florida. It includes the National Marine Fisheries Service, NMFS, that plays a key role in Florida because of our significant fishing industry—both recreational and commercial. And the National Weather Service whose hurricane forecasts many times mean the difference between life and death for Floridians. This emergency supplemental provides $150 million for mapping for debris removal, oyster bed and shrimp ground rehabilitation, the repair and reconstruction of the NOAA science facility on the Gulf of Mexico and a replacement emergency response mapping aircraft to provide information about hurricane damage—all desperately needed.

Additionally, the conference report maintains the Senate funding level of $5.2 billion for the Community Development Block Grant, CDBG, program. The President's original request was for $4.2 billion to address the utter devastation caused by Katrina in Louisiana. Yet unmet needs from the previous Gulf of Mexico hurricanes still remain in Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas. This level of CDBG funding will ensure that all States harmed by last year's hurricanes will receive an adequate level of continued support so that they may continue to invest in long-term recovery efforts, provide housing and business assistance, perform infrastructure reconstruction, and undertake mitigation efforts.

Specific to Florida, additional CDBG funds will greatly help Panhandle communities impacted by Hurricane Dennis, who were not eligible for the last round of disaster CDBG funds, and the heavily populated areas of South Florida where insured damages from Wilma were estimated at $7.4 billion. Hurricane Wilma was a major hurricane, the final major storm of last season, causing the highest amount of insured losses to southeast Florida since Hurricane Andrew over a decade ago.

Chairman BOND and Ranking Member MURRAY included a provision in the bill that will help address the backlog of emergency highway repairs. I thank them for their efforts, as this provision is vital to Florida's Panhandle which was pummeled by Hurricane Ivan in 2004 and then by Dennis in 2005. It includes language lifting the mandatory cap of $100 million in spending per state. Florida has about $118 million in damages left over from Dennis, most of it concentrated along US–98, which runs along the coast of Florida from Tallahassee to Pensacola, a distance of over 200 miles.

The assistance contained in the supplemental will go a long way towards the recovery of the gulf coast and I will support this measure.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is approving today the conference report on this supplemental appropriations bill.

The bill provides funding to replenish the spending accounts of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, as well as other agencies and departments of the Government which are engaged in the war on terror. The conference report also makes available needed funding for efforts to repair and rebuild the homes, businesses, and public facilities that were damaged by hurricanes that struck the Gulf Coast region last year.

A bipartisan majority of the conferees have reconciled the differences between the two bills and reached agreement on the conference report. The House also approved the conference report by a vote of 351 to 67.

The conference agreement provides a total of $94.519 billion. Of this amount, over $70 billion is provided to carry out the global war on terror and to cover the expenses of ongoing operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Title II of the agreement provides $19.338 billion for hurricane related damage and recovery costs. Title III provides $500 million for agriculture disaster assistance to hurricane affected areas. Title IV includes $2.3 billion for influenza pandemic preparation and response activities. Title V provides $1.9 billion for various border security initiatives. Title VI includes $27.6 million for the Architect of the Capitol to address health and safety concerns in the utility tunnels in the Capitol complex. Finally, title VII includes general provisions and technical corrections.

This conference agreement is the result of hard work and true compromise between the House and Senate, and I am pleased the Senate is prepared to approve it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Dole	Martinez
Alexander	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Allen	Durbin	Menendez
Baucus	Ensign	Mikulski
Bayh	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Graham	Obama
Boxer	Grassley	Pryor
Brownback	Gregg	Reed
Bunning	Hagel	Reid
Burns	Harkin	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Salazar
Byrd	Hutchison	Santorum
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Carper	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Jeffords	Shelby
Clinton	Johnson	Smith
Coburn	Kennedy	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Stabenow
Coleman	Kohl	Stevens
Collins	Kyl	Sununu
Conrad	Landrieu	Talent
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Thomas
Craig	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Levin	Vitter
Dayton	Lieberman	Voinovich
DeMint	Lincoln	Warner
DeWine	Lott	Wyden
Dodd	Lugar	

NAYS—1

Specter

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, today I voted in favor of the fiscal year 2006 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery conference report despite my serious reservations about using an emergency supplemental bill to fund ongoing U.S. operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and despite the fact that the bill fails to change the flawed and dangerous policy in Iraq that this administration is pursuing. That policy is taking a tremendous toll on our Nation's resources and our national security, and I will continue to look for every opportunity to force the Senate to debate and vote on changing that policy.

I supported the conference report because it included necessary funding for our troops, along with vital assistance to those communities devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and to those suffering in war-torn countries and those countries in need of immediate funding for their newly formed democracies. I am particularly pleased to see that $618 million is being provided for establishing peace in Darfur and $63 million for supporting the nascent Liberian Government that was recently elected.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I thank all Senators for their patience and support during our deliberations on this conference report. I think the vote reflects strong sentiment that we have reached an agreement that is fair. It reflects respect for the administration's budget request and remaining within that budget request.

I appreciate the cooperation of all members of our Appropriations Committee and the full Senate as well.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Department of Defense authorization bill is the pending business before the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2766, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Santorum amendment No. 4234, to authorize, with an offset, assistance for pro-democracy programs and activities inside and outside Iran, to make clear that the United States supports the ability of the people of Iran to exercise self-determination over their own form of government, and to make enhancements to the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act of 1996.

McCain amendment No. 4241, to name the act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending to the Defense authorization bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, there are two amendments pending.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that those amendments be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4253

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 4253.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a pilot program on troops to nurse teachers)

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. PILOT PROGRAM ON TROOPS TO NURSE TEACHERS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and potential benefits of a program to—

(A) assist nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in achieving necessary qualifications to become nurse educators and in securing employment as nurse educators at accredited schools of nursing;

(B) provide scholarships to nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in return for continuing service in the Selected Reserve or other forms of public service; and

(C) help alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(2) DURATION.—Except as provided in subsection (h), the pilot program shall be conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2012. A nurse corps officer may not enter into an agreement to participate in the pilot program after December 31, 2012.

(3) REGULATIONS.—The pilot program shall be conducted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The pilot program required by subsection (a) shall be known as the ''Troops to Nurse Teachers Pilot Program'' (in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(c) NURSE CORPS OFFICERS.—A nurse corps officer described in this subsection is any commissioned officer of the Armed Forces qualified and designated as an officer in a Nurse Corps of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) serving in a reserve component of the Armed Forces;

(2) honorably discharged from the Armed Forces; or

(3) a retired member of the Armed Forces.

(d) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAM.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An eligible nurse corps officer seeking to participate in the Program shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor. The application shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Secretary may require.

(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select participants in the Program from among qualified nurse corps officers submitting applications therefor under paragraph (1).

(e) PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A nurse corps officer selected under subsection (d) to participate in the Program shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense relating to participation in the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The agreement of a nurse corps officer under the program shall, at the election of the Secretary for purposes of the Program and as appropriate with respect to that status of such nurse corps officer—

(A) require such nurse corps officer, within such time as the Secretary may require, to accept an offer of full-time employment as a

nurse educator from an accredited school of nursing for a period of not less than one year; or

(B) require such nurse corps officer—

(i) within such time as the Secretary may require, to successfully complete a program leading to a master's degree or doctoral degree in a nursing field from an accredited school of nursing or to a doctoral degree in a related field from an accredited institution of higher education;

(ii) to serve in the Selected Reserve or some other form of public service under terms and conditions established by the Secretary; and

(iii) upon completion of such program and service, to accept an offer of full-time employment as a nurse educator from an accredited school of nursing for a period of not less than 3 years.

(f) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may provide a participant in the Program who enters into an agreement described in subsection (e)(2)(A) assistance as follows:

(A) Career placement assistance in securing full-time employment as a nurse educator at an accredited school of nursing.

(B) A stipend in an amount not to exceed $5,000 for transition to employment referred to in paragraph (1), and for educational training for such employment, for a period not to exceed two years after entry by such participant into an agreement under subsection (e).

(2) SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may provide a participant in the Program who enters into an agreement described in subsection (e)(2)(B) scholarship assistance to pursue a degree described in subsection (e)(2)(B)(i) in an amount not to exceed $30,000 annually for a period of not more than four years.

(g) TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE.—A stipend or scholarship provided under subsection (f) shall not be taken into account in determining the eligibility of a participant in the Program for Federal student financial assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

(h) ADMINISTRATION AFTER INITIAL PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The termination of the Program on December 31, 2012, under subsection (a)(2) shall not terminate the entitlement to assistance under the Program of any nurse corps officer entering into an agreement to participate in the Program under subsection (e) that continues in force after that date.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Education shall undertake any administration of the Program that is required after December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program after that date.

(i) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after the commencement of the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall—

(A) describe the activities undertaken under the Program; and

(B) include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in—

(i) facilitating the development of nurse educators;

(ii) encouraging service in the Selected Reserve and other forms of public service; and

(iii) helping alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NURSE EDUCATOR.—The term ''nurse educator'' means a registered nurse who—

(A) is a member of the nursing faculty at an accredited school of nursing;

(B) holds a graduate degree in nursing from an accredited school of nursing or a doctoral degree in a related field from an accredited institution of higher education;

(C) holds a valid, unrestricted license to practice nursing from a State; and

(D) has successfully completed additional course work in education and demonstrates competency in an advanced practice area of nursing.

(2) SCHOOL OF NURSING.—The term ''school of nursing'' means a school of nursing (as that term is defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296)) that is accredited (as that term is defined in section 801(6) of the Public Health Service Act).

(k) FUNDING.—From amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense, $5,000,000 may be available for the Program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, he is not on the floor, but Senator WARNER and I have been discussing this amendment. I would like to at least leave open the option that he will join me in cosponsoring it. It is a bipartisan amendment which I would like to describe at this point, if I can, and ask the Senator from Oklahoma if I may have a few minutes to describe the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. Before the Senator from Illinois proceeds, I would like to comment. The Senator has worked very hard on this amendment. There is a problem that the Senator is seeking to correct, and I believe the amendment does correct it. I join him as a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much. I am honored that the Senator from Oklahoma would join me as a cosponsor.

In speaking to this amendment, this morning's Washington Post had a front-page story that should startle and trouble all of us. It is a story about the status of emergency rooms in hospitals across America. The organization that represents the emergency rooms and their physicians across America has issued a troubling report which suggests that many of those emergency rooms are not really adequately staffed or prepared to deal with emergencies. Too often, the men and women who are brought there in terrible medical situations can't find the help they need. As a result, they are shipped off to other hospitals or they wait sometimes up to 2 days before they are admitted to a bed in the regular hospital. It is a serious problem.

You might ask: What does that have to do with the Department of Defense authorization bill? Part of the problem facing the emergency rooms is also facing hospitals and clinics across America, and the problem is this: We don't have enough health care professionals; in particular, we don't have enough nurses in America. We know this is a fact.

Just last week, an administrator of a major hospital in Chicago came to see me. She is a wonderful woman. She is a Catholic nun who runs a hospital in one of the toughest parts of Chicago—Inglewood—and she has kept that hospital open. I don't know how she has done it. It has been nothing short of a miracle. The biggest single problem that she faces year in and year out is not just coming up with money but finding nurses.

I said to her: What do you pay a nurse?

And she said: About $50,000 a year. But, she said, if I can't hire that nurse for $50,000 a year, I have to buy what we call contract nurses. There are companies which, when hospitals don't have enough nurses, will send a nurse in to work for a day, a week, or a month. But the contract nurses cost three times as much, $150,000 annualized salary.

She said to me: Senator, I don't know if I can keep this hospital open if I can't find nurses.

This isn't just a problem at that hospital. It is a problem across my State and across our Nation. I am from downstate Illinois, a part of our State dominated by smaller towns, rural areas, struggling to keep hospitals open. We know better than most that when one of our neighbors goes into labor, she may not have the time to make it to the big city where there is a big hospital. She is counting on that rural hospital being open. When she gets there, she is counting on finding a nurse and a doctor to help her.

In many places in rural Illinois and across our country, the same challenge that faces the administrator of that hospital in the Inglewood section of Chicago is facing them: inadequate supplies of professionals, health care professionals.

The ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have increased the need for qualified nurses in military medical facilities. Unfortunately, the military faces the same difficulty in recruiting and in the retention of nurses as the civilian medical facilities which I just described. Neither the Army nor the Air Force has met their nurse recruitment goals since the 1990s. In 2004, the Navy nurse core recruitment fell 32 percent below its target, while the Air Force missed its nurse recruitment target by 30 percent.

Have you seen this special on HBO called ''Baghdad ER''? I have watched a little bit of it. As you watch it, you realize the heroic efforts that are being made by the men and women in the military who are providing emergency medical care to our soldiers who are shot in Iraq. It is incredible. It is heartbreaking to think about what they go through every day.

Now, put it in the context where the major sources of military nurses are telling us they can't recruit enough nurses fast enough. Last year, the Army experienced a 30-percent shortage of certified registered nurse anesthetists, as one example.

I have talked about civilian hospitals. According to the American College of Health Care Executives, 72 percent of hospitals have been experiencing a nursing shortage since 2004, and it is growing. This chart that I will show you is an indication of the projected shortfalls and shortages in registered nurses. The dark blue indicates the supply of nurses, which continues to decline, and, of course, the lighter blue, the shortage, which continues to increase. As you can see, our need for nurses is growing, and it is no surprise. We have an aging population that needs help: specialized medical care that requires specialized nurses. Time and again we find ourselves relying and counting on those nurses to be there, and we see from this chart as we project forward for the next 15 years that the problem is going to get much worse.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services looked at all licensed nurses, both civilian and military. They found that in the year 2000, our country was 110,000 nurses short of the number needed to adequately provide quality health care—110,000 across our Nation. Five years later, that shortage had doubled to 219,000 nurses that we needed and didn't have in America. By the year 2020, we will be more than 1 million nurses short of what is necessary for quality health care.

Now, the National Institutes of Health can engage in medical research to find new cures and treatments for diseases, and God bless them for all the work they do. The best and brightest minds can get together in laboratories and find new pharmaceuticals and new medical devices that give us a new lease on life. But we know that when the moment comes, when we need this help, we need a nurse. And if we find ourselves in a few short years with a million fewer nurses than we actually need, it will compromise the quality and availability of health care in America. It is not just a problem for the military, as I mentioned earlier, it is a nationwide problem.

To avoid the vast shortages the Department of Health and Human Services is projecting, we have to make a significant and substantial increase in the number of nurses graduating and entering the workforce each year. Just to replace the nurses who are retiring, we need to increase student enrollment at nursing schools by 40 percent. This chart is an indication of where we are, starting in the year 2000. This shows the baseline supply of nurses across America, which you can see is declining. This next line, the green line, shows the demand which is going up dramatically for nurses in our society, and this purple line shows what happens if 90 percent—the supply if 90 percent more grads take place. So even increasing graduate nurses by 90 percent over the next 15 years will still leave us short of our national goal.

Clearly, this is an emergency which has to be addressed. The baseline demand for nurses is rising; the supply is falling. If we increase the number of nurses graduating from nursing school by 90 percent by 2020, we are still not going to have enough.

I might add parenthetically, there is another element to this issue. I have been involved in this as long as I have been in public service. Small hospitals, small towns come to you desperate because they have lost their doctor. They need a doctor, and I do my best to find a doctor. But in 9 cases out of 10, the doctor you find comes from a foreign land. Many doctors have come to the United States from India, from Asia, from Africa, and we welcome them. We greet their families warmly as they have come to our country, and they are meeting our needs. And I thank them for making the decision to come and be a part of the solution to America's health care problem. But I have come to learn that there are two sides to this equation. The other side of the equation, of course, is that these doctors and nurses and health care professionals are leaving a land, too.

Last year, and over the last several years, we have taken 20,000 health care professionals out of Africa; doctors and nurses, people who really are essential in the frontline of defense when it comes to medical care. We have attracted them to the United States, to England, to Germany, and to France, and it is no surprise that they want to be here. Doctors in central Africa are paid $600 a month by the Government, if they are paid. They work in substandard conditions. Despite their education, they struggle to provide even the most basic care. In the area of eastern Congo in Goma, where I visited with Senator BROWNBACK just a few months ago, we learned that there was one doctor for every 160,000 people. Think about that: one doctor for every 160,000 people. What is the number in the United States? We have 549 doctors for every 100,000 people. Also, think about what it means when it comes to specialties like surgery.

I asked them in this hospital in Goma in Congo—where women were lined up in long lines praying that this would be the day or the week or the month when they would finally have the necessary surgery that they had been waiting so long for—I asked them: How many surgeons do you have in this part of Africa? This doctor said to me: We have one surgeon for every 1 million people—one surgeon for every 1 million. What does that mean? It would mean in the United States, three surgeons for the entire city of Chicago. Think about what those poor people face without those medical professionals.

So those who argue that the answer to our need in the United States will be bringing in nurses and doctors and professionals from around the world have to understand that this equation is not a zero sum. We end up bringing in these health care professionals at the expense of other countries and other people who face many more medical challenges than in the United States.

Some would say: Well, that is their problem. They ought to pay their doctors more or train more. But it is our problem, too. If an avian flu epidemic, God forbid, should ever start, if there would be a transmission from an animal to a human, it would likely occur in one of these developing nations. If they don't have the capacity to move immediately to contain that crisis to make sure there are public health officials and doctors and nurses present, and if they don't do it within 21 days, that epidemic can circle the world.

Diseases which used to die on immigrant ships coming across the ocean live quite well, unfortunately, on the airliners that crisscross this globe every single day. So if you take away the medical professionals in some of the poorest nations on Earth, you are opening the possibility that the dread diseases in that part of the world will make it to our part of the world. That is part of this shrinking globe on which we live.

The problem, when you look at the United States, is that there are not enough teachers at schools of nursing. Last year, nursing colleges across America denied admission to 35,000 qualified applicants for nursing school simply because they didn't have enough teachers at the nursing schools. Think about that: 35,000 more nurses that we could train and have serving us and others in the military and civilian life.

In my home State of Illinois, schools of nursing are denying qualified students admittance because they don't have enough teachers. Last year, 1,900 qualified student applicants were rejected from Illinois nursing schools because there weren't enough professors. Northern Illinois University in Dekalb, one of our best, was forced to turn down 233 qualified nursing applicants because they didn't have enough teachers and financial resources.

Illinois State University, another top university in our State, increased its enrollment by 50 percent in nursing over the past 5 years by working with health care systems and seeking grants, but last year, ISU was still forced to reject 100 qualified nursing applicants because they didn't have enough faculty and fiscal resources.

Take a look at this chart which is an indication of what we are being told by nursing schools. Sixty-six percent, or two out of three nursing schools across the United States, tell us that they need additional faculty. We find that in some schools there are no vacancies and no additional faculty needed. That is 18 percent. And in 15 percent, almost 16 percent, there are no vacancies, but they could use additional faculty. They could expand. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing surveyed more than 400 schools of nursing last year. As I said, two out of three reported vacancies in their faculty. Fifteen percent said they are fully staffed

but could use more faculty. These statistics paint a bleak picture for the availability of nursing faculties now and into the future.

Take a look at this final chart I will show you which is showing that there is, as in most things in America, a graying of the population that serves us. The median age of doctorally prepared nursing faculty members is 52. The average age of retirement for faculty at nursing institutions is 62. It is expected that 200 to 300 doctorally prepared faculty will be eligible for retirement each year from 2005 to 2012, reducing faculty, even though more than a million are needed. The military recruits nurses.

I want to thank all the men and women who are in nursing in the military and all in our medical professions. But they recruit from the same place that doctors and hospitals also recruit: civilian nursing schools.

Unless we address the lack of faculty, there is going to be a shortage of nurses everywhere. In 1994, the Department of Defense established a program which is a terrific idea. It is called Troops to Teachers. It serves the dual purpose of helping relieve the shortages of math, science, and special education teachers in high-poverty schools and assists military personnel in making transitions from the military to a second career in teaching. It is a terrific idea. As of January 2004—listen to this—more than 6,000 former soldiers have been hired as teachers through the Troops to Teachers Program, and an additional 6,700 are now qualified teachers looking for placements. We need teachers, and the men and women trained and educated in the military who want to serve bring a special quality to this mission.

The amendment which I have before the Senate will set up a pilot program—we call it Troops to Nurse Teachers—to encourage nurses in the Reserves, retiring nurses, or those leaving the military, to pursue a career teaching the future nurse workforce. More than 300 nurses left the Army last year. Historically, about 330 nurses leave the Air Force each year. Between 30 and 40 percent of the nurses in the Navy leave after they fulfill their initial obligation.

The Troops to Nurse Teachers Pilot Program will provide transitional assistance for servicemembers who already hold a master's or Ph.D. in nursing or related field and are qualified to teach. Eligible servicemembers can receive career placement assistance, transitional stipends, and educational training from accredited schools of nursing to expedite their transition. Troops to Nurse Teachers will also establish a pilot scholarship program that will provide financial assistance to officers of the armed services who have been involved in nursing during their military service and help them obtain the education necessary to become nursing educators. Tuition stipends and financing for educational expenses would be provided. Recipients of scholarships must commit to teaching at an accredited school of nursing for at least 3 years in exchange for the educational support they receive. The Secretary of Defense may also require them to continue their service in selected reserve areas or perform other public service in exchange for this program.

The supporters of this amendment include the American Nurses Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, the American Organization of Nurse Executives, the American Health Care Association, and the National League for Nursing.

Let me conclude. We must increase the number of teachers preparing tomorrow's nursing workforce. With the aging of the baby boom generation, long-term needs of growing numbers of wounded veterans and military and civilian health care systems will need qualified nurses more than ever in the years to come. Let's take quality men and women serving in the armed services, who gave so much to this country, and tell them that when they leave the armed services there is an option where they can continue to serve America as professors and teachers in our nursing schools. This will increase the capacity of these nursing schools, provide more nurses for America, which is what we need, and lessen the demand for nurses to come from overseas where they are also desperately needed. I think this is a winning opportunity all across the board, and I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, let me acknowledge to my friend from Illinois he is attempting to, and I believe will successfully, resolve a problem. I happen to be more sensitive to this than most people. Two of my kids are doctors, and they assure me that this nurse shortage is nationwide. It is all out there.

One of the concerns I had when this came up was I would not want this to detract from any of the other programs. Right now I have been one to say our military budget, our Defense authorization bill, is really not quite adequate as it is. It is my understanding the Senator has been very cooperative to make sure this doesn't happen.

I have added my name as a cosponsor, and it is my understanding Senator WARNER is going to be here shortly and wants to add his name. So the amendment would give the discretion to the DOD, working with the Department of Education, to structure a program that would achieve the dual goals of creating more nurse educators and more Reserve officers. I think we have the support of the committee on both sides, and I commend the Senator for bringing up this solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I spoke with Senator WARNER about this amendment. I would really appreciate his cosponsorship, but I don't want to ask his name be added until we are certain. If there are any difficulties on this amendment, I stand ready to change it. We want to find a good bipartisan response. There are just a few elements we are still working on.

I don't know if the Senator from Oklahoma thinks this is the time for us to move for passage of the amendment or whether we should wait?

Mr. INHOFE. I respond I personally think it is time to pass it. We have limited time. This is one that enjoys support from both sides of the aisle. I am sure the Senator from Virginia can put his name on this and will make his own expression when he gets here.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise in support of this amendment to create a pilot program on troops to nurse teachers. America is facing a nursing shortage and it is getting worse. America's nurses are overworked, underpaid, and undervalued yet nursing schools are still forced to turn away qualified students. More than 30,000 qualified applicants were turned away last year. In Maryland, nursing programs turned away more than 2,000 qualified students last year. Why are they turning away all of these qualified applicants? Because there aren't enough teachers to teach them. This is the biggest bottleneck in ending the nursing shortage.

The military is also facing a nursing shortage. Medicine is a 24-hour job. Military medicine is even harder. Our military medical professionals have accomplished something truly remarkable in this war: injured troops who make it to a field hospital have a 96 percent rate of survival. That is a testament to our military doctors and nurses on the front lines.

We need to make sure there are enough military nurses to continue to provide this outstanding care. Neither the Army nor the Air Force have met their nurse recruitment goals since the 1990s. In 2004, Navy Nurse Corps recruitment fell 32 percent below its target. The Air Force and Army are also 30 percent below their targets. All branches of the military are offering incentives for nurses to join the Armed Forces. But there simply aren't enough nurses to fill those jobs because there aren't enough teachers to train them. There is a pool of potential nurse educators in our retired nurse corps. We should take advantage of their experience and their dedication to teach the next generation of military nurses.

This amendment would help to train the next generation of military nurses and help to curb the nursing shortage by encouraging nurse corps officers to become nurse educators. It establishes a ''Troops to Nurse Teachers'' pilot program which will provide scholarships and other financial assistance to

nurse corps officers so that they can get advanced degrees to become nurse educators. In exchange for these scholarships, they must teach for at least 3 years in a school of nursing and continue service in either the reserves or another form of public service. This is modeled after the ''Troops to Teachers'' program which gives incentives to people leaving the military to become teachers. Since 1994, more than 8,000 former soldiers have been hired as teachers through this program.

We must make sure our troops have enough nurses to keep them safe. The nursing shortage affects every State, every city, every town. And it affects our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq. There are so many dedicated military nurses that still want to give back to their country. They can do this by teaching the next generation of military nurses. But we must empower them to choose nurse education—making it more affordable, providing opportunities for advancement—so nurses can move up instead of moving on and so our troops get the care that they need. I thank my colleagues for accepting this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4253) was agreed to.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I was outraged this morning when I read a Washington Post article that suggests that the Prime Minister of Iraq is willing to allow an amnesty for those who have taken American lives. In this article, the Prime Minister of Iraq is quoted as saying:

Reconciliation could include an amnesty for those ''who weren't involved in the shedding of Iraqi blood. . . .''

That is where his quote ends. Mr. Prime Minister, how about American blood? Are you willing to have reconciliation on the pool of American blood that has been spilled to give your people and your country a chance for freedom?

Then to read on in this article, where a top adviser to Prime Minister Maliki is asked about clemency for those who attack U.S. troops, he is quoted as saying:

''That's an area where we can see a green line. There's some sort of preliminary understanding between us and the MNF-I,'' the U.S.-led Multi-National Force-Iraq, ''that there is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely, I believe.''

Pardoned definitely? So those who were armed and killed Iraqis, they will not be pardoned. Those who were armed and killed Americans, they will be pardoned? That is outrageous. President Bush, you went to Iraq and you said you wanted to look into the eyes of Prime Minister Maliki to know that he is a man you can trust, a man who will move us forward. I don't know how deep you looked into his soul, but you have to pick up the phone today and tell Prime Minister Maliki that we will not have the ability to pardon anyone with the blood of American soldiers on their hands.

Today we have hit the mark of 2,500 Americans who have given their lives to give the Iraqi people a chance. We have thousands of our young men and women who have returned to America wounded, who have lost their legs, who have lost their limbs, lost their sight, have had half of their faces blown off. Their blood was shed in Iraq. Are we going to stand by and permit an amnesty to be given to those who killed our fellow countrymen?

I intend to, with Senator NELSON, offer a resolution that makes it very clear that the Senate believes the Iraqi Government should not grant amnesty to persons who have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving heroically in Iraq to provide all Iraqis a better future, and that President Bush should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the U.S. Government opposes granting amnesty in the strongest possible terms. This has to end immediately.

I hope, when we offer that resolution, the Senate will speak with one clear and unequivocal voice that the blood of Americans and the lives of Americans is not subject to any pardoning, and is certainly not part of an offer that can be made that stains the honor and the sacrifices made by Americans.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4192

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 4192.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] proposes an amendment numbered 4192.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006)

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM IRAQ.

(a) REDEPLOYMENT.—The United States shall redeploy United States forces from Iraq by not later than December 31, 2006, while maintaining in Iraq only the minimal force necessary for direct participation in targeted counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.

(b) REPORT ON REDEPLOYMENT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to Congress a report that sets forth the strategy for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.

(2) STRATEGY ELEMENTS.—The strategy required in the report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A flexible schedule for redeploying United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.

(B) The number, size, and character of United States military units needed in Iraq after December 31, 2006, for purposes of counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.

(C) A strategy for addressing the regional implications for diplomacy, politics, and development of redeploying United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006.

(D) A strategy for ensuring the safety and security of United States forces in Iraq during and after the December 31, 2006, redeployment, and a contingency plan for addressing dramatic changes in security conditions that may require a limited number of United States forces to remain in Iraq after that date.

(E) A strategy for redeploying United States forces to effectively engage and defeat global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to withdraw that amendment. I had intended to call up another amendment which has to do with the special inspector general for Iraq. Will the Chair tell me what the number of that amendment is? I have to clarify the number of this amendment. In light of that, I yield the floor so Senator SCHUMER can speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I read, as many did, in the newspapers this morning that the Prime Minister of Iraq has proposed giving amnesty to those incarcerated by the Iraqi Government who have killed or maimed Americans. It was stated that if Iraqis killed Iraqis they would not be given amnesty, but if Iraqis killed Americans, they would.

That is an outrageous statement. For the Prime Minister of Iraq to offer a ''get out of jail free'' card to those who have killed American soldiers is an insult to the soldiers, their families, and every American.

Just 2 days ago, the Prime Minister stood with President Bush, and President Bush said he looked in his eyes

and saw that he was a good man. We are urging that President Bush call up the Prime Minister of Iraq immediately and get him to retract this pernicious, nasty statement which basically abdicates the great sacrifices that have been made by American soldiers for the people of Iraq.

It is just mind-boggling to believe that the Iraqi Prime Minister would decide that it would be OK to give amnesty to those who hurt Americans. What kind of ally is this? Will he turn on us in 2 months or 6 months? He seems to be the new hope of the new government, and within 24 hours after President Bush leaves Iraqi soil, he defames the sacrifices of American soldiers and their families.

President Bush, you should call your friend the Prime Minister and get him to retract this evil statement immediately. How can we ask America's young men and women to risk their lives in Iraq if those who seek to shoot at them are then absolved of any blame?

This is a statement which should really go down in infamy, and I hope and plead with the President to urge the Iraqi Prime Minister to withdraw the statement and figure out what consequences should follow if the Prime Minister refuses.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4192, WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For clarification, the amendment No. 4192 offered by the Senator from Wisconsin was withdrawn.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4256

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] for himself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 4256.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction)

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1054. STRENGTHENING THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of discharging the duties of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction under subsection (f) of section 3001 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (5 U.S.C. 8G note), and for purposes of determining the date of termination of the Office of the Special Inspector General under subsection (o) of such section, any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2006 for the reconstruction of Iraq, regardless of how such funds may be designated, shall be treated as amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their patience. I had identified the wrong amendment. I got that clarified.

What I wish to tell my colleagues is that this amendment strengthens the Special Inspector General for Iraq and ensures that U.S. taxpayer dollars will be spent wisely, efficiently, and within the law.

The Special Inspector General for Iraq, known as ''SIGIR,'' was established in 2003. I worked hard with a few of my colleagues in creating this office to monitor, audit, and report on the expenditure of billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars that this body appropriated to the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

My amendment is relatively simple. It recognizes the fact that we need to continue to ensure oversight and monitoring of U.S. taxpayer dollars that continue to support reconstruction efforts in Iraq, which includes over $1.6 billion in the latest supplemental for Iraq reconstruction and in the fiscal year 2006 foreign operations bill. It increases the mandate of the Special Inspector General for Iraq, while also extending the period for which that office will be in existence.

This amendment will strengthen the capabilities of the Special IG to monitor, audit, and inspect funds made available for assistance for Iraq in both the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund—IRRF—and in other important accounts.

I offer this amendment today because it is my firm belief that we should not be pouring tens of billions of dollars into Iraq reconstruction without ensuring there is appropriate oversight and auditing. American taxpayers deserve to know where their money is going in this costly war and that it is being used effectively and efficiently and ending up in the right place.

The SIGIR's work to date has been extremely valuable to the U.S. Government and to Congress. The SIGIR has now completed over 55 audit reports, issued over 165 recommendations for program improvement, and has seized $13 million in assets. Overall, the SIGIR estimates that its operations have resulted in saving the U.S. Government over $24 million, in addition to the considerable wasteful or fraudulent spending that office has uncovered.

Throughout 2005, the Iraq IG provided aggressive oversight to prevent waste, fraud and abuse in the at-times lethal operating environment in Iraq. Its emphasis on real-time auditing—where guidance is provided immediately to management authorities upon the discovery of a need for change—provides for independent assessments while effecting rapid improvements.

In its January report to Congress, the SIGIR concluded that massive unforeseen security costs, administrative overhead, and waste have crippled original reconstruction strategies and have prevented the completion of up to half of the work originally called for in critical sectors such as water, power, and electricity. The Iraq IG's work has resulted in the arrest of five individuals who were defrauding the U.S. Government, and it has shed light on millions of dollars of waste. It is this kind of investigation and reporting that helps shape the direction of reconstruction funding and ensures that the money is being used and allocated as transparently and effectively as possible.

I pushed to create the Special Inspector General for Iraq in order to ensure that there is critical oversight of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund allocated for Iraq reconstruction projects. Last year I fought to extend the life of this office, and my amendment today will ensure that the SIGIR has the capability and the life-span to finish up work associated with monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on how U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent in Iraq for reconstruction purposes.

Let me talk briefly about what my amendment actually does. Because current legislation requires that the SIGIR continue its work until 80 percent of the IRRF had been expended, and unless we do something to change this, the SIGIR will cease to exist before U.S. taxpayer dollars going to Iraq reconstruction have been expended. This means that despite the fact that we continue to support Iraq reconstruction efforts, we are removing our ability to oversee billions of taxpayer dollars.

To help avoid this potentially costly and unnecessary challenge, this amendment considers any money going to Iraq reconstruction efforts—regardless of whether or not it is in the IRRF—be subject to the SIGIR's oversight mandate. It will also help determine when we can ask the SIGIR to stand down.

This amendment is common sense. The SIGIR's great work has more than paid for itself, and it has developed a capacity that is unparalleled by either DoD or State's inspector general offices. The SIGIR is doing great work, and I, along with my distinguished colleagues Senator LEVIN and others, believe that this small change in the law will allow us to tell our constituents that we are making every effort to ensure that their hard-earned taxpayer dollars are being used in the most effective way possible. Let's support the SIGIR, and lets give it the time and mandate to monitor Iraq reconstruction funds.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we should consult with leadership. The yeas and nays having been ordered, I wonder if the Senator would be gracious enough to allow the Senator from Michigan and myself to consult with leadership as to the time for a vote.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, if it is all right with the Senator from Virginia, it is my understanding that it will be taken by voice vote.

Mr. WARNER. Is that the intent?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I want to be make sure it has been cleared on the other side.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it was my understanding that this was either cleared or was going to be supported by the chairman. I did not confirm that with my friend. That is a little bit in limbo. I very much support the Senator's amendment. I hope it can be cleared. If so, apparently the Senator is willing to take a voice vote.

Mr. FEINGOLD. That is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if I could proceed with my remarks in support of the amendment while they discuss it.

I support the Feingold amendment to ensure that the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction has jurisdiction over funds appropriated for the reconstruction of Iraq.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned, Congress established the Special Inspector General position in a fiscal year 2004 emergency supplemental appropriations bill to ensure effective oversight and audit of relief and reconstruction efforts in Iraq. The Special Inspector General reports jointly to the Secretaries of Defense and State and has responsibility for oversight of operations and programs funded by the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. The Senator from Wisconsin last year offered an amendment to extend the position. It was very welcome. It was a very useful and important contribution. I commend him for it. It is unfortunate that the most recent emergency supplemental which we just passed today would appropriate funds for Iraq reconstruction without including those funds in the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. It is important that this amendment be agreed to so as to ensure that this Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction has jurisdiction over all funds appropriated for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Under current law, this funding approach would have the effect of excluding reconstruction projects using these new funds from the jurisdiction of the Special Inspector General.

The State Department says that its Inspector General would be responsible for auditing the use of these funds. However, the State Department IG, unlike the Special Inspector General, does not have a significant presence in Iraq and does not have experience in auditing contracts and ferreting out fraud in the unique environment of Iraq.

For the last 3 years, the Special Inspector General has been the only source of consistent, independent, on-the ground review of reconstruction activities in Iraq. As a result, the Special Inspector General has reported case after case of criminal fraud and egregious waste that would otherwise have gone unremedied. Report after report documents cases—at al Hillah General Hospital, Babylon Policy Academy, Karbala Library, Baghdad International Airport and elsewhere—in which we paid contractors millions of dollars for work without making site visits, issuing performance reports, preparing post-award assessments, or taking other steps to ensure that the work we paid for was actually performed. In case after case, the Special Inspector General determined that either the contractor's performance was deficient or the work was not performed at all.

One particularly egregious case reviewed by the Special Inspector involved a $75 million contract with Kellogg Brown and Root, KBR, to develop a Pipeline River Crossing at Al Fatah, Iraq. The Special Inspector General reported that the project ailed because subsurface geologic conditions made it impossible to carry out the project design. These conditions were identified by a consultant before work commenced, but neither the Army Corps of Engineers nor KBR acted on the consultant's recommendation to perform additional research that would have prevented the failure.

A subject matter expert for the Coalition Provision Authority recognized that KBR had limited experience in this type of project and advised that the project would probably fail because design restrictions provided no flexibility to accommodate site conditions. However, KBR refused to conduct design reviews requested by the subject matter expert.

The Army Corps of Engineers awarded KBR a firm fixed price contract with no performance requirements. As a result, KBR was assured that it would get paid the full contract amount, regardless whether it successfully completed the project.

A KBR subcontractor identified problems with the site conditions at the outset of the project and suggested alternative drilling sites, but was turned down by KBR. KBR prohibited the subcontractor from talking directly to the Army Corps of Engineers and told the Army Corps that detailed cost reports would not be provided, because they were not required by the contract.

As a result, we spent the entire $75 million allocated to the project, but achieved only 28 percent of the planned pipeline throughput. According to the Inspector General, the lack of pipeline capacity resulted in the loss of more than $1.5 billion in potential oil revenues to the Iraqi government.

The Special Inspector General is the only U.S. audit and investigative authority with a significant on-the-ground presence in Iraq. He is the only inspector general who has an experienced staff with hands-on knowledge of how things work in Iraq. He is the only inspector general who has shown the capacity and the desire to turn over rocks in Iraq to identify and address problems of fraud and criminal conduct.

If we are serious about protecting the taxpayer and preventing contractor abuses in Iraq, we will adopt this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the Feingold amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague.

We are trying to work this out. There is a problem. The problem is not to the generic virtues of Senator FEINGOLD's amendment—which, incidentally, I support—but it is a question of the allocation of some funding in it and how that impacts on other areas of funding. As soon as I can work that out, I will advise the Senate. I am hopeful we can eventually go to a vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, while that is being worked on—I hope we can resolve that because this is a very important amendment. We want that Special Inspector General, who is really doing the only significant oversight on the expenditure of these billions of dollars in Iraq, to perform the same oversight functions on the appropriations, for instance, which we just adopted.

I again commend the Senator from Wisconsin. It was at his instigation and his initiative that we extended this Special Inspector General's Office last year, and it was that initiative which has paid off so handsomely for us. This initiative is critically important or else we might, I think inadvertently, not have the same watchdog looking over the most recent appropriations we adopted.

I also believe the Special Inspector General actually testified before the Chair's subcommittee earlier this year, so the Presiding Officer has had the ability to hear firsthand from the Special Inspector General about his operations.

By the way, I commend our Presiding Officer for those hearings. They were very helpful.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are prepared to go ahead with a voice vote at this time, if it is agreeable. I add my endorsement of the basic thrust of the amendment. Like others, I have had the opportunity to be debriefed by the inspector general, and I am very impressed with his conscientious service on this matter. He periodically goes over to Iraq, that theatre, and Afghanistan, for periods of time. He has accepted the challenges of this post with enormous enthusiasm and skill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank both the ranking member and chairman for their comments and support.

My understanding is the chairman wants to take this by voice vote. Therefore, I ask the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4256) was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WARNER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the leadership and the managers have reached a recommended unanimous consent request which I now propound.

I ask unanimous consent at 12 noon today the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to Santorum amendment No. 4234, to be followed by a vote in relation to a first-degree amendment to be offered by Senator BIDEN related to the same subject; further, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 12 be equally divided between myself, representing Senator SANTORUM and others, and Senator LEVIN, with no second degrees in order to either amendment prior to the votes; provided there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it my understanding that following the disposition of these two amendments that then a Democratic amendment would be the next in order?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am not able to answer that question. I believe that would be correct. I would be perfectly willing to have it that way because I know we did Senator DURBIN's this morning.

Mr. LEVIN. With that understanding—and there will be a Senator NELSON of Florida amendment, so you are on notice relative to that—I have no objection.

Mr. WARNER. Fine.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I first want to apologize to the chairman and ranking member that I came to the floor and realized they were in the process of doing this because I certainly would have spoken to them in advance before making this request. But I hope they will agree to this request.

We have just been informed at the Department of Defense that we have now lost our 2,500th soldier in Iraq. Last October, when we lost our 2,000th, the Senate observed a moment of silence in respect for all of the soldiers and those serving in uniform and their families. I would like to ask if the chairman would consider amending his request so that between the two rollcalls, when Members are on the floor, that they would come to their chairs and we would observe a moment of silence in respect for our troops and for this notification that we have reached this sad milestone.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I so amend the unanimous consent request that there be a time not to exceed whatever is appropriate for this proper recognition by the Senate of the loss of life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for this suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think we are ready for the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WARNER. Let it be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today for two purposes: one is to speak against the Santorum amendment relating to Iran—the Iran sanctions—and, two, to offer an amendment relating to the negotiations that are now underway by the President of the United States.

Let's cut right to it, if I may. Are we going to stand aside while the President of the United States of America is trying to stop the development of a nuclear bomb in Iran? The President of the United States of America has made a judgment—I would argue, finally, but he has made a judgment—that the best way to keep the worst thing from happening is to cooperate with our friends to put pressure on the bad guy.

What do I mean by that? The President of the United States, I assume at the urging of the Secretary of State—although it is not relevant, actually—the President of the United States took a more aggressive course about a month ago in attempting to stop the Iranians from developing a nuclear weapon, a weapon that, if developed in conjunction with a missile, could change, in a material way, the dynamics in the Middle East and particularly relating to our interests, notwithstanding the fact that it might not be able to strike the United States—a development that if it occurred would almost assuredly put great pressure on the Sunni Arabs in the region, who have lots of money, to join with possibly Egypt or another country to develop a Sunni bomb. This is not a good thing.

So the President, in conjunction with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, our three largest European allies, along with China, and Russia, has agreed to and has been sitting down and making a specific proposal, which the President of the United States has pledged the United States to, in order to both entice as well as dissuade the Iranians from pursuing their course. There are two pieces to it. One, it says to the Iranians: If you cooperate and verifiably cease and desist, we, the United States, the three European countries, China, and Russia, will move forward with the following incentives to move you closer to the family of nations as a responsible nation. And there are a set of very specific incentives that the President of the United States of America has signed on to—quote, an ''offer,'' if you will, to the Iranian Government.

It also says, as was reported in the New York Times and the Washington Post today, that the Chinese, as well as the Americans and Russians, have communicated a second piece of information to the Iranians: If you do not cease and desist, these bad things are going to happen to you, and we are all jointly—jointly—going to impose them on you.

I think that was a stroke of significant diplomacy on the part of the President, which basically, as I understand it, the Europeans, Russians, and Chinese said: Will you join us in some of the carrots? And the President, as I understand it, said: Yes, if you join me in the strikes. It is carrots and sticks.

I know of no way to avoid one of two alternatives: one is the resignation to the acceptance of an Iranian weapon, and relying upon deterrence; or, two, the use of military force against Iran to prevent the development of that weapon.

My friend from Pennsylvania, as well as all of us on this floor, have received, I expect, the same extensive briefings I have on just how limited those alternatives are at this point militarily.

So I think the President has chosen a very reasonable course here. But even if you disagree with it, one of the things that—and I have been here during seven Presidents, and I have been very critical of this President's foreign policy—but the idea, in the midst of a negotiation, at the point at which the world is expecting and waiting and wondering what Iran's response will be, that the U.S. Senate would go on record as tying the President's hands in this negotiation—I find that amazing, absolutely amazing.

I spoke this morning with the Secretary of State who authorized me to say, unequivocally, the administration opposes this amendment. It limits their flexibility in doing what we all want: preventing the construction of a nuclear weapon in Iran. How much clearer can the administration be? And as my Grandfather Finnegan from my home State of Pennsylvania used to say: Who died and left you boss? Since when do we negotiate for a President? We are in the midst of a negotiation. The only thing we have going for us now, with China, Russia, and Europe all siding with us, we are about to mess up? Folks, I think this is such a tragic mistake—well-intended but tragic. The underlying amendment, Mr. SANTORUM's amendment, in my view, and in the view of the Secretary of State, actually advocates a policy that would jeopardize President Bush's initiative and, I believe, play directly into the hands of Iranian hard-liners.

I think if you read the language, it also has the potential to damage relations with some of the key countries whose cooperation we need to pressure Iran to abandon its nuclear ambitions. If this approach were adopted, we would be in the untenable position of sanctioning companies located in countries that we are asking to impose sanctions on Iran if they fail to accept the offer put forward by Russia, China, Europe, and the United States.

It does not, with all due respect to my friend, because I have joined him in Iran sanctions legislation in the past—I have joined him—but this is a different amendment and it is a fundamentally different time.

I remember going down to see the President when he was making his first trip to Europe. He asked whether I would come down and speak with him and his staff and I did. It was very gracious of him to ask my opinion, which was very nice of him. He said he was going to Germany. And he said—I am paraphrasing—I understand you have been asked to speak to the Bundestag, the German Parliament.

I said: Yes, I have, Mr. President.

He said: I understand you have turned it down.

I said: Yes, I have, Mr. President.

He said: Why?

I said: Mr. President, we only have one President. You are my President. My disagreements with you on foreign policy—at that time it related to the Balkans and some other things—I think it is totally inappropriate, while you are in Europe, while you are in discussions with the very people who invited me to speak, for me to go and publicly afront you in a foreign capital before their—their—Parliament, the very Parliament you are going to be speaking to. I am not President. You are our President. And he pressed: Well, why?

And I said, somewhat facetiously—and I have had this discussion with Newt—I am not Newt Gingrich. I don't go to the Middle East and speak to Middle Eastern Parliaments while the previous Secretary of State is there negotiating. I think it is inappropriate.

The President of the United States is in the midst of the most important negotiations, absent Korea—and not much is going on there—that we have had since he has been President. And even if everything in here makes sense, why would we now do this?

My plea to my friend from Pennsylvania is: Withhold this amendment. See what happens in the negotiations. If, in fact, they fail—as they have an overwhelming prospect that could happen—then come back to the Senate and the Congress to put on these restrictions.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time the Senator from Delaware has remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 50 seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. I say to my friend from Pennsylvania—I have not had a chance to speak to him personally—I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I have an amendment.

Mr. President, have I sent my amendment to the desk? Is the Biden amendment at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is at the desk but not called up.

AMENDMENT NO. 4257

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4257.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1231. UNITED STATE'S POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR PROGRAMS OF IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The pursuit by the Iranian regime of a capability to produce nuclear weapons represents a threat to the United States, the Middle East region, and international peace and security.

(2) On May 31, 2006, Secretary of State Rice announced that the United States would join negotiations with Iran, along with the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, provided that Iran fully and verifiably suspends its enrichment and reprocessing activities.

(3) On June 1, 2006, President George W. Bush stated that ''Secretary Rice, at my instructions, said to the world that we want to solve the problem of the Iranian nuclear issue diplomatically. And we made it very clear publicly that we're willing to come to the table, so long as the Iranians verifiably suspend their program. In other words, we said to the Iranians [that] the United States of America wants to work with our partners to solve the problem''.

(4) On June 1, 2006, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the People's Republic of China, and the Russian Federation agreed upon a package of incentives and disincentives, which was subsequently presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union, Javier Solana.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) endorses the policy of the United States, announced May 31, 2006, to achieve a successful diplomatic outcome, in coordination with leading members of the international community, with respect to the threat posed by the efforts of the Iranian regime to acquire a capability to produce nuclear weapons;

(2) calls on Iran to suspend fully and verifiably its enrichment and reprocessing activities, cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enter into negotiations, including with the United States, pursuant to the package presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union; and

(3) urges the President and the Secretary of State to keep Congress fully and currently informed about the progress of this vital diplomatic initiative.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, what my amendment does is speak to and support the President's present negotiation. It gives full support to the President of the United States, because if there was ever a time the President should have the world know the Nation stands behind him, it is now. It is now in this negotiation. I don't have time to read the amendment, but I promise you, it is a rendition of the administration's position on negotiations and compliments him for it and says we support him.

Although Senator HAGEL is in a hearing and on his way, there will probably not be much time for him to speak. But he is a cosponsor, along with Senators LEVIN and DODD. I am sure there are others, and I ask unanimous consent that they be able to be added later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I also want to point out that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, if I am not mistaken, yesterday raised significant concerns with the Santorum amendment as well. As I look at the RECORD, they all are pertinent and accurate.

I will conclude by saying, this is no time to be meddling in the midst of a negotiation on one of the most important issues facing the United States, when the President has newly initiated a specific proposal. I urge my friend from Pennsylvania to withhold his amendment until we see what turns out there. If he thinks it is necessary after the negotiations succeed or fail, then come back.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for allowing me to probably run over a minute or so.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4234

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield such time as our colleague wishes. I ask unanimous consent that each manager have at least 3 minutes to address this at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. With respect to the Biden amendment, I was handed a copy of it a couple minutes ago. But having read it, it is a sense of the Senate. I don't see any reason not to support the Biden amendment. I have no problem with the language. It basically says that we hope for a resolution to the diplomatic efforts under way, a positive resolution with respect to Iran not pursuing nuclear weapons. That is no problem for me. But it doesn't do anything other than say we wish you well.

The amendment I have offered is an amendment that is in substance the bill that passed the House of Representatives in April with over 300 votes. At the time it passed, prior to the negotiations that were commenced at the end of May by the administration, as the Senator from Delaware suggested, when it passed in April, the administration opposed it. I suspect, although I will let the Senator from Delaware speak for himself, I know he is not a cosponsor of my bill that is in the Foreign Relations Committee, and, to my knowledge, Senator LUGAR has not supported this legislation. The State Department has not supported my legislation. It is not surprising to me that they don't support this amendment. They don't generally support amendments that have to do with sanctions and forcing them to do things they don't want to do.

We are a coequal branch of Government, and it is vitally important for us at a critical time—and I agree with the Senator from Delaware on this, this is a critical time. I disagree with him on several things. One of the things on which I disagree with him, I think these negotiations are more important than North Korea. I think the threat of Iran and Islamic fascism is more significant than the threat posed by North Korea.

I believe this is a vitally important negotiation. I think it is vitally important during the course of these negotiations to speak to them and to speak in support not only in words but in deeds of what the President is trying to accomplish. The deeds here are very clear. It is twofold. The Senator from Delaware suggested there are not very many good options on the table.

The two options on the table, other than military force, are in this amendment. Those two options are to support prodemocracy efforts within Iran, to try to see if we can get a peaceful transformation of that government. The second is to try to dissuade the Iranians from moving forward and dissuade others, companies and countries, from working with them in development of their nuclear weapons program. Those are the options.

The President is trying to do it through a diplomatic arrangement. I wish him the very best. But I remind everybody here who is going to vote, this is not going to the President today. It is not going to the President next week. It is not going to the President next month. This is an amendment to the Defense authorization bill. It will be months, I am sure. I would be amazed if we were able to get this done before September or October. This bill is not going to be decided upon, this amendment is not going to be concluded and passed on to the President before these negotiations come to a conclusion. What we do here is put ourselves in a position to have an amendment in conference ready to move if these negotiations do not work.

Putting off this amendment is not such an easy thing to do. Putting off this amendment and finding a vehicle to attach it to, particularly over the next few weeks, is not going to be easy to do, as we bring up appropriations bills. So this may be the last vehicle between now and the summer recess in August and potentially the rest of this Congress to debate this issue. It is important for us to speak to this issue now.

This is not a radical piece of legislation. This is a piece of legislation that has 61 cosponsors that passed with over 300 votes in the House of Representatives. It has broad bipartisan support. I understand it is opposed by the Department of State. Senator WARNER was kind enough to show the letter that came from the Department suggesting their opposition. I remind all Members, they opposed this bill and have consistently, not just because of these negotiations but have opposed this bill, period. They opposed it when the House passed it in April. So this is nothing new.

I suggest that the opportunity we have on the most important national security issue facing this country, the threat of Islamic fascism and the threat of Iran as the principal cog in orchestrating, supporting, financing, and encouraging this type of behavior, is to speak into the moment where we are confronting them right now with our administration in their development of nuclear weapons. For the Congress to remain silent, for the Congress to step back and say: We wish you well, Mr. President, but we are not going to go on record of really supporting you, in deed not just in word, will be interpreted one way, in my opinion, the way words are always interpreted. I think the Senator from Delaware said that this will play into the hardliners in Iran. Let me remind the Senator from Delaware, the hardliners run Iran. The hardliner is the President of Iran. The hardliners are the mullahs who run the country. There are not hardliners and then the governing powers of Iran. The hardliners are the governing powers of Iran. They are the ones making the decision. We are not playing into their hands. We are telling them we are serious, as serious as the President is about doing something about their development of nuclear weapons and their desire and explicit statements about their willingness to use those weapons on the State of Israel and others.

This is a very serious debate. This is a very serious vote. This is a very serious message that we either will or will not send. Are we going to send a message to the Iranian hardliners that we are going to stand by our President in word and action and that we are not going to let their talk of maybe possibly down the road potentially coming and talking to us, which is all they are talking about right now, dissuade us from acting while they are acting right now in developing nuclear capability, which they are. They are acting right now. They are developing. They are pursuing. They are saying they are going to use it. All we are going to say is: Well, your talk about maybe talking to us in the future will dissuade us from acting? No, it should not. We should act today. We have 61 cosponsors of this legislation. I hope that all 61 and then some stand by and say to the Iranian hardliners/government that we will stand with our President in word and deed and make sure that we do everything we can through peaceful means, and that is what this amendment is about, to stop them from getting nuclear weapons.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. I ask to speak for up to 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the time from the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

I rise to strongly support the Biden amendment. It is the responsible and appropriate position for this body to take on a very serious issue. It is important that we recognize, just as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has noted, that we support our President. I believe President Bush's actions and directions, as they are now playing out, are, in fact, the appropriate, responsible, and relevant actions to take.

I also rise to strongly oppose the Santorum amendment. Again, noting what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania said, that we should send a strong message to the world that we are supporting our President, I am not certain how that is accomplished by supporting the Santorum amendment. In fact, as has been noted on the floor this morning, the President's senior foreign policy agent, the Secretary of State, Dr. Rice, is opposed. The Secretary of State of the United States Government is opposed to the Santorum amendment. I am not certain how that connects with what my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania has noted.

What we are dealing with in the Santorum amendment is a very irresponsible, dangerous direction to take.

Let me remind colleagues that we already are at war in two nations. We have 130,000 American troops engaged now in a war in Iraq. The Middle East is in turmoil. We have 20,000 troops in Afghanistan. NATO is in Afghanistan. Many of our allies are with us in Iraq.

We better be careful here. We better be careful in how we are dealing with this issue. It is a serious issue. It is dangerous. But it is complicated. Iran is not a monolithic government that we can ascribe motives to, agreements to. Our best course of action is exactly where the President is going. And that is, engaging Iran, engaging with our allies, strengthening our alliances. If we are not careful, we will find America isolated in the world at a very dangerous time. That is what the Santorum amendment is about.

This is not helping our President. Our President is opposed to it. He is taking a different direction.

Let's be careful. This is not just some amendment. This is the force of the U.S. Senate that could be put into a law in fact limiting the President's options. Is that what we want to do and is that how we describe supporting the President, limiting the President's options? I don't think so. This is dangerous business, very dangerous business. Before our colleagues vote, they better understand what is going to be required.

Again, I thank my distinguished colleague from Virginia for the time. I hope our colleagues, before they vote, will understand the consequences of a dangerous amendment like this. I shall oppose it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in fairness, I think he should wrap this debate up. How many minutes does he desire?

Mr. SANTORUM. I understand I have 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator has 4 minutes, and the managers have 3 minutes left.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let us establish the hour of 12:15 for the vote, with 5 minutes at the conclusion for the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and 5 minutes under the control of the Senator from Virginia and 5 minutes under the control of Senator LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my distinguished colleagues here that in the course of this debate, I have studied this matter very carefully. I spoke out on it yesterday expressing my concerns. I do believe the actions proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania are not irresponsible. They are a clear matter of conscience and what he thinks is in our best interest.

My concern, which I think is the Senator's concern, is that the timing is unwise. I support the Senator from Nebraska in that observation, as I do the Senator from Delaware, because we have a negotiation of great sensitivity underway at the direction of the President, who, under the Constitution of the United States, has the primary responsibility in the matter of conducting foreign affairs. His chief designee, the Secretary of State, has spoken through Senator BIDEN.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me, to which I will refer momentarily, from the Department of State.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2006.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is our understanding that the Iran Freedom Support Act (S. 333) will soon be offered as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2007 (S. 2766). The Administration has serious concerns about S. 333, and therefore opposes its inclusion in S. 2766.

As Secretary Rice recently announced, Iran is being offered a choice: either continue to pursue nuclear weapons and face isolation and progressively stronger sanctions, or verifiably abandon uranium enrichment and reprocessing activities and receive civil nuclear energy and economic cooperation from the international community. We are in agreement with our European partners on the elements of the benefits if Iran makes the right choice, and the costs if it does not. More broadly, we have found support from Russia and China for this approach.

The amendment runs counter to our efforts and those of the international community to present Iran with a clear choice regarding their nuclear ambitions. This amendment, if enacted, would shift unified international attention away from Iran's nuclear activities and create a rift between the U.S. and our closest international partners. Moreover, it would limit our diplomatic flexibility.

By contrast, we endorse the concept of providing support for democracy and human rights in Iran. The Administration has worked closely with the Congress to include funding in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2006 (H.R. 4939) to increase our support for democracy and improve radio broadcasting, expand satellite television broadcasting, and increase contacts through expanded fellowships and scholarships for Iranian students.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this letter from the standpoint of the Administration's Program.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY T. BERGNER,
Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

Mr. WARNER. I strongly believe the Senator from Pennsylvania is of clear conscience on this matter.

Regarding the fact that he had these cosponsors and the fact that the House spoke on this in April, since the April timeframe—and I believe his earlier amendment had 60 cosponsors—much has transpired. That has been addressed here today, the sensitivity of these negotiations between our Nation and other nations in line for the interests of the United States and the Government of Iran. Therefore, my concern about this amendment is the timing of it.

I now would like to refer to the letter forwarded to me as chairman, dated today, which was printed in the RECORD. One paragraph reads:

> The amendment runs counter to our efforts and those of the international community to present Iran with a clear choice regarding their nuclear ambitions. The amendment, if enacted, would shift unified international attention away from Iran's nuclear activities and create a rift between the U.S. and our closest international partners. Moreover, it would limit our diplomatic flexibility.

Mr. President, I have to accept the good faith of the Secretary of State on this matter and as communicated to this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am one who has cosponsored a version of the Iranian sanctions amendment which Senator SANTORUM offered now over a year ago. I believed then and I believe now that it may well be necessary for sanctions to be imposed on Iran.

However, I cannot support the amendment that has been offered by Senator SANTORUM for two reasons. One is the fact that it is significantly broader than the other amendment that was introduced by Senator SANTORUM, the Iran Freedom and Support Act of 2005. In many ways, it is broader and it interjects an unrelated issue with respect to Russian pricing for nuclear reactor fuel. It removes the requirement that a person have actual knowledge of the actions for which he is going to be sanctioned. There is a direction here to a United Nations representative, which was not present in the amendment I cosponsored. It changes the threshold which makes it more difficult for the President to waive sanctions. So there are a number of significant differences between this and an amendment I cosponsored.

The other difference is that, of course, there has been significant change which occurred since that time. Senator WARNER has outlined that point. That change is now the decision of the administration—which I support—to engage or participate in direct talks with Iran under specified circumstances. I think that is a policy which should be given a chance to work, and if the policy doesn't succeed and Iran does not work out a negotiation and agreement with all the countries with which there are discussions going on, at that point, it seems to me there is a greater chance we will get those other countries, including Russia, to support sanctions if, in fact, the negotiations and discussions with Iran do not succeed.

So those discussions the President has decided to engage upon are actually a prelude to a much stronger chance to succeed with sanctions down the road because countries that might support us on sanctions, and whose

support would be extremely helpful, would then realize we had gone through the negotiation and discussion route with Iran. I believe that policy is wise. It will strengthen our position in getting sanctions, should that be necessary. Also, it is the best chance of having the solution here, which will avoid greater and greater conflict down the road. While it is with some reluctance that I cannot support a sanction amendment relating to Iran, nonetheless, because this is broader than the one that previously I cosponsored, and mainly because of the ongoing negotiations which will strengthen our position if they do not lead to a good resolution, I cannot support the Santorum amendment. I will support the Biden amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I will address the comments made by my colleagues. I appreciate their thoughtful comments.

First, this is not just a sanctions amendment. This is a sanctions amendment which imposes additional sanctions, but it also has a large prodemocracy component to support prodemocracy efforts and public diplomacy within Iran.

Second, with respect to the sanctions, I agree with some of the criticisms leveled by Senator LEVIN that it adds things which were not in the previous versions. One thing it adds is a nuclear components provision, which says that if you are going to be a company that is doing business with Iran in the development of their nuclear weapons capability, you cannot do business with us in America. If that is objectionable to folks, I find it somewhat remarkable that we would want companies doing business in Iran doing business here. But that is a new sanction; he is correct.

What he is not correct about is that we make it more difficult to waive these sanctions. In fact, we have made it easier to waive sanctions. We have given the President more time to waive sanctions. In fact, the big difference between the House bill and ours is we are much more liberal with respect to the waiver authority of the President. In that respect, the House bill passed—I have the exact vote—by a vote of 397 to 21. That is the bill which passed in the House of Representatives just 2 months ago. It has, with the exception of what I have said, a more liberal waiver authority component that deals with nuclear technology because of, obviously, this concern about the major difference between the two. I suspect that both the increased flexibility and the nuclear component provision would have very strong support in the Senate.

The other thing I wish to talk about is what Senator WARNER referred to in the letter from the Secretary of State. I remind everybody that the Secretary and the State Department have opposed this legislation from the day I have introduced it.

No. 2, I have had discussions with the Secretary personally over at the State Department, and we have had ongoing discussions. They support aspects of this bill. They don't like some of the sanction provisions, specifically the codification of Executive orders. I understand that. That has been sort of an intractable problem we have had during these negotiations.

I also remind everybody here that I bet I could pull out a letter identical to the letter just read by the Senator from Virginia on the issue of the Syrian Accountability Act, which passed here after about 3½ years or 2½ years of work, to try to get the administration on board with that legislation. The State Department opposed it, opposed it, opposed it. The President opposed it. They thought it was the wrong time, something we shouldn't do.

I had three conversations with the President on the Syrian Accountability Act. The first two times, he about tore my head off, saying how inappropriate it was for Congress to act in this regard and try to impose sanctions and mess around with foreign policy. The third conversation I had with him was a conversation where he said he would sign it. Six months later, he gave the State of the Union Address and took credit for the Syrian Accountability Act as one of the great accomplishments of his administration in foreign policy.

I believe the impact of the Syrian Accountability Act is pretty discernible—what happened with the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon. The Congress, when we act and do so in a responsible fashion, can make a difference. I believe this is an appropriate time and appropriate subject for us to make a difference.

Iran is the great threat before us. If anyone believes that by being weak, by not acting, by not stepping forward, and by not getting involved and saying we are going to hold those who cooperate with the Iranians accountable for their cooperation, if we think that by backing off on that somehow or another we will create some good will with the hardliners who control Iran, you have not been watching how the Iranians behave. They respect one thing and one thing only—we are about to give it to them, I hope—and that is action, deeds, and a credible threat that we will impose sanctions and we will hurt their capability if they do not change their course. That is what we have an opportunity to do here in about 2 minutes. I hope we take that opportunity and do not simply say that we like what the President is doing and we are all for negotiation and we hope everything goes well. It will be interpreted as stepping back, as weakness. We cannot afford that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WARNER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Biden amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Also, I ask unanimous consent, I believe with the agreement of the chairman, that Senator LAUTENBERG, who has been promised 3 minutes, be given those 3 minutes, and that if Senator SANTORUM needs a minute or two to respond to Senator LAUTENBERG, he be given it.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey, with an additional 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will try to be quick. I listened with interest to the Senator from Pennsylvania and his presentation. I also looked at the amendment he has produced. In that amendment, we are going to administer sanctions against companies doing business with Iran.

Now, the surprise here is that three times before, when I had an amendment, the Senator from Pennsylvania voted against it, would not include it, didn't want to discriminate against firms that do business with Iran and that provide revenues that kill our kids in Iraq. And now we have a flimsy aspect. We say we are going to impose sanctions; however, it will be out of reach of American jurisdiction. It, therefore, will not apply to the company that owns it—in this case it happens to be a Halliburton—that has a sham corporation operating in Dubai based originally in the Cayman Islands. That should not be allowed, that the grasp of the U.S. Government cannot reach these perpetrators of the kind of indecency that places our soldiers at risk because they are doing business with an avowed enemy of the United States that is providing funds that are lethal to our troops over there.

I hope everybody will take a good close look at this amendment and vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this goes under the old rubric of no good deed goes unpunished. We have attempted in this amendment to meet the Senator from New Jersey halfway. The Senator's amendment has consistently been voted on. I have opposed it and so has most of the Senate, which suggests that those who are currently doing business and have invested should be penalized for their investment. What we say is that on any future investment, you will be penalized. We make the Lautenberg language prospective.

In attempting to meet the Senator from New Jersey halfway, we find out

that this is not sufficient and, therefore, we should oppose this amendment. I would think half a loaf is better than no loaf. This, by the way, was not in the Iran Freedom and Support Act. This is one of the provisions Senator LEVIN mentioned that was added, frankly, out of respect for the concerns the Senator from New Jersey raised and has raised on the floor repeatedly.

This is an attempt to make a good-faith attempt—and I do mean that—a good-faith attempt to meet the Senator from New Jersey halfway and to take his policy and put it in place in a prospective manner. If that is not sufficient for the Senator from New Jersey, that is fine. He is welcome to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, is the Senator aware that the exemption in his amendment would make it almost impossible to hold a U.S. company liable for doing business with Iran through a foreign subsidiary?

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding is that we crafted this language pursuant to the language the Senator from New Jersey used in the past and put a threshold we thought was—I think it was a $20 million threshold we put in place which we thought was a reasonable threshold of investment to reach the level of sanction.

If the Senator from New Jersey would like to toughen that language or change the threshold, I would be happy to sit down and talk with him about it. I am open to discussion.

My only point, and I think the point we have had in this discussion in the past, is I don't believe it is proper to penalize companies that have investments there, in many cases longstanding investments. What we want to do is discourage future investment. That is what we attempt to do in this amendment. If the Senator does not believe it has been effectively written, I will be happy to sit down with him, in all sincerity, and work to make it effective that future investments are discouraged.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have another question, if I may, and that is, would the Senator be willing to move the vote back, if we can do it, so we can discuss the language?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are under a unanimous consent agreement. The time, I believe, has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 6 seconds remaining.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield back the 6 seconds so we can get to the vote? I regret we have to move forward.

Mr. SANTORUM. The Senator has heard his answer.

Mr. WARNER. There are Senators who have to go to the Pentagon for a memorial service. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, there are a number of differences between S. 333 and the Santorum amendment. These differences include a number of new provisions in the amendment that are not in the S. 333. Some of them are:

Remove the requirement that a parent or a subsidiary of a person against whom sanctions have been issued must have actual knowledge of the activities before sanctions can be issued against them.

Remove the requirement that an affiliate of the Company against which sanctions have been issued must have actual knowledge of the activities before sanctions can be issued against them.

Remove Libya from the scope and title of the Iran Libya Sanctions Act.

Would impose an additional condition on the exercise of the President's waiver authority by imposing an additional element in the report that must be submitted to Congress prior to the waiver going into effect. Current law requires, among other elements of the report, an assessment of the significance of the assistance provided to the development of Iran's petroleum production. The new requirement would also require an assessment of the significance of the assistance to the development of Iran's weapons of mass destruction or other military capabilities.

Reduces operations and maintenance funding for the Army for Iraq and Afghanistan by $100 million.

In other instances, there are modifications to provisions in the amendment that are included in S. 333. For instance, both S. 333 and the Santorum amendment would expand the universe of persons against whom sanctions could be imposed to include a private or government lender, insurer, underwriter, reinsurer, or guarantor of a person sanctioned. S. 333 would require that these persons would have to have actual knowledge of the activities of the person sanctioned; the Santorum amendment does not include the requirement of actual knowledge.

Both S. 333 and the Santorum amendment would expand the definition of a person to include a financial instution, insurer, underwriter, reinsurer, guarantor. The Santorum amendment would also include any other business organization, including any foreign subsidiaries of the foregoing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4234. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Allard	DeMint	McConnell
Allen	DeWine	Murkowski
Bayh	Dole	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Domenici	Roberts
Brownback	Ensign	Santorum
Bunning	Frist	Sessions
Burns	Graham	Snowe
Burr	Grassley	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Coleman	Inhofe	Thune
Collins	Isakson	Vitter
Conrad	Kyl	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lieberman	Wyden
Craig	Lott	
Crapo	Martinez	

NAYS—53

Akaka	Feingold	Menendez
Alexander	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Gregg	Murray
Bennett	Hagel	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Harkin	Obama
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Jeffords	Reed
Byrd	Johnson	Reid
Cantwell	Kennedy	Salazar
Carper	Kerry	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kohl	Schumer
Clinton	Landrieu	Shelby
Cochran	Lautenberg	Smith
Dayton	Leahy	Specter
Dodd	Levin	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lincoln	Thomas
Durbin	Lugar	Warner
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 4234) was rejected.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FRIST. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, at this moment we do want to honor the 2,500 Americans who have given their lives in Iraq, and their families. We ask all Senators to take their seats and offer that moment of silence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will observe a moment of silence out of respect for our fallen troops.

(The Senate observed a moment of silence.)

AMENDMENT NO. 4257

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Biden amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN. Will the manager yield me time to speak to my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, our amendment merely states that we support the President's efforts, in a nutshell. I only have a minute. We support the President's efforts in negotiations with our European allies, the Russians, and Chinese to both offer incentives and sanctions to Iran regarding its proceeding with construction of a nuclear weapon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the distinguished senior

Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 1 minute in opposition.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, as I said during debate, this amendment simply says that we support the President's effort to negotiate a diplomatic resolution to Iran's garnering of nuclear weapons. I support the amendment. I wish the President and those efforts well. I suspect we will be back, talking about this again in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Dole	Martinez
Alexander	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Allen	Durbin	Menendez
Baucus	Ensign	Mikulski
Bayh	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Graham	Obama
Boxer	Grassley	Pryor
Brownback	Gregg	Reed
Bunning	Hagel	Reid
Burns	Harkin	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Salazar
Byrd	Hutchison	Santorum
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Carper	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Jeffords	Shelby
Clinton	Johnson	Smith
Coburn	Kennedy	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Specter
Coleman	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Sununu
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Talent
Craig	Leahy	Thomas
Crapo	Levin	Thune
Dayton	Lieberman	Vitter
DeMint	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Dodd	Lugar	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 4257) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as if in morning business for up to 25 minutes, and that after I have spoken Senator NELSON of Florida be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GREGG and Mr. SESSIONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 3521 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Florida is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4265

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is laid aside.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON], for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 4265.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE GRANTING OF AMNESTY TO PERSONS KNOWN TO HAVE KILLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March of 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 members of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) the President should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, a significant hubbub has occurred as a result of stories that have appeared in this morning's Washington Post that directly affect the defense posture of this country. It is stated in the Washington Post that the Prime Minister of Iraq is expected to release within days a ''plan [that] is likely to include pardons for those who had attacked only U.S. troops'' in Iraq. That is according to a top adviser.

As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister of Iraq is quoted as saying—and I will get to the quote—reconciliation could include an amnesty for those ''who weren't involved in the shedding of Iraqi blood.'' Ergo, there would be amnesty for those who would have been involved in the shedding of American blood.

Now, it is possible—and this Senator hopes that something was lost in the translation because I cannot imagine the Prime Minister of Iraq turning on his heel away from American troops and suddenly—as he is trying to bring about reconciliation in his country—trying to then say as part of that reconciliation we are going to give amnesty for anybody who killed American men and women.

Well, naturally the Government of the United States should not stand for this. That is why Senator MENENDEZ and I are offering this amendment to the Defense authorization bill, so that we can clearly set forth the policy—in this case, the sense of the Senate—that we will not stand for this.

By the adoption of this sense of the Senate amendment, clearly our President should speak to the Iraqi Prime Minister, who he just spoke with a couple of days ago, and he should speak with him immediately to get him to retract this statement. There should be no amnesty for those who murder American troops. American troops continue to serve bravely, and they are fighting for the freedom of all Iraqis. So it brings us to a point that is pretty clear. The Senate should go on record as having said that we repudiate that statement.

I will very clearly state what the Senate sense of the Congress is, 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 and that the President should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

It is fairly straightforward. I could go on and on with comments. I am awaiting the arrival of Senator MENENDEZ because I want him to make some comments as well.

If you do what a number of us in this body have done in visiting either with the families of those who have borne the brunt of the fighting and have given the ultimate sacrifice or if you have visited with those who return wounded and maimed, then there is no question there should be no obfuscation as to the policy of granting amnesty to those who have killed Americans.

I remember going back to the time that I served as a captain in the Army, which was years and years ago. One of the most dread duties I had was to be the officer who was given the task of notifying the loved ones in the family of a service person who was killed. That, of course, is an exceptionally emotional event. And although it was decades ago, those experiences are seared in my memory because of the

trauma and the emotion when you meet with the grieving family of a loved one.

By the same token, there are over 18,000 of our service people who have been wounded. And many of them, because the body armor is working and saving the vital organs, their lives are being saved, but they have been maimed. The extremities are often the part of the body that is the casualty since the body armor is saving the vital organs. As a result, what we see is a lot of soldiers and sailors and Marines who come back, and they are just as optimistic as they can be in their outlook and yet think of the life that they will live with the maiming that has occurred. Their life was spared, but their life is going to be clearly different for the future.

Anyone who would dare suggest that in the formulation of a new government of Iraq, which we, the United States Government, clearly support, anyone who would even contemplate that that government have a policy that, as they try to build reconciliation, they are going to grant amnesty to those who have killed Americans, as we say in the South, they have to have another thing coming, because we are not going to tolerate it.

I offer a simple resolution on behalf of the Senate. I hope it is not going to be controversial. I hope it will be accepted.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I had my fourth trip to Iraq recently and met with a number of leaders over there. I have been impressed with them and have enjoyed them. I know Senator NELSON has also. He and I are the chair and ranking member respectively of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. We have worked together on many important issues.

I wanted to say a couple things. First, the amendment he has is of value and will be something that can be accepted. I believe it should be. You worry a little bit that maybe language difficulties come into play in how miscommunications can occur. Even among those of us who speak English together, we can have misunderstandings.

I was just handed a CNN interview today. It just came across the wire. It was by a reporter, Daryn Kagan, with the new national security adviser to Prime Minister Maliki in Iraq. He was asked about this very subject because the reporter obviously felt some of the same concerns the Senator from Florida raised. He said this to him.

The reporter:

Doctor, I know there's a big effort by your government in your country to try to prevent civil war. And as a part of that, the Washington Post reports today that your Prime Minister is considering offering amnesty to Sunnis or to others who perhaps attacked only U.S. troops. This, not surprisingly, is causing great consternation here in the U.S., even talking about it and being raised on the floor of the U.S. Senate today. Is this, indeed, the case? Is your government thinking about offering amnesty to those that attacked only U.S. military?

This is Dr. Rubaie's reply:

This is not the case. I'm sorry to say that the prime minister of Iraq has been misquoted and misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed Americans.

As a matter of fact, if you go there in his meeting with the President Bush a couple of days ago, he looked the president in the eye and he said, thank you very, very much for liberating our country. Please thank the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and blood they have invested in this country. It's well worth investing, of liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful.

And we will—the blood of the Iraqi soldier and the blood of Iraqi civilian soldier is as sacred to us as the American soldier. We are fighting the same war, we are fighting together, and this is a joined responsibility. And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldier or civilian.

What the prime minister is going to give amnesty to are those who have not committed the crimes, rather they're against Iraqis or coalition. Those who have—still carry arms and they might have probably done some minor mistakes in storing some arms or allowing some terrorists to stay overnight or shelter, give shelter to some of these insurgents. That's it. Basically, it's a goodwill gesture he's extending to the Sunni community, to those who have committed some mistakes in the past.

I don't know exactly how it all came about or how the comments were made. Mr. Maliki is new to being Prime Minister. There are language difficulties. I hope this reflects the firm view of the people of Iraq. I find it consistent with the responses I have had when I talked to the Iraqi leadership.

I thank the Senator from Florida for raising the question. I am pleased to see this very strong response from the national security adviser, Prime Minister Maliki's top adviser on national security.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. This Senator hopes, too, as I said at the outset of this Senator's remarks, that there is something lost in the translation, a mistake. But if there is, it is time for Prime Minister Maliki to step forward and clarify it. He can easily clarify it. But that does not diminish the need for the sense of Congress that says 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.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment Senator NELSON and I have offered on this issue of amnesty for those who have killed American soldiers.

I know the latest statements that have come out. I hope that is ultimately where the intention is. But it became very clear to me. I hope my colleagues have had the opportunity to read today's Washington Post article. It says: ''Iraq Amnesty Plan May Cover Attacks On U.S. Military.'' When you read the statements there, I have to be honest, they were very unequivocal but unequivocal in a way that we could not accept as the U.S. Senate.

As I continued to reread this article, my anger grew. In the article it refers to the Prime Minister of Iraq acknowledging that reconciliation could include an amnesty for those ''who weren't involved in the shedding of Iraqi blood.'' That is where the quote ends. There is not one single mention of American blood. Is that a misinterpretation? Is that an oversight on the day on which we recognize the loss of 2,500 American soldiers and the thousands and thousands who have shed their blood and come back injured? Is that an oversight?

How about American blood and American lives, Mr. Prime Minister? Are you willing to have reconciliation on the pool of American blood that has been spilled to give your country and your people a chance for freedom? Is there so little value to the 2,500 American lives that have been lost and the over 18,000 wounded on behalf of your country that you wouldn't even think about including American lives when you were talking about Iraqi lives? No way. No way.

Then I look at the article and look at the quotes attributed to Adnan Kadhimi, a top adviser to Maliki. What does he say? He says:

The government has in mind somehow to do reconciliation, and one way to do it is to offer an amnesty . . .

Then he goes on to talk about amnesty. He says:

We can see if somehow those who are so-called resistance can be accepted if they have not been involved in any kind of criminal behavior, such as killing innocent people or damaging infrastructure, and even infrastructure, if it is minor, will be part of it.

So we have this elaborate plan that talks about even infrastructure, but doesn't talk about American lives. And then, when asked about clemency for those who attacked U.S. troops, he goes on to say—the adviser to the Prime Minister—that ''that's an area where we can see a green line.''

There is some sort of preliminary understanding between us and the U.S.-led multinational force in Iraq that there is ''a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely, I believe.''

Well, who in the U.S.-led multinational force has an understanding

with the Iraqis that it is OK to offer amnesty for those who have killed Americans? I would like to know the answer to that question.

I do believe very strongly that Senator NELSON's and my amendment should be embraced by the entire Senate. We cannot allow to chance that those statements attributed on the record—one directly by the Prime Minister and one directly by his top adviser—can be equivocated on. We have to send a very strong message that we will not tolerate amnesty to those who have taken the lives of American soldiers and for those who have spilled American blood in defense of their country.

Just a little while ago, we had a moment of silence for the 2,500 American soldiers who have died in Iraq. Let's do much more than have a moment of silence in the face of these statements. Let's make sure the taking of American lives can never be rewarded with amnesty. The Senate has an opportunity to make a clear, unequivocal statement that it is unacceptable, and I believe that it should take this opportunity. It is not only with a moment of silence that we show our respect, it is with our deeds that we show our respect.

Let the Senate act unanimously and speak with one voice to make it very clear that this should not even be a thought on behalf of the Iraqi Government. Then we will have honored the lives of those people, our fellow Americans, who gave the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of their country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, I placed a call to a Nevada mother, Jennifer Laybourn. These calls are not easy; they are hard. Like many other Nevada mothers, she lost a boy, 19 years old, her son David, in Iraq. He was performing his duties as a soldier when he was killed by an improvised explosive device. Again, he was 19 years old.

Nevada has lost 39 soldiers in Iraq. Nevada is a small, sparsely populated State. Thirty-nine is a lot of funerals, a lot of sorrow for those of us from Nevada. There is no way we can ever repay those 39 Nevada heroes and their parents, siblings, family, and friends for their sacrifices. But we must always make sure their service is honored, which is why today I compliment and applaud Senators NELSON from Florida and MENENDEZ from New Jersey, and to express my complete shock and outrage that the Iraqi Prime Minister has even considered granting amnesty to the insurgents who have killed our troops.

Up to this day, today, we have lost 2,500 soldiers in Iraq. The mere idea that this proposal would go forward is an insult to the brave Nevadans who have died in the name of Iraqi freedom, and this doesn't take into consideration those Nevadans who have been grievously wounded in battle. It is my hope the President will denounce this proposal immediately—not wait for a retraction by the Iraqis but denounce it immediately. We should remember that the majority of Nevadans killed in Iraq were not killed in acts of warfare, as we historically have known warfare. They were killed in acts of terror.

All of us who are committed to freedom and democracy should recognize that their murders, 39 Nevadans, deserve justice. While I support reconciliation efforts to bring Iraqi political factions together, I don't support amnesty for those who commit acts of terror against Americans.

It sends the wrong signal to our troops, the wrong signal to the Iraqis, and it sends the wrong signal to all Americans. It certainly sends a wrong signal to the insurgents who have now been given the message that they can attack our forces without consequence.

President Bush continually makes a point of saying that a free Iraq means the United States will have a friend in the Middle East. This amnesty proposal is no sign of friendship; it is a sign of hostility which dishonors the sacrifice of our troops. Our troops deserve better. Again, I urge the President to tell the new Iraqi Government to stand down. America will not stand as our troops are dishonored in this way.

It seems so unfortunate that after the President's visit in Iraq, a day later this is floated through the Iraqi Government. It is too bad. We deserve better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to my good friend from Nevada. I hope Senators will be more supportive of our elected allies who are the Government of Iraq. The national security adviser for the Government of Iraq just said a few hours ago:

> And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

So this notion of amnesty about a new, duly-elected Iraqi Government is a sideshow, an effort to divert our attention away from the core issue. Over in the House of Representatives today, they are having a much needed debate on the Iraq war. I had hoped that we would have that debate in the Senate. I read that several of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were interested in offering an amendment that would codify what they have said publicly, which is that the troops ought to be out by the end of this year. I hope they will come down and offer that amendment. I hope we will have that debate. I think it is a good time to have that debate.

It is a good time to remind the American people that it is no accident that we have not been attacked again since 9/11. Nobody would have predicted that in the fall of 2001. If we asked for a show of hands in the Senate of how many Senators thought we would be attacked again that year, I think every hand would have gone up. Certainly, the American people expected another attack. By going on the offense, which the President suggested we do shortly after 9/11, we have succeeded dramatically in the principal reason for advancing the war on terrorism, and that was to protect us at home. Almost 5 years later, we have not been attacked again. While nobody will predict that we will never be attacked again, it is noteworthy that we have not been attacked again. Believe me, it is not an accident. Why have we not been attacked again? Because we went into Afghanistan and into Iraq. We liberated 50 million people. A lot of the terrorists are dead. Several are at Guantanamo. Many are hiding in their caves. Yes, some are still around doing mischief in Baghdad rather than in Washington or New York.

This is the time we ought to be having the debate about Iraq strategy. We are on the Defense authorization bill. Colleagues on the other side have said they were going to offer an amendment to advocate withdrawal by the end of the year. Let's have that debate. I cannot think of a better time.

Right now in Iraq, according to the latest AP story, since we were able to get Zarqawi last week, we have carried out 452 raids; 104 insurgents were killed during those actions; we have discovered 28 significant arms caches; 255 of the raids were joint operations, with 143 of them carried out by Iraqi forces alone; and the raids resulted in casualties of 759 anti-Iraqi elements. That is just in the last week. So we have them on the run in Iraq.

Why would anybody want to suggest that we ought to run when we have them on the run? But I think that is a legitimate debate. I hoped that we would have it. It is 2:10. I have been waiting anxiously all day, assuming that we would have that amendment laid down by those on the other side of the aisle and get on about the debate. Maybe we should have it in any event because it is time to step up and be counted.

Do we want to stay and finish the job and continue to protect America or do we want to send a message to the terrorists, when we have them on the run, that we are about to cut and run and leave them there to their own devices? I don't know any responsible countries in the world at this point, regardless of how they may have initially felt about the decision to go into Iraq, that think it is a good idea to leave now—particularly as we are making dramatic progress with their new constitution; a new, fully staffed government; the death of the most notorious terrorist in the country; these successful raids that have been carried out in the last week; and the effort underway to clean Baghdad out.

Why in the world would we want to say to those elements in Iraq, which want the country to be a haven for terrorism forever, that you can count on

us to be out of here by the end of the year; that we are giving you adequate notice that we are leaving by the end of the year?

I see my colleague from Texas on the Senate floor. I wondered if he had a question.

Mr. CORNYN. Yes. Will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority whip, isn't the real difference between those of us who believe war is bad and must never be fought and those of us who believe that war is bad but must sometimes be fought for the right reasons? What is the alternative to fighting the good fight that our troops are fighting in Iraq now? I just ask whether the Senator has heard any alternatives offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Texas, the only alternative I heard suggested, I have read about it in the press—I have not heard it offered on the floor yet—is that we essentially give the terrorists advance notice that we are going to be out of the country by the end of the year.

Look, we all hate, as the Senator from Texas indicated, to read reports of the death of any of our troops. We value human life in this country greatly. We do not, however, honor those who have given their lives in this great cause by giving up when we are making dramatic progress. And it is also important to remember that while we value every single life, we have lost fewer of our soldiers liberating Afghanistan and Iraq—50 million people liberated—than we lost on 9/11 in one morning or in Normandy during the invasion in World War II.

So while we value every life and we regret the loss of each soldier, it is extremely difficult to fight a war and lose absolutely no one.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for an additional question, I ask the distinguished majority whip, what does he believe the consequences in Iraq to be—and not just to Iraq, but to America itself in terms of our own security—if we were to precipitously draw down our forces and leave a void there that might then be filled by enemies of our country and, indeed, terrorists akin to those who attacked our country on 9/11?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Texas, I think one thing that is pretty obvious is the terrorists would have a haven from which to operate, once again, such as they had in Afghanistan for a number of years prior to our clearing that out and giving those folks an opportunity to set up a democratic government. They would have a base of operations right in the Middle East from which to attack our neighbors, to attack the Europeans, and probably attack us again. That would be the consequence of cutting and running just on the heels of making dramatic forward progress in Iraq.

Mr. CORNYN. If the Senator will yield for one final question, I just want to be sure I understood his earlier comments from the National Security Adviser for the Government of Iraq.

There had been some suggestion that the Iraqis were planning on granting amnesty to those who had killed American soldiers. But if I understood the distinguished majority whip, the National Security Adviser said:

> And we will never give amnesty to those who killed American soldiers or who killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

If that language is true, that they would never do that, would the Senator care to venture a guess as to what the reason for this supposed sense of the Senate is to condemn some amnesty that will never be given?

Mr. MCCONNELL. It sounds to me, I answer my good friend from Texas, as some kind of diversion from the core issue we ought to be debating in the Senate, which is these suggestions that have been made by a number of our colleagues that we ought to have all the troops out by the end of the year. It is time to have that debate in the Senate, not a sense-of-the-Senate resolution about a proposal, as the Senator from Texas points out, that has been shot down today by the National Security Adviser in Iraq who, as the Senator from Texas indicated, said today:

> And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or who killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

What part of ''never give amnesty'' do our colleagues not understand?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID addressed the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe I have the floor. Would someone like to ask a question?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield to my friend from Florida for a question.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. This Senator clearly doesn't support pulling the troops out of Iraq by the end of the year. This Senator offered an amendment which is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States based on this morning's story in this newspaper that indicates comments that were made by the Prime Minister.

Is the Senator suggesting that he does not agree with the sense-of-the-Senate resolution being expressed in this amendment as laid down by this Senator from Florida?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, answering the question, let me just repeat what the National Security Adviser in Iraq has just said:

> And we will never give amnesty to those who killed American soldiers or who killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

Is it helpful to be passing resolutions condemning our allies in Iraq for positions that the National Security Adviser says the Government doesn't hold?

I am pleased to hear that my good friend from Florida opposes the amendment that I hope will be offered later today that calls for an American troop withdrawal by the end of the year. That is a debate I thought we were going to be having, rather than adopting resolutions condemning one part of the Iraqi Government or another—the Iraqi Government, of course, being a great ally of the United States in the war on terrorism.

Maybe that debate will occur later in the day, and I look forward to hearing from the Senator from Florida when we have that debate. I am sure he will be arguing the vote on that should be no, and the Senator from Florida, of course, will be entirely correct; that is exactly how that amendment should be dealt with. I hope it will be defeated overwhelmingly.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Does the Senator have a question or is he seeking the floor?

Mr. REID. I thought the Senator was finished.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Kentucky and my friend from Texas are involved in a debate that doesn't exist. The amendment before the Senate, which will require a vote, is based on a sense-of-the-Senate resolution offered by the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ. Here is what the matter pending before the Senate now says:

> Congress makes the following findings:
>
> (1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.
>
> (2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March of 2003.
>
> (3) More than 2,500 members of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of the coalition forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.
>
> (b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that
>
> (1) the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known who have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed forces of the United States; and
>
> (2) the President should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

That is very clear. That is what we are going to be called to vote on.

Why do we have this before us? Because last night a man by the name of Adnan Ali al-Kadhimi, a top adviser to the Prime Minister of Iraq, said, among other things, the following:

> Asked about clemency for those who attacked U.S. troops, he said: ''That's an area

where we can see a green line. There's some sort of preliminary understanding between us and the MNF-I,'' the U.S.-led Multinational Force-Iraq, ''that there is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely.

That is the reason for this resolution. It is not about an amendment that will be offered and there will be some other debate. It is about whether the people of Iraq, who are running that government, should pardon those people, grant amnesty to the people who have attacked our forces either through snipers, armed combat, or explosive devices. It is a simple vote.

Further, the man went on to say they would consider taking a look at Iraqi forces who were attacked. They wouldn't necessarily be given amnesty like those who attacked Americans.

That is a pretty clear vote, Mr. President. And that is the issue before the Senate, not some make-believe thing that will come at some later time, maybe. The issue before the Senate today is whether this resolution will be approved, yes or no, based upon statements made by officials in Iraq.

Someone has since then said: We don't like that. Good. We should adopt this resolution anyway. This is no attack on the Iraqi Government other than to say: Be careful, don't tread on our soldiers' graves.

This is the debate before us. I talked about a woman I called yesterday in Nevada who lost her 19-year-old son in Iraq, and to think that anyone in the Iraqi Government—anyone in the Iraqi Government—should pardon an Iraqi who killed this young man is repulsive. That is what the debate is about today. It is not about these terms that my friends like to throw around—cut and run, tax and spend.

The American people know what is going on here. They know what is going on. We all want the Iraqi issue to proceed even though it is costing us $2.5 billion a week, 2,500 dead soldiers, 18,000 or 20,000 wounded, a third of them grievously wounded, 20 percent of them coming back from Iraq with posttraumatic stress syndrome with a Veterans' Administration that is underfunded.

That is what this is all about. It is not about some other issue. It is about whether the Government of Iraq, now or at any other time in the future, should pardon people who harm our soldiers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, what is the agreement at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the Nelson of Florida amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator from Georgia is here. I think he would like to offer an amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and that I be allowed to call up an amendment of mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous consent request.

Who seeks recognition?

Then Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since we are going to be on the amendment of the Senator from Florida for a few minutes, I have a couple other thoughts I would like to offer to our colleagues in response to those offered by the Democratic leader.

First of all, I don't know why, after the Iraqi officials have disclaimed any intent whatsoever to offer amnesty to those who have killed an American soldier, we would gratuitously offer a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to condemn them for doing something they said they are not going to do, unless we are engaged more in gamesmanship than we are in working and passing serious legislation.

The comment was made earlier that perhaps this is just a diversion. I thought we were going to have a serious debate about whether we were going to bring our troops back home and on what kind of timetable we were going to do that, whether it is some arbitrary timetable or, instead, whether it is based on conditions on the ground. I thought that was the kind of debate we were going to have today, not some sort of manufactured debate offering a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to divert public attention from an issue that does not exist about this amnesty that has been suggested which has been expressly disclaimed by the Iraqi leadership.

My suggestion is that we move on to the serious work that the people of this country sent us here to do and not to engage in sideshows, which is clearly what this sense-of-the-Senate proposition is designed to do.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORNYN. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, since this Senator from Florida is the author of the amendment, I would recall, for the consideration of the distinguished Senator from Texas, that there is nothing in this resolution that says anything about condemnation of the Iraqi Government. It says: It is 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.

I would further call to the attention of the distinguished Senator that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment, and as soon as the leadership is ready to dispose of the amendment, we can vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I don't know what the question was, but let me just respond to the distinguished Senator from Florida. It makes no sense for the Senate to shake its finger at the new Government of Iraq and to criticize them, whether it is a condemnation or a criticism or an admonishment or whatever you want to call it, for something that they have expressed that they have no intention of doing. I don't dispute from a procedural standpoint the Senator's right at some point, perhaps, to have a vote on the sense-of-the-Senate amendment, but I just question the wisdom of proceeding in this way when we are a nation at war.

We have done everything that we could to help the Iraqi people help themselves, from training their security forces to encouraging them and helping them in the development of a new government, something that is really a miracle to behold, if you think about it. Three years ago, they had a blood-thirsty dictator with his boot heel on the back of the neck of the Iraqi people, responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and a threat to the entire world because of the potential partnerships with terrorists who might export their terror to places such as the United States. Why we would gratuitously take an occasion like this, to distract us from the important business that we are about, to criticize in one way, form, or fashion the new Iraqi Government which is just beginning to show that they are able to take the first small steps toward self-determination and self-governance, why we would take this occasion to admonish them for something they have expressly indicated no intention of doing is beyond me.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I would.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know the Senator from Texas and I covered this a few moments ago, but I would ask the Senator from Texas again if it is not the case that the national security adviser to the Iraqi Government just this very day said the following: And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would answer the distinguished majority whip by saying, that is exactly the quotation. The same individuals went on to say that who the Prime Minister is going to give amnesty to are those who have not committed the crimes, whether against Iraqis or coalition forces. He went on to say, they might probably have done some minor mistakes in storing some arms or allowing some terrorist to stay overnight or provided shelter. But he has expressly said: We will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the Senator from Texas yield for an additional question?

Mr. CORNYN. I would.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Might it not be just as useful an exercise to try to pass a resolution commending the Iraqi Government for the position they have taken today with regard to this discussion of amnesty?

Mr. CORNYN. I would answer the distinguished majority whip and say, I would feel much better about something that was constructive and encouraging in assisting the Iraqi Government in their determination not to give amnesty than I would in offering criticism where it appears to be gratuitous and where it is a distraction from the debate that I think the American people would want us to have; that is, under what conditions do we want to leave Iraq, and are some of the proposals that some of our colleagues on the Senate floor have made about setting timetables, are those in the best interests of the American people or do they endanger America by allowing perhaps those who are America's enemies, the enemies of all civilization, to plot and plan, and then use that failed state as a platform to export their terrorist activities to other parts of the world?

AMENDMENT NO. 4269 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4265

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the underlying amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 4269 to amendment No. 4265.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq and urge the convening of an Iraq summit)

At the end of the amendment add the following:

SEC. ___. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ.—

(1) SCHEDULE FOR WITHDRAWAL.—The President shall reach an agreement as soon as possible with the Government of Iraq on a schedule for the withdrawal of United States combat troops from Iraq by December 31, 2006, leaving only forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The President shall consult with Congress regarding such schedule and shall present such withdrawal agreement to Congress immediately upon the completion of the agreement.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF OVER-THE-HORIZON TROOP PRESENCE.—The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests.

(b) IRAQ SUMMIT.—The President should convene a summit as soon as possible that includes the leaders of the Government of Iraq, leaders of the governments of each country bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that addresses fundamental issues including federalism, oil revenues, the militias, security guarantees, reconstruction, economic assistance, and border security.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the amendment I have sent to the desk is the amendment that I believe the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, had indicated he was going to be offering today so that we can have an appropriate debate on this very important day about whether it is appropriate to withdraw American troops by the end of 2006. That is the second-degree amendment that I just sent to the desk.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I don't have a dog in this fight, you might say, but I have been listening to this debate, and I wonder about history. I wonder about the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I remember reading so clearly that after the War Between the States, the North lined up those from the South and took their guns and let some of them take them home. I remember so well that after World War II, we went through a process of trying to urge the governments involved in the access to obtain a pledge from the former members of the military that they would support the new democracy. That was amnesty.

In Japan, we certainly had a period under General MacArthur which was probably the greatest period of amnesty that has ever been known. We helped that country immediately to form a democracy and we never prosecuted the people who killed Americans.

I wonder seriously about what the Senator from Florida is doing by telling this new fledgling democracy that they cannot go through the process of cleansing, go through the process of trying to get people who were misguided, who were part of coalitions that they now are willing to recant, if they are, to come forward and support this new democracy. What are we doing anyway on the floor of the Senate trying to tell the new democracy what they can and can't do? I didn't like that story when I read it in the paper this morning, but I was happy to see the new statement from the security people that clarified what they intend to do.

But the time will come, if that democracy is going to succeed, when they are going to have to fold into their population those who are willing now to give up terrorism, those who are willing to put aside the activities of the past which led them to attack Americans as well as any other—there are 34 other nations over there. Are we saying just those who did kill Americans, they can't get amnesty, but the rest of them can?

What are we doing on the floor of the Senate trying to debate an issue as to how this country is going to come back together again? I am sort of appalled at it, really. I don't know if anyone else is. But it seems to me that we ought to do everything we can to encourage them to bring their people together, to forget the sins of the past, to forget the terrorists of the past, and to pledge themselves to a new future of democracy and have people come forward and say: I am willing to support this new democracy. And if they do, and demonstrate that they do after a period of time, shouldn't they be recognized as being loyal citizens of the new democracy?

This is a debate that disturbs me. It disturbs me to think we are willing to just seize the moment and make a political point—seize the moment and make a point—and not think. It is time we started thinking about how we can assure and take steps to help this country survive as a democracy. If it becomes a democracy in that part of the world, it will be a marvelous success, and I think it will lead to greater consideration by other countries of liberalization of their concepts and giving the people more power.

I believe we ought to try to find some way to encourage that country, to demonstrate to those people who have been opposed to what we are trying to do, that it is worthwhile for them and their children to come forward and support this democracy. And if that is amnesty, I am for it, I would be for it. And if those people who come forward and want to obtain a better life for their families in the future are willing to support that democracy—if they bear arms against our people, what is the difference between those people who bore arms against the Union in the War Between the States? What is the difference between the Germans and the Japanese and all the people we have forgiven?

When I left the war and came home, I had a deep hatred for the Japanese. Today, Mr. President, I have a granddaughter who is Japanese. I have a daughter-in-law who is Japanese. And her parents were involved in World War II. Now, are we to understand that time can heal, heal the pain of the past?

I really wish the Senator from Florida would have the courage to withdraw the amendment, just withdraw it and say it was a political effort. This is nothing but politics. I will vote to table it or vote against it in good conscience.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Is it not true, Mr. President, that today we have Iraqis who are fighting the war against the

insurgents who at one time fought against American troops and other coalition troops as they were marching to Baghdad, who have now come over to our side and are doing one heck of a job of fighting alongside the Americans and coalition forces, attacking and killing insurgents on a daily basis?

Mr. STEVENS. That is absolutely true. I would say to the Senator, I was there and participated in the conversation with some of our military people who were trying to find ways to help the Iraqis take into the regular armed services some of those people who served in the Red Guard under Saddam Hussein. But they are willing to come forward now and see that there is a country they would like to support. And if they asked my opinion about that, I would say I would encourage it. I would encourage it. I think if there is anything that can bring about stability in that country and have them support this new democracy, we should encourage it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. I will, Mr. President.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Alaska would agree that as he goes through the history of countries that have been torn apart by war, including our country in the Civil War and Japan, after the Second World War, and the processes of reconciliation, whether South Africa might not be an example. And is it not true that Nelson Mandela's courage and his ability to create a process of reconciliation and forgiveness was a major factor in what has been a political miracle in Africa, where White and Black people now are able to live together in a democracy? Is not that process of reconciliation one of the most admired processes in the last century? Nelson Mandela, the winner of a Nobel Peace Prize just for this sort of gesture, would he not fit into the series of examples that the Senator from Alaska used a few moments ago?

Mr. STEVENS. Absolutely. Mr. President, I would say it falls under the concept of the Christian ethic. We are people who believe that you can be converted. You can be a nonbeliever and then become a believer. What is the difference between that and amnesty, between those people who may have been on the wrong side and then will come forward and belong to this new government? And if they pledge and demonstrate to do it, I think it is up to the Iraqis to determine when and how they become full-fledged citizens of the new democracy.

But this amendment would have us say if they indicate they are going to grant amnesty to them, that is wrong. Amnesty ought to be a reward for a pledge of cooperation and support. In this context, the military context, I think you can go through history and find time after time after time where it was successful. But this amendment is a political amendment, and I am tired of these political things coming on the floor. The minute something comes in the paper, before it can even be corrected by the country, we have an amendment saying, oh, here, let's force the majority to vote against this amendment. Baloney. I am proud to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I just came to the Chamber a few moments ago. I understand the pending amendment is the Kerry amendment, and although I have not reviewed it in its entirety, I see that it reads that the President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader will be corrected; the pending amendment is the McConnell amendment.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand. I will speak to the Kerry amendment. I will read that amendment just so my colleagues will be clear what I am talking to. The amendment says:

> The President shall reach an agreement as soon as possible with the Government of Iraq on a schedule for the withdrawal of United States combat troops from Iraq by December 31, 2006, leaving only forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces.

As I look at this amendment, as we evaluate it, I think the first thing we must do is say: What if we did cut and run? I know we hear that discussion of a rapid withdrawal. In many ways, I am glad this amendment has come to the floor, that it has been put on the floor by Senator KERRY. I think we do have to grasp what is at stake, and if we withdraw from Iraq——

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

Does the majority leader yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRIST. I will shortly. Let me finish my statement because I think it is important to look at the issue that has been put on the floor. I will be very brief. Then we can do the parliamentary inquiries back and forth.

If we withdraw from Iraq before the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people are capable of defending their new democracy, I am absolutely convinced that the terrorists would see this as a vindication, a vindication of their strategy of intimidation, of confrontation, and that they would take that vindication and continue to challenge us elsewhere in the world—in Afghanistan, in other countries in the region, overseas, and, indeed, right here at home. If we were to cut and run, the violence in Iraq would certainly increase.

We know there is violence there, and we know how tough it is on our troops who are there and the American people who watch this violence. But I am absolutely convinced that if we cut and run, violence will increase in Iraq, terrorists will increase their attacks on the Iraqi people and on that brandnew Iraqi Government. Clearly, it has only been 5 days. Clearly, the Government itself is not able, completely alone, to defend itself. Chaos would result. Bloody civil war would result. Terrorists and rival militia would tear the country apart. They would kill thousands of innocent Iraqis, and that terrorism would spread through that region, around the world, and, indeed, I believe right here at home.

The unity of Iraq that we celebrated on this floor, the unity of Iraq that has resulted from a democratically elected government through three elections, would be destroyed, would be torn apart; sectarian violence would ensue and would explode. It would split the country apart into segments that, yes, probably would be controlled, but they would be controlled by terrorists, ethnic militias, tribal militias. I am convinced parts of Iraq would become safe havens for terrorists who have spelled out—and we think of the letters and the words of Zarqawi—who have spelled out what their intentions are in terms of us here, right here in the United States.

I believe terrorist bases in Iraq would threaten Middle East security. Although it may be a secondary issue, we do know that energy supplies ultimately would be disrupted. We have seen supply go down, demand go up, and a disruption of energy sources all over the country. Indeed, I believe it would result in a skyrocketing of gas prices in this country.

The terrorists affiliated with bin Laden and Zarqawi have stated in crystal clear terms what their objectives are, their aim of overthrowing moderate governments.

Given the presence in Iraq of many of Saddam Hussein's former weapons scientists—remember Saddam Hussein? Forget about weapons of mass destruction right now, but we actually know that Saddam Hussein and his scientists have developed weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons, and he has used both of those on his own people. Those scientists are still around. If we cut and run, I believe those scientists once again will pursue and will have the freedom to pursue those weapons of mass destruction: saran gas, anthrax, biological weapons.

President Bush has repeatedly stated that the potential combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction does pose the greatest threats to the United States. I believe cutting and running would allow those weapons of mass destruction and that terrorism intent to come back together, to endanger the people of the region but also the people right here in the United States of America.

In some ways, I am glad this amendment has come to the floor, this modification of the amendment. It is clear that those calling for an early withdrawal of American troops from Iraq failed to fully play out, to fully understand the potential implications of

leaving prematurely. Cutting and running before Iraq can really defend itself threatens the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority reader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, two things that do not exist in Iraq and have not are weapons of mass destruction and cutting and running.

This is the McConnell amendment. It is not the Kerry amendment. People have the right to file amendments. They can decide whether they want to offer them or modify them or change them.

I move to table the McConnell amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I reoffer my motion to table. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Akaka	Dole	McConnell
Alexander	Domenici	Menendez
Allard	Dorgan	Mikulski
Allen	Durbin	Murkowski
Baucus	Ensign	Murray
Bayh	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Frist	Obama
Bingaman	Graham	Pryor
Bond	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Hatch	Salazar
Burr	Hutchison	Santorum
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Carper	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Jeffords	Shelby
Clinton	Johnson	Smith
Coburn	Kohl	Snowe
Cochran	Kyl	Specter
Coleman	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Lautenberg	Stevens
Conrad	Leahy	Sununu
Cornyn	Levin	Talent
Craig	Lieberman	Thomas
Crapo	Lincoln	Thune
Dayton	Lott	Vitter
DeMint	Lugar	Voinovich
DeWine	Martinez	Warner
Dodd	McCain	Wyden

NAYS—6

Boxer	Feingold	Kennedy
Byrd	Harkin	Kerry

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my understanding is the Senate now turns to the measure by the Senator from Florida, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. I understand that. I ask the indulgence of the Senator if, after he has finished his business, I could just have a moment.

Mr. WARNER. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, what is ''a moment''?

If the Senator propounds a unanimous consent for an amount of time, I would be glad to not object. I wonder what a moment is?

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to have 5 minutes.

I thought the concept of ''a moment'' was not incomprehensible even in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, following that, I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Arizona be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me just say if I may, earlier today, the distinguished chairman and manager of this legislation came to me and asked me if I was prepared to put my amendment in. I told him then, as he knows, that I said no, because a number of Members were talking, as is the right of the Senator with respect to any amendment filed. So the chairman, the manager, was on notice that we were, in fact, in the process of working on this.

I voted no on this because any Senator reserves that right, No. 1; and No. 2, this is a debate I look forward to. This is a debate I want to have on the floor of the Senate. This is a debate we will have on the floor of the Senate.

I resent the fact that some Senators think the business of the United States is somehow better done by calling up another Senator's amendment, that may or may not be the language presented to the Senate, and having a fictitious vote on it. It is not unlike the war itself where we are in the third war: The first being about Saddam Hussein and weapons of mass destruction; the second being about al-Qaida; and the third, now, the sectarian violence.

I look forward to having a debate on the floor of the Senate. But I look forward to having a debate on the language that I, as a U.S. Senator, present to the Senate in an amendment that bears my name and the name of other Senators that joined me. That has always been the prerogative of the Senator, and it is one that ought to be protected.

I respect and I understand completely what the distinguished minority leader did. He did it in consultation with me. I think it was the appropriate measure for him to take to protect my interests and the interests of those on our side.

The Senate ought to give a more appropriate kind of seriousness of purpose to debate of this kind of consequence. This will be the first time in some time that we will have debated this issue. I suggest some of my colleagues go back and reread the resolution which gave the President the authority to go into Iraq. There is nothing in that resolution that gives authority for what we are doing today.

So, in effect, this is a war of evolution, a war of transformation, and it deserves the kind of serious debate that it will get next week in the Senate.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. MCCAIN. For a moment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts and I did have a brief conversation just before the conclusion of the vote in the middle of the noon hour. I, in an effort to try and keep momentum on the bill, did inquire of the desire to move forward with his amendment. I only conveyed his response to me, which was not at this time—he was in consultation with colleagues—to my distinguished ranking member, advising him we best look at other amendments to keep the momentum going forward. I then departed for the memorial services at the Department of Defense honoring those who lost their lives on 9/11. And, therefore, when I arrived back we were in the middle of the debate that has been described by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and I thank the distinguished chairman for his explanation of what just transpired.

Mr. President, I rise to discuss the pending Nelson amendment. I think it is very important that, first of all, we try not to react on the floor of the Senate to the headlines that appear in the morning paper—whether they happen to be totally accurate or not.

The second thing I want to point out is that all of us—all of us—are pained

when a brave American is killed in this terrible, long, drawn-out conflict which has divided America and cost us so much in American blood and treasure. All of us—no matter where we stand on this conflict—feel the utmost sorrow and regret at the loss or wounding of a single brave, young American man or woman. So this debate is certainly not about the enormous sacrifice that has already been made and probably will be made in the course of this conflict.

But I think we have to be realistic about the way out of this conflict, the way out we have seen time after time throughout history of other conflicts, especially those that in many respects are civil wars.

Nelson Mandela probably had the greatest reason to seek revenge and full accounting not only for the years of imprisonment and mistreatment he personally received but also because of the hundreds if not thousands of his countrymen who were brutalized, mistreated, kept in inferior status, and, in some cases, even massacred by the minority government that ruled his country.

When Nelson Mandela was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, it was not only because of his bravery and courage while he underwent unspeakable unpleasantries and indignities as a prisoner—I believe the number was 27 years—but primarily because Nelson Mandela realized he had to knit and heal the wounds that had so badly scarred his nation.

Nelson Mandela, in the spirit of forgiveness, for the good of his country, put his personal injuries aside because he realized the only way his nation could move forward is to put those terrible things that happened behind him.

We also saw terrible things happen in El Salvador's civil war. Jose Napoleon Duarte, a name that some of us have forgotten, was elected President of the country. And he did two things. He vigorously prosecuted the insurgency, and then he reached out his hand to the insurgents because he knew if they did not forgive and even try to forget, that nation would continue a bloodletting that had afflicted it for a long period of time.

In Colombia, the President of Colombia has just attested that 40,000 people—paramilitaries and guerrillas who, again, have carried out these same kinds of attacks and murder and mayhem in their country—have laid down their arms because of an amnesty program that he has extended to them.

I could go on about many of the conflicts in our history. But the fact is that wars end when enemies stop killing each other. After Pearl Harbor we talked with the Japanese. After years of war in Vietnam, we talked to the North Vietnamese in Paris. Time and again, there reaches a point where enemies must if not be forgiven at least be included, as hostilities come to an end and peace begins.

Our brave men and women are working with Iraqis to build a new country, and by co-opting the insurgents, perhaps we can save the lives and fortunes of our own and those who we support.

Things are very difficult in Iraq. And we are angered when we hear of an IED that blows up and kills and maims innocent Americans. We are sometimes driven to frustration and incredible—incredible—sorrow when we hear of the loss of these precious young men and women.

But we also know that the insurgency does not end until the insurgents stop fighting. And the sooner the new Prime Minister, freely elected—freely elected—Mr. Maliki, is able to bring his country back together, the sooner we will find peace, and the sooner Americans can be withdrawn, and the sooner American casualties will end.

I am confident the amendment by the Senator from Florida amendment is well-meaning, and I understand the intentions behind it. But I think it is important we look back and recognize that not only do times change, as in the case of Vietnam—our Secretary of Defense just in the last week visited Vietnam, as we have renewed our relationships, as we have healed the wounds of the Vietnam war, and moved forward in partnership with the Vietnamese.

Mr. President, from a personal standpoint, there are a few Vietnamese I would very much like to see again, people I may not have the most peaceful intentions toward. But the reality is—the reality is—we must heal the wounds of war if we are going to unite a nation and move forward. And that is the case with Iraq, as it has been with almost every other nation in history.

I finally add, as a footnote, I am not sure we here in the U.S. Senate should be dictating to the leaders of Iraq how they should conduct their affairs as they, the freely elected leaders of that nation, attempt to bring about peace and reconciliation in their nation.

But the larger issue here is, I believe, that our goal is to bring an end to the conflict as quickly as possible in Iraq. If that means, in return for laying down their arms, that some are allowed an amnesty or allowed to reenter the society of Iraq, in a peaceful manner, in a productive manner, as has happened in South Africa, El Salvador—and is happening in Colombia—and many other insurgencies throughout history, then I think we should welcome it. And as we place our confidence in the new Government of Iraq, perhaps we should give them some latitude.

I would also like to add, by the way, that that quote in the press may not have been exactly right as to who might be eligible for amnesty and who might not. At least that should be cleared up. But it doesn't obscure the fact that the freely elected government, that we support, of the country of Iraq is now reaching out to attempt to end the fighting and the conflict. I do not think we should be micro managing that from the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I am sure that the enemies we faced in World War II—who the distinguished chairman of the committee fought against in that great war—that there was a time where we had reconciliation with our enemies on both sides of the Atlantic.

Now, were people who were guilty of specific war crimes brought to trial? Absolutely, and punished, in some cases, to the point of execution. But those who fought against us are clearly now our friends.

So I hope that we would understand that this amendment would not be helpful to the process of peace, would not be an endorsement of the freely elected leaders of the country of Iraq, and might even serve, in an unintended fashion, as an impediment to a process of peaceful reconciliation in Iraq rather than helping it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my very good and longtime friend, we have known each other since the closing months of the war in Vietnam when I was Secretary and he was serving in our naval service and returned. So I just think sometimes of the great fortune of this body to have men such as JOHN MCCAIN, DANIEL INOUYE, and TED STEVENS, and others, who have experience firsthand. I do not claim that same experience that these men had in the mortal combat of the wars.

Senator MCCAIN recounts the history of our Nation very accurately; that is, when the conflicts are over, it has always been the stature and the greatness of this Nation to bind the wounds of war and to move forward with peace.

I say to the Senator from Florida, I have just handed him the corrections that are now in the press, corrected by the national security adviser to the new Prime Minister of Iraq, in which it is very explicit that there was an error in translation. Some misfortune. But he sets it forth here with absolute clarity, and I think that I would want to state for my colleagues exactly what he said. He said the following—and he said it, I presume, with the full knowledge of the Prime Minister.

He said: We thank—and the quote is—''the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in this country . . . of liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful.''

And further, he affirmed their position of the government that they ''will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.''

It seems to me that puts to rest, as my colleague from Arizona said, this issue. And I wonder if the Senator would consider the withdrawal of his amendment to obviate the necessity on our side to take other steps, and let us move forward with the bill.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Does the Senator from Florida have the floor or——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. The Senator from Florida has been seeking recognition for the past hour and has not been able to speak.

Will the Senator from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee, agree to a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Florida would be allowed to speak on this issue immediately after the comments of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am delighted to accommodate my colleague. I would hope we could discourse this matter in the traditional way of a colloquy, but if you want the exclusive right to the floor—if that is your desire—then I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Is that your desire?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. It is.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, what I understand of the parliamentary procedure is that the majority will offer an additional amendment that will be a side-by-side and be voted upon, and the Senate can make its choice.

In the case of the amendment that is being proffered by the majority—indeed, in the copy that has been represented to me as being the accurate one—it will recite the comments of the gentleman to whom in Iraq the chairman has just referred.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is the national security adviser.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. And that side-by-side amendment will state that the national security adviser of Iraq, on today, had ''thanked 'the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in the country . . . of liberating 30 million people in this country . . . And we are ever so grateful.' '' And that affirms their position that they will never give amnesty to those who would kill American soldiers or those who have killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians. I think that is all well and good. This Senator would certainly intend to vote yes on that side-by-side amendment.

The reason the Senator from Florida has been seeking recognition for the last hour is this Senator's amendment has been characterized in ways that defy what the amendment says. The amendment clearly said that it is 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; and the President should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked members of the Armed Forces of the United States.''

That is what the amendment says.

What this has been causing is a brouhaha because of something being read in to a simple little amendment that came as a result of a front-page story today in the Washington Post in which a top adviser to the Prime Minister, Mr. Adnan Ali al-Kadhimi, who happens to be the former chief of staff to the previous Prime Minister, a high-ranking official in the Dawa Party, he is the one who is quoted in the article as going on to say, when asked about clemency for those who attacked U.S. troops:

> That's an area where we can see a green line. There's some sort of preliminary understanding between us and the MNF–1 that there is a patriotic feeling among Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely, I believe.

Now, it is very enlightening that the national security adviser has tried to clarify Prime Minister Maliki's comments. The Prime Minister can certainly clarify his own comments. But here we have a high-ranking Iraqi official who is quoted on the front page of the paper today as saying amnesty for those who would have killed American men and women.

This Senator's name has been invoked by several speakers, including the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who I have the greatest and utmost respect for, in talking about the reconciliation process as if this were contrary to the reconciliation process. The Senator from Alaska was even quoting the reconciliation that took place after the Civil War, on which we all agree. The Senator from Alaska was talking about the reconciliation that has taken place in South Africa, of which we all agree, even talk of the reconciliation that took place with regard to Germany and Japan. But that didn't stop those who were responsible for war crimes and the killings of Americans to be brought to justice; in other words, not to have amnesty granted for them. That was not the case in South Africa where they had a process that those who did those criminal acts were brought to justice. That was certainly not the case in Germany after World War II where those who had committed those atrocities were brought to justice.

It just simply, in the opinion of this Senator, ought to be that a policy of the very government that we have helped and have liberated a people should not be amnesty for those who have killed Americans. How much more simple could it be? Yet I suspect, as others have implied politics, I suspect politics has a way of taking over and starting to make something seem like it isn't. It certainly wasn't the intention of this Senator.

As I understand, my wonderful chairman of the committee is going to offer a second-degree or will offer another amendment that will be a side by side amendment to that which I have offered, and we can vote for both. It would be the intention of this Senator to vote for both.

I said at the outset of my remarks, the first thing out of my mouth when I offered the amendment was, I hope there was something lost in the translation of what was reported in this morning's Post.

I don't understand—or maybe I do—all the brouhaha that has occurred over the course of the last 2 hours on such a simple amendment as saying that it is 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first I would like to say to my colleague, we have had a very strong, fervent and heartfelt debate, not a brouhaha by any definition of the use of those terms. We have heard from two of the most respected combat veterans currently serving in this Chamber. It was not in the nature of a brouhaha. They were simply reciting the history of this great Republic since its inception as to how it has dealt with adversaries in the several conflicts that we have had.

I first say to the Senator, I hope that you will reconsider the use of that term.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, of course.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. This Senator is referring to the rhubarb that has occurred for the last 2 hours on the floor, where statements were made about my amendment that mischaracterized the amendment and that further, then, allowed a totally different issue, an issue on which this Senator agrees with the chairman of the committee, not withdrawing all of the troops by the end of the year.

The Senator can characterize it as he would like. This Senator will characterize it as he would like.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I so note his comments.

Again, addressing the Senator's amendment, it clearly, in my judgment, restricts in some respects the recognition that this is a sovereign government in Iraq today, in the hands of a duly elected Prime Minister and others, and that this amendment could well be construed as restricting what they can and cannot do. That was so eloquently stated by Senator MCCAIN. I wondered if the Senator would care to try and revise the amendment so it is consistent with the longstanding practices of our country with respect to our adversaries, in some way to recognize that it is not in conflict with that?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. If the Senator would like, we could have a quorum call and discuss exactly that matter.

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, as a coauthor of the amendment of my distinguished colleague from Florida, I hope he will continue to pursue his amendment. It is incredibly important to send a very clear message on behalf of the United States about what is and is not acceptable as it relates to the future of our young men and women in the armed services of the United States.

We are told on the Senate floor: Don't react to the morning's papers. But, in fact, it is our reaction to it that brings about a clarification from the National Security Adviser of the Iraqi Government that moves us in the direction which should have been the position of the Iraqi Government from the outset.

I am amazed how I have heard some of my colleagues in this Chamber stretch and twist and turn to justify a position which even now the Iraqi Government supposedly rejects. We had some history lessons about amnesty. Most of those were as it related to civil wars. But I remember how President Bush started this engagement. He said to the Nation: You are either with the terrorists or you are with us.

As I listened to my colleagues suggest that amnesty is something we should actually be in favor of for those who have committed acts against the Armed Forces of the United States, for those who have killed American soldiers, for those who have wounded American soldiers, it is beyond my imagination that there are Members of the Senate who believe that is the signal we want to send throughout the world. What happened to ''you are either with the terrorists or you are with us''? What happened to making it very clear that our men and women are not sitting ducks for those who think they could ultimately seek to kill them and then walk away and get amnesty? I don't understand—if a terrorist survives our arrest or attack, does that mean that if they suddenly see the light, we will say: Yes, it is up to the Iraqis to give them amnesty? Is that the message the Senate wants to send?

It is beyond my imagination—we hear about the challenges of democracy in Iraq. Democracy is about the rule of law, and then ultimately we would set aside the rule of law and say you can kill American soldiers and we will have no say. Imagine that as the Nation sends its sons and daughters abroad to shed their blood and to give their lives, that we should have no say? That is what we heard on the Senate floor, that we should have no say, that we should let the Iraqi Government pursue even a course which might include amnesty against those who kill American soldiers. That is the message we want to send? I think not.

The essence of the message we want to send is that we do not believe and do not accept and are outraged by the fact that there may have even been a consideration that there could be amnesty for those who killed American soldiers but not amnesty for those who killed Iraqis. That is the world's worst message we could send. We have to send a very clear message that we will not allow our sons and daughters to have their lives lost, and that their lives are not expendable and cannot be bartered for amnesty. That is what Senator NELSON is trying to do with this amendment. Why it is so difficult for the Senate to come together in a bipartisan effort to send that very clear message, not only in Iraq but throughout the world, that this is simply not a standard which is acceptable, is beyond belief.

This amendment is very clear, it is very simple, but it is also very powerful. It is a message that you can't kill our soldiers and walk away with impunity. Truly, you are either with the terrorists or you are with us, but you can't be a terrorist and then suddenly get caught, see the light, and then ultimately walk away with amnesty. That would be a horrible message for the Senate to send.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCONNELL now be recognized, that the pending amendments be set aside, and that Senator MCCONNELL then offer an amendment which is relevant to the Nelson amendment; provided further that if and when the McConnell and Nelson amendments are scheduled for votes—that would be sometime next week—the McConnell amendment would be voted on first. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the offering of the amendment, Senator CHAMBLISS be recognized in order to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. I have no objection.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might amend the UC to delete the last sentence which reads:

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the offering of the amendment, Senator CHAMBLISS be recognized in order to offer an amendment.

I ask that sentence be dropped.

Mr. LEVIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 4272

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the agreement just entered into, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 4272.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces)

Sec.___. Sense of the Congress Commending the Government of Iraq for affirming its Position of No Amnesty for Terrorists who Attack U.S. Armed Forces.

(a) Findings. Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that the new Government of Iraq is commended for its statement by the National Security Adviser of Iraq on June 15, 2006 that—

(1) thanked ''the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in this country . . . of liberating 30 million people in this country . . . And we are ever so grateful.'' and

(2) that affirmed their position that they ''will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians''.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I now ask that the amendments be laid aside. The leadership is in agreement that there will be no more votes tonight. We will now turn to other matters relating to the bill. My understanding, then, is these two amendments are now the pending amendments; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The McConnell amendment is the pending amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4278, 4279, 4280, 4200, 4201, 4198, 4281, 4282, 4283, 4284, 4252, AS MODIFIED; 4225, 4218, 4285, 4286, 4199, AS MODIFIED; AND 4287, EN BLOC

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and members of the Armed Services Committee, I send a series of amendments to the desk which have been cleared by myself and the ranking member. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider these amendments en bloc, the amendments be agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that any statements related to any of these individual amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4278

(Purpose: To provide for the incorporation of a classified annex)

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1008. INCORPORATION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.

(a) STATUS OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The Classified Annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to accompany S. 2766 of the 109th Congress and transmitted to the President is hereby incorporated into this Act.

(b) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF ACT.—The amounts specified in the Classified Annex are not in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by other provisions of this Act.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act that are made available for a program, project, or activity referred to in the Classified Annex may only be expended for such program, project, or activity in accordance with such terms, conditions, limitations, restrictions, and requirements as are set out for such program, project, or activity in the Classified Annex.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The President shall provide for appropriate distribution of the Classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

AMENDMENT NO. 4279

(Purpose: To modify the limitations applicable to payments under incentives clauses in chemical demilitarization contracts)

On page 93, strike lines 23 through 25 and insert the following:

(c) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENT CONDITIONAL ON PERFORMANCE.—No payment may be made under an incentives clause under this section unless the Secretary determines that the contractor concerned has satisfactorily performed its duties under such incentives clause.

(2) PAYMENT CONTINGENT ON APPROPRIATIONS.—An incentives clause under this section shall specify that the obligation of the Government to make payment under such incentives clause is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose. Amounts appropriated for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, shall be available for payments under incentives clauses under this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 4280

(Purpose: To repeal requirements for certain reports applicable to other nations)

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1223. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTS ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMON DEFENSE.—Section 1003 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(b) COST-SHARING REPORT.—Section 1313 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2894; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

AMENDMENT NO. 4200

(Purpose: To modify the requirements for contingency program management to require only a Department of Defense plan for such management)

On page 358, strike lines 18 and 19 and insert the following:

SEC. 864. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PLAN FOR CONTINGENCY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

On page 358, beginning on line 21, strike ''Secretary of Defense'' and all that follows through ''interagency plan'' and insert ''Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan for the Department of Defense''.

On page 359, beginning on line 1, strike ''interagency plan'' and insert ''plan of the Department of Defense''.

On page 359, line 17, strike ''United States Government'' and insert ''Department''.

On page 360, line 20, strike ''government procedures'' and insert ''procedures for the Department''.

On page 361, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(c) UTILIZATION IN PLAN FOR INTERAGENCY PROCEDURES FOR STABILIZATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS.—To the extent practicable, the elements of the plan of the Department of Defense for contingency program management required by subsection (a) shall be taken into account in the development of the plan for the establishment of interagency operating procedures for stabilization and reconstruction operations required by section 1222.

AMENDMENT NO. 4201

(Purpose: To make a technical correction to section 871, relating to a clarification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects)

On page 362, line 1, strike ''by striking'' and insert ''by inserting''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4198

(Purpose: To improve the authorities relating to policies and practices on test and evaluation to address emerging acquisition approaches)

On page 51, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(a) REPORTS ON CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS TO PROCEED BEYOND LOW-RATE INITIAL PRODUCTION.—Section 2399(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) If, before a final decision is made within the Department of Defense to proceed with a major defense acquisition program beyond low-rate initial production, a decision is made within the Department to proceed to operational use of the program or allocate funds available for procurement for the program, the Director shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees the report with respect to the program under paragraph (2) as soon as practicable after the decision under this paragraph is made.''.

On page 51, line 17, strike ''(a)'' and insert ''(b)''.

On page 51, line 20, insert ''and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation'' after ''Logistics''.

On page 51, beginning on line 22, strike ''in light'' and all that follows through line 23 and insert ''in order to—

(A) reaffirm the test and evaluation principles that guide traditional acquisition programs; and

(B) determine how best to apply such principles to emerging acquisition approaches.''

On page 52, line 4, strike ''shall issue'' and insert ''and the Director shall jointly issue''.

On page 52, strike lines 7 through 11.

On page 52, line 12, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

On page 52, line 13, strike ''subsection (a)'' and insert ''subsection (b)''.

On page 53, line 18, strike ''(c)'' and insert ''(d)''.

On page 53, line 25, strike ''subsection (a)'' and insert ''subsection (b)''.

On page 54, line 4, strike ''(d)'' and insert ''(e)''.

On page 54, line 8, strike ''subsection (a)'' and insert ''subsection (b)''.

On page 54, line 11, strike ''(e)'' and insert ''(f)''.

On page 54, line 15, insert before the period the following '', which length of time may be not more than 6 years from milestone B to initial operational capability''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4281

(Purpose: To improve the authorities relating to major automated information system programs)

On page 296, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

''(c) INCREMENTS.—In the event any increment of a major automated information system program separately meets the requirements for treatment as a major automated information system program, the provisions of this chapter shall apply to such increment as well as to the overall major automated information system program of which such increment is a part.

On page 297, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

''(c) BASELINE.—(1) For purposes of this chapter, the initial submittal to Congress of the documents required by subsection (a) with respect to a major automated information system program shall constitute the original estimate or information originally submitted on such program for purposes of the reports and determinations on program changes in section 2445c of this title.

''(2) An adjustment or revision of the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program may be treated as the original estimate or information originally submitted on the program if the adjustment or revision is the result of a critical change in the program covered by section 2445c(d) of this title.

''(3) In the event of an adjustment or revision to the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense shall include in the next budget justification documents submitted under subsection (a) after

such adjustment or revision a notification to the congressional defense committees of such adjustment or revision, together with the reasons for such adjustment or revision.

On page 302, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

''(g) PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—(1) If the determination of a critical change to a program is made by the senior Department official responsible for the program under subsection (d)(2) and a report is not submitted to Congress within the 60-day period provided by subsection (d)(1), appropriated funds may not be obligated for any major contract under the program.

''(2) The prohibition on the obligation of funds for a program under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply on the date on which Congress has received a report in compliance with the requirements of subsection (d)(2).

AMENDMENT NO. 4282

(Purpose: To require a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of incentives to encourage certain members and former members of the Armed Forces to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO SERVE IN THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of offering incentives to covered members and former members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of encouraging such members to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(b) COVERED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—For purposes of this section, covered members and former members of the Armed Forces are the following:

(1) Members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(2) Former members of the Armed Forces within two years of separation from service in the Armed Forces.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—

(1) NATURE OF INCENTIVES.—In considering incentives for purposes of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretaries shall consider such incentives, whether monetary or otherwise and whether or not authorized by current law or regulations, as the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(2) TARGETING OF INCENTIVES.—In assessing any incentive for purposes of the report, the Secretaries shall give particular attention to the utility of such incentive in—

(A) encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former of the Armed Forces who have provided border patrol or border security assistance to the Bureau as part of their duties as members of the Armed Forces; and

(B) leveraging military training and experience by accelerating training, or allowing credit to be applied to related areas of training, required for service with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(3) PAYMENT.—In assessing incentives for purposes of the report, the Secretaries shall assume that any costs of such incentives shall be borne by the Department of Homeland Security.

(d) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of various monetary and non-monetary incentives considered for purposes of the report.

(2) An assessment of the desirability and feasibility of utilizing any such incentive for the purpose specified in subsection (a), including an assessment of the particular utility of such incentive in encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (c)(2).

(3) Any other matters that the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 4283

(Purpose: Relating to energy efficiency in the weapons platforms of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to improve the fuel efficiency of weapons platforms, consistent with mission requirements, in order to—

(1) enhance platform performance;

(2) reduce the size of the fuel logistics systems;

(3) reduce the burden high fuel consumption places on agility;

(4) reduce operating costs; and

(5) dampen the financial impact of volatile oil prices.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility of designating a senior Department of Defense official to be responsible for implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(B) A summary of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(i) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in April 2006;

(ii) the Defense Science Board Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Strategy established by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006; and

(iii) the January 2001 Defense Science Board Task Force report on Improving Fuel Efficiency of Weapons Platforms.

(C) For each recommendation summarized under subparagraph (B)—

(i) the steps that the Department has taken to implement such recommendation;

(ii) any additional steps the Department plans to take to implement such recommendation; and

(iii) for any recommendation that the Department does not plan to implement, the reasons for the decision not to implement such recommendation.

(D) An assessment of the extent to which the research, development, acquisition, and logistics guidance and directives of the Department for weapons platforms are appropriately designed to address the policy established by subsection (a).

(E) An assessment of the extent to which such guidance and directives are being carried out in the research, development, acquisition, and logistics programs of the Department.

(F) A description of any additional actions that, in the view of the Secretary, may be needed to implement the policy established by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 4284

(Purpose: To modify limitations on assistance under the American Servicemembers' Protection Act of 2002)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE UNDER THE AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS' PROTECTION ACT OF 2002.

Section 2013(13)(A) of the American Servicemembers' Protection Act of 2002 (title II of Public Law 107–206; 116 Stat. 909; 22 U.S.C. 7432(13)(A)) is amended by striking ''or 5''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4252

(Purpose: To amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes)

At the end of title X of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. COURT SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) JUDICIAL BRANCH SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ENSURING CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH THE JUDICIARY.—Section 566 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) The Director of the United States Marshals Service shall consult and coordinate with the Judicial Conference of the United States on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 331 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''The Judicial Conference shall consult and coordinate with the Director of United States Marshals Service on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government.''.

(b) PROTECTION OF FAMILY MEMBERS.—Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or a family member of that individual'' after ''that individual''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting ''or a family member of that individual'' after ''the report''.

(c) EXTENSION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App) is amended by striking ''2005'' each place that term appears and inserting ''2009''.

(d) PROTECTIONS AGAINST MALICIOUS RECORDING OF FICTITIOUS LIENS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGES AND FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1521. RETALIATING AGAINST A FEDERAL JUDGE OR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER BY FALSE CLAIM OR SLANDER OF TITLE.

''(a) Whoever files or attempts to file, in any public record or in any private record which is generally available to the public, any false lien or encumbrance against the real or personal property of a Federal judge or a Federal law enforcement official, on account of the performance of official duties by that Federal judge or Federal law enforcement official, knowing or having reason to know that such lien or encumbrance is false

or contains any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

''(b) As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'Federal judge' means a justice or judge of the United States as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code, a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, a United States bankruptcy judge, a United States magistrate judge, and a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, United States Tax Court, District Court of Guam, District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, or District Court of the Virgin Islands; and

''(2) the term 'Federal law enforcement officer' has the meaning given that term in section 115 of this title and includes an attorney who is an officer or employee of the United States in the executive branch of the Government.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1521. Retaliating against a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer by false claim or slander of title.''.

(e) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 118. PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES.

''(a) Whoever knowingly makes restricted personal information about a covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official, publicly available, with the intent that such restricted personal information be used to kill, kidnap, or inflict bodily harm upon, or to threaten to kill, kidnap, or inflict bodily harm upon, that covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'restricted personal information' means, with respect to an individual, the Social Security number, the home address, home phone number, mobile phone number, personal email, or home fax number of, and identifiable to, that individual;

''(2) the term 'covered official' means—

''(A) an individual designated in section 1114;

''(B) a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer as those terms are defined in section 1521; or

''(C) a grand or petit juror, witness, or other officer in or of, any court of the United States, or an officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States magistrate judge or other committing magistrate; and

''(3) the term 'immediate family' has the same meaning given that term in section 115(c)(2).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 117. Domestic assault by an habitual offender.

''Sec. 118. Protection of individuals performing certain official duties.''.

(f) PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN FEDERAL COURT FACILITIES.—Section 930(e)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or other dangerous weapon'' after ''firearm''.

(g) CLARIFICATION OF VENUE FOR RETALIATION AGAINST A WITNESS.—Section 1513 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) A prosecution under this section may be brought in the district in which the official proceeding (whether or not pending, about to be instituted or completed) was intended to be affected, or in which the conduct constituting the alleged offense occurred.''.

(h) WITNESS PROTECTION GRANT PROGRAM.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART JJ—WITNESS PROTECTION GRANTS

''SEC. 3001. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available to carry out this part, the Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to create and expand witness protection programs in order to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, crimes.

''(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this part shall be—

''(1) distributed directly to the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe; and

''(2) used for the creation and expansion of witness protection programs in the jurisdiction of the grantee.

''(c) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General may give preferential consideration, if feasible, to an application from a jurisdiction that—

''(1) has the greatest need for witness and victim protection programs;

''(2) has a serious violent crime problem in the jurisdiction; and

''(3) has had, or is likely to have, instances of threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, crimes.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.''.

(i) GRANTS TO STATES TO PROTECT WITNESSES AND VICTIMS OF CRIMES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 31702 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13862) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) to create and expand witness and victim protection programs to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, violent crimes.''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31707 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13867) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 31707. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2010 to carry out this subtitle.''.

(j) ELIGIBILITY OF STATE COURTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GRANTS.—

(1) CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS GRANTS.—Section 515 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3762a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) grants to State courts to improve security for State and local court systems.''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting after the period the following:

''Priority shall be given to State court applicants under subsection (a)(4) that have the greatest demonstrated need to provide security in order to administer justice.''.

(2) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 516(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3762b) is amended by—

(A) striking ''80'' and inserting ''70'';

(B) striking ''and 10'' and inserting ''10''; and

(C) inserting before the period the following: '', and 10 percent for section 515(a)(4)''.

(l) BANKRUPTCY, MAGISTRATE, AND TERRITORIAL JUDGES LIFE INSURANCE.—

(1) BANKRUPTCY JUDGES.—Section 153 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a bankruptcy judge of the United States in regular active service or who is retired under section 377 of this title shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(2) UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGES.—Section 634(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a magistrate judge of the United States in regular active service or who is retired under section 377 of this title shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(3) TERRITORIAL JUDGES.—

(A) GUAM.—Section 24 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1424b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(B) COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—Section 1(b) of the Act of November 8, 1977 (48 U.S.C. 1821) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(C) VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Section 24(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U.S.C. 1614(a)) is amended—

(i) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(m) HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SURVIVING FAMILY AND SPOUSES OF JUDGES.—Section 8901(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by adding ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) a member of a family who is a survivor of—

''(i) a Justice or judge of the United States, as defined under section 451 of title 28, United States Code;

''(ii) a judge of the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands;

''(iii) a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims; or

''(iv) a United States bankruptcy judge or a full-time United States magistrate judge.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4225

(Purpose: To require that, not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army transport to an authorized disposal facility for appropriate disposal all of the Federal Government-furnished uranium in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma)

At the end of division C, add the following new title:

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

SEC. 3301. TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT-FURNISHED URANIUM STORED AT SEQUOYAH FUELS CORPORATION, GORE, OKLAHOMA.

(a) TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL.—Not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall, subject to subsection (c), transport to an authorized disposal facility for appropriate disposal all of the Federal Government-furnished uranium in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for the Army for operation and maintenance may be used for the transport and disposal required under subsection (a).

(c) LIABILITY.—The Secretary may only transport uranium under subsection (a) after receiving from Sequoyah Fuels Corporation a written agreement satisfactory to the Secretary that provides that—

(1) the United States assumes no liability, legal or otherwise, of Sequoyah Fuels Corporation by transporting such uranium; and

(2) the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation waives any and all claims it may have against the United States related to the transported uranium.

AMENDMENT NO. 4218

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention)

On page 437, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DESTRUCTION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, done at Paris on January 13, 1993 (commonly referred to as the ''Chemical Weapons Convention''), requires all United States chemical weapons stockpiles be destroyed by no later than the extended deadline of April 29, 2012.

(2) On April 10, 2006, the Department of Defense notified Congress that the United States would not meet even the extended deadline under the Chemical Weapons Convention for destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpiles.

(3) Destroying existing chemical weapons is a homeland security imperative, an arms control priority, and required by United States law.

(4) The elimination and nonproliferation of chemical weapons of mass destruction is of utmost importance to the national security of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States is committed to making every effort to safely dispose of its chemical weapons stockpiles by the Chemical Weapons Convention deadline of April 29, 2012, or as soon thereafter as possible, and will carry out all of its other obligations under the Convention;

(2) the Secretary of Defense should prepare a comprehensive schedule for safely destroying the United States chemical weapons stockpiles to prevent further delays in the destruction of such stockpiles, and the schedule should be submitted annually to the congressional defense committees separately or as part of another required report; and

(3) the Secretary of Defense should make every effort to ensure adequate funding to complete the elimination of the United States chemical weapons stockpile in the shortest time possible, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4285

(Purpose: To improve authorities to address urgent nonproliferation crises and United States nonproliferation operations)

On page 480, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 1304. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON PROVISION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) SOVIET NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 1991.—Section 211(b) of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (title II of Public Law 102–228; 22 U.S.C. 2551 note) is repealed.

(2) COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 1993.—Section 1203(d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (title XII of Public Law 103–160; 22 U.S.C. 5952(d)) is repealed.

(3) RUSSIAN CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION FACILITIES.—Section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) is repealed.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF OTHER RESTRICTIONS.—

Section 502 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–511; 106 Stat. 3338; 22 U.S.C. 5852) shall not apply to any Cooperative Threat Reduction program.

AMENDMENT NO. 4286

(Purpose: To provide for the applicability of certain requirements to the acquisition of certain specialty metals)

Strike section 822 and insert the following:

SEC. 822. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS REGARDING SPECIALTY METALS.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—Subsection (i) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting '', DUAL-USE ITEMS, AND ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS'' after ''COMMERCIAL ITEMS'';

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''this section'';

(3) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by inserting ''described in subsection (b)(1)'' after ''commercial items''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) This section is not applicable to—

''(A) a contract or subcontract for the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metals described in subsections (b)(2) and (b)(3); or

''(B) specialty metals that are incorporated into an electronic component, where the value of the specialty metal used in the component is de minimis in relation to the value of the electronic component.

''(3) For purposes of paragraph (2)(A), a commercial item does not include—

''(A) any item that contains noncommercial modifications that cost or are expected to cost, in the aggregate, more than 5 percent of the total price of such item;

''(B) any item that would not be considered to be a commercial item, but for sales to government entities or inclusion in items that are sold to government entities;

''(C) forgings or castings for military unique end items;

''(D) fasteners other than commercial off-the-shelf items (as defined in section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c)); or

''(E) specialty metals.''.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN DUAL-USE ITEMS TO FACILITATE CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN DUAL-USE ITEMS TO FACILITATE CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the procurement of an item from a contractor or a first-tier subcontractor if the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department determines that—

''(1) the item is or will be produced using the same production facilities, a common supply chain, and the same or similar production processes that are used for the production of similar items delivered to non-defense customers; and

''(2) the contractor or subcontractor has made a contractual commitment to purchase a quality, grade, and amount of domestically-melted specialty metals for use by the purchaser during the period of contract performance in the production of the item and other similar items delivered to non-defense customers that is not less that the greater of—

''(A) the amount of specialty metals that is purchased by the contractor for use in the item delivered to the Department of Defense; or

''(B) 40 percent of the amount of specialty metals purchased by the contractor or subcontractor for use during such period in the production of the item and similar items delivered to non-defense contractors.''.

(c) DE MINIMIS STANDARD FOR SPECIALTY METALS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) MINIMUM THRESHOLD FOR SPECIALTY METALS.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may accept delivery of an item containing specialty metals that were not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States if the total amount of noncompliant specialty metals in the item does not exceed 2 percent of the total amount of specialty metals in the item.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to items accepted for delivery on or after that date.

(2) CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to contracts entered into on or after that date.

AMENDMENT NO. 4199

(Purpose: To authorize a pilot program on the expanded use of mentor-protege authority)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 874. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANDED USE OF MENTOR-PROTEGE AUTHORITY.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of treating small business concerns described in subsection (b) as disadvantaged small business concerns under the Mentor-Protege Program under section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note).

(b) COVERED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—The small business concerns described in this subsection are small business concerns that—

(1) are participants in the Small Business Innovative Research Program of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638); and

(2) as determined by the Secretary, are developing technologies that will assist in detecting or defeating Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) or other critical force protection measures.

(c) TREATMENT AS DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the pilot program, the Secretary may treat a small business concern described in subsection (b) as a disadvantaged small business concern under the Mentor-Protege Program.

(2) MENTOR-PROTEGE AGREEMENT.—Any eligible business concerned approved for participation in the Mentor-Protege Program as a mentor firm may enter into a mentor-protege agreement and provide assistance described in section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 with respect to a small business concern treated under paragraph (1) as a disadvantaged small business concern under the Mentor-Protege Program.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the limitation in section 9(f)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)(2)), funds for any reimbursement provided to a mentor firm under section 831(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 with respect to a small business concern described in subsection (b) under the pilot program shall be derived from funds available for the Small Business Innovative Research Program of the Department of Defense.

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for reimbursement described in that paragraph may not exceed the amount equal to one percent of the funds available for the Small Business Innovative Research Program.

(e) SUNSET.—

(1) AGREEMENTS.—No mentor-protege agreement may be entered into under the pilot program after September 30, 2010.

(2) OTHER MATTERS.—No reimbursement may be paid, and no credit toward the attainment of a subcontracting goal may be granted, under the pilot program after September 30, 2013.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2009, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the pilot program. The report shall—

(1) describe the extent to which mentor-protege agreements have been entered under the pilot program; and

(2) describe and assess the technological benefits arising under such agreements.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, and Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate; and

(B) the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''small business concern'' has the meaning given that term in section 831(m)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991.

AMENDMENT NO. 4287

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate on the nomination of an individual to serve as Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense on a permanent basis)

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. SENSE OF SENATE ON NOMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO SERVE AS DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION ON A PERMANENT BASIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Congress established the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense in 1983 to ensure the operational effectiveness and suitability of weapon systems in combat.

(2) The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation serves as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on operational test and evaluation and is vital to ensuring the operational effectiveness of weapon systems in combat.

(3) The position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has been held on an acting basis since February 15, 2005.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should submit to the Senate the nomination of an individual for the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as soon as practicable.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to provide compensation for civilian veterans of the Cold War who contracted cancer as a result of their work at our nuclear weapons facilities.

My amendment will ensure that employees who worked at the Nevada Test Site during the years of above- and below-ground nuclear weapons testing and suffer from radiation-induced cancers as a result of that work finally receive the compensation they deserve. These Cold War veterans sacrificed their health and well-being for their country. We can wait no longer to acknowledge those sacrifices and to try, in some small way, to compensate for the cancers they have suffered as a result of their service to their country.

U.S. citizens have served their country working in facilities producing and testing nuclear weapons and engaging in other atomic energy defense activities that served as a deterrent during the Cold War. Many of these workers were exposed to cancer-causing levels of radiation and placed in harm's way by the Department of Energy and contractors, subcontractors, and vendors of the Department without the knowledge and consent of the workers, without adequate radiation monitoring, and without necessary protections from internal or external occupational radiation exposures.

Six years ago, I worked with President Clinton to pass The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, EEOICPA, to ensure fairness and equity for the men and women who performed duties uniquely related to the nuclear weapons production and testing programs by establishing a program that would provide timely, uniform, and adequate compensation for 22 specified radiation-related cancers.

Research by the Department of Energy, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, NIOSH's contractors, the President's Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, and congressional committees indicates that workers were not adequately monitored for internal or external exposures to ionizing radiation to which the workers were exposed and records were not maintained, are not reliable, are incomplete, or fail to indicate the radioactive isotopes to which workers were exposed.

Because of the inequities posed by the factors described above and the resulting harm to the workers, EEOICPA has an expedited process for groups of workers whose radiation dose cannot be estimated with sufficient accuracy or whose dose cannot be estimated in a timely manner. These workers are placed into a Special Exposure Cohort, SEC. Workers in an SEC do not have to go through the dose reconstruction process, which can take years and be extremely difficult as these workers are often unable to produce information because it was or is classified.

Congress has already legislatively designated classes of atomic energy veterans at the Paducah, Kentucky, Portsmouth, Ohio, Oak Ridge K–25, Tennessee, and the Amchitka Island, AK, sites as members of the special exposure cohort under EEOICPA. Amchitka Island was designated because three underground nuclear tests were conducted on the Island.

Nevada Test Site workers deserve the same designation.

I and many other Nevadans remember watching explosions at the Nevada Test Site. We were struck with awe and wonder at the power and strength of these explosions. Little did we know that there was another side to those atomic tests—the exposure of men and women working at the site to cancer-causing substances. Now, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of these Cold War veterans face deadly cancers. Many have already passed away.

The contribution of the State of Nevada to the security of the United States throughout the Cold War and since has been unparalleled. In 1950, President Harry S. Truman designated what would later be called the Nevada Test Site as the Nation's nuclear proving grounds and, a month later, the first atmospheric test at the Nevada Test Site was detonated. The United States conducted 100 aboveground and 828 underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site from 1951 to 1992. Out of the 1054 nuclear tests conducted in the United States, 928, or 88 percent, were conducted at the Nevada Test Site.

Unfortunately, Nevada Test Site workers, despite having worked with significant amounts of radioactive materials and having known exposures leading to serious health effects, have been denied compensation under EEOICPA as a result of flawed calculations based on records that are incomplete or in error as well as the use of faulty assumptions and incorrect models.

It has become evident that it is not feasible to estimate with sufficient accuracy the radiation dose received by employees at the Department of Energy facility in Nevada known as Nevada Test Site at all in some cases and in others in a timely manner. In fact, the administration has admitted that it cannot construct internal radiation dose for workers employed on the site during the aboveground test and yet is still balking at full compensation for all of these workers. There are many reasons for this, including inadequate monitoring, incomplete radionuclide lists, and DOE's ignoring nearly a dozen tests conducted at the site that vented. Because of these problems, Nevada Test Site workers have been denied compensation under the act, some of which have waited for decades for their Government to acknowledge the sacrifices they made for their country and compensate them.

Unfortunately, 6 years since the passage of EEOICPA and in some cases decades after their service to their country, very few of those Nevada Test Site Cold War veterans who have cancer have received compensation. In fact, Nevada Test Site workers are receiving compensation at a rate lower than the national average, and many who have waited decades are being told that they have to wait longer. And many have already died while waiting for their compensation.

Last November, I sent a letter to President Bush asking him to initiate this process himself. He still has not responded. However, his administration is trying to rewrite the law via regulation and cut funding to this program in order to delay compensation further and halt it for some workers altogether.

This is unacceptable.

That is why I am committed to ensuring that Nevada Test Site workers through 1993 are designated as a ''special exposure cohort.'' This will streamline and speed up the recovery process for those workers.

My amendment would ensure employees and survivors of employees who worked at the Nevada Test Site through 1993 that they receive compensation. They helped this country win the Cold War, sacrificing their personal health in the process, and after decades of waiting and suffering, it is time the Government honored these sacrifices.

This bill would include within the special exposure cohort Nevada Test Site workers employed at the site from 1950 to 1993 who were present during an atmospheric or underground nuclear test or performed drillbacks, reentry, or cleanup work following such tests; present at an episodic event involving radiation release; or employed at Nevada Test Site for at least 250 workdays and in a job activity that was monitored for exposure to ionizing radiation or worked in a job activity that is or was comparable to a job that is, was, or should have been monitored for exposure to ionizing radiation.

The Nevada Test Site has served, and continues to serve, as the premier research, testing, and development site for our nuclear defense capabilities. The Nevada Test Site and its workers have been, and are, an essential and irreplaceable part of our Nation's defense capabilities. This bill would honor the service of our atomic energy veterans and provide them with the compensation they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished ranking member for his always cooperative efforts to move this bill along. I think we have made progress on the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Somehow or other, we did make progress.

Mr. WARNER. We did make progress. There will be a briefing in S–407 tomorrow with regard to operations in Iraq. Members of the Senate are invited. I expect we will convene in the morning under an order later this evening from the leadership, but we will be back on the bill for some period of time tomorrow.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, you can imagine the surprise, the consternation of so many who woke up this morning and read on the front page of the Washington Post that the Prime Minister of Iraq suggested he would grant amnesty to those who killed, maimed, hurt Americans. This was just appalling.

I rise in support of the resolution offered by my colleagues from Florida and New Jersey to, first, condemn those despicable remarks, and, second, to importune our President, President Bush, to make sure the Prime Minister of Iraq retracts those remarks and registers the strong disapproval of this Senate and of our Nation about what happened.

To give those who shot at, sometimes killed, often maimed Americans a get-out-of-jail-free card is nothing short of despicable and a slap in the face to all Americans. We have been told we are in Iraq for the noblest of purposes—to bring peace and democracy. When the head of state of that country says it is okay if you shot at American troops, it defies belief, it defies credibility.

The bottom line is our President stood with Prime Minister Maliki just a day or two ago and said he looked him in the eye and saw he was a good man. President Bush must have missed something. Clearly, no one can be a good man and state that it would be okay to give amnesty to those who shot at our soldiers.

This is something which calls into question the whole endeavor in Iraq. If this is the man we are relying on to get us out of the morass, to lead a government, and he is able to say that those who shot at our soldiers should be given amnesty while those who shot at Iraqis should not, something is dramatically wrong.

I will never forget when our President said he met President Putin, looked in his eye, and found he was a good man. Yet we have had trouble with President Putin ever since.

Something is desperately the matter. We need to do a few things. We need to pass this resolution immediately and register our condemnation of the remarks.

President Bush, America is asking you to demand a retraction from the Prime Minister of Iraq of these despicable words or America can no longer support sending soldiers to defend Iraqi freedom, to defend Iraqi peace. How can we, our soldiers, and their families go over to Iraq if, when they are shot at by renegade Iraqis, those Iraqis may be given amnesty and a pat on the back? That is despicable. It is so wrong.

I have spent time with families who have lost loved ones in Iraq. I have spent hours seeing our soldiers off to victory, watching as their families, their wives, their husbands, and their children, with tears in their eyes, watched them board the planes and the transports. For these families, while their beloved men and women are over there, to read that the Prime Minister of Iraq would grant amnesty to someone who tried to kill that soldier who is bravely serving, how would they feel?

President Bush must get on the phone, if he has not already, with the Iraqi Prime Minister and demand a retraction. If not, the American people, and particularly the soldiers and their families, deserve an explanation about what is going on over there. Again, to give a get-out-of-jail-free card to those who shoot at American soldiers while those soldiers are trying to defend freedom and peace in Iraq boggles the mind.

Another question: How can we rely on this man, this new Prime Minister Maliki, as an ally if he says this? My faith in him is shaken to the core. What will happen 2 months from now or 6 months from now?

This is a serious issue. I hope my colleagues will pay attention. It is serious

because of the honor of our soldiers. It is serious because it casts doubt on the future of whatever plan there is in Iraq. It is serious mostly because it is an inhumane and nasty comment that negativizes all the sacrifices our people have made.

I hope our President will act. He has been silent today. There is no clarification. There is no discussion of a phone call. There is no expression of outrage from the White House. I hope that will change and change soon. If it doesn't, it has to call into doubt everything we are trying to do over there. This was not a happy day for what is going on in Iraq because of that awful newspaper story this morning and what it reported. I hope, I pray, things will change.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support unanimously the resolution offered by my colleague from Florida and my colleague from New Jersey, that I am proud to support, asking for that change.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I understand the Senate is in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business with 10-minute grants.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, earlier in the week, on Monday to be exact, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, our very distinguished colleague, became the longest serving Senator in the history of the U.S. Senate. It is obviously a moment to celebrate and recognize his accomplishments in the service of the Nation. Our celebration is tempered only by the fact that his beloved wife Erma, with whom he spent nearly 69 years of marriage, passed away recently.

I want to join my colleagues who, in the course of this week, have paid tribute to the senior Senator from West Virginia. Senator BYRD this year completes his eighth Senate term, having first been elected to the Senate in 1958. Prior to that, he served 6 years in the U.S. House of Representatives and, before that, 6 years in the West Virginia legislature.

In his now almost 48 years in the U.S. Senate, he has held an extraordinary range of committee and subcommittee assignments and has served in leadership positions as secretary of the majority conference, majority whip, minority leader, majority leader, and President pro tempore. His vote has been recorded on nearly 99 percent of all Senate rollcalls since 1958. Indeed, he has cast far more votes than any other Senator in our Nation's history.

It is not for his longevity, however, that we honor our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia. It is, rather, the manner in which he has faithfully carried out his responsibilities as a U.S. Senator and his abiding dedication to the Constitution of the United States and the system of government it created. No Member of the U.S. Congress understands better than Senator BYRD the Constitution's role in framing our lives as Americans. As he has written:

> Only the Constitution's genius affords our people the powers and prerogatives that truly keep us a free nation, most centrally through maintenance of the checks and balances and separation of powers.

Over many years, while vigorously and effectively representing the people of West Virginia, Senator BYRD has made the study, exposition, and defense of the Constitution his life's work. In so doing, he has spoken not only for West Virginians but for us all. If, as Senator BYRD has said, the Senate functions as the central pillar of our constitutional system, then I would say that Senator BYRD himself is the central pillar of the Senate. His commitment to the Senate and its history, its custom, and procedures is equaled only by his commitment to the State of West Virginia, our Nation, and our Constitution.

No one is more keenly attuned to the Senate's role in assuring the proper functioning of our constitutional system. He has studied the Senate's origins in Roman and British history. He has, as he puts it, ''ponder[ed] the lives of the framers and founders and set down a four-volume history of the Senate.'' And he has read the journals and other writings of the early Members of this body. He has mastered the Senate rules to a degree that few, if any, others have ever attained. Even in the most contentious debates, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD remains a steady voice for courtesy and civility. Indeed, his is the voice of courtesy and civility.

Senator BYRD begins his autobiography, ''Child of the Appalachian Coalfields,'' with an observation by William James:

> The best use of life is to invest it in something which will outlast life.

This certainly is what he has done.

It was not foreordained that he would some day be a U.S. Senator from West Virginia. Born in North Carolina, he lost his mother in the great influenza epidemic of 1918, when he was a year old, whereupon he was adopted by an aunt and her husband and moved with them to West Virginia. His adopted father was a coal miner, and he grew up in company towns. He was an excellent student, valedictorian of his high school class, ''a self-styled sort of somebody,'' one high school teacher later said, but his prospects were few. As another teacher observed:

> Knowing the background and how hard it would be to move out from that background, I picture him as being an office man or a scrip clerk at one of the mines.

In those years of the Great Depression, there was obviously no money for college. ROBERT BYRD took what jobs he could get: Shop clerk, butcher, a welder in a Baltimore shipyard during World War II. We were honored to have had him in our State.

In 1946, he was elected to the first of three terms in the State legislature. Of the decision to run for office he has said:

> I grew up in a state where we didn't have much hope. I wanted to help my people and give them hope . . .

He did not abandon his hopes of continuing his education. Upon his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1952, he enrolled in law school. When he learned that he would be denied a law degree because he had never received a college degree in the law school in which he had enrolled, he transferred to the Washington College of Law at American University where he went to night classes for 10 years and received his law degree cum laude in 1963—a remarkable achievement. By that time he had been a Senator from West Virginia for 5 years. ROBERT BYRD is the only person ever to have served in either House of Congress to begin and complete a law degree while serving.

Twenty years later, the College of Law at American University honored him as the First Distinguished Fellow of the honor society established by the late dean of the college, a most fitting tribute. Eleven years later, in 1994, he received his bachelor's degree in political science from Marshall University in recognition of the credits accumulated there and other places over a period of many years.

Of the many awards he has received in the course of his long and distinguished career, Senator BYRD has said that none means more to him than the tribute from the Governor and legislature of his State in naming him ''West Virginian of the 20th Century.''

As his colleague here in the Senate for the past 30 years and as one who has the deepest respect and admiration for him and cherishes his counsel and friendship, I submit that he will be remembered not only for his service to his State but for the courage and dedication and tenacity he has shown and continues to show every day in the service of our Nation. It is a privilege to be his colleague here in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege and honor for me to join my colleagues in commemorating and honoring my friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, on the occasion of his becoming the longest serving Senator in the history of our country, passing the old mark of 17,326 days on June 12, 2006. The fact that West Virginians have returned him to the

Senate in eight prior elections speaks volumes of the love and affection and respect they feel for him as their Senator who serves them most effectively.

When I first came to the Senate in 1990 from the other side of the Capitol, Senator BYRD was one of the first Senators I met with to get advice and counsel, which he generously shared with me. Of course, he gave me a copy of a pocket edition of the Constitution, the document upon which our country is based and one that is ever-present in his pocket. Over the years, he has been most generous with his friendships, and indeed I feel a sense of kinship and aloha with him. In Hawaii, this feeling of kinship is often referred to as being part of the ohana, or family, and used with love and endearment.

With stewards like Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, we can rest assured that our country is in good hands. I look forward to his continuing friendship and serving with him for many years to come.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do want to talk for a minute about Senator BYRD and recognize he has set a record in the Senate, as many of my colleagues have noted on the floor.

He marked his 17,327th day in office yesterday and became the longest serving Senator in history. That is truly a remarkable accomplishment, and I personally have many fond memories of working with Senator BYRD and look forward to many more.

I remember well when I came here as a freshman Senator 13½ years ago. Senator BYRD at the time brought in all of us freshmen Senators to sit across from him in his very important office and looked down at us and told us that we would be presiding, as is the Presiding Officer today, and told us about our responsibilities and made it very clear he would be watching from his office, and if we were reading any other material or talking to anyone, it would be noted.

I certainly did remember that during the many hours I spent in the Presiding Officer's chair because I knew he was watching. But I think it was a simple reminder to all of us as to the importance of the office we hold here and the respect we have to have for our colleagues.

I remember as well that he invited me to lunch several months later with the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Hatfield, a Republican, to sit down and talk with me about the responsibilities I had as a Senator. And I was so impressed sitting in the room with Senator BYRD and Senator Hatfield, never in my life expecting to have that kind of opportunity. At that meeting they impressed upon me the importance of working across the aisle and respect for the minority and how important everybody's voice is here. It was an important lesson and one I think we all should be reminded of more often.

But just that simple act of inviting me to lunch with two incredible leaders in the Senate is a memory I hold dear, and I thank my colleague for doing that.

But, frankly, I think what I most will remember Senator BYRD for—and is a good reminder to all of us, too—is several years ago when my husband came out here to Washington, DC—he lives in Washington State. I go home every weekend. But he came out here because it was our wedding anniversary, and instead of me having to fly home, he flew out here. He was coming up the steps of the Capitol, and I met him as Senator BYRD was walking out to his car.

Senator BYRD saw my husband, and he said: Welcome. Nice to have you here at this end of the country. What brings you here?

And my husband said: Well, it is our wedding anniversary.

And Senator BYRD, who, as we well know, lost his beloved wife just a few short weeks ago, was about to celebrate I think it was his 67th wedding anniversary. He looked at my husband and said: Which anniversary is this?

And my husband said: It is our 32nd.

Senator BYRD paused and said: Well, it is a good start.

I think the message of that is important for all of us in our everyday lives, in our responsibilities as spouses, and as Senators, to remember it is a good start every day, and you can't rest on your laurels and think back: Well, we have done this for 32 years. The next 32 will be easy. Every day you have to come out and work hard at whatever role you are in at the time.

I certainly say to my good friend, Senator BYRD, how much I respect him and admire him. And today, as he marks his 17,328th day in office, I say to him: It is a good start.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today the Chief Justice and associate Justices of the Supreme Court held a memorial observance honoring Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist. It was a really grand event. I am sorry I could not be there the whole time.

At 2 p.m., resolutions in tribute to the Chief Justice were presented for consideration by members of the Supreme Court bar. There were presentations made by the Solicitor General and by the Attorney General of the United States during a special sitting of the Court, which commenced at 3:15 p.m. this afternoon. Following that, the Supreme Court held a reception for friends of the former Chief Justice.

I think one of the great joys of my life was to be able to say that I was a long-time friend of our former Chief Justice. He and I met here as young lawyers the year we got out of law school. We were very friendly. As a matter of fact, we double-dated during those days. And as the years went on, as I went to Alaska and came back as U.S. Attorney and had various other functions, we kept in touch. We were divided by a continent, but we remained friends.

Years later, when I came to the Senate, he was with the Department of Justice. I can say it was one of the longest friendships I have had, and I was sad when he passed away. I am here really to ask that the Senate review some of the comments made about my friend and former Chief Justice of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the schedule of the Supreme Court for today, Thursday, June 15, 2006, and also the resolution of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in gratitude and appreciation for the life, work, and service of Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist presented to the Supreme Court today be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST MEMORIAL

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006

Meeting of the Supreme Court Bar—Upper Great Hall, 2:00 p.m.

Call to Order—Paul D. Clement, Solicitor General of the United States.

Introduction of Speakers—Ronald J. Tenpas, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Clerk to Chief Justice Rehnquist (1991 Term), Chairman of the Meeting.

Remarks—Allen R. Snyder, Partner (retired) at Hogan & Hartson LLP, Clerk to Justice Rehnquist (1971 Term).

Remarks—James C. Rehnquist, Son of the Chief Justice.

Remarks—Maureen E. Mahoney, Partner at Latham & Watkins, Clerk to Justice Rehnquist (1979 Term).

Remarks—Courtney Simmons Elwood, Deputy Chief of Staff and Counselor to the Attorney General, Clerk to the Chief Justice (1995 Term).

Remarks—James C. Duff, Partner at Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz PC, Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice (1996–2000).

Motion to Adopt Committee Resolutions—Honorable Steven M. Colloton, Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Clerk to the Chief Justice (1989 Term), Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

Call for Second and Closing Remarks—Ronald J. Tenpas, Chairman of the Meeting.

Special Session of the Supreme Court—Courtroom, 3:15 p.m.

Presentation of Resolutions—Paul D. Clement, Solicitor General of the United States.

Request to Accept Resolutions—Paul McNulty, Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

Response—John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF THE BAR OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IN GRATITUDE AND APPRECIATION FOR THE LIFE, WORK, AND SERVICE OF CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, JUNE 15, 2006

Today, the members of the Bar of the Supreme Court honor the life and legacy of a

gifted lawyer, a selfless public servant, and a treasured teacher, mentor, and friend. Those who knew William Rehnquist will remember him as one who, in the words of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, ''lived greatly in the law.'' To his credit, however, Bill Rehnquist cared less about being ''great'' than about doing and living well. As President George W. Bush remarked on the occasion of his funeral, ''to work beside William Rehnquist was to learn how a wise man looks at the law and how a good man looks at life.''

Rehnquist was born in Wisconsin, on October 1, 1924, the son of a paper salesman and a homemaker who also worked as a translator. Christened William Donald Rehnquist at birth, the future Chief Justice changed his middle name to Hubbs—a family name—in high school. His mother, Rehnquist later explained, had once met a numerologist on a train, and Mrs. Rehnquist was advised that her son would enjoy great success in life if his middle name were changed to begin with the letter ''H.''

Rehnquist was raised in Shorewood, a Milwaukee suburb on Lake Michigan. Early on, he displayed his love of the friendly wager, betting his sister on a Memorial Day weekend that he could dive into the lake more often than she. He won, and contracted pneumonia in the bargain. Rehnquist graduated from high school in 1942, and after a year at Kenyon College, he joined the United States Army Air Corps. Consistent with his lifelong interest in the weather—a fascination that would be the stuff of many jokes and memories among his friends and law clerks—he signed up for a premeteorology program. He was reassigned to work as a weather observer when, as he later put it, ''the brass realized that someone had mistakenly added a zero to the number of weather forecasters that would be needed.'' His war-time service took him not only to Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, New Jersey, and Illinois, but also to more exotic destinations such as Casablanca, Marrakesh, Tripoli, and Cairo.

Rehnquist's assignment in North Africa impressed upon him that ''if you lived in the right place, you didn't have to shovel snow for four months a year.'' Accordingly, after discharging from the service as a sergeant, he headed west, and matriculated as an undergraduate at Stanford University in 1946. There, he supplemented the financial assistance he received through the G.I. Bill with odd jobs, including working as a ''hasher'' in the dormitory of his future colleague, Sandra Day.

After graduation, Rehnquist thought he wanted to become a professor of political science, so he studied government for a year at Harvard and earned his master's degree. But he later decided against continuing his graduate work, and instead took a standardized occupational examination, the results of which suggested that he might thrive as a lawyer. He then returned to the west, and to Stanford's law school, where he flourished. As he recalled, some fifty years later, in his typically understated manner, ''the law curriculum came more easily to me than it did to some others.'' His friend and classmate, the future Justice O'Connor, was more definitive: ''[H]e quickly rose to the top of the class and, frankly, was head and shoulders above all the rest of us in terms of sheer legal talent and ability.''

One of Rehnquist's professors had been a law clerk for Justice Robert Jackson, and thought highly enough of Rehnquist to recommend him to Jackson as a prospective clerk. When Jackson hired the young lawyer, the position was Rehnquist's first ''honest-to-goodness job as a graduate lawyer'' and, more significantly, his first exposure to the institution to which he would dedicate thirty-three years of his professional life. Rehnquist later described his clerkship during the 1951 and 1952 Terms as ''one of the most rewarding experiences of my life.'' His time in Washington proved doubly rewarding, for during this period he began dating Natalie ''Nan'' Cornell, a San Diegan he had met at Stanford. They started with ''Thursday night'' dates, until Nan was convinced that she liked the young lawyer enough to move on to Saturdays.

After the clerkship, Rehnquist kept in his study a photograph of his boss, inscribed ''To William Rehnquist, with the friendship and esteem of Robert H. Jackson.'' Later, as a member of the Court, Rehnquis would make the same inscription for his law clerks, recounting Jackson's remark, ''You may not be impressed, but it might impress your clients.'' Perhaps most telling, the personal attributes that the young William Rehnquist admired most in Justice Jackson include many of the same qualities his own law clerks remember and appreciate about him: ''[H]is own ego or view of his own capacities was never unduly elevated by any of the successes which he achieved''; he ''never succumbed to the temptation,'' so common in Washington, to ''become . . . isolated in high public office''; and ''[h]e did not have to read the view of some particular columnist, commentator, or editorial writer in order to know what he thought about a particular factual situation.''

Characteristically unconventional, Rehnquist passed up opportunities at lucrative East Coast law firms. He thought California too big and too populated, and decided to look for a home in the southwestern United States, hoping to find the American equivalent of the North African climate he so enjoyed. Rehnquist married his beloved Nan in August 1953, and the couple ultimately settled on Phoenix. He later told his law clerks that the descent into Phoenix, without air conditioning, in his 1941 Studebaker, was like ''driving into Hell.''

He was the ninth lawyer at one of the ''large'' law firms in Phoenix, and he was paid $300 per month. Two years later, hoping for more courtroom experience, he opened a two-lawyer office, and for a time, Rehnquist took whatever clients came in the door. He volunteered to represent indigent criminal defendants in federal court, but suffered a series of defeats, leading a federal prosecutor to joke that a cell block at Leavenworth had been named after Rehnquist. He delighted in telling stories of his practice before eccentric jurists in Arizona's remote ''cow counties.'' A favorite involved the representation of state legislators in a lawsuit adverse to the state's attorney general, during which Rehnquist made pointed reference to an inconsistency between his adversary's litigating position and previous public statements. Summoned to the judge's chambers after oral argument, young Rehnquist remembered that his ''heart almost stopped'' as he prepared himself for a trip to the woodshed, only to hear the jurist from Cochise County remark: ''I was sure glad to see you tee off on the Attorney General in your argument on that last motion. He's a worthless son-of-a-bitch, and the sooner this state gets rid of him the better off we'll all be.''

During his 16 years of private practice, Rehnquist represented a broad array of clients and handled a wide range of litigation matters. He was also active in politics, providing legal advice and draft speeches for the 1964 Goldwater presidential campaign. He wrote op-ed pieces and bar journal articles, spoke before bar and civic groups, served as President of the Maricopa County Bar Association, and was a favorite at continuing legal education seminars. He spent four years as the town attorney for Paradise Valley, was special counsel to the Arizona Department of Welfare, served as Special Assistant Attorney General for the Arizona Highway Department, and represented the State Bar of Arizona in attorney disciplinary matters. In 1971, the Board of Governors of the State Bar of Arizona praised Rehnquist for having ''continually demonstrated the very highest degree of professional competence and integrity and devotion to the ends of justice.''

Through it all, Rehnquist maintained a balanced life. He would work typically from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., then close the law books, and go home for a family dinner. He and Nan were blessed with three children, Jim, Janet, and Nancy. Even when Rehnquist was in trial, the family dinner was sacred, and he would either bring work home or make the ten-minute drive back to the office after dinner. Keeping a schedule that was unusual then, and virtually unheard of today, for the family of a top litigator, the Rehnquists managed to take a month's vacation every year. Rehnquist especially loved camping vacations across the West, visits to a small cabin in the Bradshaw Mountains of Arizona, and driving fast on country roads, telling his children that a double yellow line was ''just a recommendation.'' The Rehnquists also maintained an active family-oriented social life, including bridge, charades, cookouts, and hikes. Later in life, Rehnquist reminisced that he ''had the good fortune to realize long ago, instinctively, what I now see very clearly—and that is that time is a wasting asset.'' Rehnquist spent abundant time with his wife and young children, ''not out of any great sense of duty, but just because I enjoyed it so much.''

After the 1968 presidential election, Rehnquist's involvement in politics resulted in an opportunity to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel in the United States Department of Justice. Upon receiving word of this job offer, Rehnquist visited the Phoenix public library to see what he could learn about the office, and he was sufficiently intrigued by what he read to accept the position. The family moved to Washington, but Rehnquist never lost his deep affection for Arizona or his fond memories of these earlier years. He left Phoenix, as he put it, ''very much richer for the experience, but having accumulated very little of the world's goods.''

As Assistant Attorney General, Rehnquist was ''in effect, the President's lawyer's lawyer,'' as President Richard Nixon would later say. Rehnquist served in the Justice Department during challenging years in the midst of the Vietnam War. He helped to hone the position of the Executive Branch on delicate legal issues and carried the message of the Administration around the country in numerous public appearances. He discharged his responsibilities with such great distinction that President Nixon would declare that ''among the thousands of able lawyers who serve in the Federal Government, he rates at the very top as a constitutional lawyer and as a legal scholar.'' When Justice John Marshall Harlan II retired in 1971, Rehnquist was the President's choice to be the 100th Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Confirmed in 1972 at age 47, Rehnquist was one of the youngest Justices of the Supreme Court in modem history. Yet his views on important matters of constitutional law were remarkably well formed. Rehnquist once wrote that ''[p]roof that a Justice's mind at the time he joined the Court was a complete tabula rasa in the area of constitutional adjudication would be evidence of lack of qualification, not lack of bias,'' and Rehnquist's mind certainly was no blank slate.

In 1976, he summed up his judicial philosophy in an essay entitled, ''The Notion of a

Living Constitution.'' He rejected the notion that judges ''are a small group of fortunately situated people with a roving commission to second-guess Congress, state legislatures, and state and federal administrative officers concerning what is best for the country.'' That elected representatives had not solved a particular social problem, he wrote, did not necessarily authorize the federal judiciary to act: ''Surely the Constitution does not put either the legislative branch or the executive branch in the position of a television quiz show contestant so that when a given period of time has elapsed and a problem remains unsolved by them, the federal judiciary may press a buzzer and take its turn at fashioning a solution.'' Rehnquist was critical of a mode of constitutional interpretation that would allow ''appointed federal judges'' to impose on others a rule that ''the popularly elected branches of government would not have enacted and the voters have not and would not have embodied in the Constitution.'' This approach, he warned, was a ''formula for an end run around popular government,'' and ''genuinely corrosive of the fundamental values of our democratic society.''

As an Associate Justice, Rehnquist emerged as a powerful intellectual force. He authored a number of significant opinions for the Court, but also did not hesitate to express his position in solitary dissent, thus inspiring an early group of law clerks to bestow upon him a Lone Ranger doll as a mantlepiece. When Chief Justice Warren Burger resigned in 1986, it was precisely Rehnquist's powerful intellect, his stellar record on the Court, and his consistent judicial philosophy that made him President Ronald Reagan's pick to lead the Court. But no less important were Rehnquist's leadership qualities and the respect he garnered from all of his colleagues, owing to his pleasant and down-to-earth nature, quiet confidence, quick wit, and basic fairness.

On June 17, 1986, the President announced his nomination of Justice Rehnquist to become the sixteenth Chief Justice of the United States. During the ensuing confirmation hearings, numerous witnesses testified glowingly to Rehnquist's distinguished service on the Court and his high-powered legal mind. Former Solicitor General Rex Lee, for instance, stated: ''Of all the lawyers with whom I am acquainted, I know of literally no one who is better qualified to be Chief Justice of the United States.'' A representative of the American Bar Association reported the ''genuine enthusiasm'' felt by other Justices and Court employees about Rehnquist's nomination to be Chief Justice: ''There was almost a unanimous feeling of joy. . . . [H]e is regarded as a close personal friend of men who are diametrically opposed to him philosophically and politically.''

As Rehnquist took his new seat as the leader of the Court in 1986, President Reagan presciently remarked that he ''will be a Chief Justice of historic stature.'' Rehnquist served as Chief Justice for nearly 20 years, and together with his service as an Associate Justice for more than 14 years, this tenure made him one of the Supreme Court's seven longest-serving members. In that time, Rehnquist left an indelible mark on the Supreme Court, on the functioning of the federal Judiciary, and on the face of American law.

Rehnquist's jurisprudential legacy cuts a broad swath, but it is undoubtedly substantial in the areas of criminal procedure and the constitutional rights of criminal defendants. Rehnquist was appointed to the Court shortly after a series of decisions by the Warren Court had expanded the constitutional rights of the accused in criminal cases, and his early opinions made clear that he believed the pendulum had swung too far in that direction. Dissenting from the denial of a stay in California v. Minjares, he called for re-evaluation of the ''exclusionary rule'' applied to the States in Mapp v. Ohio in 1961. Complaining that evidence was suppressed ''solely because of a good-faith error in judgment'' on the part of arresting officers, Rehnquist disputed that the exclusionary rule was necessary to preserve the ''integrity'' of the courts: ''[W]hile it is quite true that courts are not to be participants in 'dirty business,' neither are they to be ethereal vestal virgins of another world, so determined to be like Caesar's wife, Calpurnia, that they cease to be effective forums in which both those charged with committing criminal acts and the society which makes the charge may have a fair trial in which relevant competent evidence is received in order to determine whether or not the charge is true.'' In another early opinion, explaining the controversial 1966 decision in Miranda v. Arizona, Rehnquist wrote for the Court in Michigan v. Tucker that the procedural safeguards recommended by Miranda ''were not themselves rights protected by the Constitution but were instead measures to insure that the right against compulsory self-incrimination was protected.''

Neither Mapp nor Miranda was overruled during Rehnquist's long tenure on the Court. Indeed, in Dickerson v. United States, the Chief Justice wrote for the Court in 2000 that ''[w]hether or not we would agree with Miranda's reasoning and its resulting rule, were we addressing the issue in the first instance, the principles of stare decisis weigh heavily against overruling it now.'' Yet the pendulum surely swung back, with the Court affording the States more latitude in developing procedures for the prosecution of criminal cases, recognizing the practical needs of the police in investigating crime, and fashioning clearer rules for law enforcement officials and citizens alike. The exclusionary rule remains in effect, but the suppression of evidence seized in ''good faith,'' decried by Rehnquist in his Minjares dissent, is far less common in light of the good-faith exception to the exclusionary rule adopted during Rehnquist's tenure. Miranda remains a ''constitutional decision,'' but exceptions and limitations adopted by the Court ensure that it gives way to competing concerns such as the protection of public safety and the strong interest in making available to the trier of fact all relevant and trustworthy evidence. Testifying in support of Rehnquist's appointment as Chief Justice, former Attorney General Griffin Bell aptly observed that Justice Rehnquist had joined in making the right to counsel, Miranda rights, and the exclusionary rule ''more workable,'' and cited the good-faith exception as ''a good example of saving the exclusionary rule from its own excesses.''

Another area where Rehnquist's work had a powerful effect on the shape and development of the law is religious freedom and church-state relations. In First Amendment cases, Rehnquist consistently endorsed the idea that governments may, consistent with the Constitution, do quite a bit to accommodate and acknowledge religion, but are not required by the Constitution to provide religious believers with special exemptions from generally applicable laws. It is not an ''establishment'' of religion, he maintained, for politically accountable actors to act in ways that benefit religious believers and institutions or to recognize religious traditions and teachings. That governments may not ''establish[]'' religion does not mean, he believed, that religion has no place in public life or civil society. At the same time, he insisted, it is rarely a violation of the free-exercise guarantee for those same actors to apply to religious people and religiously motivated conduct the same rules that apply generally.

As it turned out, Rehnquist's last opinion was for a plurality in Van Orden v. Perry, in which the Justices ruled that Texas had not ''establish[ed]'' religion by including a Ten Commandments monument among the nearly 40 monuments and historical markers on the grounds surrounding the State Capitol. He wrote: ''Our cases, Janus like, point in two directions in applying the Establishment Clause. One face looks toward the strong role played by religion and religious traditions throughout our Nation's history. . . . The other face looks toward the principle that governmental intervention in religious matters can itself endanger religious freedom. This case, like all Establishment Clause challenges, presents us with the difficulty of respecting both faces. Our institutions presuppose a Supreme Being, yet these institutions must not press religious observances upon their citizens. One face looks to the past in acknowledgment of our Nation's heritage, while the other looks to the present in demanding a separation between church and state. Reconciling these two faces requires that we neither abdicate our responsibility to maintain a division between church and state nor evince a hostility to religion by disabling the government from in some ways recognizing our religious heritage[.]'' In this last opinion, Rehnquist returned to themes that he had developed at length in one of his most famous opinions, a dissent in Wallace v. Jaffree.

A third area where Rehnquist's legacy is both striking and significant involves the structure and powers of the federal government created by our Constitution and the role and retained powers of the States. From his earliest to his final days on the Court, Rehnquist was committed to what he called ''first principles:'' Ours is a national government of limited, delegated, and divided powers, and the government's structure, no less than the Bill of Rights, is a safeguard for individual liberty. Rehnquist's dedication to these principles, and to enforcing the limits and boundaries that our Constitution imposes on federal power, reflected his understanding that our constitutional design leaves ample room for diverse policy experiments and different answers to pressing social questions.

Rehnquist's commitment to judicial enforcement of enumerated powers and the federal-state balance was perhaps most discernible in the Court's cases interpreting the Commerce Clause. As early as 1975, dissenting alone, Rehnquist argued that the federal government must treat the States like sovereign entities, rather than like individuals. Even when Congress has authority under the federal commerce power to regulate private conduct in a particular area, it could not apply that regulation to the States if doing so would interfere with what he called ''traditional state functions.''

As happened a number of times during his tenure, Rehnquist's position in dissent ultimately was embraced by a majority of his colleagues. In National League of Cities v. Usery, a majority of the Court adopted his ''traditional governmental functions'' test. Although the Court ultimately overruled National League of Cities nine years later, Rehnquist, in a pithy reply, thought it not ''incumbent on those of us in dissent to spell out further the fine points of a principle that will, I am confident, in time again command the support of a majority of this Court.'' And true to his prediction, Rehnquist's promotion of federalism forged ahead, serving as the basis for the Court's declaration of an anti-commandeering principle, its strengthening of the States' sovereign immunity, and

its reaffirmation of the existence of ''judicially enforceable outer limits'' on the commerce power itself, in United States v. Lopez in 1995.

Rehnquist's dedication to judicial restraint and popular government is perhaps most evident in his writings on the subject of ''substantive due process.'' At his death, Rehnquist was the last remaining member of the Court that had decided Roe v. Wade. He had dissented from the opinion of the Court, comparing the majority's reasoning to the discredited doctrine of Lochner v. New York, and commenting that the Court's opinion in Roe ''partakes more of judicial legislation than it does of a determination of the intent of the drafters of the Fourteenth Amendment.'' While Rehnquist garnered only four votes for his later view that Roe should be overruled, the Court ultimately did adopt his restrained approach to substantive due process. In Washington v. Glucksberg, Chief Justice Rehnquist wrote for the majority and recognized that ''[b]y extending constitutional protection to an asserted right or liberty interest, we, to a great extent, place the matter outside the arena of public debate and legislative action.'' The Court declared that it would ''exercise the utmost care'' whenever asked to ''break new ground in this field, lest the liberty protected by the Due Process Clause be subtly transformed into the policy preferences of the Members of this Court.'' Thus, Rehnquist's opinion was consistent with the view articulated more than 20 years earlier, in his essay on the ''living Constitution,'' that judicial review under the Fourteenth Amendment should not be employed as an ''end run around popular government,'' in a way that is ''genuinely corrosive of the fundamental values of our democratic society.'' Running through his opinions on any number of questions—from assisted suicide and abortion to Christmas displays, campaign finance, and the death penalty—is a deep commitment to the idea that our Constitution leaves important, difficult, and even divisive decisions to the people.

Rehnquist's legacy on the Supreme Court involves much more than doctrinal contributions and particularly noteworthy decisions. He encouraged and exemplified collegiality, fairness, and graciousness among the Justices, urging them towards greater consensus where possible, and thereby enhancing the respect enjoyed by the Court in American society. To some degree, Rehnquist's achievements as the leader of the Court were the result of a subtle transformation in Rehnquist himself—from Justice Rehnquist, ''The Lone Dissenter,'' to Chief Justice Rehnquist, the consensus-builder.

In his 1986 confirmation hearings, Rehnquist alluded to the role of a Chief Justice in gaining consensus, and allowed that deviation from his personal judicial philosophy may be proper ''where there are constraints that there ought to be a court opinion rather than a plurality opinion.'' Rehnquist later acknowledged, in a 2001 interview, that while his legal philosophy had never changed, since becoming the Chief Justice he had ''become a lot more convinced of the need for the Court to get a Court opinion in each case. . . . I'm more conscious of the need for that and also conscious of the . . . lack of need for a lot of concurring opinions.''

For those attorneys privileged to argue before the Supreme Court during Rehnquist's long tenure, his legacy is probably as much about his commanding presence on the Bench as his approach to the Constitution or the Conference. Rehnquist's view of oral argument was emblematic of his no-nonsense approach to judging and life. He wrote that oral argument ''forces the judges who are going to decide the case and the lawyers who represent the clients whose fates will be affected by the outcome of the decision to look at one another for an hour, and talk back and forth about how the case should be decided.''

Rehnquist preferred plain-spoken arguments to flowery rhetoric or pretense. Although he was a kind and easygoing man, he adopted a stem and no-nonsense demeanor on the Bench, running arguments with Nordic precision. The moment the red light came on, the Chief thanked counsel for the presentation, even if the lawyer was in midsentence, and then called the next lawyer or case. When one lawyer rose to present his rebuttal, the Chief ended the argument by stating, while breaking a wry smile, ''the Marshal says you have 5 seconds left, and under the principle of de minimis non curat lex, the case is submitted.''

Rehnquist's dry sense of humor often was on display during argument sessions. During one argument, a lawyer gave what he described as an ''honest and principled answer'' to another Justice's question, and the Chief quickly replied, ''we hope all your answers will be principled.'' When a lawyer responded to Rehnquist's recitation of a case by saying ''you are correct, Chief Justice,'' the Chief said, ''I'm glad to know that.'' During his last public session on the Bench, Rehnquist observed that seven different opinions had been written in a case, then remarked, ''I didn't know we had so many Justices.''

As the Chief Justice, Rehnquist presided over not only the Bench and the Conference, but over the entire Judicial Branch as well. He brought to this role the same collegiality, wisdom, effectiveness, and clarity of purpose that marked his leadership of the Supreme Court itself. As with so many things he did, he impressed all with his ability to perform so effortlessly the myriad tasks of running the Judiciary. His colleague Justice Byron White remarked in 1996 that ''of the three Chief Justices with whom I have served, the man who now sits in the center chair. . . seems to me to be the least stressed by his responsibilities and to be the most efficient manager of his complicated schedule.'' Rehnquist, he said, ''reminds me of a highly conditioned cross between a quarter horse and racing thoroughbred.''

Rehnquist brought his penchant for innovation and efficiency to management of the judicial branch. He adopted changes that dramatically improved the efficiency and operation of the Judicial Conference, including what he termed a ''notably strengthened Executive Committee,'' which became the senior executive arm of the Judicial Conference. He fostered inclusiveness by requiring, for the first time, that members of Judicial Conference committees rotate regularly, and he never asserted his authority as Chief Justice to govern with a heavy hand. A vigorous defender of the Third Branch, Rehnquist effectively used the pulpit provided by his position to support and defend the Judiciary and to improve inter-branch relations. He wisely understood that Congress had an important role to play in overseeing the Judiciary, and he communicated often with congressional leaders, in both formal and less formal settings, to advance the goals of the Judiciary. As he put it, ''Judges. . . have no monopoly of wisdom on matters affecting the Judiciary. . . . Legislators and executive officials, no less than judges, are committed to an effective Judiciary.''

But Rehnquist also understood full well the importance of an independent and vibrant Judiciary, and he staunchly defended the Judiciary from attacks, often resorting—as he did in other areas—to lessons from history. In 2004, he addressed congressional suggestions for impeachment of federal judges who issue unpopular decisions by explaining that ''our Constitution has struck a balance between judicial independence and accountability, giving individual judges secure tenure but making the federal Judiciary subject ultimately to the popular will because judges are appointed and confirmed by elected officials.'' His leadership engendered great loyalty from the members of the federal Judiciary, and in the end, one judge captured the sentiment of a great many, saying that Chief Justice Rehnquist ''was our wise leader, our strongest supporter and our true friend.''

Above and beyond his demanding official duties, Rehnquist pursued and cultivated a rich array of interests and passions. Family, friends, and law clerks remember well his dedication to afternoon swims and weekly tennis matches, his friendly wagering on football, horse races, or even the amount of snowfall, his love for trivia and charades, and his interest and voluminous knowledge of literature, geography, history, and art. Rehnquist also served as Historian-in-Chief, writing books on the history of the Supreme Court, the impeachment trials of Chase and Johnson, the controversial Hayes-Tilden presidential election of 1876, and civil liberties in wartime. Remarkably, Rehnquist himself became the second Chief Justice in history to preside over an impeachment trial, confronted a disputed presidential election in 2000, and led the Court as it decided pressing questions involving civil liberties and security in the context of the war on terror and the attacks of September 11, 2001.

For those who knew, worked with, learned from, and cared about William Rehnquist, his personal qualities—the unassuming manner, the care he took to put people at ease, and his evident desire to serve as a teacher and mentor—are as salient in memories of him as his re-invigoration of the ''first principles'' of our federalism, his re-focusing of the Fourth Amendment on reasonableness, or his conviction that the religion clauses of the First Amendment do not require a public square scrubbed clean of religious faith and expression. Rehnquist never forgot what it felt like to arrive at the Court as a slightly awestruck and appropriately apprehensive law clerk. He never lost his sense of gratitude for the opportunity to learn and serve the law in that great institution. And he never outgrew or got tired of teaching young lawyers how to read carefully, write clearly, think hard, and live well.

William Rehnquist served well his country, his profession, and the Constitution. All the while, he kept and nurtured a healthy focus on real things and places, and he embraced the value, interest, and importance of ordinary, everyday life. We are reminded of how the Chief had taken to heart Dr. Johnson's dictum that ''[t]o be happy at home is the end of all human endeavor.'' In a 2000 commencement address, he invoked the wonderful old Jimmy Stewart movie, You Can't Take it With You, to urge the assembled, ambitious young lawyers to ''[d]evelop a capacity to enjoy pastimes and occupations that many can enjoy simultaneously—love for another, being a good parent to a child, service to your community.'' He instilled in so many of his friends, colleagues, and law clerks a commitment to building and living an integrated life as a lawyer, a life that is not compartmentalized, atomized, or segregated but that pulls and holds together work, friends, family, faith, and community. Rehnquist understood that the need for such a commitment is particularly acute among lawyers, and he worried that the profession he so thoroughly enjoyed and in which he thrived had become marked, for many, by brutally long hours of well-paid stress and drudgery.

In the final years of his life, he recalled happily that the ''structure of the law practice'' in Phoenix when he practiced there ''was such that I was able to earn a decent living, while still finding time for my wife and children and some civic activities. Lawyers were not nearly as time conscious then as they are now; this meant that they probably earned less money than they might have, but had a more enjoyable life.'' He exhorted law school graduates to realize that because of their abilities and opportunities, they would have ''choices,'' and that ''how wisely you make these choices will determine how well spent you think your life is when you look back at it.'' Gathered here together, looking back at his life, the Members of the Bar of the Supreme Court are pleased and honored to announce the opinion that his was a great life, and well spent.

Wherefore, it is Resolved, That we, the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, express our great admiration and respect for Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, our deep sense of loss upon his death, our appreciation for his contribution to the law, the Court, and the Nation, and our gratitude for his example of a life well spent; and it is further

Resolved, That the Solicitor General be asked to present these resolutions to the Court and that the Attorney General be asked to move that they be inscribed on the Court's permanent records.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as President pro tempore, I ask unanimous consent that the attached statement from the President of the United States be entered into the record today pursuant to the War Powers Resolution (P.L. 93–148) and P.L. 107–40.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2006.

HON. TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am providing this supplemental consolidated report, prepared by my Administration and consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148), as part of my efforts to keep the Congress informed about deployments of U.S. combat-equipped Armed Forces around the world. This supplemental report covers operations in support of the war on terror, Kosovo, and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

THE WAR ON TERROR

Since September 24, 2001, I have reported, consistent with Public Law 107–40 and the War Powers Resolution, on the combat operations in Afghanistan against al-Qaida terrorists and their Taliban supporters, which began on October 7, 2001, and the deployment of various combat-equipped and combat-support forces to a number of locations in the Central, Pacific, and Southern Command areas of operation in support of those operations and of other operations in our war on terror.

I will direct additional measures as necessary in the exercise of the U.S. right to self-defense and to protect U.S. citizens and interests. Such measures may include short-notice deployments of special operations and other forces for sensitive operations in various locations throughout the world. It is not possible to know at this time either the precise scope or duration of the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces necessary to counter the terrorist threat to the United States.

United States Armed Forces, with the assistance of numerous coalition partners, continue to conduct the U.S. campaign to pursue al-Qaida terrorists and to eliminate support to al-Qaida. These operations have been successful in seriously degrading al-Qaida's training capabilities. United States Armed Forces, with the assistance of numerous coalition partners in Combined Forces Command, Afghanistan, ended the Taliban regime and are actively pursuing and engaging remnant al-Qaida and Taliban fighters in Afghanistan. Approximately 200 U.S. personnel also are assigned to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The U.N. Security Council authorized the ISAF in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1386 of December 20, 2001, and has reaffirmed its authorization since that time, most recently for a 12–month period beginning October 13, 2005, in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1623 of September 13, 2005. The mission of the ISAF under NATO command is to assist the Government of Afghanistan in creating a safe and secure environment that allows reconstruction and the reestablishment of Afghan authorities. Currently, all 26 NATO nations contribute to the ISAF. Ten non-NATO contributing countries also participate by providing military and other support personnel to the ISAF.

The United States continues to detain several hundred al-Qaida and Taliban fighters who are believed to pose a continuing threat to the United States and its interests. The combat-equipped and combat-support forces deployed to Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in the U.S. Southern Command area of operations since January 2002 continue to conduct secure detention operations for the approximately 460 enemy combatants at Guantanamo Bay.

The U.N. Security Council authorized a Multinational Force (MNF) in Iraq under unified command in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1511 of October 16, 2003, and reaffirmed its authorization in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1546 of June 8, 2004. In U.N. Security Council Resolution 1637 of November 8, 2005, the Security Council, noting the Iraqi government's request to retain the presence of the MNF, extended the MNF mandate for a period ending on December 31, 2006. Under Resolutions 1546 and 1637, the mission of the MNF is to contribute to security and stability in Iraq, as reconstruction continues. These contributions have included assisting in building the capability of the Iraqi security forces and institutions as the Iraqi people drafted and approved a constitution and established a constitutionally elected government. The U.S. contribution to the MNF is approximately 131,000 military personnel.

In furtherance of our efforts against terrorists who pose a continuing and imminent threat to the United States, our friends and allies, and our forces abroad, the United States continues to work with friends and allies in areas around the globe. These efforts include the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped and combat-support forces to assist in enhancing the counterterrorism capabilities of our friends and allies. United States combat-equipped and combat-support forces continue to be located in the Horn of Africa region, and the U.S. forces headquarters element in Djibouti provides command and control support as necessary for military operations against al-Qaida and other international terrorists in the Horn of Africa region, including in Yemen. In addition, the United States continues to conduct maritime interception operations on the high seas in the areas of responsibility of all of the geographic combatant commanders. These maritime operations have the responsibility to stop the movement, arming, or financing of international terrorists.

NATO-LED KOSOVO FORCE (KFOR)

As noted in previous reports regarding U.S. contributions in support of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo, the U.N. Security Council authorized Member States to establish KFOR in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999. The mission of KFOR is to provide an international security presence in order to deter renewed hostilities; verify and, if necessary, enforce the terms of the Military Technical Agreement between NATO and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (which is now Serbia); enforce the terms of the Undertaking on Demilitarization and Transformation of the former Kosovo Liberation Army; provide day-to-day operational direction to the Kosovo Protection Corps; and maintain a safe and secure environment to facilitate the work of the U.N. Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).

Currently, there are 24 NATO nations contributing to KFOR. Eleven non-NATO contributing countries also participate by providing military personnel and other support personnel to KFOR. The U.S. contribution to KFOR in Kosovo is about 1,700 U.S. military personnel, or approximately 11 percent of KFOR's total strength of approximately 16,000 personnel.

The U.S. forces have been assigned to the eastern region of Kosovo. For U.S. KFOR forces, as for KFOR generally, maintaining a safe and secure environment remains the primary military task. The KFOR operates under NATO command and control and rules of engagement. The KFOR coordinates with and supports the UNMIK at most levels; provides a security presence in towns, villages, and the countryside; and organizes checkpoints and patrols in key areas to provide security, protect minorities, resolve disputes, and help instill in the community a feeling of confidence.

In accordance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1244, UNMIK continues to transfer additional competencies to the Kosovar Provisional Institutions of Self-Government, which includes the President, Prime Minister, multiple ministries, and the Kosovo Assembly. The UNMIK retains ultimate authority in some sensitive areas such as police, justice, and ethnic minority affairs.

NATO continues formally to review KFOR's mission at 6-month intervals. These reviews provide a basis for assessing current force levels, future requirements, force structure, force reductions, and the eventual withdrawal of KFOR. NATO has adopted the Joint Operations Area plan to regionalize and rationalize its force structure in the Balkans. The UNMIK international police and the Kosovo Police Service (KPS) have full responsibility for public safety and policing throughout Kosovo. The UNMIK international police and KPS also have begun to assume responsibility for guarding patrimonial sites and established border-crossing checkpoints. The KFOR augments security in particularly sensitive areas or in response to particular threats as needed.

NATO HEADQUARTERS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Pursuant to the June 2004 decision made by NATO Heads of State and Government, and in accordance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1575 of November 22, 2004, NATO concluded its Stabilization Force operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and established NATO Headquarters-Sarajevo to continue to assist in implementing the Peace Agreement in conjunction with a newly established European Force. The NATO Headquarters-Sarajevo, to which approximately 250 U.S. personnel are assigned, is, with the European Force, the legal successor to SFOR. The principal tasks of NATO Headquarters-Sarajevo are providing advice on defense reform and performing operational supporting tasks, such as counterterrorism and supporting the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in all of these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. Officials of my Administration and I communicate regularly with the leadership and other Members of Congress with regard to these deployments, and we will continue to do so.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 2006*.

EDUCATING NEW MOTHERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the importance of educating new mothers about postpartum depression. The bill I am introducing today with Senator MENENDEZ will provide screening and education for women who have given birth and will promote research into the causes, diagnoses and treatments for postpartum depression.

The Commonwealth Fund released a study last month that finds postpartum depression inhibits a mother's ability to safely and effectively care for her children after pregnancy. Mothers who are affected by postpartum depression are less likely to provide essential developmental support for the child through playing, talking, showing picture books, and following daily routines.

For many mothers, the depression worsens if it isn't diagnosed, which can lead to substance abuse, loss of employment, divorce, further social alienation, self-destructive behavior, and even suicide.

A few years ago in Chicago, within a 4-week period, several new mothers who were affected by postpartum depression took their own lives.

Melanie Stokes jumped from a 12-story Chicago hotel, taking her life only a few months after her daughter was born, The day before her daughter's first birthday, Amy Garvey's body was found floating in Lake Michigan. Jennifer Mudd Houghtaling, from Wisconsin, jumped in front a subway train in Chicago less than 5 months after giving birth to her son, Five days after giving birth to quadruplets, Ariceli Erivas Sandoval drowned herself in Lake Michigan.

These are tragic, heart-wrenching stories. I wish I could say that is the end of the story, but the problem is far more common than that. Each year, far more than half of women giving birth suffer from postpartum mood changes. The more mild ''baby blues'' affect up to 80 percent of new mothers. Postpartum mood and anxiety disorders impair 10 to 20 percent of new mothers, and postpartum psychosis strikes 1 in 1,000 women after birth.

The Menendez-Durbin bill authorizes postpartum depression screening and information for mothers before they leave the birthing center. Through a State grant program, health care providers are given the tools they need to recognize signs of depression and to educate women and their families about the disorder and how to access help.

We also call on the National Institutes of Health to convene a series of national meetings on postpartum depression and psychosis and then to expand and intensify research around that consensus.

Our bill has been endorsed by the Illinois Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics; the Illinois Psychiatric Association; Postpartum Support International; the Association of Women's Health; Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, AWHONN; the Family Mental Health Institute, Inc.; the National Mental Health Association and the New Jersey chapter, and the New Jersey Chapter of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, ACOG.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator MENENDEZ and me in supporting the MOTHERS Act, which will ensure that new mothers are educated about postpartum depression and that research will help us prevent and treat postpartum depression in new mothers.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PETTY OFFICER 2ND CLASS JAIME JAENKE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the first female Iowan to have lost her life in the Iraq conflict. Petty Officer 2nd Class Jaime Jaenke was a naval reservist who had been in Iraq for only 3 months. She was killed on Monday, June 5, when the humvee she was traveling in was hit by an improvised explosive device. She was 29 years old and was assigned to the Naval Mobile Construction Battalion 25 at Fort McCoy, WI.

Petty Officer Jaenke has given her life for our country, and I would ask that all Americans join me today in remembering and honoring Petty Officer Jaenke. Her loss will be felt deeply in the town of Iowa Falls. Although she had lived in Wisconsin for a number of years, she returned to Iowa 2 years ago and last fall opened an equestrian business outside Iowa Falls. My thoughts and prayers are with Petty Officer Jaenke's daughter, Kayla, her parents, Susan and Larry, as well as all those other family and friends who are grieving the loss of this young mother.

We owe a huge debt of gratitude to Petty Officer Jaenke for her sacrifice. I am greatly saddened by her passing but deeply proud and grateful for what she gave for America. Her loss remains tragic but she died a true patriot.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I strongly support traditional marriage, the bedrock of our society, and I therefore support the Marriage Protection Amendment.

Like some of my colleagues, I believe that marriage is typically a State issue. Unelected, lifetime-appointed judges, however, have forced our hand on this issue. We can no longer sit idly by while a handful of activist judges lay the groundwork to overturn the Defense of Marriage Act and redefine marriage for the entire Nation.

I voted in favor of the Defense of Marriage Act a decade ago, which reinforced States rights on this issue. Since then, 26 States have passed statutes designed to protect traditional marriage by defining marriage only as the union of a man and a woman. Further, 19 States now have constitutional amendments that contain this same definition. Voters in seven additional States will vote on constitutional amendments this year. Another four State legislature—including that of my own State, Iowa—are considering sending constitutional amendments to voters within the next 2 years. Ballot initiatives are currently underway in three States. Only a handful of States have redefined marriage to include same-sex partnerships, created a version of civil unions, or lack actual or planned protection for traditional marriage.

The states have spoken. A great majority of them have decided that marriage, in their States, shall consist solely of the union of a man and a woman. But, it has become a common prediction that the Federal Defense of Marriage Act will be overturned by the judiciary. In that case, the full faith and credit clause of our Constitution would require every State to recognize so-called marriages performed in States that allow the union of same-sex couples, many only by judicial decree. We cannot allow unelected judges to force their will upon the people, who have acted through the democratic process to defend traditional marriage.

Under our Constitution, Congress has the responsibility to enact legislation. Congress also has the responsibility to initiate the constitutional amendment process. We must fulfill this duty to protect traditional marriage. We must provide the States the opportunity to defend marriage as they have defined it.

SCHOOL SAFETY ACQUIRING FACULTY EXCELLENCE ACT

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my support

for H.R. 4894, the School Safety Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act.

As the father of three children, I know that nothing is more important than protecting their safety. We do everything to ensure that our children are safe while they are in our care. But just as important, we must do everything we can to make sure they are safe when we cannot be right there beside them. One of the ways we can accomplish this is to provide for a safe school environment.

We trust teachers, principals, coaches, and other school employees to teach our children, to protect our children, and to nurture our children during the school day. Therefore, it is imperative that our school districts have the necessary tools to thoroughly review all school employees before they ever come into contact with our children.

The School Safety Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act will help school districts better examine job applicants by having the Attorney General and the Department of Justice provide localities with direct access to the FBI's national crime information databases and assistance with fingerprint background checks for potential employees. Currently there are a myriad of laws across the States pertaining to background checks for school employees. This legislation will ensure a more thorough process and encourage information sharing across State borders.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, which is a step forward in promoting safe schools and protecting our children.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR RECOMMENDATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to inform my colleagues of my request to Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to strongly recommend the nomination of MSG Woodrow W. Keeble for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Last week, the Secretary of the Army made a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense that the late MSG Woodrow W. Keeble be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I strongly encourage and request that the Secretary of Defense recommend Mr. Keeble for this award and that action be taken quickly, particularly for the sake of Mr. Keeble's widow, to recommend approval to President Bush.

Mr. Keeble was a full-blooded Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux, who fought in both World War II and the Korean war. He was born in Waubay, SD, and attended Wahpeton Indian School in North Dakota. While attending Wahpeton Indian School, Mr. Keeble excelled as a baseball pitcher. His outstanding athletic ability, for which he is remembered in the Wahpeton community, would later serve him well during his acts of bravery and courage in the Korean war.

The brave actions that make Mr. Keeble deserving of the Congressional Medal of Honor occurred during Operation Nomad of the Korean war on October 20, 1951. During the Korean war, Mr. Keeble was assigned to Company G, 19th Infantry, 24th Division of the U.S. Army. He was charged with leading the 1st platoon of Company G as master sergeant.

Mr. Keeble's actions on October 20, 1951, were reminiscent of Hollywood movies, but this was real heroism. On that date, Mr. Keeble's company was charged with the mission of taking and securing Hill 765, a steep rocky and well-defended terrain near Kumsong, Korea. As they began to reach their final objective, the lead platoon of Company G was ambushed with heavy fire from three enemy machine gun nests. The platoon's situation became grave as Mr. Keeble, acting platoon leader of a support platoon, left his position of cover and bravely made his way forward and joined the trapped platoon.

It took Mr. Keeble little time to decide that immediate action had to be taken. He courageously crawled directly into the line of fire to take out the enemy machine guns. He successfully crawled up the rocky terrain and neutralized the first two machine gun nests by hurling grenades and rendering them useless. The remaining enemy machine gun nest brought terrific fire down upon him. Undaunted by the rain of concussion and fragmentation grenades, Mr. Keeble proceeded to disable the final enemy position. After missing the enemy with his last grenade, he launched a one-man assault with his M–1 rifle. By this time, he sustained multiple shrapnel wounds. Fearlessly, he took out the final machine gun position with his rifle. While awaiting the arrival of his fellow soldiers, he continued to singlehandedly take out two additional nearby trenches of enemy troops, and he effectively neutralized the enemy stronghold, involving a series of close combat struggles. Mr. Keeble's heroic actions led to the successful accomplishment of Company G's mission and, no doubt, saved the lives of many American troops.

Those who served with Mr. Keeble twice recommended him for the Congressional Medal of Honor, but the recommendations were lost. The first was due to the regiment's move from the Korean theater, and the second was an inability to meet mapping requirements. However, it should be noted that both instances of application only required two signatures, but in each case, all the men in Master Sergeant Keeble's company signed the Congressional Medal of Honor request. Eventually, the deadline for the Medal of Honor consideration passed, but Mr. Keeble's family was granted their request in 2002 that his file be reopened.

For his acts of heroism he was awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Service Cross. The criteria for the Congressional Medal of Honor include deeds of personal bravery, self-sacrifice, or an action that conspicuously distinguishes the individual above his comrades. Should the President agree to this recommendation, Mr. Keeble would be the first Sioux Indian to be awarded the Nation's highest military honor if he is chosen to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. Certainly the courageous and patriotic acts exhibited by Mr. Keeble during times of war make him a long overdue and deserving recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. President, I urge the Secretary of Defense to strongly recommend the nomination of MSG Woodrow W. Keeble for the Congressional Medal of Honor to the President of the United States, and I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting a truly brave and courageous American.

MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank Senators STEVENS and INOUYE, the chair and ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, for their efforts in incorporating my amendment into the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2005, S. 2012. My amendment makes Oregon's salmon fishermen eligible for disaster assistance. Their willingness to accommodate my concerns and help Oregon's salmon fishers means that I can withdraw the objection I issued 2 weeks ago to any unanimous consent request for the Senate to act on the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act. I also wish to thank Senator SMITH and Senator BOXER for their important contributions and assistance. I look forward to swift passage of the legislation, as amended.

The inclusion of the disaster declaration in the Magnuson-Stevens authorization is an important first step in getting relief for our salmon fishers and coastal communities that depend on salmon for their livelihoods. After waiting months for a disaster declaration from the administration, our salmon fishers now finally have some movement to help address their immediate financial needs.

Even with this important language, the fight to help Oregon's salmon fishermen is far from over, and I will continue to press for congressional appropriations to fund the disaster assistance fishing families and the coastal fishing communities need.

WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. As ranking member on the Special Committee on Aging, I am pleased that the international community has designated this day. It is important to recognize the grim reality of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation and focus on

what we can do to end these horrible crimes.

In the past 40 years, our Nation has struggled to address some of our society's worst ills: child abuse and domestic violence. Now we must confront elder abuse.

For the past 25 years, Congress has held hearings on the devastating effects of elder abuse, yet we have taken no comprehensive action. Abuse of the elderly is nothing new, but as our Nation has aged and the baby boom generation stands on the cusp of retirement, the prevalence of elder abuse will only get worse. The time to act is now. We can no longer ignore or tolerate the shame and scandal of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of our Nation's seniors.

I have long made ending elder abuse a top priority. I worked hard to develop a national criminal background check system for nursing home, home health, and other long-term care employees. While the vast majority of these employees are diligent, dedicated, and professional, it is too easy for people with abusive and criminal backgrounds to find work in long-term care. This is unacceptable. Today, seven States, including my home State of Wisconsin, are engaged in a pilot project based on my legislation which requires long-term care employers to run FBI criminal background checks on potential employees before they are hired and trusted to care for our loved ones. My hope is that upon completion of this pilot project, we will move to a national criminal background check system and protect seniors in all 50 States.

I am also a proud original cosponsor of the Elder Justice Act, which takes a number of steps to prevent and treat elder abuse. It will improve prevention and intervention by funding State and local projects that keep older Americans safe. It will ensure that health officials, social services, law enforcement, long-term care facilities, consumer advocates, and families are all working together to confront this problem; and, it will establish training programs so health professionals in both forensic pathology and geriatrics can better detect elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

Finally, the bill will establish victim assistance programs, create ''safe havens'' for seniors in dangerous living situations, and help train law enforcement officers to prioritize and investigate cases of elder abuse.

Researchers have warned us that the reported cases of elder abuse might only be the tip of the iceberg; that is why World Elder Abuse Awareness Day is so important. We must spread the word: elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation is occurring every day and, if left unchecked, will only grow more prevalent. As I continue my efforts here in the Senate, I encourage my colleagues and Americans everywhere to join me in putting an end to this terrible scourge of elder abuse.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING 17 OUTSTANDING HOOSIER DADS

● Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to pay tribute to 17 Hoosier men whose outstanding commitment to fatherhood serves as example of how responsible, involved dads can promote stronger families and raise exceptional children.

This year, I invited Hoosier children to pay tribute to their dads by writing essays about what makes their father an Outstanding Hoosier Dad.

In a nation that leads the world in absentee fatherhood, it is particularly important this Father's Day to recognize outstanding dads who are doing their part to raise bright, healthy children. Children whose fathers are absent are five times more likely to live in poverty and twice as likely to commit a crime, drop out of school or become substance abusers. The essays provided a touching reminder to all men of the impact they have when they play an active role in their children's lives.

It is an honor today to recognize the 17 Hoosier children who submitted essays and their outstanding dads by reading their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States.

R. Bradley Allen, father of John Allen, South Bend
Ronnie Asher, father of Jessica Asher, Martinsville
Brian Bolsen, father of Brennan Bolsen, Chesterton
Neil Day, father of Adam Day, Fort Wayne
Chris Dixon, father of William Dixon, Bloomington
Kevin Ford, father of Kimberly Ford, Schererville
Jeff Gratz, father of Clare Gratz, Batesville
Tom Gutzwiller, father of Lawson Gutzwiller, Batesville
Samuel Hale, father of Greg Hale, Granger
Dennis Mansfield, father of Alison Mansfield, Fort Wayne
Matt McKaig, father of Caleb McKaig, Urbana
Jonathan Plucker, father of Paige Plucker, Bloomington
Frederick Richards, father of Corey Richards, Churubusco
Andy Schultz, father of Mary Kate Schultz, DeMotte
Mike Stefanski, father of Matthew Stefanski, Valparaiso
Amitav Thamba, father of Aish Thamba, Fishers
Wiley Traylor, father of Stephanie Traylor, Mooresville●

IN HONOR OF GEORGE WINGATE HIGH SCHOOL

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to honor George Wingate High School in Brooklyn, NY. Wingate High School, my alma mater, will graduate its last class on June 27, 2006.

In 1954, Wingate High School accepted its first class of students and had its first graduating class in 1957. It was the first high school built in New York after the end of World War II, and it embodied many of the ideals of the baby boomer generation. Wingate High School was so different from the standard design plan for schools that it became known as ''The Banjo School'' because of its open design.

Wingate High School was also innovative in its approach to teaching. Instead of focusing strictly on academic classes, Wingate was one of the first high schools in the Nation to offer a comprehensive range of classes in vocational, commercial and academic fields. Wingate High School has been known for its outstanding aviation, culinary arts, nursing and law programs, and many of its students have gone on to become successful pilots, chefs, nurses and attorneys.

Wingate has had a few famous graduates such as former New York State senator and current Brooklyn Borough president, Marty Markowitz, and Roger Brown, a New York City playground legend who went on to greatness in the American Basketball Association. However, thousands of other Wingate graduates have made priceless contributions to their communities, in part because of the valuable lessons they learned there.

I firmly believe that a quality education is the key to our youths' success and our nation's future. I commend Wingate's teachers, faculty, staff, and volunteers for their many years of hard work and dedication to Wingate High School's students. Their work has resulted in thousands of students who are better prepared to face the world and its challenges. I commend them for their commitment to quality education. Their enthusiasm and love of teaching means a brighter future for all of our children.

Wingate High School's motto is: ''Ad Astra per Ardua''—''To the stars through struggle.'' In its 52-year history, George Wingate High School has graduated thousands of students who have gone on to make the world a better place. Though the journey has not always been easy, I know that Wingate's 2006 graduates will go on to do great things.

I give my most sincere congratulations and best wishes for the future to Wingate High School's Class of 2006.●

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the National History Day program. A basic knowledge of history is essential for our Nation's children to become active 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. The National History Day program also allows students to create exhibits, documentaries and performances, by using their critical thinking and research skills in the subject of history.

It brings me great pleasure to pay special tribute to Emily Brown, as she is recognized for her scholastic achievements in National History Day.

Emily is a student at Sunrise Park Middle School in White Bear Lake, MN, and was one of 12 students chosen from across America to display and present her history project at the White House Visitors Center on June 15. Emily's project is titled ''The Iron Jawed Angel: Alice Paul takes a stand for women's right to vote.''

I congratulate Emily as she is honored for her presentation and commend her for her dedication and commitment. I join with the citizens of Minnesota in wishing Emily well in all her future endeavors.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF STEELE, NORTH DAKOTA

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I recognize a community in North Dakota that will be celebrating its 125th anniversary. On June 30–July 2, the residents of Steele will gather to celebrate their community's history and founding.

Steele is a thriving community in North Dakota. The city was founded by Wilbur F. Steele in 1878. He purchased the land from the railroad and had hopes that the city would house the State capitol. Mr. Steele constructed a building in the city to serve as a place for the legislature to meet. Since Steele was not chosen as the State's capital, the building became the Kidder County Courthouse, which is still in use today.

Steele is best known for its 38½ foot high Sandhill Crane. This piece of art was inspired by the numerous birds and ducks that migrate through Steele each year. Steele has plenty to offer to its residents and visitors, from the golf course and parks to fishing, hunting, and crosscountry skiing.

The community has planned a wonderful weekend celebration to commemorate its 125th anniversary. The celebration includes an all school reunion, parade, fireworks, auction, outdoor concert, a street dance, and much more.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in congratulating Steele, ND, and its residents on their first 125 years and in wishing them well through the next century. By honoring Steele and all the other historic small towns of North Dakota, we keep the great pioneering frontier spirit alive for future generations. It is places such as Steele that have helped to shape this country into what it is today, which is why this fine community is deserving of our recognition.

Steele has a proud past and a bright future.●

ASSOCIATION OF ENERGY SERVICE COMPANIES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Association of Energy Service Companies and the beneficial contributions it has made to the oil and gas industry since February 1956. This organization has helped unite the oil and gas industry and advocates the most efficient production models for all of the member companies, resulting in vastly superior oil and gas operations across the Nation.

The association formed when six service contractors met and formed the Association of Oil Well Servicing Companies to combat increasing governmental regulations, rising insurance costs, and the rising difficulty in employee recruitment. With Mr. Frank Poole appointed as the first president, the association began to gradually grow and gain prominence in the oil and gas industry. Soon after formation, the group grew to represent 35 wells and 15 trucks and eventually placed an association chapter in 17 oil-producing States.

Over the past 50 years, the organization has blossomed from 6 members to over 400. The association currently boasts representation of over 70 percent of the well-servicing rigs in domestic oil production. In 1996, due to a rapidly growing national membership and expansive chapter representation, the Association of Oil Well Servicing Companies changed their name to the Association of Energy Service Companies.

The AESC continues to lead the oil and gas industry by providing a host of services including safety training and seminars on current and new technology, environmental protection initiatives, monthly meetings of State and local chapters, as well as national meetings, conferences, and tradeshows.

Mr. President, as the members of the AESC prepare to celebrate 50 years of dedicated service, I extend my congratulations to all of those members who have remained committed to excellence in the oil and gas industry. In a world driven by oil and gas production and consumption, this organization has provided guidance and regulation to maintain equal standards in a competitive industry. For the next 50 years and beyond, I sincerely hope this organization's leadership and dedication to fairness remains as strong as it has been the past 50 years.●

TRIBUTE TO ROGER MEIER

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a great man, Roger Meier.

The late Oregon Governor Tom McCall once said, ''Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky. They are people who say, 'This is my community and it is my responsibility to make it better.' ''

When Roger Meier passed away on June 5, I lost a trusted friend and Oregon lost a true hero. Through leadership, vision, and generosity, Roger made his community of Portland and his State of Oregon a better place in which to live, work, and raise a family.

Roger was a fourth-generation Oregonian and a descendant of the founders of the Meier and Frank Company, one of Oregon's most beloved institutions. Roger spent 13 years working in the family business before venturing out on his own and serving as president and CEO of a privately owned investment company for more than 30 years.

Roger earned a reputation as a savvy analyst of the business and financial scene. He put his intelligence and knowledge to work for all Oregonians, serving for 13 years as chairman of the Oregon Investment Council, which helps to manage pension funds for Oregon's public employees. Under his stewardship, Oregon's portfolio of investments grew from $400 million to $7 billion.

Roger was also a tireless advocate for and a generous philanthropist to countless worthy causes and charitable organizations, including the Oregon Health Sciences University, Good Samaritan Hospital, and the Oregon Historical Society. Roger and his wonderful and gracious wife of 54 years, Laura, also had a special love of art. Along with their good friends, Pete and Mary Mark, Roger and Laura's generosity has helped to make the Portland Art Museum into a world-class institution.

It was fitting that a memorial tribute to Roger was held at the Portland Art Museum on June 11. My predecessor, Senator Mark Hatfield, spoke at the service and said that there was one word he believed best summed up Roger: gentleman.

Senator Hatfield was right. A man of courtesy, kindness, honesty and integrity, Roger Meier was a true gentleman. He will be greatly missed by Laura, by his daughters Alix and Jill and their families, by his friends, and by the community and State he served so ably.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize South Dakota State University, which is celebrating its 125th year anniversary.

Over the past 125 years, SDSU has proven to its students, faculty, and alumni that ''you can go anywhere from here.'' South Dakota State University, or SDSU, was founded in 1881 as the primary agriculture university in my home State of South Dakota, and 125 years later it now holds the distinction of being the State's largest university. SDSU not only provides students with an excellent academic environment, but beginning in 2004, the SDSU Jackrabbits started participating in NCAA Division I athletics.

It gives me great pleasure to rise with the students, faculty, and alumni of South Dakota State University in celebrating their 125th year anniversary and wish them continued success in the years to come.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DRAPER, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Draper, SD. The town of Draper will celebrate the 100th anniversary of its founding this year.

Located in Jones County, Draper was founded as an agricultural town in 1906. Although 100 years have passed since its founding, the city remains a great example of what makes rural South Dakota a welcoming place to live and raise a family.

I would like to offer my congratulations to Draper on their centennial and I wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.•

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5576. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, Colorado, as the ''William H. Emery Post Office''.

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 4939. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5576. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–7169. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation relative to the use of gambling devices as technologic aids in Class II gaming in Indian Country; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–7170. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Secretary, White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Department, received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–7171. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report on Small Arms Programs''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–7172. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement involving the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract in the amount of $100,000,000 or more to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–7173. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coordinated Communications'' (Notice 2006–10) received on June 5, 2006; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–7174. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7175. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7176. A communication from the Chairman and President (Acting), Export Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7177. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the designation of an acting officer for the position of Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7178. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December 31, 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7179. A communication from the Chairman, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2005 Audit of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps (NSCC) and the 2005 Annual Report of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7180. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation entitled ''Restitution for Victims of Crime Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 3524. An original bill to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve health care provided to Indians under the Medicare, Medicaid, and State Children's Health Insurance Programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3525. A bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve outcomes for children in families affected by methamphetamine abuse and addiction, to reauthorize the promoting safe and stable families program, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPECTER for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Frank D. Whitney, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

Thomas D. Anderson, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 3516. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permanently extend the floor on the Medicare work geographic adjustment under the fee schedule for physicians' services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 3517. A bill to enhance the services available to members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom to assist such members in transitioning to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3518. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to establish a new disclosure statement; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 3519. A bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3520. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 3521. A bill to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CRAIG, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3522. A bill to amend the Bonneville Power Administration portions of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 through 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. KYL):

S. 3523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running on the period of limitations while such claims are pending; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 3524. An original bill to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve health care provided to Indians under the Medicare, Medicaid, and State Children's Health Insurance Programs, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 3525. A bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve outcomes for children in families affected by methamphetamine abuse and addiction, to reauthorize the promoting safe and stable families program, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 3526. A bill to amend the Indian Land Consolidation Act to modify certain requirements under that Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 3527. A bill to require the Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce to establish an Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Institute; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. DAYTON):

S. 3528. A bill to provide higher education assistance for nontraditional students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3529. A bill to ensure that new mothers and their families are educated about postpartum depression, screened for symptoms, and provided with essential services, and to increase research at the National Institutes of Health on postpartum depression; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3530. A bill to revise the limitation on Impact Aid special payments; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DODD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. DOLE):

S. Res. 513. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning September 10, 2006, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. Con. Res. 102. A concurrent resolution condemning the decision by the city of St. Denis, France, to name a street in honor of Mumia Abu-Jamal, the convicted murderer of Philadelphia Police Officer Danny Faulkner; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 337

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service, to expand certain authorities to provide health care benefits for Reserves and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 809

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies when pharmacists employed by the pharmacies refuse to fill valid prescriptions for drugs or devices on the basis of personal beliefs, and for other purposes.

S. 900

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 900, a bill to reinstate the Federal Communications Commission's rules for the description of video programming.

S. 914

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 914, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a competitive grant program to build capacity in veterinary medical education and expand the workforce of veterinarians engaged in public health practice and biomedical research.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) 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. 1496

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1496, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a pilot program under which up to 15 States may issue electronic Federal migratory bird hunting stamps.

S. 1524

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1524, a bill to repeal the sunset on the reduction of capital gains rates for individuals and on the taxation of dividends of individuals at capital gain rates.

S. 2140

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2140, a bill to enhance protection of children from sexual exploitation by strengthening section 2257 of title 18, United States Code, requiring producers of sexually explicit material to keep and permit inspection of records regarding the age of performers, and for other purposes.

S. 2246

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2246, a bill to establish within the United States Marshals Service a short term State witness protection program to provide assistance to State and local district attorneys to protect their witnesses in homicide and major violent crime cases and to provide Federal grants for such protection.

S. 2253

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2253, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to offer the 181 Area of the Gulf of Mexico for oil and gas leasing.

S. 2354

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2354, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage gap in prescription drug coverage under part D of such title based on savings to the Medicare program resulting from the negotiation of prescription drug prices.

S. 2465

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2465, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased assistance for the prevention,

treatment, and control of tuberculosis, and for other purposes.

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to ensure that State and local emergency preparedness operational plans address the needs of individuals with household pets and service animals following a major disaster or emergency.

S. 2563

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require prompt payment to pharmacies under part D, to restrict pharmacy co-branding on prescription drug cards issued under such part, and to provide guidelines for Medication Therapy Management Services programs offered by prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans under such part.

S. 2599

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to prohibit the confiscation of firearms during certain national emergencies.

S. 2663

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2663, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, supra.

S. 2814

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2814, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for support of funeral ceremonies for veterans provided by details that consist solely of members of veterans organizations and other organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 2915

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2915, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve screening for colorectal cancer for TRICARE beneficiaries over the age of 50.

S. 2970

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide free credit monitoring and credit reports for veterans and others affected by the theft of veterans' personal data, to ensure that such persons are appropriately notified of such thefts, and for other purposes.

S. 3275

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3275, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State.

S. 3475

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3475, a bill to provide housing assistance for very-low-income veterans.

S. 3506

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

S. CON. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 20, a concurrent resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and support for the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month.

S. CON. RES. 96

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors 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. 482

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room.

S. RES. 507

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 507, a resolution designating the week of November 5 through November 11, 2006, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 508, a resolution designating October 20, 2006 as ''National Mammography Day''.

S. RES. 512

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 512, a resolution celebrating the 231st birthday of the Army and commending the men and women of the Army as exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service.

AMENDMENT NO. 4199

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4199 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4205

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4205 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4224

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4224 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4234

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4234 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4243

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4243 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. 4252

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4252 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 3516. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permanently extend the floor on the Medicare work geographic adjustment under the fee schedule for physicians' services; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today with Senators SNOWE, COCHRAN, CANTWELL, DOMENICI, LINCOLN, JEFFORDS, COLLINS, MURRAY, HARKIN, LANDRIEU, OBAMA, SALAZAR, and SESSIONS entitled the ''Rural Equity Payment Index Reform Extension Act of 2006.'' The legislation would extend a provision that was included as part of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 and came from my original legislation, S. 881 in the 108th Congress, with Congressman DOUG BEREUTER of Nebraska to ensure that the work component of the Medicare physician payment formula is set to ensure that no geographic region is paid less than the national average.

The Medicare physician payment formula, known as the Medicare Resource-Based Relative Value Scale, or RBRVS, is based on three components of each service: work, practice expense, and professional liability insurance. The relative value of each service is then multiplied by a geographic adjuster for each Medicare locality, which is known as the Geographic Practice Cost Indices, or GPCIs.

Prior to the enactment of this provision as part of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, the physicians in States that have the worst workforce shortages were being paid far less than their counterparts in States with adequate or even an oversupply of physicians due to the GPCI adjustment. For the ''work component'' in particular, which accounts for about 55 percent of the total Medicare physician payment, an adjustment based on geographic adjustments made little sense. An office visit to a rural physician is no different in time, effort, or workload compared to an office visit to an urban physician.

As National Rural Health Association president Dr. Wayne Myers said on January 7, 2003, prior to the legislation's passage, ''An office visit to a rural physician is no different than an office visit to an urban physician. The idea that physicians are reimbursed for their work and their skills at a lower rate simply on the basis that they choose to practice in a rural area and serve our rural communities is completely ludicrous.''

In addition, since Medicare beneficiaries pay the same premium for all Part B services, inequitable physician fee payments result in substantial cross-subsidization from people living in low payment States to people living in higher payment States.

Congress determined that such extensive geographic disparities were unfair and, as part of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, language from my bill was included that brought all geographic areas up to the national average for the calculation of this piece of the Medicare physician payment formula.

It is important to highlight that the importance of this formula extends well beyond Medicare. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics in its February 8, 2006, update on the Medicare payment formula, ''. . . over 74 percent of public and private payors, including state Medicaid programs, have adopted components of the Medicare RBRVS to reimburse physicians, while many other payors are exploring its implementation.''

Furthermore, Medicare Advantage plan payments are based in large part on fee-for-service payments made in various geographic locations. Disparities in Medicare Advantage payments are also caused, in part, by such geographic adjustments made to physician payments.

Unfortunately, these disparities will increase if the ''work component'' in the physician payment rate is allowed to once again fully adjust based on geography. The provision bringing payment levels up to the national average for every geographic area was in effect for 2004–2006 and is set to expire at the end of this calendar year. As a result, physicians, who already face a potential reduction in their overall Medicare payment rate, might also see their payment rates further reduced unless this legislative extension is passed.

According to the November 21, 2005, Federal Register notice, if payment rates were not brought up to the national average, there would be reductions in physician payments to the following States: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia outside of Atlanta, Idaho, parts of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland outside of Baltimore region, Michigan outside of Detroit, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, most of New York outside of New York City and suburbs, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon outside of Portland, Pennsylvania outside of Philadelphia, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas outside of Houston, Dallas, and Brazoria, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington outside of Seattle, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Lack of equitable reimbursement is a critical factor leading to the shortage of physicians in many rural areas, including the State of New Mexico. The extension of the Rural Equity Payment Index Reform Extension Act of 2006 will ensure that the disparity in physician payments between states such as New Mexico and other geographic areas does not once again widen.

I urge prompt passage of this important legislation and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rural Equity Payment Index Reform Extension Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF FLOOR ON MEDICARE WORK GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT.

Section 1848(e)(1)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(e)(1)(E)) is amended by striking ''and before January 1, 2007,''.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 3517. A bill to enhance the services available to members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom to assist such members in transitioning to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce the Heroes

at Home Act of 2006. This legislation would take several important steps toward assisting our brave men and women in uniform in transitioning back home to their families, workplaces, and communities after deployment in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Hundreds of thousands of troops have rotated through Iraq and Afghanistan as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom, OIF, and Operation Enduring Freedom, OEF, including thousands of courageous men and women from New York. More military service members than ever are surviving these conflicts because of better body armor and helmets and improved battlefield medicine.

But surviving these wars and transitioning home can be an uphill battle. Many OIF and OEF service members, including the unprecedented number of National Guard and Reserve members, face readjustment challenges after war, such as medical, mental health, relationship, and work problems. Family members also are affected by the transition as they struggle to reconnect with their war heroes, some who may be deployed two, three, if not more times.

As I meet with returning service members and their families around the State of New York and the country, I hear about the real hardships they battle after deployment—just how difficult it can be to adjust back to life at home.

Several articles and reports have highlighted these struggles. According to a March 2006 study, 19 percent of Iraq veterans and 11 percent of Afghanistan veterans reported mental health problems. Among the OIF and OEF veterans seeking care at Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, hospitals, nearly a third have been diagnosed with mental disorders, with over 40 percent of those posttraumatic stress disorder, PTSD. Another report found that 10 to 30 percent of National Guard members come home from Iraq searching for work. Others return to civilian jobs dissatisfied with old tasks that pale in comparison to wartime responsibilities.

In addition to these challenges, a large number of service members are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan with life-threatening brain injuries from roadside blasts that can cause brain damage. It is estimated that traumatic brain injuries, TBI, affect more than 25 percent of bomb blast survivors—a percentage thought to be higher than in any other past U.S. conflict, making TBI the ''signature'' injury of Iraq. The diffuse but debilitating symptoms of TBI can leave service members with cognitive and emotional problems, including the inability to adapt to civilian life. However, TBI frequently goes undiagnosed because returning troops may show no visible wounds or may not realize they suffered a concussion.

Lessons from past wars have taught us that identifying and dealing with problems like PTSD and TBI right away is vital for overcoming them. Yet just last month, a GAO report found that only 22 percent of OIF and OEF service members who may have been at risk for developing PTSD based on post deployment screenings were referred on for further mental health evaluations. In another report from May 2005, the GAO identified that, despite DOD efforts, the needs of demobilizing Reserve and National Guard members for transition assistance were still unmet.

We must do more today to reach out and help our newest generation of war heroes as they transition home after serving bravely in Iraq and Afghanistan. And we must do more to shore up their families, who have courageously maintained family life on the home front during their deployment. That is why I am introducing this legislation today. The Heroes at Home Act would help address returning service members' readjustment to work, PTSD, TBI, and other problems, as well as provide support to their family members.

This bill would involve partnerships with employers and community organizations because—despite more services and resources offered at DOD facilities, VA hospitals, and Vet Centers—returning service members are often reluctant to go to traditional mental health clinics due to stigma and concerns about confidentiality and their military careers. Only 29 percent of the approximately 500,000 separated OIF and OEF veterans have sought VA health care services, including mental health services.

This legislation would identify ways to better assist National Guard and Reserve members in returning to civilian jobs, who are often hurled from civilian life into combat with less preparation and are then expected to reenter the civilian workforce. It would develop an assistance center for employers, employee assistance programs, and other organizations to provide them with best practices and education for ensuring the success of Guard and Reserve members in resuming civilian work after deployment, a win for our businesses, our employers, and our troops.

Under this legislation, demonstration grants would be awarded to organizations in community setting for providing mental health education and assistance to National Guard and Reserve members and their families. Since many of these troops return to local communities scattered across the country far away from military bases and VA hospitals, these pilot projects would help reach them and their loved ones in more convenient places like community colleges, public schools, community mental health clinics, and family support organizations.

With more and more troops injured by improvised explosive devices, IEDs, and bombs in Iraq, we must do more to understand the effects of these blasts on those impacted by them. That is why this legislation also calls for a study on the long-term physical and mental health consequences and rehabilitation needs of traumatic brain injured service members of OIF and OEF. This study would examine ways to help prevent future generations of service members from sustaining such injuries while assessing what types of programs and services are available to treat those who have already been injured in the years ahead.

To further assist the mushrooming number of traumatic brain injured service members and their families, this legislation would establish a TBI family caregiver training curricula. Health professionals at DOD and VA hospitals would use this training to teach family members how to care for traumatic brain injured service members after they leave the hospital. It is crucial that we give family members the tools they need to effectively assist their loved ones at home in their communities.

Those who have proudly served our Nation in OIF and OEF have made extraordinary sacrifices in the battlefield in defense of democracy and freedom. Back home, these heroes deserve our best resources and support to make sure they once again are vibrant and welcomed members in our neighborhoods, our towns, and our cities, at our work sites, and in our families. None of our returning service members should suffer alone in silence. Nor should their families. We all must do our part. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to ensure passage of this bill that champions the successful transition of our newly returning heroes to their families, workplaces and communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Heroes at Home Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3348) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND ENDURING FREEDOM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the activities required under subsection (c), the task force shall, not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Heroes at Home Act of 2006, submit to the Secretary a report containing an assessment of, and recommendations for improving, assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families, in transitioning to civilian employment upon their return from such deployment, including—

''(A) members who were self-employed before deployment and seek to return to such employment after deployment;

''(B) members who were students before deployment and seek to return to school or commence employment after deployment;

''(C) members who have experienced multiple recent deployments; and

''(D) members who have been wounded or injured during deployment.

''(2) WORKING GROUP.—In conducting the assessment and making the recommendations required by paragraph (1), the task force shall utilize the assistance of a working group that consists of individuals selected by the task force from among individuals as follows:

''(A) With the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, personnel of the Small Business Administration.

''(B) Representatives of employers who employ members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) on their return to civilian life as described in that paragraph.

''(C) Representatives of employee assistance organizations.

''(D) Representatives of associations of employers.

''(E) Representatives of organizations that assist wounded or injured members of the National Guard and Reserves in finding or sustaining employment.

''(F) Representatives of such other public or private organizations and entities as the co-chairs of the task force, in consultation with the members of the task force, consider appropriate.

''(3) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the following:

''(A) The provision of outreach and training to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers on the employment, readjustment, and mental health needs of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) upon their return from deployment as described in that paragraph.

''(B) The provision of outreach and training to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers on the needs of family members of such members.

''(C) The improvement of collaboration between the pubic and private sectors in order to ensure the successful transition of such members into civilian employment upon their return from such deployment.

''(4) OTHER DUTIES.—In the period between the submittal of the report required by paragraph (1) and the termination of the task force under subsection (h), the task force (including the working group established under paragraph (2)) shall serve as an advisor to the Assistance Center for Employers and Employment Assistance Organizations established under section 3 of the Heroes at Home Act of 2006.

''(5) EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'employment assistance organization' means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.''.

(b) REPORT.—Subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''REPORT'' and inserting ''REPORTS'';

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph (1):

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The report submitted to the Secretary under each of subsections (c) and (d) shall include—

''(A) a description of the activities of the task force under such subsection;

''(B) the assessment and recommendations required by such subsection; and

''(C) such other matters relating to the activities of the task force under such subsection as the task force considers appropriate.''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''the report under paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''a report under paragraph (1)''; and

(B) by striking ''the report as'' and inserting ''such report as''.

(c) PLAN MATTERS.—Subsection (g) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking ''the report from the task force under subsection (e)(1)'' and inserting ''a report from the task force under subsection (f)(1)''; and

(2) by inserting ''contained in such report'' after ''the task force'' the second place it appears.

(d) TERMINATION.—Subsection (h) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by inserting ''with respect to the assessment and recommendations required by subsection (d)'' after ''the task force''; and

(2) by striking ''subsection (e)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (f)(2)''.

SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE CENTER FOR EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an office to assist employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers in facilitating the successful transition to civilian employment of members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The office established under this subsection shall be known as the ''Assistance Center for Employers and Employment Assistance Organizations'' (in this section referred to as the ''Center'').

(3) HEAD.—The Secretary shall designate an individual to act as the head of the Center.

(4) INTEGRATION.—In establishing the Center, the Secretary shall ensure close communication between the Center and the military departments, including the commands of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Center shall have the following functions:

(1) To provide education and technical assistance to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers to assist them in facilitating the successful transition to civilian employment of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a) on their return from deployment as described in that subsection.

(2) To provide education and technical assistance to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers to assist them in facilitating the successful adjustment of family members of the National Guard and Reserve to the deployment and return from deployment of members of the National Guard and Reserve as described in that subsection.

(c) RESOURCES TO BE PROVIDED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Center shall provide employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers resources, services, and assistance that include the following:

(A) Guidelines on best practices and effective strategies.

(B) Education on the physical and mental health difficulties that can and may be experienced by members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a) on their return from deployment as described in that subsection in transitioning to civilian employment, including difficulties arising from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI), including education on—

(i) the detection of warning signs of such difficulties;

(ii) the medical, mental health, and employment services available to such members, including materials on services offered by the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs (including through the vet center program under section 1712A of title 38, United States Code), the Department of Labor, military support programs, and community mental health clinics; and

(iii) the mechanisms for referring such members for services described in clause (ii) and for other medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(C) Education on the range and types of potential physical and mental health effects of deployment and post-deployment adjustment on family members of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a), including education on—

(i) the detection of warning signs on such effects on family members of members of the National Guard and Reserves;

(ii) the medical, mental health, and employment services available to such family members, including materials on such services as described in subparagraph (B)(ii); and

(iii) mechanisms for referring such family members for services described in clause (ii) and for medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(D) Education on mechanisms, strategies, and resources for accommodating and employing wounded or injured members of the National Guard and Reserves in work settings.

(2) PROVISION OF RESOURCES.—The Center shall make resources, services, and assistance available under this subsection through such mechanisms as the head of the Center considers appropriate, including the Internet, video conferencing, telephone services, workshops, trainings, presentations, group forums, and other mechanisms.

(d) PERSONNEL AND OTHER RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Defense shall assign to the Center such personnel, funding, and other resources as are required to ensure the effective discharge by the Center of the functions under subsection (b).

(e) REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT BY CENTER.—Not later than one year after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the head of the Center, in consultation with the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health (while in effect), shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a written report on the progress and outcomes of the Center during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(2) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after receipt of a report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit

such report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with—

(A) such comments on such report, and such assessment of the effectiveness of the Center, as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(B) such recommendations on means of improving the effectiveness of the Center as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report under paragraph (2) available to the public, including through the Internet website of the Center.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''employment assistance organization'' means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH.—The term ''Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health'' means the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health established under section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, as amended by section 2 of this Act.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 4. GRANTS ON ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED SETTINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE AND THEIR FAMILIES AFTER DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may award grants to eligible entities to carry out demonstration projects to assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing community-based settings for the provision of assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve who serve in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families, after the return of such members from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, as the case may be, including—

(1) services to improve the reuniting of such members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families;

(2) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on their return from such deployment, including education on—

(A) Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI); and

(B) mechanisms for the referral of such members of the National Guard and Reserve for medical and mental health screening and care when necessary; and

(3) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that family members of such members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on the return of such members from such deployment, including education on—

(A) depression, anxiety, and relationship problems; and

(B) mechanisms for medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity eligible for the award of a grant under this section is any public or private non-profit organization, such as a community mental health clinic, family support organization, military support organization, law enforcement agency, community college, or public school.

(c) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require for purposes of this section, including a description of how such entity will work with the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, State health agencies, other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, family support organizations, and other community organization in undertaking activities described in subsection (a).

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS BY GRANT RECIPIENTS.—An entity awarded a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense on an annual basis a report on the activities undertaken by such entity during the preceding year utilizing amounts under the grant. Each report shall include such information as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of this subsection.

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on activities undertaken under the grants awarded under this section. The report shall include recommendations for legislative, programmatic, or administrative action to improve or enhance activities under the grants awarded under this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report under this subsection available to the public.

SEC. 5. LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(b) SELECTION OF ENTITY FOR CONDUCT OF STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, select an entity to conduct the study required by subsection (a) from among private organizations or entities qualified to conduct the study.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries.

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(4) The health care, mental health care, and rehabilitation needs of such members for such injuries after the completion of inpatient treatment through the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, or both.

(5) The type and availability of long-term care rehabilitation programs and services within and outside the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for such members for such injuries, including community-based programs and services and in-home programs and services.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) PERIODIC AND FINAL REPORTS.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the appropriate elements of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(A) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study.

(B) In the case of a report to elements of the Department of Defense—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for programmatic and administrative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries; and

(ii) such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate based on the outcomes of the study.

(C) In the case of a report to elements of the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers appropriate for programmatic and administrative action to improve long-term care and rehabilitative programs and services for members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury; and

(ii) such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate based on the outcomes of the study.

(D) In the case of a report to Congress—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for legislative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries;

(ii) such recommendations as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers appropriate for legislative action to improve long-term care and rehabilitative programs and services for members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury; and

(iii) such other recommendations as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly consider appropriate based on the outcomes of the study.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly take appropriate actions to make each report under this subsection available to the public.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 6. TRAINING CURRICULA FOR FAMILY CAREGIVERS ON CARE AND ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY FAMILY CAREGIVER PANEL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, establish within the Department of Defense a panel to develop coordinated, uniform, and consistent training curricula to be used in training family members in the provision of care and assistance to members and former members of the Armed Forces for traumatic brain injuries incurred during service in the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) DESIGNATION OF PANEL.—The panel established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the ''Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel''.

(3) MEMBERS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel established under paragraph (1) shall consist of 15 members appointed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, equally represented from among—

(A) physicians, nurses, rehabilitation therapists, and other individuals with an expertise in caring for and assisting individuals with traumatic brain injury, including those who specialize in caring for and assisting individuals with traumatic brain injury incurred in war;

(B) representatives of family caregivers or family caregiver associations;

(C) Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs health and medical personnel with expertise in traumatic brain injury, and Department of Defense personnel and readiness representatives with expertise in traumatic brain injury;

(D) representatives of military service organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans;

(E) representatives of veterans service organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans;

(F) psychologists or other individuals with expertise in the mental health treatment and care of individuals with traumatic brain injury;

(G) experts in the development of training curricula;

(H) researchers and academicians who study traumatic brain injury; and

(I) any other individuals the Secretary considers appropriate.

(4) MEETINGS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall meet not less than monthly.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall develop training curricula to be utilized during the provision of training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) on techniques, strategies, and skills for care and assistance for such members and former members with the traumatic brain injuries described in that subsection.

(2) SCOPE OF CURRICULA.—The curricula shall—

(A) be based on empirical research and validated techniques; and

(B) shall provide for training that permits recipients to tailor caregiving to the unique circumstances of the member or former member of the Armed Forces receiving care.

(3) PARTICULAR REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall—

(A) specify appropriate training commensurate with the severity of traumatic brain injury; and

(B) identify appropriate care and assistance to be provided for the degree of severity of traumatic brain injury for caregivers of various levels of skill and capability.

(4) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricular, materials, and resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.

(5) CONSULTATION.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall consult with the Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee, as appropriate.

(6) DEADLINE FOR DEVELOPMENT.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall develop the curricula not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF CURRICULA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel, develop mechanisms for the dissemination of the curricula developed under subsection (b) to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who treat or otherwise work with members and former members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury incurred in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. In developing such mechanisms, the Secretary may utilize and enhance existing mechanisms, including the Military Severely Injured Center.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.—The health care professionals referred to in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Personnel at military medical treatment facilities.

(B) Personnel at the polytrauma centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(C) Personnel and care managers at the Military Severely Injured Center.

(D) Such other health care professionals of the Department of Defense as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(E) Such other health care professionals of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, considers appropriate.

(3) SCOPE.—The mechanisms developed under paragraph (1) shall include the provision of refresher training in the curricula developed under subsection (a) for the health care professional referred to in paragraph (2) not less often than once every six months.

(4) PROVISION OF TRAINING TO FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who are trained in the curricula developed under subsection (b) shall provide training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces who incur traumatic brain injuries during service in the Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom in the care and assistance to be provided for such injuries.

(B) TIMING OF TRAINING.—Training under this paragraph shall, to the extent practicable, be provided to family members while the member or former member concerned is undergoing treatment at a facility of the Department of Defense or Department of Veterans Affairs, as applicable, in order to ensure that such family members receive practice on the provision of such care and assistance under the guidance of qualified health professionals.

(C) PARTICULARIZED TRAINING.—Training provided under this paragraph to family members of a particular member or former member shall be tailored to the particular care needs of such member or former member and the particular caregiving needs of such family members.

(5) QUALITY ASSURANCE.—The Secretary shall develop mechanisms to ensure quality in the provision of training under this section to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) and in the provision of such training under paragraph (4) by such health care professionals.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the development of the curricula required by subsection (b), and annually thereafter, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Training Panel shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a report on the following:

(A) The actions undertaken under this subsection.

(B) The results of the tracking of outcomes based on training developed and provided under this section.

(C) Recommendations for the improvement of training developed and provided under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3518. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to establish a new disclosure statement; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act, CROA, to stop abusive class action lawsuits against companies offering legitimate credit file monitoring products. The following is a summary of why we need to pass this legislation.

Credit-monitoring products are offered by consumer reporting agencies, their affiliates, and resellers. These products help consumers access their consumer report information and credit scores on a regular basis. They include credit alert features when derogatory information appears in the consumer's file or someone obtains the consumer's report. The products give consumers a front-line defense against identity theft, and are routinely made available to victims of security breaches. Credit-monitoring products also educate consumers about their credit scores and credit histories. The market is highly competitive. Banks and other creditors also provide these products to their customers.

These products are threatened by abusive class action lawsuits, based on CROA's language. CROA was to combat the assault on the integrity of accurate credit file data by credit repair organizations and by consumers acting on their advice. Under CROA, a credit repair organization is subject to a number of appropriately harsh and specific requirements. The most significant of these is a prohibition on collecting fees before completion of performance of the promised services. CROA also mandates that consumers be given a written warning that the services cannot result in the change or deletion of negative but accurate data. This ''warning'' would be confusing and inappropriate if given to a consumer of credit monitoring products or services.

CROA was enacted before credit monitoring products were created. The CROA definition of ''credit repair organization'' is intentionally broad in order to prevent circumvention of its coverage. Among other things, the definition includes an entity that implies its activities or services can ''improve'' a consumer's credit record, credit history or credit rating. The breadth of the definition has been used by plaintiffs' lawyers an attempt to obtain statutory damages against consumer reporting agencies and their resellers solely for offering these monitoring

products. The class action lawsuits threaten the viability of the credit-monitoring industry.

This result can be prevented through the enactment of a technical amendment to CROA that clarifies the definition of ''credit repair organization'' as it includes ''improving'' a consumer's credit record, etc. The amendment can explain that ''improving'' a consumer's credit record does not include credit monitoring, notifications, analysis, evaluation, or explanations.

Because this is a clarifying amendment, it will not affect the CROA's essential operation or Federal agency enforcement. The Federal Trade Commission has stated that it does not think credit-monitoring products should be subject to CROA. If this amendment is enacted, consumers will continue to enjoy CROA's important rights and protections, including the right to bring private lawsuits against credit repair organizations for violations of the act. The amendment to CROA will also assure the continued availability of credit monitoring products and services for consumers.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me in passing this important legislation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 3519. A bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Agriculture Small Business Opportunity and Enhancement Act of 2006. Currently, 28 States, including my home State of Utah, have State meat inspection programs. But, outdated Federal laws prohibit the interstate shipment of certain meats inspected under these programs. My legislation would remove that unfair ban.

Let me provide some background on why this legislation is necessary. A 1906 law, the Federal Meat Inspection Act, requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, to inspect all cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and horses slaughtered for human consumption. An amendment in 1957, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, added poultry to that list. While the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the 1968 Poultry Products Inspection Act recognized State inspection programs separate from the Federal program, these laws also prohibit certain meats inspected under State programs from being sold in interstate commerce. That ban applies to beef, poultry, pork, lamb, and goat products, but not to specialty meats such as venison, pheasant, quail, rabbit, and numerous others that are typically inspected under State programs.

It is important to point out that this ban is unique. State-inspected beef, poultry, pork, lamb, and goat products are the only food commodities that are banned from interstate shipment. Many perishable products, including milk and other dairy items, fruit, vegetables, and fish, which are inspected under State programs, are shipped freely across State lines.

There is no legitimate reason for the ban on the interstate shipment of State-inspected meats to continue. The State programs are equal or superior to the Federal program. In fact, the 1967 and 1968 Meat and Poultry Inspection Acts require State inspection programs to be ''at least equal to'' the Federal program. Since 1967, USDA has conducted comprehensive reviews of each individual State inspection program to verify whether or not the program meets the statutory requirement to be ''at least equal to'' the Federal program. In the nearly 30 years that USDA has been conducting these reviews, the agency has never unilaterally found that a State inspection program should be discontinued due to an inability to meet Federal food safety standards.

Further, the 2002 farm bill required USDA to conduct an additional comprehensive review of State inspection programs. After a 2-year study, USDA issued an interim report which found that State inspection programs are indeed ''at least equal to'' the Federal inspection program. In addition, three USDA Advisory Committees have recommended that the ban on interstate shipment be lifted.

In short, there is no distinction between the Federal and State inspection programs. Without exception, State inspection programs meet or exceed Federal food-safety requirements, and USDA has verified the safety of these programs for decades.

In Utah, we have 32 establishments that inspect meat under a State's inspection program. These establishments, like the nearly 2,000 similar plants nationwide, are, for the most part, small businesses. And, generally speaking, these establishments cater to the needs of small, family-run farms and ranches. The outdated ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected meats clearly disrupts the free flow of trade, restricts market access for countless small businesses, and creates an unfair advantage for big businesses.

But it gets worse. Current regulations also favor foreign meat producers over small businesses in our Nation. In fact, meat inspected in 34 foreign countries can be shipped anywhere in the U.S. because the USDA has certified that the inspection programs in these foreign countries are equivalent to the Federal program. As I have pointed out, State inspection programs must meet the same Federal equivalency standard. In fact, USDA supervision of State inspection programs is far more frequent and thorough than its oversight of foreign inspection programs.

In my view, it is absurd that meat inspected in 34 foreign countries can be shipped anywhere in the United States without restriction, but small businesses in 28 States are prohibited from shipping their products across State lines, even though these small businesses meet the same Federal food safety requirements as their foreign competitors.

A ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected meat unfairly hinders our Nation's economy. My legislation would remove the outdated, unnecessary, unjust ban that puts our small businesses at such a disadvantage. Removing this prohibition will increase competition and innovation. It will provide farmers and ranchers with increased opportunities to sell their products at a better price. It will not do anything more than level the playing field and ensure that our small businesses have the opportunity to economically compete in the market.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defending America's small businesses by supporting this important legislation.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3520. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as you know, Turkey invaded the northern area of the Republic of Cyprus in the summer of 1974. At that time, less than 20 percent of the private real property in this area was owned by Turkish Cypriots, with the rest owned by Greek Cypriots and foreigners. Turkey's invasion and subsequent occupation of northern Cyprus displaced people who are to this day prevented by the Turkish armed forces from returning to and repossessing their homes and properties.

A large proportion of these properties were distributed to, and are currently being used by, the 120,000 Turkish settlers brought into the occupied area by Turkey. It is estimated that 7,000 to 10,000 U.S. nationals today claim an interest in such property.

Adding urgency to the plight of Greek-Cypriots and Americans who lost property in the wake of the invasion is a recent property development boom in the Turkish-occupied north of Cyprus. As an ever-increasing number of disputed properties are transferred or developed, the rightful owners' prospects for recovering their property or being compensated worsen.

In 1998, the European Court of Human Rights found that Turkey had unlawfully deprived Greek Cypriot refugees of the use of their properties in the north of the island. The Court ruled that the Government of Turkey was obliged to compensate the refugees for such deprivation, and to allow them to return home.

It is to provide similar redress to the American victims of Turkey's invasion and occupation of Cyprus that my colleague Senator MENENDEZ and I today introduce the American-Owned Property in Occupied Cyprus Claims Act. A substantively identical bill has been

proposed in the House of Representatives by Representative PALLONE and 32 of his Republican and Democratic colleagues.

This act would direct the U.S. Government's independent Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to receive, evaluate, and determine awards with respect to the claims of U.S. citizens and businesses that lost property as a result of Turkey's invasion and continued occupation of northern Cyprus. To provide funds from which these awards would be paid, the act would urge the President to authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate an agreement for settlement of such claims with the Government of Turkey.

The act would further grant U.S. Federal courts jurisdiction over suits by U.S. nationals against any private persons—other than Turkey—occupying or otherwise using the U.S. national's property in the Turkish-occupied portion of Cyprus. Lastly, the act would expressly waive Turkey's sovereign immunity against claims brought by U.S. nationals in U.S. courts relating to property occupied by the Government of Turkey and used by Turkey in connection with a commercial activity carried out in the United States.

This bill represents an important step toward righting the internationally recognized wrong of the expropriation of property, including American property, in northern Cyprus in the wake of the 1974 invasion by the Turkish Army. I strongly urge my colleagues to promptly consider and pass this critical piece of legislation.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 3521. A bill to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill which is sponsored by myself and 20 other Members of the Senate.

The purpose of this bill is to put some control over spending—or at least put procedures in—to allow us as a Congress to begin to control spending.

I think we all recognize that in the short run we are headed toward a budget that looks like it may actually move toward balance. We have seen some very significant, positive gains. A deficit that was supposed to be about $425 billion this year is down to about $300 billion, and it may well go below that. That does not solve our problem even though we have gotten things moving the right way because in the outyears we face a fiscal crisis. That is reflected in this chart.

The fact is, there is facing this country a situation where we have a generation known as the baby boom generation which is such a large generation that it has basically overwhelmed the systems of America at each point in its evolution. It started out in the early 1950s and late 1940s. It overwhelmed the school systems it was so big. As it moved forward in the 1960s, it created the civil rights movement, and in the 1980s and 1990s it created the greatest prosperity in the history of our country as a result of its size and productivity.

But now that generation is beginning to retire. It will start to retire in the year 2008. It will be fully retired by the year 2020. It will be the largest retired generation in the history of our Nation by a factor of two. There will essentially be 70 million people retiring during that period.

What are the implications? The implications are rather severe for our Nation's fiscal policy, and especially for our children. All of our retirement systems in this Nation—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—all our major safety nets were built around the concept created by FDR, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that there would always be many more people working than retiring.

In fact, in the early 1950s there were about 12 people working and paying into the Social Security system for every one person taking it out of Social Security. Today there are about three and a half people working for every one person who is retired. By the years 2020 to 2025, there will only be two people working for every one person taking out of the system. That means this pyramid concept goes to a rectangle, and our children and our grandchildren who will then be the working people in America will not be able to support the benefit structure which is in place for the retired.

This chart reflects the dramatic effect of this situation rather starkly. The blue line represents what percent of gross national product the Federal Government usually spends. Historically, since World War II, the Federal Government has spent about 20 percent of the gross national product. The red line represents three programs in the Federal process: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The red line grows dramatically beginning in about the year 2008 and proceeds at an exponential rate of growth, so that by the years 2025 to 2028 those three programs alone will actually cost more than 20 percent of the gross national product of America.

What does that mean? It means if we were to spend the historic amount we have spent on the Federal Government, those three programs would use up all that money and there would be no money available for education, for national defense, for laying out roads, for health care for everyone else, other than those who are retired, or for anything else the Federal Government is supposed to do. Everything would have to be spent on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It does not stop there. It continues up at a rather dramatic movement.

The point, of course, is that our children will have to pay the cost. They will find themselves confronted with a dramatic increase in tax burden unless we address the cost of those programs from the spending side.

The point, also, is we really cannot tax our way out of this problem. We cannot possibly raise taxes high enough to keep up with the cost of these programs and still have a viable country. If we did that, we would eliminate the ability of our children to buy a new home, to send their kids to college, to even buy cars. The lifestyle of an American, our children and our grandchildren, would be dramatically reduced—their quality of life—were we to raise taxes to try to keep up with this rate of growth of spending.

Again, it is not a revenue problem; it is a spending problem. That is important to stress. In fact, if you look at the revenues over the last few years, this reinforces this point. Revenues dropped precipitously at the beginning of this President's term for two reasons. One, we had the largest bubble in the history of the world, the Internet bubble, back in the late 1990s, where we were essentially producing false income, paper returns through the issuance of stock which wasn't backed up by productive companies. This bubble burst, and it was the biggest bubble in history, bigger than the tulip or south seas bubble. And the effect of it was to cause our economy to retrench.

Then we had the attack of September 11, which dramatically impacted our psyche as a nation. Obviously, it had a horrific effect in the area of loss of lives, but it had a dramatic effect on our economy. Those two back-to-back events basically forced a significant drop in revenues.

So President Bush came in and said: Let's try to get out of this recession—and it was a shallow recession but would have headed a lot deeper—by cutting taxes and giving people an incentive to be more productive. We have heard a lot from the other side about how it is terrible we cut taxes at the beginning of this administration. But what those tax cuts did was create an atmosphere where people who wanted to be entrepreneurial, who wanted to go out and take risks, who were willing to put their own personal efforts and their dollars behind an effort to be productive, and, thus, create jobs, did exactly that.

Then the economy started to recover. We had 39 straight months of recovery. We had one of the largest expansions of the post-World-War II period. The practical effect of that is that we have created more economic activity, created

more jobs, and created more revenue to the Federal Government. So in the last 2 years, the revenue to the Federal Government has actually jumped greater in a 2-year period than at any time in the post-World-War II period. Each of the last 2 years has had historic increases of revenues for the Federal Government.

We are at a point where revenues are essentially at the same place they would be over history as a percent of gross national product. We are essentially generating about the same amount of revenue we have always generated to the Federal Government.

The other side of the aisle says: Let's raise taxes some more. That is not going to help because we are already generating as much revenue as we usually generate. We are doing it the right way, with a fair tax system, telling entrepreneurs to make jobs and create risks. We have created jobs and given revenues to the Federal Government.

The real issue is, you have to be willing to address spending, which is what the chart shows. A group on our side of the aisle said: How do you do this? Probably the way to do it is to put in place a series of processes in the Senate and in the House, which basically forced the Congress to address the public policy issues of reducing the rate of growth and spending for the Federal Government. This is very difficult for an elected body. We know it is a natural tendency of an elected body to spend more money because people come to you and say: We need this for that. Usually the stories are compelling and the purposes are good.

The simple fact is, we cannot afford to spend all the money that people want to spend, and we need to have some mechanisms around here which energize an atmosphere of producing fiscal responsibility, delivering government that is efficient, delivering government that is effective, delivering government that people get what they expect, and, also, get their dollars used efficiently and effectively to produce a government that works.

So we are suggesting a program that basically renews, redesigns; it reforms, it rebuilds the Federal system relative to how we are going to spend money and makes sure we spend it effectively so we give people an affordable government, something that delivers the type of services they need but does it in a way that can be afforded. That is our goal. Our goal, essentially, is to contain spending so that we are able to deliver quality government and still pass on to our children a government that is affordable, a tax burden they can afford that won't overwhelm them and will give them the opportunity to have as good a life as we have had.

The proposal we have come up with has a variety of different elements to accomplish this. First, we follow the ideas put forward by the President, which has eight basic elements. It is a very extensive reform package, renewal package, redesign package, rebuilding package.

The first element is what I call fast-track rescission. I suppose that is too technical. The President calls it the line-item veto. But it says the President has the opportunity to look at bills we have passed in the Senate and say: Listen, we do not need to spend money on that item. That is really an item of earmark, or maybe you might call it pork, or it is just simply not what we need. It is not what the American people have to have their dollars spent on. He gets to put together a package of items, and he sends them to us. He says: These are the items I don't think we need. We think the American people don't need them. We don't think the Government can afford them, and you, the Congress, can take another look at them and vote them up or down. Fast-track rescission. We have to take the vote. It is an opportunity for the executive branch to have a say and for the legislative branch to take a second look. We have done it in a way so neither branch is prejudiced as to our constitutional role which is very important.

The second thing we have done is we have reinstated statutory caps. What is that? It means that we say every year how much the Federal Government is going to spend and we lock it down so that if we spend over that amount we have to go back and cut somewhere else to bring us down to that number.

What has happened around here, we have said we are going to spend X dollars. That is called a cap. But we have not had any enforcement mechanism behind the cap. Those lapsed in 2002. So when we exceed the cap, you get 60 votes and people say: Fine, we will spend the money anyway, even though we said we were not going to spend that much money, and it is ignored. This puts in place a system where we have to be responsible to the number we set out as to what the Federal Government should spend. It is basically truth in budgeting and forces budgeting to be effective and responsive.

The third item we put in, we reduce the deficit so it will move to zero by 2012. This is done by saying essentially this: The deficit today is X percent of gross national product. We are going to say that the deficit should be dropped as a percent of gross national product every year until we get to about 2012 where we expect it to be basically no deficit. If we exceed those numbers—in other words, if the deficit exceeds that percent of gross national product which we set out in the bill—and these numbers are historical numbers and they are obtainable numbers.

In fact, in the first 2 years, the numbers we have set out are basically above where the actual deficit looks like it will hit, and it is about the third and fourth year we may have some issues to keep the deficit moving down—but if the deficit is not moving down, we put in place a process called reconciliation, directed at entitlement spending.

The problem we have as a Federal Government isn't the discretionary side of the ledger. That is spending that occurs every year. Every year you have to spend X dollars on defense, X dollars on education, and you can make a choice regarding how much you will spend here, how much you spend there. Nondefense spending in those accounts has been flat for the last few years, essentially flat if you factor in inflation. The real growth of the Federal Government has been in these accounts that are entitlement accounts, mandatory accounts which I had on the first chart, three of the major ones. They represent, along with the Federal debt, about 60 percent of Federal spending.

What this bill says is that essentially you have to go back and take a look at those accounts if we are not meeting our deficit targets and bring them into line so we will meet those deficit targets.

Now, in order to help accomplish this, this proposal also includes an entitlement commission. There have been a lot of commissions around here and everyone is a little tired of commissions. This commission is different. This commission says take a look at the entitlement accounts of the Federal Government, report back to the Congress, and Congress must act on your proposal. We actually put in place a policy procedure to try to correct the entitlement issue. Then we put in place a budgeting procedure which allows us to legislate changes if the entitlement improvements are not accomplishing our goals.

The purpose is to make these entitlement programs affordable for our children while they still maintain a quality lifestyle for those who are retired. That can be and should be able to be accomplished. But it takes a Congress being willing to step up to the plate and doing it. So far, we have not been willing to do that. We have been burying our head in the sand on that issue.

Another element in this proposal is a BRAC commission, a proposal from Senator BROWNBACK, which essentially looks at the whole Government, independent of the Defense Department, which was looked at under its own BRAC commission. And if you recall, it looked at the entire Defense Department and decided what the Defense Department needed and didn't need and set up a package and we voted on it as a package.

This is a ''BRAC Commission'' for the Government with very strong, thoughtful people being appointed to the Commission, the same way the BRAC Commission was set up relative to the Defense Department. We will be able to take a look at functions of the Government which maybe should be eliminated or reduced or significantly changed.

It is a good proposal. It is also a proposal that includes biennial budgeting—an idea that is strongly supported by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, who is managing the bill on the floor right now, and the Senator

from New Mexico—so we can have a budget process where we are not always looking at the budget every year and everybody spinning their wheels around the budget but, rather, having a year where we develop a budget and a year where we do a lot more oversight. That is the theory behind that, so we can become more efficient.

Finally, it has reforms to what is known as the reconciliation process. The reconciliation process is the teeth under which we accomplish savings in the budget process. But it can also, unfortunately, be used for expanding spending if it is not handled properly. So these reforms make it clear that reconciliation is primarily for the purposes of controlling spending, not of expanding spending.

So the goal is simple. The goal is to put in place a package which will allow us as a Congress to step up and address the issue of overspending. That is why we call it SOS, ''stop overspending.'' The purpose of that goal is to be able to pass on to our children a government that is affordable, that continues to deliver the services people expect, continues to give high-quality services but does it in an affordable way so our children's quality of life is not overwhelmed by the burden of a government that is trying to support a retired generation that is huge.

Again, I must stress, that you cannot do this on the tax side. You cannot solve the issues of the deficit, you cannot solve the issues of entitlement concerns on the tax side. There is simply too much programmatic commitment in the pipeline to accomplish that.

Let me give you a couple numbers to highlight that fact. The General Accounting Office—the comptroller of the Government—has told us there is presently pending relative to entitlement responsibility for retired people an obligation which we don't know how we are going to pay for—that is called an unfunded liability—of $46 trillion; and that is ''trillion'' with a ''T.'' So that is $46 trillion of responsibility that we have put on the books in costs that we don't really know how we are going to pay for.

I don't know what $1 trillion is. It is very hard to comprehend $1 trillion. But just to put it in some sort of context, since the beginning of this country, since our Revolution, we have paid something like $43 trillion in taxes. So all the taxes paid since this country started would not pay for the bills we have on the books for our upcoming retired generation. Or to put it in another context, if you took all the assets owned in America today—all the cars, all the homes, all the stock, all the small businesses, all the big businesses—and totaled them up, their total is about $47 trillion in net value. So we have on the books a liability that is essentially the same as the net worth of our Nation. That is a serious problem, and you cannot deal with that problem by simply raising taxes.

The other side of the aisle has not put forward any substantive ideas in this area relative to spending. They have suggested a proposal called pay-go, which is a stalking-horse for tax increases. Fine. That is their position: We should raise taxes to address all problems. But we know from the numbers that are now coming in at the Treasury that we are already taxing Americans at a level which is at our historic level, our traditional level, and that revenues to the Federal Government are jumping significantly because of the good tax policies we have in place, the fair tax policies we have in place.

So we know you cannot solve this problem by continuing to raise taxes on the American people. The total tax burden to the American people today, including State, local, and Federal, is almost at a historic high. How much higher can you put that tax burden on the American people? No, you cannot do it on that side of the ledger. In fact, what we have proven is you generate more revenues by giving people an incentive to be productive and to go out and create jobs by having a fair and reasonable tax rate rather than jumping tax rates to the point where people have a disincentive to be productive and thus start to reduce revenues to the Federal Government.

That was proven by John Kennedy, confirmed by Ronald Reagan, and now confirmed again by George W. Bush. It should be accepted policy around here, but it is rejected by the other side of the aisle, which still subscribes to this 1930s philosophy of governance, which is that you can always raise taxes to meet any problem. No. The problem is that we need to be willing to step up and address spending.

This package, if it were to pass in its entirety—I hope the other side will not obstruct it coming to the floor. We hope to mark it up in Budget next week and report it out, and hope the other side will let us take it up. Let's have a free-flowing debate out here on the floor about how you address this issue.

The outyear threat to our children—which is a function of the fact there is a baby boom generation floating around here that is huge—is not going to go away and is going to demand significant services which will cost a dramatic amount of money.

Our proposal is comprehensive and extensive. It is a rebuilding, retooling approach toward how we manage this Congress and especially our budgets. It is a constructive approach, one that is committed toward delivering an affordable and effective government and a government that does not overburden our children and our grandchildren with taxes. So it will lead to a balanced budget, and it will lead to a government that is affordable.

I thank all my colleagues who have joined me in this effort, and I do hope we can move it forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. First, I wish to say to any Americans listening and all our colleagues, when Chairman GREGG speaks about long-term financial challenges facing this Nation, we ought to listen. ''E.F. Hutton'' speaks. So our ''E.F. Hutton'' is speaking, and I could not be more proud of the package he has proposed because all of those proposals, in my view, are not only workable but they will work.

What we tend to do around here a lot is we propose packages and ideas, and the ones that pass will not actually work.

I say to Chairman GREGG, you had a chart that showed a declining deficit. Would you put that up? I just want to raise one point about it because it, perhaps, raises a misconception. It shows a reduction of the deficit and, in effect, a zero deficit. But you do not mean by that that to achieve that huge reduction in our current deficit, we have to cut spending; is that correct?

Mr. GREGG. No.

Mr. SESSIONS. Is it necessary we actually cut the current rate of spending to achieve that?

Mr. GREGG. Absolutely not. In fact, under most scenarios, the current rate of spending on almost all of these major programs—such as Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid—would rise significantly; they just would not rise as fast. Medicare, for example, would probably, over this 5-year period, rise by about 40 percent, instead of 43 percent—something like that. Those are numbers off the top of my head, but those are the types of numbers we are talking about. You are talking about increased spending but at a slower rate and affordable.

Mr. SESSIONS. And even with this long-term 20-, 30-, 60-year projection of larger deficits, if we just contain the growth in the entitlement programs by a realistic amount, we could have a great impact on reducing those projected deficits; isn't that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is absolutely right. We do not have to cut anywhere. All we have to do is slow the rate of growth so it is an affordable rate of growth because the compounding effect of slowing these rates of growth is huge.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is such an important answer.

Let me ask the Senator this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. With regard to the growth of revenue to our Government—and you had a chart which showed that—as I recall, last year we showed over 14 percent growth, and with this year almost half gone, we are looking at in excess of 11 percent growth. That is after taxes have been cut. Is that correct?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is correct. The rate

of growth of revenues to the Federal Government last year was about 14 percent. This year, through the first 6 months, it was about 11 percent and continues to grow dramatically. That is a function of the fact that we now have a tax policy which encourages people to go out and take risks and create jobs, which creates revenue.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator because he has given us optimism and hope that we can reduce this deficit, and he has shown us we can do this without slashing our social programs or any other spending but just contain the growth.

BY Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CRAIG, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3522. A bill to amend the Bonneville Power Administration portions of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 through 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today by Senator GORDON SMITH, Senator LARRY CRAIG and Senator PATTY MURRAY in introducing the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2006—or FRIMA. Our legislation extends a homegrown, commonsense program that has a proven track record in helping restore Northwestern salmon runs. Dollar-for-dollar, the fish screening and fish passage facilities funded by our legislation are among the most cost-effective uses of public and private restoration dollars. These projects protect fish while producing significant benefits. That is why it is important that this program be reauthorized and funding be appropriated now.

Since 2001, when the original Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000, FRIMA, was enacted, more than $9 million in Federal funds has leveraged nearly $20 million in private, local funding. This money has been used to protect, enhance, and restore more than 550 river miles of important fish habitat and species throughout Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana. For decades, State, tribal and Federal fishery agencies in the Pacific Northwest have identified the screening of irrigation and other water diversions, and improved fish passage, as critically important for the survival of salmon and other fish populations.

This program is very popular and has the support of a wide range of constituents, including community leaders, environmental organizations, and agricultural producers. Senator SMITH and I are proud of the successful collaborative projects that irrigators and members of the Oregon Water Resources Congress have completed while putting this program to work in our home State. Our program also has the support of Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski, irrigators throughout the Northwestern States, Oregon Trout, American Rivers and the National Audubon Society.

FRIMA authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to plan, design, and construct fish screens, fish passage devices, and related features. It also authorizes inventories to provide the information needed for planning and making decisions about the survival and propagation of all Northwestern fish species. The program is currently carried out by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on behalf of the Interior Secretary.

FRIMA provides benefits by: keeping fish out of places where they should not be—such as in an irrigation system; easing upstream and downstream fish passage; improving the protection, survival, and restoration of native fish species; helping avoid new endangered species listings by protecting and enhancing the fish populations not yet listed; making progress toward the delisting of listed species; utilizing a positive, win/win, public-private partnership; and, assisting in achieving both sustainable agriculture and fisheries. Since FRIMA's enactment in 2001, 103 projects have been installed. This is a true partnership and fine example of how our fisheries and farmers can work together to protect fish species throughout the Northwest.

While he was Governor of Idaho, Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne said, ''. . . the FRIMA program serves as an excellent example of government and private land owners working together to promote conservation. The screening of irrigation diversions plays a key role in Idaho's efforts to restore salmon populations while protecting rural economies.'' [from ''Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Programs, FY 2002–2004'', U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C., July, 2005, p. 13]

The bill that we are introducing today specifically extends the authorization for this program through 2012; gives priority to projects costing less than $2.5 million—a reduction in a targeted project's cost from $5,000,000 to $2,500,000; clarifies that projects funded under the act are viewed as recipients of a ''pass through program'' and not a ''grant'' program; that any Bonneville Power Administration, BPA, funds provided either directly or through a grant to another entity shall be considered non-Federal matching funds—because BPA's funding comes from ratepayers; requires an inventory report describing funded projects and their benefits; and changes the administrative expenses formula used by the Fish & Wildlife Service and the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana and Idaho, so that administrative costs are scaled in proportion to the amount of funds appropriated for the program each year.

Ultimately, it will take the combined efforts of all interests in our region to recover our salmon. State, Tribal and local governments, local watershed councils, private landowners and the Federal Government need to continue working together. Initiatives such as the bill I am introducing today help to sustain the partnerships upon which successful salmon recovery will be based.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to see this legislation pass.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support from Oregon Governor Kulongoski be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3522

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. PRIORITY PROJECTS; PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM.

The Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 777 note; Public Law 106–502) is amended—

(1) in section 3—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''as a pass-through program'' before ''within the Department''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(3), by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$2,500,000''; and

(2) in section 4, by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) NONREIMBURSABLE FEDERAL AND TRIBAL EXPENDITURES.—Development and implementation of projects under the Program on land or facilities owned by the United States or an Indian tribe shall be nonreimbursable expenditures.''.

SEC. 3. COST SHARING.

Section 7(c) of Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 777 note; Public Law 106–502) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The value'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The value''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.—Any amounts provided by the Bonneville Power Administration directly or through a grant to another entity for a project carried under the Program shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the costs of the project.''.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Section 9 of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 777 note; Public Law 106–502) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''any'' before ''amounts are made''; and

(2) by inserting after ''Secretary shall'' the following: '', after partnering with local governmental entities and the States in the Pacific Ocean drainage area,''.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 10 of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 777 note; Public Law 106–502) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2001 through 2005'' and inserting ''2006 through 2012''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE.—In this paragraph, the term 'administrative expense' means any expenditure relating to—

''(i) staffing and overhead, such as the rental of office space and the acquisition of office equipment; and

''(ii) the review, processing, and provision of applications for funding under the Program.

''(B) LIMITATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a percentage of amounts up to 6 percent made available for each fiscal year, as determined under clause (ii), may be used for Federal (including tribal) and State administrative expenses of carrying out this Act.

''(ii) FORMULA.—For purposes of determining the percentage of administrative expenses to be made available under clause (i) for a fiscal year—

''(I) 1 percent shall be provided if less than $1,000,000 is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

''(II) 2 percent shall be provided if $1,000,000 or more, but less than $6,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

''(III) 3 percent shall be provided if $6,000,000 or more, but less than $11,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

''(IV) 4 percent shall be provided if $11,000,000 or more, but less than $15,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year;

''(V) 5 percent shall be provided if $15,000,000 or more, but less than $21,000,000, is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year; and

''(VI) 6 percent shall be provided if $21,000,000 or more is made available to carry out the Program for the fiscal year.

''(iii) FEDERAL AND STATE SHARES.—To the maximum extent practicable, of the amounts made available for administrative expenses under clause (i)—

''(I) 50 percent shall be provided to the Federal agencies (including Indian tribes) carrying out the Program; and

''(II) 50 percent shall be provided to the State agencies provided assistance under the Program.

''(iv) STATE EXPENSES.—Amounts made available to States for administrative expenses under clause (i)—

''(I) shall be divided evenly among all States provided assistance under the Program; and

''(II) on request of a project sponsor, may be used to provide technical support to the project sponsor.

''(C) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts expended by the Secretary for the provision of technical assistance relating to the Program shall not be subject to the 6 percent limitation on administrative expenses under subparagraph (B)(i).

''(ii) INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of clause (i), expenditures for the provision of technical assistance include any staffing expenditures (including staff travel expenses) associated with—

''(I) arranging meetings to promote the Program to potential applicants;

''(II) assisting applicants with the preparation of applications for funding under the Program; and

''(III) visiting construction sites to provide technical assistance, if requested by the applicant.''.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 12, 2006.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.
Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Ranking Member, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS DOMENICI AND BINGAMAN: I write in support of the re-authorization of the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act (FRIMA). In addition, I support the funding level originally authorized by Congress of $25 million per year.

The Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act is one of the most successful cost share programs in the Pacific Northwest, funding the installation of fish screens and ladders at irrigation diversions in Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington. Conservationists support it because it saves wild, migrating Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed fish such as Steelhead, Coho and Chinook salmon, as well as those produced in state and federal hatcheries. Irrigated agriculture supports the program both for its conservation effects and because it helps protect operators from possible federal enforcement actions resulting from take of ESA fish.

It is widely accepted that correcting fish barrier, diversion and screen problems is a very cost-effective investment. Each federal FRIMA dollar has been matched by $1.37 in state or local dollars. Participants have contributed a total of 58 percent toward the cost share—exceeding the legal requirement of 35 percent—and also pay 100 percent of project operation and maintenance costs. The FRIMA projects are completed quickly because existing state fish screening and passage programs are used to implement projects.

The program, which I have summarized for you in the enclosed fact sheet, has resulted in fish-friendly irrigation projects as well as increased spawning and rearing habitat. Since FRIMA's introduction in 2000, 103 projects have been installed, providing fish access to 553 miles of habitat upstream and screening a total volume of water at 1,572,757 gallons per minute. Healthy fish populations produce commercial and recreational fishing opportunities, which are essential to our coastal economies and rural communities that have often lost other industries in recent years.

Due to its popularity and success, there is a backlog of hundreds of potential FRIMA projects. To date, appropriations have averaged only $3 million per year, or $750,000 per state, per year. This amount has jump-started the process, but is inadequate given the magnitude of the available projects and the fish benefits they are designed to provide.

I urge you to increase funding to $25 million per year—the level originally authorized by Congress—so we can continue increasing fish populations, assisting irrigators in installing fish protection devices and bolstering local economies.

Sincerely,

THEODORE R. KULONGOSKI,
Governor.

FRIMA

Re-authorization Fact Sheet

Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act 2000 (P.L. 106–502).

FRIMA is a highly popular and cost-effective voluntary fish screening and passage partnership program that benefits Idaho, western Montana, Oregon and Washington.

Why do fish need protection at water diversions?

Water diversions redirect water from streams and rivers so it can be used for crop irrigation, power, drinking water, and other beneficial purposes. Water diversions also block the normal migration of fish and pull fish into pumps, irrigation canals, and fields greatly reducing their survival.

Benefits of fish protection 98% of young salmon survive an encounter with a properly designed fish screen that meets accepted state and federal criteria. Fish protection devices benefit by: Keeping fish out of places where they should not be (like an irrigation system); providing safe upstream and downstream fish passage; improving the protection, survival, and restoration of native fish species; achieving both sustainable agriculture and sustainable fisheries.

How the program works

FRIMA is a 65%/35% cost share program requiring that grant recipients contribute at least 35% in non-federal matching funds. Projects must: Be associated with an irrigation, or other water diversion; benefits fish species native to the project area; have a local, state, tribal or federal government sponsor or co-applicant.

Successful cost share 2000–2005: 83 fish screens installed, screening 1,572,757 gallons of water per minute; 20 fishways installed, opening 553 miles of habitat to fish; $1 in FRIMA funds leverage $1.37 in state/local funds; participants have contributed 58% in cost share, which is much more than the required 35%.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. KYL):

S. 3523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running on the period of limitations while such claims are pending; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that enhances the innocent spouse equitable relief provision of the Internal Revenue Code. Through only minor legislative modifications, this bill clarifies the statute's original intent, affording innocent spouses the necessary recourse to ensure their cases and circumstances are given a fair hearing.

According to section 6015(f) of the Internal Revenue Code, the IRS may relieve an innocent spouse of liability for unpaid taxes generated through the filing of a joint tax return if ''taking into account all the facts and circumstances'' it would be inequitable to hold the spouse responsible.

Little recourse exists, however, to prevent the IRS from seizing assets or garnishing wages if a petition for innocent spouse equitable relief is not approved.

Recent decisions of the Eighth and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals have denied the Tax Court jurisdiction over petitions for equitable relief under the Innocent Spouse Statute. Consequently, there is no mechanism for review or appeal of these IRS decisions.

The story of one of my constituents provides a stunning example of the problem.

The IRS seized all of her husband's income to pay a tax liability incurred 20 years earlier, before they were married. Because the IRS seized the entirety of the income, the taxes on the income remained unpaid.

When her husband died, the IRS pursued the innocent spouse for the taxes

on her husband's income. She was forced to sell her family home and all property owned jointly with her husband. My constituent is employed, but due to financial hardship she must live with friends. Even so, the IRS may have her wages garnished along with funds set aside for her in trust by a probate court.

Because the Tax Court does not have jurisdiction to review claims for innocent spouse equitable relief, my constituent can do little to prevent the IRS from seizing what remains.

The aim of this legislation is to provide an avenue through which innocent spouse equitable relief decisions may be appealed, if originally denied by the IRS.

This bill: expressly provides that the Tax Court has jurisdiction to review the denial of equitable innocent spouse relief under Internal Revenue Code section 6015(f); and suspends IRS collection activity while a request for relief under Internal Revenue Code section 6015(f) is pending.

I believe that my proposal would provide a straightforward and uncontroversial solution to the unfair treatment of innocent spouses under current law. Moreover, without this bill, an increasing number of innocent spouse equitable relief appeals will remain in limbo—pending, with no method for consideration.

When this body enhanced innocent spouse protections—through passage of the 1998 Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act—the goal was to modernize, simplify, and streamline the cumbersome process of seeking relief from liabilities of tax, interest, and related penalties.

Unfortunately, the conference report on the 1998 act included vague language, which ultimately has left innocent spouses with no avenue for appeal.

It is worth noting that the IRS grants fewer than three in 10 requests for innocent spouse relief. This bill in no way guarantees relief, but rather fixes the broken appeals process for these IRS decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support this small change that will have a profound effect on the lives of many innocent spouses—mostly women—who deserve their day in court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TAX COURT REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR EQUITABLE INNOCENT SPOUSE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 6015(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to petition for tax court review) is amended by inserting ''or in the case of an individual who requests equitable relief under subsection (f)'' after ''who elects to have subsection (b) or (c) apply''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6015(e)(1)(A)(i)(II) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''or request is made'' after ''election is filed''.

(2) Section 6015(e)(1)(B)(i) of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting ''or requesting equitable relief under subsection (f)'' after ''making an election under subsection (b) or (c)'', and

(B) by inserting ''or request'' after ''to which such election''.

(3) Section 6015(e)(1)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or to which the request under subsection (f) relates'' after ''to which the election under subsection (b) or (c) relates''.

(4) Section 6015(e)(4) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or the request for equitable relief under subsection (f)'' after ''the election under subsection (b) or (c)''.

(5) Section 6015(e)(5) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or who requests equitable relief under subsection (f)'' after ''who elects the application of subsection (b) or (c)''.

(6) Section 6015(g)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or of any request for equitable relief under subsection (f)'' after ''any election under subsection (b) or (c)''.

(7) Section 6015(h)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or a request for equitable relief made under subsection (f)'' after ''with respect to an election made under subsection (b) or (c)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to requests for equitable relief under section 6015(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to liability for taxes which are unpaid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, in introducing legislation to clarify the jurisdiction of the U.S. Tax Court in cases involving ''equitable relief'' for innocent spouse claims.

In general, spouses who sign joint tax returns are held jointly and severally liable for taxes owed on such returns. An individual may be relieved from such liability if she meets the ''innocent spouse'' test set forth in section 6015 of the Internal Revenue Code. The current standards were put in place by the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

An article published in the New York Times in late 1999 notes that the number of innocent spouse applications increased sharply after the 1998 law and that as many as 90 percent of the people filing innocent spouse applications are women. Clearly, the 1998 law opened an important avenue for exspouses to challenge unexpected tax bills they received after their former spouses cheated on their taxes without the knowledge of the ''innocent'' spouse.

Unfortunately, the 1998 law also left uncertain the Tax Court's jurisdiction to hear appeals from denials of ''equitable relief.'' The Treasury Secretary is authorized to grant equitable relief if a taxpayer does not meet any of the statutorily specified qualifications for being an innocent spouse. But while the Tax Court was given jurisdiction to hear appeals under those specific avenues spelled out in the Code, the Code is silent on whether the Tax Court can hear appeals based on the Treasury Secretary's equitable relief authority. Recent decisions by the Eight and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals have held that the Tax Court lacks jurisdiction to hear petitions for innocent spouse equitable relief.

The legislation Senator FEINSTEIN and I have introduced makes clear that the Tax Court has jurisdiction to hear appeals of decisions denying equitable relief. The National Taxpayer Advocate has recommended that Congress pass this legislation, and I am hopeful that we can move this important bill through the Finance Committee in very short order.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 3526. A bill to amend the Indian Land Consolidation Act to modify certain requirements under that Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to amend various provisions of the Indian Land Consolidation Act, ILCA. Some of these amendments are of a technical or clarifying nature; others have the effect of delaying the effective date of certain provisions of the Indian Probate Code set forth in ILCA section 207.

Section 1 of the bill clarifies the meaning of certain defined terms used in ILCA—''trust or restricted interest land'' and ''land''—and also delays the application of the act's probate code to permanent improvements located on Indian trust lands until after July 20, 2007. This delay will provide additional time to analyze how the probate code should apply to permanent improvements and determine whether further amendments are needed. The definition of land is amended to clarify that a decedent's interest in such improvements is included in the term ''land'' only for purposes of intestate succession under ILCA section 207(a) and even then only when the improvements are located on a parcel of trust or restricted land that is itself included in the decedent's estate. Thus, ''land'' would not include a decedent's interest in permanent improvements located on tribal trust land or for that matter on individually owned trust land if the underlying parcel of land is not itself part of the decedent's estate.

Section 2 of the bill also amends the ''single heir rule'' of ILCA section 207(a)(2)(D)—which governs the inheritance of interests that are less than 5 percent of the total undivided interest in a parcel of land—by making it inapplicable to any interest in the estate of a decedent who dies during the period beginning on the enactment date of the clause and ending on July 20, 2007, and authorizing the Secretary of Interior to extend this period for up to 1 year.

The bill would also delay until July 21, 2007, the application of the presumption in ILCA section 207(c) that a devise of a trust interest to more than 1 person creates a joint tenancy absent clear language in the will to the contrary. It would amend ILCA section

207(o), which authorizes purchase of interests during probate, in various ways, but most significantly limiting nonconsensual purchases to the Secretary and the Indian tribe; clarifying that the 5 percent threshold applies to the decedent's interest rather than to the interest passing to an heir; and holding the rule allowing nonconsensual purchase at probate of small interests inapplicable to interests in the estate of any decedent who dies on or before July 20, 2007. This section would also authorize the Secretary to extend this period for up to 1 additional year.

The amendments delaying the application of these provisions will give Indian landowners more time to understand how these provisions work and plan their estates accordingly. The delays of the single heir rule and nonconsensual purchase option at probate will also allow the Department more time to have procedures and systems in place to determine whether a given interest is above or below the 5 percent threshold that triggers the application of the rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Indian Land Consolidation Act Amendments of 2006''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 202 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2201) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''(i)'' after ''(4)'';

(B) by striking '' 'trust or restricted interest in land' or'' and inserting the following:

''(ii) 'trust or restricted interest in land' or''; and

(C) in clause (ii) (as designated by subparagraph (B)), by striking ''an interest in land, title to which'' and inserting ''an interest in land, the title to which interest''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) the term 'land'—

''(A) means any real property; and

''(B) for purposes of intestate succession only under section 207(a), includes, with respect to any decedent who dies after July 20, 2007, the interest of the decedent in any improvements permanently affixed to a parcel of trust or restricted lands (subject to any valid mortgage or other interest in such an improvement) that was owned in whole or in part by the decedent immediately prior to the death of the decedent;''.

SEC. 3. DESCENT AND DISTRIBUTION.

Section 207 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2206) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''clauses (ii) through (iv)'' and inserting ''clauses (ii) through (v)''; and

(B) by striking clause (v) and inserting the following:

''(v) EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH; NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN INTERESTS.—Nothing in this paragraph—

''(I) limits the right of any person to devise any trust or restricted interest pursuant to a valid will in accordance with subsection (b); or

''(II) applies to any interest in the estate of a decedent who died during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subclause and ending on July 20, 2007 (or the last day of any applicable period of extension authorized by the Secretary under clause (vi)).

''(vi) AUTHORITY TO EXTEND PERIOD OF NONAPPLICABILITY.—The Secretary may extend the period of nonapplicability under clause (v)(II) for not longer than 1 year if, by not later than July 2, 2007, the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice of the extension.'';

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''the date that is'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''July 21, 2007.''; and

(3) in subsection (o)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii) and indenting the clauses appropriately;

(ii) by striking ''(3)'' and all that follows through ''No sale'' and inserting the following:

''(3) REQUEST TO PURCHASE; CONSENT REQUIREMENTS; MULTIPLE REQUESTS TO PURCHASE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No sale''; and

(iii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

''(B) MULTIPLE REQUESTS TO PURCHASE.—Except for interests purchased pursuant to paragraph (5), if the Secretary receives a request with respect to an interest from more than 1 eligible purchaser under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall sell the interest to the eligible purchaser that is selected by the applicable heir, devisee, or surviving spouse.'';

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''auction and'';

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(III) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking ''auction'' and inserting ''sale'';

(bb) by striking ''the interest passing to such heir represents'' and inserting '', at the time of death of the applicable decedent, the interest of the decedent in the land represented''; and

(cc) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii)(I) the Secretary is purchasing the interest as part of the program authorized under section 213(a)(1); or

''(II) after receiving a notice under paragraph (4)(B), the Indian tribe with jurisdiction over the interest is proposing to purchase the interest from an heir that is not a member, and is not eligible to become a member, of that Indian tribe.'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''(B)'' and all that follows through ''such heir'' and inserting the following:

''(B) EXCEPTION; NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN INTERESTS.—

''(i) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the consent of the heir or surviving spouse'';

(II) in clause (i), by inserting ''or surviving spouse'' before ''was residing''; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN INTERESTS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any interest in the estate of a decedent who dies on or before July 20, 2007 (or the last day of any applicable period of extension authorized by the Secretary under subparagraph (C)).''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) AUTHORITY TO EXTEND PERIOD OF NONAPPLICABILITY.—The Secretary may extend the period of nonapplicability under subparagraph (B)(ii) for not longer than 1 year if, by not later than July 2, 2007, the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice of the extension.''.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 3527. A bill to require the Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce to establish an Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Institute; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3527

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Blue Collar Computing and Business Assistance Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Computational science, the use of advanced computing capabilities to understand and solve complex problems, including the development of new products and processes, is now critical to scientific leadership, economic competitiveness, and national security.

(2) Advances in computational science and high performance computing provide a competitive advantage because they allow businesses to run faster simulations of complex systems or to develop more precise computer models.

(3) The Federal Government is one of the investors in research aimed at the development of new computational science and high-performance computing capabilities.

(4) As determined by the Council on Competitiveness, the Nation's small businesses and manufacturers must ''Out Compute to Out Compete''. However, new computational science technologies are not being transferred effectively from the research organizations to small businesses and manufacturers.

(5) Small businesses and manufacturers are especially well-positioned to benefit from increased availability and utilization of high-performance computing technologies and software.

(6) Current cost and technology barriers associated with high-performance computing and software algorithms often inhibit small businesses and manufacturers from successfully making use of these technologies.

(7) The establishment of an advanced multidisciplinary computing software institute will help make existing high performance computing resources more accessible to small businesses and manufacturers. This will create new opportunities for economic growth, jobs, and product development.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide grants for the creation of an Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Institute that will—

(1) develop and compile high-performance computing software and algorithms suitable for applications in small business and manufacturing;

(2) effectively carry out the transfer of new computational science and high-performance computing technologies to small businesses and manufacturers; and

(3) actively assist small businesses and manufacturers in utilizing such technologies.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY COMPUTING SOFTWARE CENTER; CENTER.—The term ''Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Center'' or ''Center'' is a center created by an eligible entity with a grant awarded under section 4.

(2) ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY COMPUTING SOFTWARE INSTITUTE.—The term ''Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Institute'' means a network of up to 5 Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Centers located throughout the United States.

(3) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term ''nonprofit organization'' means any organization if such organization is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(4) SMALL BUSINESS OR MANUFACTURER.—The term ''small business or manufacturer'' means a small business concern as that term is defined by section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)), including a small manufacturing concern.

(5) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ''Under Secretary'' means the Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 4. GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce shall award grants to establish up to 5 Advanced Multidisciplinary Computing Software Centers at eligible entities throughout the United States. Each Center shall—

(1) conduct general outreach to small businesses and manufacturers in all industry sectors within a geographic region assigned by the Under Secretary; and

(2) conduct technology transfer, development, and utilization programs relating to a specific industry sector, for all firms in that sector nationwide, as assigned by the Under Secretary.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—For the purposes of this section, an eligible entity is any—

(1) nonprofit organization;

(2) consortia of nonprofit organizations; or

(3) partnership between a for-profit and a nonprofit organization.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that desires to receive a grant under this Act shall submit an application to the Under Secretary, at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such additional information as the Under Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Under Secretary shall publish the requirements described in paragraph (1) in the Federal Register no later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An application that conforms to the requirements set by the Under Secretary under paragraph (1).

(B) A proposal for the allocation of the legal rights associated with any invention that may result from the activities of the proposed Center.

(4) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall be evaluated by the Under Secretary on the basis of merit review. In carrying out this merit review process, the Under Secretary shall consider—

(A) the extent to which the eligible entity—

(i) has a partnership with nonprofit organizations, businesses, software vendors, and academia recognized for relevant expertise in their selected industry sector;

(ii) makes use of State-funded academic supercomputing centers and universities or colleges with expertise in the computational needs of the industry assigned to the eligible entity under subsection (a)(1);

(iii) has a history of working with businesses;

(iv) has experience providing educational programs aimed at helping organizations adopt the use of high-performance computing and computational science;

(v) has partnerships with education or training organizations that can help educate future workers on the application of computational science to industry needs;

(vi) is accessible to businesses, academia, incubators, or other economic development organizations via high-speed networks; and

(vii) is capable of partnering with small businesses and manufacturers for the purpose of enhancing the ability of such entities to compete in the global marketplace;

(B) the ability of the eligible entity to enter successfully into collaborative agreements with small businesses and manufacturers in order to experiment with new high performance computing and computational science technologies; and

(C) such other factors as identified by the Under Secretary.

(d) AMOUNT.—A grant awarded under this section shall not exceed $5,000,000 for any year of the grant period.

(e) DURATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for a renewal under paragraph (2), the duration of any grant awarded under subsection (a) may not exceed 5 years.

(2) RENEWAL.—Any grant awarded under subsection (a) may be renewed at the discretion of the Under Secretary.

(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall provide at least 50 percent of the capital and annual operating and maintenance funds required to create and maintain a Center.

(2) FUNDING FROM OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—The funds provided by the eligible entity under paragraph (1) may consist of amounts received by the eligible entity from a Federal department or agency, other than the Department of Commerce, or a State or local government agency.

(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Under Secretary may establish a reasonable limitation on the portion of each grant awarded under subsection (a) that may be used for administrative expenses or other overhead costs.

(h) FEES AND ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A Center established pursuant to this Act may, according to regulations established by the Under Secretary—

(A) collect a nominal fee from a small business or manufacturer for a service provided pursuant to this Act, if such fee is utilized for the budget and operation of the Center; and

(B) accept funds from any other Federal department or agency for the purpose of covering capital costs or operating budget expenses.

(2) CONDITION.—Any Center that is supported with funds that originally came from a Federal department or agency, other than the Department of Commerce, may be selected, and if selected shall be operated, according to the provisions of this section.

SEC. 5. USE OF FUNDS.

An eligible entity that receives a grant under section 4(a) shall use the funds for the benefit of businesses in the industry sector designated by the Under Secretary under such subsection, and the eligible entity shall use such funds to—

(1) create a repository of nonclassified, nonproprietary new and existing federally-funded software and algorithms;

(2) test and validate software in the repository;

(3) determine when and how the industry sector it serves could benefit from resources in the repository;

(4) work with software vendors to commercialize repository software and algorithms from the repository;

(5) make software available to small businesses and manufacturers where it has not been commercialized by a software vendor;

(6) help software vendors, small businesses, and manufacturers test or utilize the software on high-performance computing systems; and

(7) maintain a research and outreach team that will work with small businesses and manufacturers to aid in the identification of software or computational science techniques which can be used to solve challenging problems, or meet contemporary business needs of such organizations.

SEC. 6. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Each eligible entity who receives a grant under section 4(a) shall submit to the Under Secretary on an annual basis, a report describing the goals of the Center established by the eligible entity and the progress the eligible entity has achieved towards meeting the purposes of this Act.

(b) EVALUATION.—The Under Secretary shall establish a peer review committee, consisting of representatives from industry and academia, to review the goals and progress made by each Center during the grant period.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Funds provided for the establishment and operation of Centers under this Act shall remain available until expended.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, the manufacturing sector is under siege from cheap imports, unfair trade agreements, and escalating heath care and energy costs. Instead of working to alleviate this burden, the Bush administration has turned its back on manufacturing; focusing instead on tax cuts for the rich and their heirs. Indeed, the administration has slashed funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, and the Advanced Technology Program, ATP, in this year's budget. MEP helps manufacturers streamline operations, integrate new technologies, shorten production times, and lower costs. ATP provides grants to support research and development of high risk, cutting edge technologies. Both MEP and ATP help manufacturers survive and compete with countries like China.

I today offer, with Senator DEWINE, some more help for beleaguered manufacturers. The Blue Collar Computing and Business Assistance Act of 2006 was

drafted from recommendations made by the Council on Competitiveness regarding high performance computing. The legislation would provide grants for the creation of five Advanced Computing Software Centers throughout the United States that would transfer high performance computing technologies to small businesses and manufacturers.

High Performance Computing will allow manufacturers to visualize and simulate parts and products before they can be created which will cut the time and cost required to experiment with new materials. General Motors, for example, uses high performance computing to simulate collisions, saving millions of dollars in development costs and substantially shortening design cycle times.

Presently, only large companies like GM have the resources to reap the benefits of high performance computing. This bill would provide grants to small and medium manufacturers to implement this technology and create new opportunities for economic growth, job creation and product development and allow manufacturers and businesses to harness the full potential of high performance computing.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3529. A bill to ensure that new mothers and their families are educated about postpartum depression, screened for symptoms, and provided with essential services, and to increase research at the National Institutes of Health on postpartum depression; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today with my good friend Senator DURBIN to introduce the Mom's Opportunity to Access Help, Education, Research, and Support for Postpartum Depression, MOTHERS, Act. Senator DURBIN has been and continues to be a leader on this issue and I am grateful for the opportunity to work with him on this important legislation. I would also like to recognize Representative RUSH, who has been a champion for women battling postpartum depression, PPD, in the House for many years. I am proud to say that his bill, The Melanie Stokes Postpartum Depression Research and Care Act, shares the same goals as the legislation I am introducing today.

In the United States, 10 to 20 percent of women suffer from a disabling and often undiagnosed condition known as postpartum depression. Unfortunately, many women are unaware of this condition and often do not receive the treatment they need. That is why I am introducing the MOTHERS Act, so that women no longer have to suffer in silence and feel alone when faced with this difficult condition.

Recently, the great State of New Jersey passed a first-of-its-kind law requiring doctors and nurses to educate expectant mothers and their families about postpartum depression. This bill was introduced in the State legislature by State Senate President Richard Codey. The attention Senator Codey and his wife, Mary Jo Codey—who personally battled postpartum depression—have brought to the issue is remarkable. Brooke Shields, a graduate of Princeton University, has also shared her struggle with postpartum depression publicly and should be commended for her efforts to bring awareness to this condition. Postpartum depression affects women all across the country, not just in New Jersey, and that is why I believe the MOTHERS Act is so important.

In America, 80 percent of women experience some level of depression after childbirth. This is what people often refer to as the ''baby blues.'' However, each year, there are between 400,000 and 800,000 women across America who suffer from postpartum depression, a much more serious condition. These mothers often experience signs of depression and may lose interest in friends and family, feel overwhelming sadness or even have thoughts of harming their baby or harming themselves. People often assume that these feelings are simply the ''baby blues,'' but the reality is much worse. Postpartum depression is a serious and disabling condition and new mothers deserve to be given information and resources on this condition so, if needed, they can get the appropriate help.

The good news is that treatment is available. Many women have successfully recovered from postpartum depression with the help of therapy, medication, and support groups. However, mothers and their families must be educated so that they understand what might occur after the birth of their child and when to get help. The legislation I am introducing today will require doctors and nurses to educate every new mother and their families about postpartum depression before they leave the hospital and offer the opportunity for new mothers to be screened for postpartum depression symptoms during the first year of postnatal check-up visits. It also provides social services to new mothers and their families who are suffering and struggling with postpartum depression. By increasing education and early treatment of postpartum depression, mothers, husbands, and families will be able to recognize the symptoms of this condition and help new mothers get the treatment they need and deserve.

The MOTHERS Act has another important component. While we continue to educate and help the mothers of today, we must also be prepared to help future moms. By increasing funding for research on postpartum conditions at the National Institutes of Health, we can begin to unravel the mystery behind this difficult to understand illness. The more we know about the causes and etiology of postpartum depression, the more tools we have to treat and prevent this heartbreaking condition.

We must attack postpartum depression on all fronts with education, screening, support, and research so that new moms can feel supported and safe rather than scared and alone. Many new mothers sacrifice anything and everything to provide feelings of security and safety to their innocent, newborn child. It is our duty to provide the same level of security, safety and support to new mothers in need.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 513—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD DESIGNATE THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 10, 2006, AS ''NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK''

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DODD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. RES. 513

Whereas there are 103 historically Black colleges and universities in the United States;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities provide the quality education essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities have a rich heritage and have played a prominent role in the history of the United States;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities have allowed many underprivileged students to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of historically Black colleges and universities are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning September 10, 2006, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week''.

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The Senate requests the President to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the week beginning September 10, 2006, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week''; and

(2) calling on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for historically Black colleges and universities in the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 102—CONDEMNING THE DECISION BY THE CITY OF ST. DENIS, FRANCE, TO NAME A STREET IN HONOR OF MUMIA ABU-JAMAL, THE CONVICTED MURDERER OF PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER DANNY FAULKNER

Mr. SANTORUM submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 102

Whereas on the night of December 9, 1981, Police Officer Danny Faulkner was shot and killed in cold blood during a traffic stop in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

Whereas in the process of arresting the driver of a car traveling the wrong way down a one-way street, the driver's brother appeared from across the street and proceeded to open fire on Officer Faulkner while his back was turned away;

Whereas the driver's brother was identified as Mumia Abu-Jamal;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal shot Officer Faulkner 4 times in the back;

Whereas, although seriously injured, Officer Faulkner returned fire, striking his attacker;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal was undeterred and stood over Officer Faulkner and shot him in the face, mortally wounding him;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal attempted to flee, but collapsed several feet from the slain Officer Faulkner, murder weapon in hand;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal was charged and convicted of first degree murder by a jury of his peers;

Whereas Mumia Abu-Jamal has had numerous legal appeals, including appeals to the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court, and his conviction has been upheld each time;

Whereas, on April 29, 2006, the municipal government of St. Denis, a suburb of Paris, dedicated a street in the honor of Mumia Abu-Jamal; and

Whereas the official recognition and celebration of a convicted murderer of a police officer of the United States is an affront to law enforcement officers across the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the murder of Philadelphia Police Officer Danny Faulkner;

(2) urges the municipal government of St. Denis to take immediate action to change the name of Rue Mumia Abu-Jamal and, if such action is not taken by the municipal government of St. Denis, urges the Government of France to take appropriate action against the city of St. Denis to change the name of Rue Mumia Abu-Jamal; and

(3) commends all police officers in the United States and throughout the world for their commitment to public service and public safety.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution to condemn an action that I find terribly appalling. On April 29, 2006, the municipal government of St. Denis, France, named a street in honor of Mumia Abu-Jamal, the convicted killer of Philadelphia Police Officer Danny Faulkner. Representative FITZPATRICK has introduced a similar resolution in the House of Representatives.

On the morning of December 9, 1981, Officer Danny Faulkner, a 5 year veteran of the Philadelphia Police Department, made a traffic stop at Locust Street near Twelfth Street. The car stopped by Officer Faulkner was driven by William Cook who was driving the wrong way down a one way street. William Cook's brother, Mumia Abu-Jamal, was across the street. As Faulkner attempted to handcuff William Cook, Abu-Jamal ran from across the street and shot the officer in the back. Faulkner was able to fire one shot that struck Abu-Jamal in the chest; the wounded officer then fell to the pavement. Mumia Abu-Jamal stood over the officer and shot him four more times at close range, including one directly in the face. Abu-Jamal was found at the scene of the shooting by officers who arrived there within seconds.

Official ballistics tests on the fatal bullet confirmed that Officer Faulkner was killed by a bullet identical in type, brand, and caliber to the bullet found in Abu-Jamal's gun. Witnesses to the brutal slaying identified Abu-Jamal as the killer both at the scene and during his trial. In July 1982, Mumia Abu-Jamal was convicted of murdering Officer Danny Faulkner and was sentenced to death. Abu-Jamal has had numerous legal appeals, including to the PA State Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court, and his conviction has been upheld each time.

I am outraged that the municipal government of St. Denis, France would make such a thoughtless and insensitive decision as to name a street after the murderer of a Philadelphia police officer. This is a monumental insult to the memory of Danny Faulkner, to his family, and to the courageous men and women who put on a police uniform every day to protect our communities. Officer Danny Faulkner gave his life to keep our nation's streets safe. St. Denis lawmakers have made the chilling decision of choosing to support a cold-blooded killer over a police officer who made the ultimate sacrifice.

I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in condemning the murder of Officer Faulkner, and urging the municipal government of St. Denis to take immediate action to change the name of ''Rue Mumia Abu-Jamal.'' If such action is not taken, this resolution urges the French Government to take appropriate action against the city of St. Denis to change the name of the street. Finally, this resolution appropriately commends all police officers for their commitment to public service and public safety. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4253. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, 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 4254. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4255. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4256. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr . LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4257. Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra .

SA 4258. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4259. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4260. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4261. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4262. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4263. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4264. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4265. Mr. NELSON, of Florida (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4266. Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4267. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4268. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4269. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4265 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ , and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4270. Mr. BURNS (for himself 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 4271. Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4272. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4273. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S.

2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4274. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. THOMAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4275. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4276. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4277. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4278. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4279. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. SALAZAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4280. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4281. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4282. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4283. Mr. LEVIN (for Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. BINGAMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4284. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4285. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. LUGAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4286. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4287. Mr. LEVIN (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4288. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4289. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4290. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4291. Mr. FRIST (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 409, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4253. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, 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 E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. PILOT PROGRAM ON TROOPS TO NURSE TEACHERS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and potential benefits of a program to—

(A) assist nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in achieving necessary qualifications to become nurse educators and in securing employment as nurse educators at accredited schools of nursing;

(B) provide scholarships to nurse corps officers described in subsection (c) in return for continuing service in the Selected Reserve or other forms of public service; and

(C) help alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(2) DURATION.—Except as provided in subsection (h), the pilot program shall be conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2012. A nurse corps officer may not enter into an agreement to participate in the pilot program after December 31, 2012.

(3) REGULATIONS.—The pilot program shall be conducted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The pilot program required by subsection (a) shall be known as the ''Troops to Nurse Teachers Pilot Program'' (in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(c) NURSE CORPS OFFICERS.—A nurse corps officer described in this subsection is any commissioned officer of the Armed Forces qualified and designated as an officer in a Nurse Corps of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) serving in a reserve component of the Armed Forces;

(2) honorably discharged from the Armed Forces; or

(3) a retired member of the Armed Forces.

(d) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAM.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An eligible nurse corps officer seeking to participate in the Program shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor. The application shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Secretary may require.

(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select participants in the Program from among qualified nurse corps officers submitting applications therefor under paragraph (1).

(e) PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A nurse corps officer selected under subsection (d) to participate in the Program shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense relating to participation in the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The agreement of a nurse corps officer under the program shall, at the election of the Secretary for purposes of the Program and as appropriate with respect to that status of such nurse corps officer—

(A) require such nurse corps officer, within such time as the Secretary may require, to accept an offer of full-time employment as a nurse educator from an accredited school of nursing for a period of not less than one year; or

(B) require such nurse corps officer—

(i) within such time as the Secretary may require, to successfully complete a program leading to a master's degree or doctoral degree in a nursing field from an accredited school of nursing or to a doctoral degree in a related field from an accredited institution of higher education;

(ii) to serve in the Selected Reserve or some other form of public service under terms and conditions established by the Secretary; and

(iii) upon completion of such program and service, to accept an offer of full-time employment as a nurse educator from an accredited school of nursing for a period of not less than 3 years.

(f) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may provide a participant in the Program who enters into an agreement described in subsection (e)(2)(A) assistance as follows:

(A) Career placement assistance in securing full-time employment as a nurse educator at an accredited school of nursing.

(B) A stipend in an amount not to exceed $5,000 for transition to employment referred to in paragraph (1), and for educational training for such employment, for a period not to exceed two years after entry by such participant into an agreement under subsection (e).

(2) SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may provide a participant in the Program who enters into an agreement described in subsection (e)(2)(B) scholarship assistance to pursue a degree described in subsection (e)(2)(B)(i) in an amount not to exceed $30,000 annually for a period of not more than four years.

(g) TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE.—A stipend or scholarship provided under subsection (f) shall not be taken into account in determining the eligibility of a participant in the Program for Federal student financial assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

(h) ADMINISTRATION AFTER INITIAL PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The termination of the Program on December 31, 2012, under subsection (a)(2) shall not terminate the entitlement to assistance under the Program of any nurse corps officer entering into an agreement to participate in the Program under subsection (e) that continues in force after that date.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Education shall undertake any administration of the Program that is required after December 31, 2012, including responsibility for any funding necessary to provide assistance under the Program after that date.

(i) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after the commencement of the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall—

(A) describe the activities undertaken under the Program; and

(B) include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in—

(i) facilitating the development of nurse educators;

(ii) encouraging service in the Selected Reserve and other forms of public service; and

(iii) helping alleviate the national shortage of nurse educators and registered nurses.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NURSE EDUCATOR.—The term ''nurse educator'' means a registered nurse who—

(A) is a member of the nursing faculty at an accredited school of nursing;

(B) holds a graduate degree in nursing from an accredited school of nursing or a doctoral degree in a related field from an accredited institution of higher education;

(C) holds a valid, unrestricted license to practice nursing from a State; and

(D) has successfully completed additional course work in education and demonstrates competency in an advanced practice area of nursing.

(2) SCHOOL OF NURSING.—The term ''school of nursing'' means a school of nursing (as that term is defined in section 801 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296)) that is accredited (as that term is defined in section 801(6) of the Public Health Service Act).

(k) FUNDING.—From amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense, $5,000,000 may be available for the Program.

SA 4254. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING IN HURRICANE RECOVERY.

The exceptions to full and open competition otherwise available under paragraphs (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.

SA 4255. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCLUSION OF CONTRACTS UNDER TERMINATION AUTHORITY.—Subsection (b) of section 305 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 535) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) CONTRACTS FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICE.—A contract for a cellular phone used, or intended to be used, by a servicemember or a servicemember's dependent for a personal or business purpose if—

''(A) the contract is executed by or on behalf of a person who thereafter and during the term of the contract enters into military service under call or order specifying a period of not less than 90 days (or who enters military service under a call or order specifying a period of 90 days or less and who, without a break in service, receives orders extending the period of military service to a period not less than 90 days);

''(B) the servicemember, while in military service, executes the contract and thereafter receives military orders for a permanent change of station outside of the continental United States or to deploy with a military unit for a period of not less than 90 days; or

''(C) the servicemember, while in military service, executes the contract and thereafter receives military orders for a permanent change of station to a location within the continental United States where the contract cannot be transferred at the same rate, terms, and quality of service.''.

(2) MANNER OF TERMINATION.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) in the case of a contract for a cellular phone, by delivery by the contractee of written notice of such termination, and a copy of the servicemember's military orders, to the contractor or to the contractor's agent.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE OF TERMINATION.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) CONTRACT FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICE.—In the case of a contract for a cellular phone described in subsection (b)(3), termination of the contract under subsection (a) is effective on the day on which the requirements of subsection (c) are met for such termination.''.

(4) ARREARAGES.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking ''(e) ARREARAGES AND OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND LIABILITIES.—Rents or lease amounts'' and inserting the following:

''(e) ARREARAGES AND OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND LIABILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Rents or lease amounts'';

(B) by designating the second sentence as paragraph (2), indenting such paragraph 4 ems from the left margin, and inserting before ''In the case of the lease'' the following:

''(2) LEASE CHARGES FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.—''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) TERMINATION CHARGES FOR CELLULAR PHONE CONTRACTS.—In the case of a contract for a cellular phone, the contractor may not impose an early termination charge, but may request the return of equipment provided to the contractee as part of the contract which would normally remain the property of the contractee at the end of the contract term if the contractee is given the option of paying a pro-rated amount to retain such equipment based on the original retail price of such equipment, the amount previously paid for such equipment by the contractee, and the time remaining on the contract.

''(4) REACTIVATION FEES.—In the event a contractor and contractee jointly agree to treat the termination of a contract for a cellular phone under this section as a suspension of such contract, the contractor may not impose any fee for reactivation of service under such contract at the completion of suspension of such contract.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a)(1)(B) of such section is amended by striking ''or (2)(B)'' and inserting '', (2)(B), (3)(B), or (3)(C)''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 305. TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL OR MOTOR VEHICLE LEASES OR CONTRACTS FOR CELLULAR PHONE SERVICE.''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 305 and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 305. Termination of residential or motor vehicle leases or contracts for cellular phone service.''.

SA 4256. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. LEVIN and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1054. STRENGTHENING THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of discharging the duties of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction under subsection (f) of section 3001 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (5 U.S.C. 8G note), and for purposes of determining the date of termination of the Office of the Special Inspector General under subsection (o) of such section, any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2006 for the reconstruction of Iraq, regardless of how such funds may be designated, shall be treated as amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

SA 4257. Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1231. UNITED STATE'S POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR PROGRAMS OF IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The pursuit by the Iranian regime of a capability to produce nuclear weapons represents a threat to the United States, the Middle East region, and international peace and security.

(2) On May 31, 2006, Secretary of State Rice announced that the United States would join negotiations with Iran, along with the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, provided that Iran fully and verifiably suspends its enrichment and reprocessing activities.

(3) On June 1, 2006, President George W. Bush stated that ''Secretary Rice, at my instructions, said to the world that we want to solve the problem of the Iranian nuclear issue diplomatically. And we made it very clear publicly that we're willing to come to the table, so long as the Iranians verifiably suspend their program. In other words, we said to the Iranians [that] the United States of America wants to work with our partners to solve the problem''.

(4) On June 1, 2006, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the People's Republic of China, and the Russian Federation agreed upon a package of incentives and disincentives, which was subsequently presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union, Javier Solana.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) endorses the policy of the United States, announced May 31, 2006, to achieve a successful diplomatic outcome, in coordination with leading members of the international community, with respect to the threat posed by the efforts of the Iranian regime to acquire a capability to produce nuclear weapons;

(2) calls on Iran to suspend fully and verifiably its enrichment and reprocessing activities, cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enter into negotiations, including with the United States, pursuant to the package presented to Iran by the High Representative of the European Union; and

(3) urges the President and the Secretary of State to keep Congress fully and currently informed about the progress of this vital diplomatic initiative.

SA 4258. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for 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 4259. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, and Mr. JOHNSON) 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. FUNDING FOR VETERANS HEALTH CARE TO ADDRESS CHANGES IN POPULATION AND INFLATION.

(a) FUNDING TO ADDRESS CHANGES IN POPULATIONS AND INFLATION.—(1) Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 320. Funding for veterans health care to address changes in population and inflation

''(a) By the enactment of this section, Congress and the President intend to ensure access to health care for all veterans. Upon the enactment of this section, funding for the programs, functions, and activities of the Veterans Health Administration specified in subsection (d) to accomplish this objective shall be provided through a combination of discretionary and mandatory funds. The discretionary amount should be equal to the fiscal year 2006 discretionary funding for such programs, functions, and activities, and should remain unchanged each fiscal year thereafter. The annual level of mandatory amount shall be adjusted according to the formula specified in subsection (c). While this section does not purport to control the outcome of the annual appropriations process, it anticipates cooperation from Congress and the President in sustaining discretionary funding for such programs, functions, and activities in future fiscal years at the level of discretionary funding for such programs, functions, and activities for fiscal year 2006. The success of that arrangement, as well as of the funding formula, are to be reviewed after 2 years.

''(b) On the first day of each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the amount determined under subsection (c) with respect to that fiscal year. Each such amount is available, without fiscal year limitation, for the programs, functions, and activities of the Veterans Health Administration, as specified in subsection (d). There is hereby appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts necessary to implement this section.

''(c)(1) The amount applicable to fiscal year 2007 under this subsection is the amount equal to—

''(A) 130 percent of the amount obligated by the Department during fiscal year 2005 for the purposes specified in subsection (d), minus

''(B) the amount appropriated for those purposes for fiscal year 2006.

''(2) The amount applicable to any fiscal year after fiscal year 2007 under this subsection is the amount equal to the product of the following, minus the amount appropriated for the purposes specified for subsection (d) for fiscal year 2006:

''(A) The sum of—

''(i) the number of veterans enrolled in the Department health care system under section 1705 of this title as of July 1 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year; and

''(ii) the number of persons eligible for health care under chapter 17 of this title who are not covered by clause (i) and who were provided hospital care or medical services under such chapter at any time during the fiscal year preceding such fiscal year.

''(B) The per capita baseline amount, as increased from time to time pursuant to paragraph (3)(B).

''(3)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2)(B), the term 'per capita baseline amount' means the amount equal to—

''(i) the amount obligated by the Department during fiscal year 2006 for the purposes specified in subsection (d), divided by

''(ii) the number of veterans enrolled in the Department health care system under section 1705 of this title as of September 30, 2005.

''(B) With respect to any fiscal year, the Secretary shall provide a percentage increase (rounded to the nearest dollar) in the per capita baseline amount equal to the percentage by which—

''(i) the Consumer Price Index (all Urban Consumers, United States City Average, Hospital and related services, Seasonally Adjusted), published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor for the 12-month period ending on the June 30 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which the increase is made, exceeds

''(ii) such Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period preceding the 12-month period described in clause (i).

''(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the purposes for which amounts made available pursuant to subsection (b) shall be all programs, functions, and activities of the Veterans Health Administration.

''(2) Amounts made available pursuant to subsection (b) are not available for—

''(A) construction, acquisition, or alteration of medical facilities as provided in subchapter I of chapter 81 of this title (other than for such repairs as were provided for before the date of the enactment of this section through the Medical Care appropriation for the Department); or

''(B) grants under subchapter III of chapter 81 of this title.

''(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent or limit the authority of Congress to reauthorize provisions relating to veterans health care.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''320. Funding for veterans health care to address changes in population and inflation.''.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—(1) Not later than January 31, 2009, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which section 320 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), has achieved the purpose set forth in subsection (a) of such section 320 during fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

(2) The report under paragraph (1) shall set forth the following:

(A) The amount appropriated for fiscal year 2006 for the programs, functions, and activities of the Veterans Health Administration specified in subsection (d) of section 320 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) The amount appropriated by annual appropriations Acts for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 for such programs, functions, and activities.

(C) The amount provided by section 320 of title 38, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 for such programs, functions, and activities.

(D) An assessment whether the amount described in subparagraph (C) for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 was appropriate to address the changes in costs to the Veterans Health Administration for such programs, functions, and activities that were attributable to changes in population and in inflation over the course of such fiscal years.

(E) An assessment whether the amount provided by section 320 of title 38, United States Code, in each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008, when combined with amounts appropriated by annual appropriations Acts for each of such fiscal years for such programs, functions, and activities, provided adequate funding of such programs, functions, and activities in each such fiscal year.

(F) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate regarding modifications of the formula under subsection (c) of section 320 of title 38, United States Code, or any other modifications of law, to better ensure adequate funding of such programs, functions, and activities.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.—(1) JOINT RESOLUTION.—or purposes of this subsection, the term ''joint resolution'' means only a joint resolution which is introduced (in the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (or the Speaker's designee) or the Minority Leader (or the Minority Leader's designee) and in the Senate by the Majority Leader (or the Majority Leader's designee) or the Minority Leader (or the Minority Leader's designee)) within the 10-day period beginning on the date on which Congress receives the report of the Comptroller General of the United States under subsection (b), and—

(A) which does not have a preamble;

(B) the matter after the resolving clause of which consists of amendments of title 38, United States Code, or other amendments or modifications of laws under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to implement the recommendations of the Comptroller General in the report under subsection (b)(2)(F); and

(C) the title of which is as follows: ''Joint resolution to ensure adequate funding of health care for veterans.''.

(2) REFERRAL.—resolution described in paragraph (1) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives. A resolution described in paragraph (1) introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate.

(3) DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a resolution described in paragraph (1) is referred has not reported such resolution (or an identical resolution) by the end of the 20-day period beginning on the date on which the Comptroller General submits to Congress the report under subsection (b), such committee shall be, at the end of such period, discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—(A) On or after the third day after the date on which the committee to which such a resolution is referred has reported, or has been discharged (under paragraph (3)) from further consideration of, such a resolution, it is in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (but only on the day after the calendar day on which such Member announces to the House concerned the Member's intention to do so). The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the respective House shall immediately proceed to consideration of the joint resolution without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed of.

(B) Debate on the resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the resolution is not in order. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. A motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

(C) Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a resolution described in paragraph (1) and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the vote on final passage of the resolution shall occur.

(D) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution described in paragraph (1) shall be decided without debate.

(5) CONSIDERATION BY OTHER HOUSE.—(A) If, before the passage by one House of a resolution of that House described in paragraph (1), that House receives from the other House a resolution described in paragraph (1), then the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee and may not be considered in the House receiving it except in the case of final passage as provided in clause (ii)(II).

(ii) With respect to a resolution described in paragraph (1) of the House receiving the resolution—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(B) Upon disposition of the resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the resolution that originated in the receiving House.

(6) RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in paragraph (1), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SA 4260. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE __—NEVADA TEST SITE VETERANS' COMPENSATION

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Nevada Test Site Veterans' Compensation Act of 2006''.

SEC. ___02. FINDINGS.

(a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Employees working on Cold War-era nuclear weapons programs were employed in facilities owned by the Federal Government and the private sector producing and testing nuclear weapons and engaging in related atomic energy defense activities for the national defense beginning in the 1940s.

(2) These Cold War atomic energy veterans helped to build and test the nuclear arsenal that served as a deterrent during the Cold War, sacrificing their personal health and well-being in service of their country.

(3) During the Cold War, many of these workers were exposed to radiation and placed in harm's way by the Department of Energy and contractors, subcontractors, and vendors of the Department without their knowledge and consent, without adequate radiation monitoring, and without necessary

protections from internal or external occupational radiation exposure.

(4) The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384 et seq.) (in this section referred to as ''EEOICPA'') was enacted to ensure fairness and equity for the men and women who, during the past 60 years, performed duties uniquely related to the nuclear weapons production and testing programs of the Department of Energy, its predecessor agencies, and contractors by establishing a program that would provide timely, uniform, and adequate compensation for beryllium- and radiation-related health conditions.

(5) Research by the Department of Energy, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), NIOSH contractors, the President's Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, and congressional committees indicates that at certain nuclear weapons facilities—

(A) workers were not adequately monitored for internal or external exposure to ionizing radiation; and

(B) records were not maintained, are not reliable, are incomplete, or fail to indicate the radioactive isotopes to which workers were exposed.

(6) Due to the inequities posed by the factors described above and the resulting harm to the workers, Congress designated classes of atomic weapons employees at the Paducah, Kentucky, Portsmouth, Ohio, Oak Ridge K–25, Tennessee, and the Amchitka Island, Alaska, sites as members of the Special Exposure Cohort under EEOICPA.

(7) The contribution of the State of Nevada to the security of the United States throughout the Cold War and since has been unparalleled.

(8) In 1950, President Harry S Truman designated what would later be called the Nevada Test Site as the country's nuclear proving grounds and, a month later, the first atmospheric test at the Nevada Test Site was detonated.

(9) The United States conducted 100 aboveground and 828 underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site from 1951 to 1992.

(10) Out of the 1,054 nuclear tests conducted in the United States, 928, or 88 percent, were conducted at the Nevada Test Site.

(11) The Nevada Test Site has served, and continues to serve, as the premier research, testing, and development site for our nuclear defense capabilities.

(12) The Nevada Test Site and its workers are an essential and irreplaceable part of our nation's defense capabilities.

(13) It has become evident that it is not feasible to estimate with sufficient accuracy in a timely manner the radiation dose received by employees at the Department of Energy facility at the Nevada Test Site for many reasons, including the following:

(A) The NIOSH Technical Basis Document, the threshold document for radiation dose reconstruction under EEOICPA, has incomplete radionuclide lists.

(B) NIOSH has not demonstrated that it can estimate dose from exposure to large, nonrespirable hot particles.

(C) There are significant gaps in environmental measurement and exposure data.

(D) Resuspension doses are seriously underestimated.

(E) NIOSH has not been able to estimate accurately exposures to bomb assembly workers and radon levels.

(F) NIOSH has not demonstrated that it can accurately sample tritiated water vapor.

(G) External dose records lack integrity.

(H) There are no beta dose data until 1966.

(I) There are no neutron dose data until 1966 and only partial data after such date.

(J) There are no internal dose data until late 1955 or 1956, and limited data until well into the 1960s.

(K) NIOSH has ignored exposure from more than a dozen underground tests that vented, including Bianca, Des Moines, Baneberry, Camphor, Diagonal Line, Riola, Agrini, Midas Myth, Misty Rain, and Mighty Oak.

(L) Instead of monitoring individuals, groups were monitored, resulting in unreliable personnel monitoring.

(14) Amchitka Island, where only 3 underground nuclear tests were conducted, has been designated a Special Exposure Cohort under EEOICPA.

(15) Some Nevada Test Site workers, despite having worked with significant amounts of radioactive materials and having known exposures leading to serious health effects, have been denied compensation under EEOICPA as a result of flawed calculations based on records that are incomplete, in error, or based on faulty assumptions and incorrect models.

SEC. __03. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS IN SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT UNDER ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384l(14)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) The employee was so employed at the Nevada Test Site or other similar sites located in Nevada during the period beginning on January 1, 1950, and ending on December 31, 1993, and, during such employment—

''(i) was present during an atmospheric or underground nuclear test or performed drillbacks, re-entry, or clean-up work following such a test (without regard to the duration of employment);

''(ii) was present during an episodic event involving radiation releases (without regard to the duration of employment); or

''(iii) was employed at the Nevada Test Site for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days and was employed in a job activity that—

''(I) was monitored through the use of dosimetry badges or bioassays for exposure to ionizing radiation; or

''(II) worked in a job activity that is or was, comparable to a job that is, was, or should have been monitored for exposure to ionizing radiation through the use of dosimetry badges or bioassay.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR CLAIMS ADJUDICATION.—Claims for compensation under section 3621(14)(C) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, as added by subsection (a), shall be adjudicated and a final decision issued—

(1) in the case of claims pending as of the date of the enactment of this Act, not later than 30 days after such date; and

(2) in the case of claims filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, not later than 30 days after the date of such filing.

SA 4261. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal 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 29, strike lines 6 through 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 146. FUNDING FOR PROCUREMENT OF F–22A FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF INCREMENTAL FUNDING.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall not use incremental funding for the procurement of F–22A fighter aircraft.

(b) MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year for procurement of not more than 60 F–22A fighter aircraft.

SEC. 147. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT OF F–119 ENGINES FOR F–22A FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.

The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year for procurement of the following:

(1) Not more than 120 F–119 engines for F–22A fighter aircraft.

(2) Not more than 13 spare F–119 engines for F–22A fighter aircraft.

SA 4262. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) PRESEPARATION COUNSELING.—Section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''provide for individual preseparation counseling'' and inserting ''shall provide individual preseparation counseling'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) For members of the reserve components who have been serving on active duty continuously for at least 180 days, the Secretary concerned shall require that preseparation counseling under this section be provided to all such members (including officers) before the members are separated.

''(5) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that commanders of members entitled to services under this section authorize the members to obtain such services during duty time.''.

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''(4) Information concerning'' and inserting the following:

''(4) Provision of information on civilian occupations and related assistance programs, including information concerning—

''(A) certification and licensure requirements that are applicable to civilian occupations;

''(B) civilian occupations that correspond to military occupational specialties; and

''(C)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) Information concerning the priority of service for veterans in the receipt of employment, training, and placement services provided under qualified job training programs of the Department of Labor.

''(12) Information concerning veterans small business ownership and entrepreneurship programs of the Small Business Administration and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation.

''(13) Information concerning employment and reemployment rights and obligations under chapter 43 of title 38.

''(14) Information concerning veterans preference in federal employment and federal procurement opportunities.

''(15) Information concerning homelessness, including risk factors, awareness assessment, and contact information for preventative assistance associated with homelessness.

''(16) Contact information for housing counseling assistance.

''(17) A description, developed in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, of health care and other benefits to which the member may be entitled under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(18) If a member is eligible, based on a preseparation physical examination, for compensation benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a referral for a medical examination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (commonly known as a 'compensation and pension examination').'';

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that—

''(A) preseparation counseling under this section includes material that is specifically relevant to the needs of—

''(i) persons being separated from active duty by discharge from a regular component of the armed forces; and

''(ii) members of the reserve components being separated from active duty;

''(B) the locations at which preseparation counseling is presented to eligible personnel include—

''(i) each military installation under the jurisdiction of the Secretary;

''(ii) each armory and military family support center of the National Guard;

''(iii) inpatient medical care facilities of the uniformed services where such personnel are receiving inpatient care; and

''(iv) in the case of a member on the temporary disability retired list under section 1202 or 1205 of this title who is being retired under another provision of this title or is being discharged, a location reasonably convenient to the member;

''(C) the scope and content of the material presented in preseparation counseling at each location under this section are consistent with the scope and content of the material presented in the preseparation counseling at the other locations under this section; and

''(D) follow up counseling is provided for each member of the reserve components described in subparagraph (A) not later than 180 days after separation from active duty.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of the materials used by the National Veterans Training Institute and such officials' other activities that provide direct training support to personnel who provide preseparation counseling under this section.

''(e) NATIONAL GUARD MEMBERS ON DUTY IN STATE STATUS.—(1) Members of the National Guard, who are separated from long-term duty to which ordered under section 502(f) of title 32, shall be provided preseparation counseling under this section to the same extent that members of the reserve components being discharged or released from active duty are provided preseparation counseling under this section.

''(2) The preseparation counseling provided personnel under paragraph (1) shall include material that is specifically relevant to the needs of such personnel as members of the National Guard.

''(3) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, by regulation, the standards for determining long-term duty under paragraph (1).''; and

(4) by amending the heading to read as follows:

''§ 1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 58 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1142 and inserting the following:

''1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling.''.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TRANSITIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''paragraph (4)(A)'' in the second sentence and inserting ''paragraph (6)(A)'';

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) PARTICIPATION.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require participation by members of the armed forces eligible for assistance under the program carried out under this section.

''(2) The Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security need not require, but shall encourage and otherwise promote, participation in the program by the following members of the armed forces described in paragraph (1):

''(A) Each member who has previously participated in the program.

''(B) Each member who, upon discharge or release from active duty, is returning to—

''(i) a position of employment; or

''(ii) pursuit of an academic degree or other educational or occupational training objective that the member was pursuing when called or ordered to such active duty.

''(3) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that commanders of members entitled to services under this section authorize the members to obtain such services during duty time.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) UPDATED MATERIALS.—The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of all materials used by the Department of Labor that provide direct training support to personnel who provide transitional services counseling under this section.''.

SEC. 588. SEPARATION COUNSELING BY VETERANS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES NEARING SEPARATION AND VETERANS.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 58 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1154. Veteran-to-veteran preseparation counseling

''(a) COOPERATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to facilitate the access of representatives of military and veterans' service organizations and representatives of veterans' services agencies of States to provide preseparation counseling and services to members of the armed forces who are scheduled, or are in the process of being scheduled, for discharge, release from active duty, or retirement.

''(b) REQUIRED PROGRAM ELEMENT.—The program under this section shall provide for representatives of military and veterans' service organizations and representatives of veterans' services agencies of States to be invited to participate in the preseparation counseling and other assistance briefings provided to members under the programs carried out under sections 1142 and 1144 of this title and the benefits delivery at discharge programs.

''(c) LOCATIONS.—The program under this section shall provide for access to members—

''(1) at each installation of the armed forces;

''(2) at each armory and military family support center of the National Guard;

''(3) at each inpatient medical care facility of the uniformed services administered under chapter 55 of this title; and

''(4) in the case of a member on the temporary disability retired list under section 1202 or 1205 of this title who is being retired under another provision of this title or is being discharged, at a location reasonably convenient to the member.

''(d) CONSENT OF MEMBERS REQUIRED.—Access to a member of the armed forces under the program under this section is subject to the consent of the member.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'benefits delivery at discharge program' means a program administered jointly by the Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide information and assistance on available benefits and other transition assistance to members of the armed forces who are separating from the armed forces, including assistance to obtain any disability benefits for which such members may be eligible.

''(2) The term 'representative', with respect to a veterans' service organization, means a representative of an organization who is recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 58 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1154. Veteran-to-veteran preseparation counseling.''.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1709. Veteran-to-veteran counseling

''(a) COOPERATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to facilitate the access of representatives of military and veterans' service organizations and representatives of veterans' services agencies of States to veterans furnished care and services under this chapter to provide information and counseling to such veterans on—

''(1) the care and services authorized by this chapter; and

''(2) other benefits and services available under the laws administered by the Secretary.

''(b) FACILITIES COVERED.—The program under this section shall provide for access to veterans described in subsection (a) at each facility of the Department and any non-Department facility at which the Secretary furnishes care and services under this chapter.

''(c) CONSENT OF VETERANS REQUIRED.—Access to a veteran under the program under this section is subject to the consent of the veteran.

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'veterans' service organization' means an organization who is recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1708 the following new item:

''1709. Veteran-to-veteran counseling.''.

SA 4263. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REQUIRED PARTICIPATION FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS.—Subsection (c) of section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) PARTICIPATION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense shall require participation by members of the armed forces eligible for assistance under the program carried out under this section.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense need not require, but shall encourage and otherwise promote, participation in the program by the following members described in paragraph (1):

''(A) A member who has previously participated in the program.

''(B) A member who, upon discharge or release from active duty, is returning to—

''(i) a position of employment; or

''(ii) pursuit of an academic degree or other educational or occupational training objective that the members was pursuing when called or ordered to such active duty.

''(3) Members of the armed forces eligible for assistance under this section include—

''(A) members of the reserve components being separated from service on active duty for a period of more than 30 days; and

''(B) members of the National Guard being separated from full-time National Guard duty.

''(4) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that commanders of members who are required to be provided assistance under this section authorize the members to be provided such assistance during duty time.''.

(b) REQUIRED UPDATING OF MATERIALS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) UPDATING OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of the materials used by the National Veterans Training Institute of the Department of Labor and the Secretary's other materials that provide direct training support to personnel who carry out the program established in this section.''.

SA 4264. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. LAUTENBERG) 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 title VI, add the following:

Subtitle F—Transition Assistance for Members of the National Guard and Reserve Returning From Deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom

SEC. 681. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Heroes at Home Act of 2006''.

SEC. 682. RESPONSIBILITIES OF TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3348) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE RETURNING FROM DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND ENDURING FREEDOM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the activities required under subsection (c), the task force shall, not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Heroes at Home Act of 2006, submit to the Secretary a report containing an assessment of, and recommendations for improving, assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families, in transitioning to civilian employment upon their return from such deployment, including—

''(A) members who were self-employed before deployment and seek to return to such employment after deployment;

''(B) members who were students before deployment and seek to return to school or commence employment after deployment;

''(C) members who have experienced multiple recent deployments; and

''(D) members who have been wounded or injured during deployment.

''(2) WORKING GROUP.—In conducting the assessment and making the recommendations required by paragraph (1), the task force shall utilize the assistance of a working group that consists of individuals selected by the task force from among individuals as follows:

''(A) With the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, personnel of the Small Business Administration.

''(B) Representatives of employers who employ members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) on their return to civilian life as described in that paragraph.

''(C) Representatives of employee assistance organizations.

''(D) Representatives of associations of employers.

''(E) Representatives of organizations that assist wounded or injured members of the National Guard and Reserves in finding or sustaining employment.

''(F) Representatives of such other public or private organizations and entities as the co-chairs of the task force, in consultation with the members of the task force, consider appropriate.

''(3) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the following:

''(A) The provision of outreach and training to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers on the employment, readjustment, and mental health needs of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in paragraph (1) upon their return from deployment as described in that paragraph.

''(B) The provision of outreach and training to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers on the needs of family members of such members.

''(C) The improvement of collaboration between the pubic and private sectors in order to ensure the successful transition of such members into civilian employment upon their return from such deployment.

''(4) OTHER DUTIES.—In the period between the submittal of the report required by paragraph (1) and the termination of the task force under subsection (h), the task force (including the working group established under paragraph (2)) shall serve as an advisor to the Assistance Center for Employers and Employment Assistance Organizations established under section 683 of the Heroes at Home Act of 2006.

''(5) EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'employment assistance organization' means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.''.

(b) REPORT.—Subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''REPORT'' and inserting ''REPORTS'';

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph (1):

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The report submitted to the Secretary under each of subsections (c) and (d) shall include—

''(A) a description of the activities of the task force under such subsection;

''(B) the assessment and recommendations required by such subsection; and

''(C) such other matters relating to the activities of the task force under such subsection as the task force considers appropriate.''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''the report under paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''a report under paragraph (1)''; and

(B) by striking ''the report as'' and inserting ''such report as''.

(c) PLAN MATTERS.—Subsection (g) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking ''the report from the task force under subsection (e)(1)'' and inserting ''a report from the task force under subsection (f)(1)''; and

(2) by inserting ''contained in such report'' after ''the task force'' the second place it appears.

(d) TERMINATION.—Subsection (h) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by inserting ''with respect to the assessment and recommendations required by subsection (d)'' after ''the task force''; and

(2) by striking ''subsection (e)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (f)(2)''.

SEC. 683. ASSISTANCE CENTER FOR EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an office to assist employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers in facilitating the successful transition to civilian employment of members of the National Guard and Reserve returning from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The office established under this subsection shall be known as the ''Assistance Center for Employers and Employment Assistance Organizations'' (in this section referred to as the ''Center'').

(3) HEAD.—The Secretary shall designate an individual to act as the head of the Center.

(4) INTEGRATION.—In establishing the Center, the Secretary shall ensure close communication between the Center and the military departments, including the commands of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Center shall have the following functions:

(1) To provide education and technical assistance to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers to assist them in facilitating the successful transition to civilian employment of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a) on their return from deployment as described in that subsection.

(2) To provide education and technical assistance to employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers to assist them in facilitating the successful adjustment of family members of the National Guard and Reserve to the deployment and return from deployment of members of the National Guard and Reserve as described in that subsection.

(c) RESOURCES TO BE PROVIDED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Center shall provide employers, employment assistance organizations, and associations of employers resources, services, and assistance that include the following:

(A) Guidelines on best practices and effective strategies.

(B) Education on the physical and mental health difficulties that can and may be experienced by members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a) on their return from deployment as described in that subsection in transitioning to civilian employment, including difficulties arising from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI), including education on—

(i) the detection of warning signs of such difficulties;

(ii) the medical, mental health, and employment services available to such members, including materials on services offered by the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs (including through the vet center program under section 1712A of title 38, United States Code), the Department of Labor, military support programs, and community mental health clinics; and

(iii) the mechanisms for referring such members for services described in clause (ii) and for other medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(C) Education on the range and types of potential physical and mental health effects of deployment and post-deployment adjustment on family members of members of the National Guard and Reserve described in subsection (a), including education on—

(i) the detection of warning signs on such effects on family members of members of the National Guard and Reserves;

(ii) the medical, mental health, and employment services available to such family members, including materials on such services as described in subparagraph (B)(ii); and

(iii) mechanisms for referring such family members for services described in clause (ii) and for medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(D) Education on mechanisms, strategies, and resources for accommodating and employing wounded or injured members of the National Guard and Reserves in work settings.

(2) PROVISION OF RESOURCES.—The Center shall make resources, services, and assistance available under this subsection through such mechanisms as the head of the Center considers appropriate, including the Internet, video conferencing, telephone services, workshops, trainings, presentations, group forums, and other mechanisms.

(d) PERSONNEL AND OTHER RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Defense shall assign to the Center such personnel, funding, and other resources as are required to ensure the effective discharge by the Center of the functions under subsection (b).

(e) REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT BY CENTER.—Not later than one year after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the head of the Center, in consultation with the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health (while in effect), shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a written report on the progress and outcomes of the Center during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(2) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after receipt of a report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit such report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with—

(A) such comments on such report, and such assessment of the effectiveness of the Center, as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(B) such recommendations on means of improving the effectiveness of the Center as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report under paragraph (2) available to the public, including through the Internet website of the Center.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''employment assistance organization'' means an organization or entity, whether public or private, that provides assistance to individuals in finding or retaining employment, including organizations and entities under military career support programs.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH.—The term ''Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health'' means the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health established under section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, as amended by section 682 of this Act.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 684. GRANTS ON ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED SETTINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE AND THEIR FAMILIES AFTER DEPLOYMENT IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may award grants to eligible entities to carry out demonstration projects to assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing community-based settings for the provision of assistance to members of the National Guard and Reserve who serve in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, and their families, after the return of such members from deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, as the case may be, including—

(1) services to improve the reuniting of such members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families;

(2) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on their return from such deployment, including education on—

(A) Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI); and

(B) mechanisms for the referral of such members of the National Guard and Reserve for medical and mental health screening and care when necessary; and

(3) education to increase awareness of the physical and mental health difficulties that family members of such members of the National Guard and Reserve can and may experience on the return of such members from such deployment, including education on—

(A) depression, anxiety, and relationship problems; and

(B) mechanisms for medical and mental health screening and care when appropriate.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity eligible for the award of a grant under this section is any public or private non-profit organization, such as a community mental health clinic, family support organization, military support organization, law enforcement agency, community college, or public school.

(c) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application therefor in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require for purposes of this section, including a description of how such entity will work with the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, State health agencies, other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, family support organizations, and other community organization in undertaking activities described in subsection (a).

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS BY GRANT RECIPIENTS.—An entity awarded a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Defense on an annual basis a report on the activities undertaken by such entity during the preceding year utilizing amounts under the grant. Each report shall include such information as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of this subsection.

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on activities undertaken under the grants awarded under this section. The report shall include recommendations for legislative, programmatic, or administrative action to improve or enhance activities under the grants awarded under this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to make each report under this subsection available to the public.

SEC. 685. LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, provide for a longitudinal study on the effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The duration of the longitudinal study shall be 15 years.

(b) SELECTION OF ENTITY FOR CONDUCT OF STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, select an entity to conduct the study required by subsection (a) from among private organizations or entities qualified to conduct the study.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The long-term effects of traumatic brain injury on the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mechanisms for improving body armor and helmets in order to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries.

(3) The long-term physical and mental health consequences of traumatic brain injuries incurred by members of the Armed Forces during service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(4) The health care, mental health care, and rehabilitation needs of such members for such injuries after the completion of inpatient treatment through the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, or both.

(5) The type and availability of long-term care rehabilitation programs and services within and outside the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for such members for such injuries, including community-based programs and services and in-home programs and services.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) PERIODIC AND FINAL REPORTS.—After the third, seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit to the appropriate elements of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a comprehensive report on the results of the study during the preceding years. Each report shall include the following:

(A) Current information on the cumulative outcomes of the study.

(B) In the case of a report to elements of the Department of Defense—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for programmatic and administrative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries; and

(ii) such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate based on the outcomes of the study.

(C) In the case of a report to elements of the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers appropriate for programmatic and administrative action to improve long-term care and rehabilitative programs and services for members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury; and

(ii) such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate based on the outcomes of the study.

(D) In the case of a report to Congress—

(i) such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for legislative action to improve body armor and helmets to protect members of the Armed Forces from sustaining traumatic brain injuries;

(ii) such recommendations as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers appropriate for legislative action to improve long-term care and rehabilitative programs and services for members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury; and

(iii) such other recommendations as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly consider appropriate based on the outcomes of the study.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly take appropriate actions to make each report under this subsection available to the public.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 686. TRAINING CURRICULA FOR FAMILY CAREGIVERS ON CARE AND ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY INCURRED IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY FAMILY CAREGIVER PANEL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, establish within the Department of Defense a panel to develop coordinated, uniform, and consistent training curricula to be used in training family members in the provision of care and assistance to members and former members of the Armed Forces for traumatic brain injuries incurred during service in the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) DESIGNATION OF PANEL.—The panel established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the ''Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel''.

(3) MEMBERS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel established under paragraph (1) shall consist of 15 members appointed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, equally represented from among—

(A) physicians, nurses, rehabilitation therapists, and other individuals with an expertise in caring for and assisting individuals with traumatic brain injury, including those who specialize in caring for and assisting individuals with traumatic brain injury incurred in war;

(B) representatives of family caregivers or family caregiver associations;

(C) Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs health and medical personnel with expertise in traumatic brain injury, and Department of Defense personnel and readiness representatives with expertise in traumatic brain injury;

(D) representatives of military service organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans;

(E) representatives of veterans service organizations who specialize in matters relating to disabled veterans;

(F) psychologists or other individuals with expertise in the mental health treatment and care of individuals with traumatic brain injury;

(G) experts in the development of training curricula;

(H) researchers and academicians who study traumatic brain injury; and

(I) any other individuals the Secretary considers appropriate.

(4) MEETINGS.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall meet not less than monthly.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall develop training curricula to be utilized during the provision of training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) on techniques, strategies, and skills for care and assistance for such members and former members with the traumatic brain injuries described in that subsection.

(2) SCOPE OF CURRICULA.—The curricula shall—

(A) be based on empirical research and validated techniques; and

(B) shall provide for training that permits recipients to tailor caregiving to the unique circumstances of the member or former member of the Armed Forces receiving care.

(3) PARTICULAR REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall—

(A) specify appropriate training commensurate with the severity of traumatic brain injury; and

(B) identify appropriate care and assistance to be provided for the degree of severity of traumatic brain injury for caregivers of various levels of skill and capability.

(4) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall utilize and enhance any existing training curricular, materials, and resources applicable to such curricula as the Panel considers appropriate.

(5) CONSULTATION.—In developing the curricula, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall consult with the Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee, as appropriate.

(6) DEADLINE FOR DEVELOPMENT.—The Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel shall develop the curricula not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF CURRICULA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Panel, develop mechanisms for the dissemination of the curricula developed under subsection (b) to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who treat or otherwise work with members and former members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury incurred in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. In developing such mechanisms, the Secretary may utilize and enhance existing mechanisms, including the Military Severely Injured Center.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.—The health care professionals referred to in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Personnel at military medical treatment facilities.

(B) Personnel at the polytrauma centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(C) Personnel and care managers at the Military Severely Injured Center.

(D) Such other health care professionals of the Department of Defense as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(E) Such other health care professionals of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, considers appropriate.

(3) SCOPE.—The mechanisms developed under paragraph (1) shall include the provision of refresher training in the curricula developed under subsection (a) for the health care professional referred to in paragraph (2) not less often than once every six months.

(4) PROVISION OF TRAINING TO FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) who are trained in the curricula developed under subsection (b) shall provide training to family members of members and former members of the Armed Forces who incur traumatic brain injuries during service in the Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom in the care and assistance to be provided for such injuries.

(B) TIMING OF TRAINING.—Training under this paragraph shall, to the extent practicable, be provided to family members while the member or former member concerned is undergoing treatment at a facility of the Department of Defense or Department of Veterans Affairs, as applicable, in order to ensure that such family members receive practice on the provision of such care and assistance under the guidance of qualified health professionals.

(C) PARTICULARIZED TRAINING.—Training provided under this paragraph to family members of a particular member or former member shall be tailored to the particular care needs of such member or former member and the particular caregiving needs of such family members.

(5) QUALITY ASSURANCE.—The Secretary shall develop mechanisms to ensure quality in the provision of training under this section to health care professionals referred to in paragraph (2) and in the provision of such training under paragraph (4) by such health care professionals.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the development of the curricula required by subsection (b), and annually thereafter, the Traumatic Brain Injury Family Caregiver Training Panel shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a report on the following:

(A) The actions undertaken under this subsection.

(B) The results of the tracking of outcomes based on training developed and provided under this section.

(C) Recommendations for the improvement of training developed and provided under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out this section amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2007, $5,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as may be necessary.

SA 4265. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE GRANTING OF AMNESTY TO PERSONS KNOWN TO HAVE KILLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March of 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 members of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) the President should immediately notify the Government of Iraq that the Government of the United States strongly opposes granting amnesty to persons who have attacked members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SA 4266. Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) 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 421, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORTS ON DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE EFFORTS TO INVESTIGATE AND PROSECUTE CASES OF CONTRACTING ABUSE IN IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND THROUGHOUT THE WAR ON TERROR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Waste, fraud, and abuse in contracting are harmful to United States efforts to successfully win the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan and succeed in the war on terror. The act of stealing from our soldiers who are daily in harm's way is clearly criminal and must be actively prosecuted.

(2) There are reports that the Department of Defense has lost accountability of significant funding due to theft by corrupt contractors. These taxpayer funds should be recovered and spent on the services and equipment that our troops need to accomplish their mission abroad.

(3) It is a vital interest of United States taxpayers to be protected from theft of their tax dollars by corrupt contractors.

(4) Whistleblower lawsuits are an important tool for exposing waste, fraud, and abuse and can identify serious graft and corruption. Whistleblowers have brought many cases of contractor corruption to light, and must be commended as true patriots and champions of honesty and integrity.

(5) Based on published reports about whistleblower lawsuits initiated under sections 3729 and 3730(b) of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the ''False Claims Act''), to address contractor corruption in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, it is unclear if the Department of Justice has brought a sufficient number of these cases to resolution. It is also unclear whether a chain of command and an accountable management structure exists for handling such whistleblower lawsuits, which aim to root out contractor corruption in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(6) This issue is of paramount importance to the United States taxpayer, and the Congress has not received enough information about the contractor waste, fraud, and abuse taking place in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror and about the efforts of the Department of Justice to combat these crimes. Sharing of this information will show how seriously the Federal Government, as a whole, takes the issue of contractor theft of United States taxpayer dollars.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report on efforts to investigate and prosecute cases of waste, fraud, and abuse under sections 3729 and 3730(b) of title 31, United States Code, or any other related law that are related to Federal contracting in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(2) CONTENT.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Information on all of the organized efforts of the Department of Justice that have been created to ensure that the Department of Justice is investigating, in a timely and appropriate manner, all claims of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse related to the activities of the United States Government in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(B) Specific information on the cases and investigations of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror that have been undertaken by United States Attorneys and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the names and locations of these offices, as well as the personnel and financial resources committed to the task and a description of the type, nature, and substance of the allegations made and the amount of funds in controversy for each case and investigation, to the greatest extent possible under the law. Information that would otherwise be prohibited from disclosure by Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or by a seal order pursuant to section 3730(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be submitted in a confidential memorandum to the committees specified in paragraph (1) and shall not be deemed to be a violation of either Rule 6(e) or such seal order. If there is a showing of extraordinary circumstances that disclosure of particular information would pose an imminent threat of harm to a relator and be detrimental to the public interest, then this information should be redacted in accordance with standard practices.

(C) Information on the specific number of personnel, financial resources, and workdays devoted to addressing this waste, fraud, and abuse, including a complete listing of all of the offices across the United States and throughout the world that are working on these cases and an explanation of the types of additional resources, both in terms of personnel and finances, that the Department of Justice needs to ensure that all of these cases proceed on a timely basis.

(D) A detailed description of any internal Department of Justice task force that exists to work specifically on these cases of contractor fraud and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including a description of its action plan, the frequency of its meetings, the level and quantity of staff dedicated to it, its measures for

success, the nature and substance of the allegations, and the amount of funds in controversy for each case. If there is a showing of extraordinary circumstances that disclosure of particular information would pose an imminent threat of harm to a relator and be detrimental to the public interest, then this information should be redacted in accordance with standard practices.

(E) A detailed description of any interagency task force that exists to work specifically on these cases of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including its action plan, the frequency of its meetings, the level and quantity of staff dedicated to it, its measures for success, the type, nature, and substance of the allegations, and the amount of funds in controversy for each case. If there is a showing of extraordinary circumstances that disclosure of particular information would pose an imminent threat of harm to a relator and be detrimental to the public interest, then this information should be redacted in accordance with standard practices.

(F) The names of the senior officials directly responsible for oversight of the efforts to address these cases of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(G) Specific information on the number of investigators and other personnel that have been provided to the Department of Justice by other Federal departments and agencies in support of the efforts of the Department of Justice to combat contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including data on the quantity of time that these investigators have spent working within the Department of Justice structures dedicated to this effort.

(H) Specific information on the full number of investigations, including grand jury investigations currently underway, that are addressing these cases of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(I) Specific information on the number and status of the criminal cases that have been launched to address contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

(J) Specific information on the number of civil cases that have been filed to address contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including specific information on the quantity of cases initiated by private parties, as well as the quantity of cases that have been referred to the Department of Justice by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and other relevant Federal departments and agencies.

(K) Specific information on the resolved civil and criminal cases that have been filed to address contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror, including the specific results of these cases, the types of waste, fraud, and abuse that took place, the amount of funds that were returned to the United States Government as a result of resolution of these cases, and a full description of the type and substance of the waste, fraud, and abuse that took place, including its direct and indirect impacts on United States troops, officers, and other individuals working for the United States Government in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror. If there is a showing of extraordinary circumstances that disclosure of particular information would pose an imminent threat of harm to a relator and be detrimental to the public interest, then this information should be redacted in accordance with standard practices.

(L) The best estimate by the Department of Justice of the scale of the problem of contractor waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq, Afghanistan, and throughout the war on terror.

SA 4267. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1223. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF UNITED STATES OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On October 13, 1999, the Senate voted not to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

(2) Immediately following such vote, then-Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright sent a letter to, among others, the governments of the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of Russia, China, India, Japan, and Australia assuring them that ''the United States will continue to act in accordance with its obligations as a signatory under international law, and will seek reconsideration of the Treaty at a later date when conditions are better suited for ratification'' (in this section referred to as the ''assurances letter'').

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General, submit to Congress a report on the status of United States obligations under the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall specifically address each of the following issues:

(A) Whether the assurances regarding United States obligations under the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty that were provided in the assurances letter are consistent with the current policy of the United States.

(B) If the assurances are not consistent with United States policy, a description of the steps taken by the President to communicate to the foreign governments that received the assurances letter that such assurances are no longer operative.

(C) If the assurances are not consistent with United States policy, whether the President has provided to the foreign governments that received the assurances letter written notice that the letter is no longer operative.

(D) Whether the President agrees with the statement by then-Secretary of State Albright in the assurances letter that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty imposes on the United States continuing ''obligations as a signatory under international law,'' irrespective of the October 13, 1999, vote by the Senate not to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Treaty.

(E) If the President believes that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty does not impose on the United States continuing obligations as a signatory under international law—

(i) whether the President believes that the assertion in the assurances letter that such obligations existed was erroneous; and

(ii) if not, a description of the steps taken by the President to terminate the obligations that existed at the time of the assurances letter.

(F) If the President believes that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty does impose on the United States continuing obligations as a signatory under international law, a description of the nature and extent of such obligations.

(G) Whether, as a matter of international law, the United States is, as of the time of the report, a signatory to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

(H) Whether the official list of signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty maintained by the depositary of the Treaty accurately reflects whether the United States is still a signatory to the Treaty.

(I) Whether the President has a constitutional duty to ensure that United States international legal obligations conform with domestic legislation subsequently enacted that is inconsistent with such obligations, and whether any such duty extends to reconciling or changing internationally-maintained records that purport to reflect the official status of the United States as a signatory to a treaty the ratification of which has been rejected by the Senate and is no longer supported by the President.

SA 4268. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION OF FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION.

None of the funds authorized or otherwise made available by this Act or by any other Act may be obligated or expended in connection with United States participation in, or support for, the activities of the United Nations Disarmament Commission as long as Iran serves as a vice-chair of the Commission.

SA 4269. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4265 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following:

SEC. ___. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ.—

(1) SCHEDULE FOR WITHDRAWAL.—The President shall reach an agreement as soon as possible with the Government of Iraq on a schedule for the withdrawal of United States combat troops from Iraq by December 31, 2006, leaving only forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The President shall consult with Congress regarding such schedule and shall present such withdrawal agreement to Congress immediately upon the completion of the agreement.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF OVER-THE-HORIZON TROOP PRESENCE.—The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests.

(b) IRAQ SUMMIT.—The President should convene a summit as soon as possible that includes the leaders of the Government of Iraq, leaders of the governments of each country bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that addresses fundamental issues including federalism, oil revenues, the militias, security guarantees, reconstruction, economic assistance, and border security.

SA 4270. Mr. BURNS (for himself 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:

On page 187, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(c) USE OF ELECTRONIC VOTING TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) CONTINUATION OF INTERIM VOTING ASSISTANCE SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Defense shall continue the Interim Voting Assistance System (IVAS) ballot request program with respect to all absent uniformed services voters (as defined under section 107(1) of the Uniformed Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-6(1))), overseas employees of the Department of Defense, and the dependents of such voters and employees, for elections on or after November 1, 2006.

(2) REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office for November 2006, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth—

(i) an assessment of the success of the implementation of the Interim Voting Assistance System ballot request program carried out under paragraph (1); and

(ii) recommendations for improvements to the program.

(B) FUTURE ELECTIONS.—Not later than January 15, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing plans for expanding the use of electronic voting technology for individuals covered under the Uniformed Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff et seq.) for elections on or after for November 1, 2010.

SA 4271. Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) 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 title IX, add the following:

Subtitle D—National Guard Bureau Matters

SEC. 931. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006''.

SEC. 9322. EXPANDED AUTHORITY OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AND EXPANDED FUNCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) EXPANDED AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 10501 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''joint bureau of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force'' and inserting ''joint activity of the Department of Defense''.

(2) PURPOSE.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking ''between'' and all that follows and inserting ''between—

''(1)(A) the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the commanders of the combatant commands for the United States, and (B) the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force; and

''(2) the several States.''.

(b) ENHANCEMENTS OF POSITION OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—

(1) ADVISORY FUNCTION ON NATIONAL GUARD MATTERS.—Subsection (c) of section 10502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''to the Secretary of Defense, to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,'' after ''principal advisor''.

(2) GRADE.—Subsection (e) of such section, as redesignated by paragraph (2)(A)(i) of this subsection, is further amended by striking ''lieutenant general'' and inserting ''general''.

(3) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON VALIDATED REQUIREMENTS.—Section 10504 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON VALIDATED REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 31 each year, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to Congress a report on the requirements validated under section 10503a(b)(1) of this title during the preceding fiscal year.''.

(c) ENHANCEMENT OF FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF CHARTER.—Section 10503 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall jointly develop'' and inserting ''The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, shall develop''; and

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking ''the Secretaries'' and inserting ''the Secretary of Defense''.

(2) ADDITIONAL GENERAL FUNCTIONS.—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (12), as amended by paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection, as paragraph (13); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following new paragraph (12):

''(12) Facilitating and coordinating with other Federal agencies, and with the several States, the use of National Guard personnel and resources for and in contingency operations, military operations other than war, natural disasters, support of civil authorities, and other circumstances.''.

(3) MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR CIVIL AUTHORITIES.—Chapter 1011 of such title is further amended by inserting after section 10503 the following new section:

''§ 10503a. Functions of National Guard Bureau: military assistance to civil authorities

''(a) IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL NECESSARY ASSISTANCE.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall—

''(1) identify gaps between Federal and State capabilities to prepare for and respond to emergencies; and

''(2) make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense on programs and activities of the National Guard for military assistance to civil authorities to address such gaps.

''(b) SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—In meeting the requirements of subsection (a), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall, in coordination with the Adjutant Generals of the States, have responsibilities as follows:

''(1) To validate the requirements of the several States and Territories with respect to military assistance to civil authorities.

''(2) To develop doctrine and training requirements relating to the provision of military assistance to civil authorities.

''(3) To administer amounts provided the National Guard for the provision of military assistance to civil authorities.

''(4) To carry out any other responsibility relating to the provision of military assistance to civil authorities as the Secretary of Defense shall specify.

''(c) ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall assist the Chief of the National Guard Bureau in carrying out activities under this section.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall carry out activities under this section in consultation with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force.''.

(4) LIMITATION ON INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—The Secretary of Defense shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that no additional personnel are assigned to the National Guard Bureau in order to address administrative or other requirements arising out of the amendments made by this subsection.

(d) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 10503 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 10503. Functions of National Guard Bureau: charter''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 10503 and inserting the following new items:

''10503. Functions of National Guard Bureau: charter.

''10503a. Functions of National Guard Bureau: military assistance to civil authorities.''.

SEC. 933. REQUIREMENT THAT POSITION OF DEPUTY COMMANDER OF THE UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND BE FILLED BY A QUALIFIED NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The position of Deputy Commander of the United States Northern Command shall be filled by a qualified officer of the National Guard who is eligible for promotion to the grade of lieutenant general.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the requirement in subsection (a) is to ensure that information received from the National Guard Bureau regarding the operation of the National Guard of the several States is integrated into the plans and operations of the United States Northern Command.

SA 4272. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year

2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ FOR AFFIRMING ITS POSITION OF NO AMNESTY FOR TERRORISTS WHO ATTACK U.S. ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces are serving heroically in Iraq to provide all the people of Iraq a better future.

(2) The Armed Forces of the United States and coalition military forces have served bravely in Iraq since the beginning of military operations in March 2003.

(3) More than 2,500 of the Armed Forces of the United States and members of coalition military forces have been killed and more than 18,000 injured in operations to bring peace and stability to all the people of Iraq.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the new Government of Iraq is commended for its statement by the National Security Adviser of Iraq on June 15, 2006 that—

(1) thanked ''the American wives and American women and American mothers for the treasure and the blood they have invested in this country . . . of liberating 30 million people in this country. . . . And we are ever so grateful.'' and

(2) that affirmed their position that they ''will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers or civilians.''

SA 4273. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to improve the fuel efficiency of weapons platforms, consistent with mission requirements, in order to—

(1) enhance platform performance;

(2) reduce the size of the fuel logistics systems;

(3) reduce the burden high fuel consumption places on agility;

(4) reduce operating costs; and

(5) dampen the financial impact of volatile oil prices.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility of designating a senior Department of Defense official to be responsible for implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(B) A summary of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(i) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in April 2006;

(ii) the Defense Science Board Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Strategy established by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006; and

(iii) the January 2001 Defense Science Board Task Force report on Improving Fuel Efficiency of Weapons Platforms.

(C) For each recommendation summarized under subparagraph (B)—

(i) the steps that the Department has taken to implement such recommendation;

(ii) any additional steps the Department plans to take to implement such recommendation; and

(iii) for any recommendation that the Department does not plan to implement, the reasons for the decision not to implement such recommendation.

(D) An assessment of the extent to which the research, development, acquisition, and logistics guidance and directives of the Department for weapons platforms are appropriately designed to address the policy established by subsection (a).

(E) An assessment of the extent to which such guidance and directives are being carried out in the research, development, acquisition, and logistics programs of the Department.

(F) A description of any additional actions that, in the view of the Secretary, may be needed to implement the policy established by subsection (a).

SA 4274. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. THOMAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 147. MINUTEMAN III INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference on H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the conferees state that the policy of the United States ''is to deploy a force of 500 ICBMs''. The conferees further note ''that unanticipated strategic developments may compel the United States to make changes to this force structure in the future.''.

(2) The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) conducted under section 118 of title 10, United States Code, in 2005 finds that maintaining a robust nuclear deterrent ''remains a keystone of United States national power''. However, notwithstanding that finding and without providing any specific justification for the recommendation, the Quadrennial Defense Review recommends reducing the number of deployed Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) from 500 to 450 beginning in fiscal year 2007. The Quadrennial Defense Review also fails to identify what unanticipated strategic developments compelled the United States to reduce the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force structure.

(3) The commander of the Strategic Command, General James Cartwright, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that the reduction in deployment of Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles is required so that the 50 missiles withdrawn from the deployed force could be used for test assets and spares to extend the life of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile well into the future. If spares are not modernized, the Air Force may not have sufficient replacement missiles to sustain the force size.

(b) MODERNIZATION OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES REQUIRED.—The Air Force shall modernize Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles in the United States inventory such that a sufficient supply of launch test assets and spares is retained to sustain the deployed force of such missiles through 2030.

(c) LIMITATION ON TERMINATION OF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM PENDING REPORT.—No funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the termination of any Minuteman III ICBM modernization program, or for the withdrawal of any Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile from the active force, until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) A detailed strategic justification for the proposal to reduce the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force from 500 to 450 missiles, including an analysis of the effects of the reduction on the ability of the United States to assure allies and dissuade potential competitors.

(2) A detailed analysis of the strategic ramifications of continuing to equip a portion of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force with multiple independent warheads rather than single warheads as recommended by past reviews of the United States nuclear posture.

(3) An assessment of the test assets and spares required to maintain a force of 500 deployed Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles through 2030.

(4) An assessment of the test assets and spares required to maintain a force of 450 deployed Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles through 2030.

(5) An inventory of currently available Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile test assets and spares.

(6) A plan to sustain and complete the modernization of all deployed and spare Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, a test plan, and an analysis of the funding required to carry out modernization of all deployed and spare Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

(7) An assessment of whether halting upgrades to the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles withdrawn from the deployed force would compromise the ability of those missiles to serve as test assets.

(8) A description of the plan of the Department of Defense for extending the life of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile force beyond fiscal year 2030.

(d) ICBM MODERNIZATION PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''ICBM Modernization program'' means each of the following for the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile:

(1) The Guidance Replacement Program (GRP).

(2) The Propulsion Replacement Program (PRP).

(3) The Propulsion System Rocket Engine (PSRE) program.

(4) The Safety Enhanced Reentry Vehicle (SERV) program.

SA 4275. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, 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. ADVANCED ALUMINUM AEROSTRUCTURES INITIATIVE.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force is hereby increased by $2,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force, as increased by subsection (a), $2,000,000 may be available for Aerospace Technology Development and Demonstration (PE #603211F) for the Advanced Aluminum Aerostructures Initiative (A3I).

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(4) for operation and maintenance for the Air Force is hereby decreased by $2,000,000.

SA 4276. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. LEGGED MOBILITY ROBOTIC RESEARCH.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $1,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by subsection (a), $1,000,000 may be available for Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology (PE #602601A) for legged mobility robotic research for military applications.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army is hereby decreased by $1,000,000.

SA 4277. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. ARDEC COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIP, PROJECT NUMBER 859.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $1,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by subsection (a), $1,000,000 may be available for Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness, and Safety (PE #605805A) for ARDEC Commercial Partnership, Project No. 859.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army is hereby decreased by $1,000,000.

SA 4278. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1008. INCORPORATION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.

(a) STATUS OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The Classified Annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to accompany S. 2766 of the 109th Congress and transmitted to the President is hereby incorporated into this Act.

(b) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF ACT.—The amounts specified in the Classified Annex are not in addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by other provisions of this Act.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act that are made available for a program, project, or activity referred to in the Classified Annex may only be expended for such program, project, or activity in accordance with such terms, conditions, limitations, restrictions, and requirements as are set out for such program, project, or activity in the Classified Annex.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The President shall provide for appropriate distribution of the Classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

SA 4279. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. SALAZAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 93, strike lines 23 through 25 and insert the following:

(c) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENT CONDITIONAL ON PERFORMANCE.—No payment may be made under an incentives clause under this section unless the Secretary determines that the contractor concerned has satisfactorily performed its duties under such incentives clause.

(2) PAYMENT CONTINGENT ON APPROPRIATIONS.—An incentives clause under this section shall specify that the obligation of the Government to make payment under such incentives clause is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose. Amounts appropriated for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, shall be available for payments under incentives clauses under this section.

SA 4280. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1223. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTS ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMON DEFENSE.—Section 1003 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(b) COST-SHARING REPORT.—Section 1313 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2894; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

SA 4281. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 296, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

''(c) INCREMENTS.—In the event any increment of a major automated information system program separately meets the requirements for treatment as a major automated information system program, the provisions of this chapter shall apply to such increment as well as to the overall major automated information system program of which such increment is a part.

On page 297, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

''(c) BASELINE.—(1) For purposes of this chapter, the initial submittal to Congress of the documents required by subsection (a) with respect to a major automated information system program shall constitute the original estimate or information originally submitted on such program for purposes of the reports and determinations on program changes in section 2445c of this title.

''(2) An adjustment or revision of the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program may be treated as the original estimate or information originally submitted on the program if the adjustment or revision is the result of a critical change in the program covered by section 2445c(d) of this title.

''(3) In the event of an adjustment or revision to the original estimate or information originally submitted on a program under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense shall include in the next budget justification documents submitted under subsection (a) after such adjustment or revision a notification to the congressional defense committees of such adjustment or revision, together with the reasons for such adjustment or revision.

On page 302, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

''(g) PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—(1) If the determination of a critical change to a program is made by the senior Department official responsible for the program under subsection (d)(2) and a report is not submitted to Congress within the 60-day period provided by subsection (d)(1), appropriated funds may not be obligated for any major contract under the program.

''(2) The prohibition on the obligation of funds for a program under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply on the date on which Congress has received a report in compliance with the requirements of subsection (d)(2).

SA 4282. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO SERVE IN THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the desirability and feasibility of offering incentives to covered members and former members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of encouraging such members to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(b) COVERED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—For purposes of this section, covered members and former members of the Armed Forces are the following:

(1) Members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(2) Former members of the Armed Forces within two years of separation from service in the Armed Forces.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—

(1) NATURE OF INCENTIVES.—In considering incentives for purposes of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretaries shall consider such incentives, whether monetary or otherwise and whether or not authorized by current law or regulations, as the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(2) TARGETING OF INCENTIVES.—In assessing any incentive for purposes of the report, the Secretaries shall give particular attention to the utility of such incentive in—

(A) encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former of the Armed Forces who have provided border patrol or border security assistance to the Bureau as part of their duties as members of the Armed Forces; and

(B) leveraging military training and experience by accelerating training, or allowing credit to be applied to related areas of training, required for service with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(3) PAYMENT.—In assessing incentives for purposes of the report, the Secretaries shall assume that any costs of such incentives shall be borne by the Department of Homeland Security.

(d) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of various monetary and non-monetary incentives considered for purposes of the report.

(2) An assessment of the desirability and feasibility of utilizing any such incentive for the purpose specified in subsection (a), including an assessment of the particular utility of such incentive in encouraging service in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection after service in the Armed Forces by covered members and former members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (c)(2).

(3) Any other matters that the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services, Homeland Security, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 4283. Mr. LEVIN (for Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. BINGAMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN WEAPONS PLATFORMS.

(a) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to improve the fuel efficiency of weapons platforms, consistent with mission requirements, in order to—

(1) enhance platform performance;

(2) reduce the size of the fuel logistics systems;

(3) reduce the burden high fuel consumption places on agility;

(4) reduce operating costs; and

(5) dampen the financial impact of volatile oil prices.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility of designating a senior Department of Defense official to be responsible for implementing the policy established by subsection (a).

(B) A summary of the recommendations made as of the time of the report by—

(i) the Energy Security Integrated Product Team established by the Secretary of Defense in April 2006;

(ii) the Defense Science Board Task Force on Department of Defense Energy Strategy established by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on May 2, 2006; and

(iii) the January 2001 Defense Science Board Task Force report on Improving Fuel Efficiency of Weapons Platforms.

(C) For each recommendation summarized under subparagraph (B)—

(i) the steps that the Department has taken to implement such recommendation;

(ii) any additional steps the Department plans to take to implement such recommendation; and

(iii) for any recommendation that the Department does not plan to implement, the reasons for the decision not to implement such recommendation.

(D) An assessment of the extent to which the research, development, acquisition, and logistics guidance and directives of the Department for weapons platforms are appropriately designed to address the policy established by subsection (a).

(E) An assessment of the extent to which such guidance and directives are being carried out in the research, development, acquisition, and logistics programs of the Department.

(F) A description of any additional actions that, in the view of the Secretary, may be needed to implement the policy established by subsection (a).

SA 4284. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE UNDER THE AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS' PROTECTION ACT OF 2002.

Section 2013(13)(A) of the American Servicemembers' Protection Act of 2002 (title II of Public Law 107–206; 116 Stat. 909; 22 U.S.C. 7432(13)(A)) is amended by striking ''or 5''.

SA 4285. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. LUGAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 480, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 1304. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON PROVISION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) SOVIET NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 1991.—Section 211(b) of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (title II of Public Law 102–228; 22 U.S.C. 2551 note) is repealed.

(2) COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 1993.—Section 1203(d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (title XII of Public Law 103–160; 22 U.S.C. 5952(d)) is repealed.

(3) RUSSIAN CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION FACILITIES.—Section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) is repealed.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF OTHER RESTRICTIONS.—

Section 502 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–511; 106 Stat. 3338; 22 U.S.C. 5852) shall not apply to any Cooperative Threat Reduction program.

SA 4286. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 822 and insert the following:

SEC. 822. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS REGARDING SPECIALTY METALS.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—Subsection (i) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting '', DUAL-USE ITEMS, AND ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS'' after ''COMMERCIAL ITEMS'';

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''this section'';

(3) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by inserting ''described in subsection (b)(1)'' after ''commercial items''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) This section is not applicable to—

''(A) a contract or subcontract for the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metals described in subsections (b)(2) and (b)(3); or

''(B) specialty metals that are incorporated into an electronic component, where the value of the specialty metal used in the component is de minimis in relation to the value of the electronic component.

''(3) For purposes of paragraph (2)(A), a commercial item does not include—

''(A) any item that contains noncommercial modifications that cost or are expected to cost, in the aggregate, more than 5 percent of the total price of such item;

''(B) any item that would not be considered to be a commercial item, but for sales to government entities or inclusion in items that are sold to government entities;

''(C) forgings or castings for military unique end items;

''(D) fasteners other than commercial off-the-shelf items (as defined in section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c)); or

''(E) specialty metals.''.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN DUAL-USE ITEMS TO FACILITATE CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN DUAL-USE ITEMS TO FACILITATE CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the procurement of an item from a contractor or a first-tier subcontractor if the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department determines that—

''(1) the item is or will be produced using the same production facilities, a common supply chain, and the same or similar production processes that are used for the production of similar items delivered to non-defense customers; and

''(2) the contractor or subcontractor has made a contractual commitment to purchase a quality, grade, and amount of domestically-melted specialty metals for use by the purchaser during the period of contract performance in the production of the item and other similar items delivered to non-defense customers that is not less that the greater of—

''(A) the amount of specialty metals that is purchased by the contractor for use in the item delivered to the Department of Defense; or

''(B) 40 percent of the amount of specialty metals purchased by the contractor or subcontractor for use during such period in the production of the item and similar items delivered to non-defense contractors.''.

(c) DE MINIMIS STANDARD FOR SPECIALTY METALS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) MINIMUM THRESHOLD FOR SPECIALTY METALS.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may accept delivery of an item containing specialty metals that were not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States if the total amount of noncompliant specialty metals in the item does not exceed 2 percent of the total amount of specialty metals in the item.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to items accepted for delivery on or after that date.

(2) CIVIL-MILITARY INTEGRATION.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to contracts entered into on or after that date.

SA 4287. Mr. LEVIN (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. SENSE OF SENATE ON NOMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL TO SERVE AS DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION ON A PERMANENT BASIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Congress established the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense in 1983 to ensure the operational effectiveness and suitability of weapon systems in combat.

(2) The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation serves as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on operational test and evaluation and is vital to ensuring the operational effectiveness of weapon systems in combat.

(3) The position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has been held on an acting basis since February 15, 2005.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should submit to the Senate the nomination of an individual for the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as soon as practicable.

SA 4288. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 746. STUDY OF HEALTH EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO DEPLETED URANIUM.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary for Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a comprehensive study of the health effects of exposure to depleted uranium munitions on uranium-exposed soldiers and on children of uranium-exposed soldiers who were born after the exposure of the uranium-exposed soldiers to depleted uranium.

(b) URANIUM-EXPOSED SOLDIERS.—In this section, the term ''uranium-exposed soldiers'' means a member or former member of the Armed Forces who handled, came in contact with, or had the likelihood of contact with depleted uranium munitions while on active duty, including members and former members who—

(1) were exposed to smoke from fires resulting from the burning of vehicles containing depleted uranium munitions or fires at depots at which depleted uranium munitions were stored;

(2) worked within environments containing depleted uranium dust or residues from depleted uranium munitions;

(3) were within a structure or vehicle while it was struck by a depleted uranium munition;

(4) climbed on or entered equipment or structures struck by a depleted uranium munition; or

(5) were medical personnel who provided initial treatment to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4).

SA 4289. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subsection (k).

SA 4290. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 707. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY OF SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (a) of section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—A member'' and inserting ''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member'';

(2) by striking ''after the member completes'' and all that follows through ''one or more whole years following such date''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to a member who is enrolled, or is eligible to enroll, in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5.''.

(b) CONDITION FOR TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) PERIOD OF COVERAGE.—(1) TRICARE Standard'' and all that follows through ''(4) Eligibility'' and inserting ''(b) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY UPON TERMINATION OF SERVICE.—Eligibility''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Such section is further amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e);

(B) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (e) and transferring such subsection within such section so as to appear following subsection (d); and

(C) by striking paragraph (3) of subsection (f).

(2) The heading for such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1076d. TRICARE program: TRICARE standard coverage for members of the Selected Reserve''.

(d) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.—Effective October 1, 2007, section 1076b of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Effective October 1, 2007, the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 1076b; and

(2) by striking the item relating to section 1076d and inserting the following:

''1076d. TRICARE program: TRICARE Standard coverage for members of the Selected Reserve.''.

(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Enrollments in TRICARE Standard that are in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on such day, shall be continued until terminated after such day under such section 1076d as amended by this section.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that health care under TRICARE Standard is provided under section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section, beginning not later than October 1, 2007.

SA 4291. Mr. FRIST (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 409, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand; as follows:

On page 2, in the third Whereas clause of the resolution, strike ''Agency'' and insert ''Program''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, June 22, 2006, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2747, to enhance energy efficiency and conserve oil and natural gas, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact John Peschke at (202) 224–4797 or Shannon Ewan at (202) 224–7555.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on ''The OFHEO Report of the Special Examination of Fannie Mae.''

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on a nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting to consider pending committee business.

Agenda

Legislation

1. S. 2145, Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2005;

2. S. 1554, a bill to establish an intergovernmental grant program to identify and develop homeland security information, equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services to further the homeland security of the United States and to address the homeland security needs of Federal, State, and local governments;

3. S. 1741, Disaster Area Health and Environmental Monitoring Act;

4. S. 1838, Federal and District of Columbia Real Property Act of 2005;

5. S. 2068, a bill to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia;

6. S. 2146, a bill to extend relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees;

7. S. 2296, Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Latin Americans of Japanese Descent Act;

8. H.R. 3508, 2005 District of Columbia Omnibus Authorization Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., in the Senate Dirksen Office Building, Room 226. The agenda will be provided when it becomes available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Judicial Nominations'' on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 2 p.m., in the Senate Dirksen Office Building Room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: The Honorable Thad Cochran; the Honorable Trent Lott; the Honorable James Inhofe; and the Honorable Luis Fortuño.

Panel II: Jerome A. Holmes to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Panel III: Daniel P. Jordan III to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi; Gustavo A. Gelpe to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed briefing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Subcommittee on Fisheries and the Coast Guard be authorized to meet on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 10:30 a.m. on the Coast Guard's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund and Waste Management be authorized to hold a hearing on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct oversight of the Superfund Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Pollock and Alison Garfield, detailees

with the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KING OF THAILAND TO THE THRONE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 409, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 409) commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble as amended be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 409) was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to, as follows:

On page 2, in the third Whereas clause of the resolution strike ''Agency'' and insert ''Program''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF AN ANNUAL NATIONAL TIME-OUT DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 482, and that the Senate then proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 482) supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD as if read, without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 482) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

(S. RES. 482)

Whereas according to an Institute of Medicine (referred to in this resolution as the ''IOM'') report entitled ''To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System'', published in 2000, between 44,000 and 98,000 hospitalized people in the United States die each year due to medical errors, and untold thousands more suffer injury or illness as a result of preventable errors;

Whereas the IOM report recommends the establishment of a national goal of reducing the number of medical errors by 50 percent over 5 years;

Whereas there are more than 40,000,000 inpatient surgery procedures and 31,000,000 outpatient surgery procedures performed annually in the United States;

Whereas it is the right of every patient to receive the highest quality of care in all surgical settings;

Whereas a patient is the most vulnerable and unable to make decisions on their own behalf during a surgical or invasive procedure due to anesthesia or other sedation;

Whereas improved communication among the surgical team and a reduction in medical errors in the operating room are essential for optimal outcomes during operative or other invasive procedures;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Society for Healthcare Risk Management celebrated a National Time-Out Day on June 23, 2004, to promote the adoption of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations' universal protocol for preventing wrong site surgery errors in operating rooms in the United States;

Whereas the Senate during the 109th Congress supported a National Time-Out Day in 2005 on behalf of the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Society for Healthcare Risk Management to promote the adoption of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations' universal protocol for preventing errors in the operating room;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, joined by coalition partners, celebrated a National Time-Out Day on June 22, 2005, for the purpose of promoting safe medication administration practices and the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses distributed ''Safe Medication Administration Tool Kits'' to more than 5,000 hospitals and 13,000 nurse managers or educators;

Whereas the 109th Congress passed the Patient Safety and Quality Improvement Act of 2005 to provide for the improvement of patient safety and to reduce the incidence of events that adversely affect patient safety;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses develops and issues, with coalition partners, universally-accepted authoritative statements, recommended guidelines, best practice guidelines, and competency statements for how to provide optimal care for patients in the operating room;

Whereas there is nationally-focused attention on improving patient safety in all healthcare facilities through the reduction of medical errors;

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, the recognized leader in patient safety in the operating room, promotes the highest quality of patient care during all operative or invasive procedures; and

Whereas the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses designates and celebrates National Time-Out Day on June 21, 2006, and each third Wednesday of June thereafter to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room by focusing on the reduction of medical errors, fostering better communication among the members of the surgical team, and collaborating with coalition partners to establish universal protocols to increase quality and safety for surgical patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideal of an annual National Time-Out Day as designated by the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses for ensuring patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room; and

(2) congratulates perioperative nurses and representatives of surgical teams for working together to protect patient safety during all operative and other invasive procedures.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: Calendar Nos. 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, and 712. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Robert M. Couch, of Alabama, to be President, Government National Mortgage Association.

James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development for a term of five years.

FEDERAL DEPOSITE INSURANCE CORPORATION

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring July 15, 2013. (Reappointment)

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2007.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, June 16. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2766, the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we sent the emergency supplemental appropriations conference report to the President with a 98-to-1 vote. We also made some progress on the Defense authorization bill, and we will continue on that bill tomorrow. Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN will be here tomorrow. However, we will not have any rollcall votes during Friday's session. Senators should be reminded that there is a rollcall vote scheduled for Monday's session at 5:30 p.m. on a U.S. circuit judge, and there may be additional votes Monday evening on amendments to the Defense bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Friday, June 16, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged, pursuant to an order of the Senate of January 20, 2005, from further consideration of the following nomination and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*JON T. RYMER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION.

*NOMINEE HAS COMMITTED TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, June 15, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ROBERT M. COUCH, OF ALABAMA, TO BE PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION.

JAMES B. LOCKHART III, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

SHEILA C. BAIR, OF KANSAS, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

SHEILA C. BAIR, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 15, 2013.

SHEILA C. BAIR, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JULY 15, 2007.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

KATHLEEN L. CASEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2011.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE NASHVILLE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to mark the final performance of the Nashville Symphony Orchestra at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center this May 27th.

Since its premier season in 1980–1981, the Tennessee Performing Arts Center has provided a magnificent setting for the Nashville Symphony.

Today we remember fondly the years our symphony has spent at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center, but look forward to many wonderful performances in the new world class Schermerhorn Symphony Center.

It is appropriate that the new facility be named after Principal Conductor Kenneth Schermerhorn, who led the symphony so capably for 20 years. We miss Maestro Schermerhorn, but I know he'd be pleased to see the symphony making the move to this new, world class space.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the members, staff, and many, many fans of the Nashville Symphony Orchestra as they celebrate their success.

ON DRILLING IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I made the attached statement in opposition to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge on May 25, 2006:

Here we go again. For decades, this Congress has rejected attempts to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in recognition of the fact that American working families do not want it. It is bad for our economy and it is a violation of human rights.

The effect on our economy of choosing a path of yesterday over a positive vision of a renewable energy future is stark. A report by researchers at the University of California at Berkeley found that ''Across a broad range of scenarios, the renewable energy sector generates more jobs per average megawatt of power installed, and per unit of energy produced, than the fossil fuel-based energy sector.''

Drilling in the Arctic Refuge is also a violation of the international human rights of the native Gwich'in people. It threatens the Porcupine Caribou Herd on which the Gwich'in depend for subsistence, culture and religion. We have no right to threaten their culture and livelihood in order to prop up an archaic energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

TRIBUTE TO WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the California Democratic Congressional Delegation, I rise in gratitude to recognize the efforts of the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, INPEA, in their extraordinary attempts to raise awareness of elder abuse (which encompasses neglect or mal or mistreatment) throughout the world. The nature of abuse as a hidden problem is now universally accepted. INPEA, as coauthor of the report Missing Voice, 2002, with the World Health Organization, states that ''abuse, neglect and financial exploitation of elders are much more common than societies admit.'' Missing Voices demonstrates clear links between elder abuse, and disempowerment and discrimination. INPEA claims that ''ultimately the challenge for us all is not only to listen to what has been said, but to believe and act upon it.'' The key objective of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, WEAAD, is to raise awareness of the ubiquity of elder abuse and its consequences throughout the world.

World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, seeks to foster independence and empowerment for older adults to act for themselves and on their own behalf; and to enable older adults to exercise their rights and advocate for their own interests. WEAAD also attempts to educate people that older adults need to be aware of the problem and of their rights, as well as available services and resources in their community. Due to the collaborative efforts across the nation, World Elder Abuse Awareness Day places an emphasis on the need to encourage closer and more positive contact between generations and to strengthen the positive attitudes among youth toward their elders.

Continued education and prevention efforts worldwide need to emphasize closer relations between generations and I join my colleagues in recognizing all of those community groups across our great Nation that have made this issue a priority in their value system. Such laudable family tenets will only serve to create a more caring, thus stable society.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues—Representatives CAPPS, CARDOZA, ESHOO, HONDA, LANTOS, LEE, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, LORETTA SANCHEZ, SCHIFF and TAUSCHER—join me in recognizing INPEA for their dedication and tireless efforts in raising awareness of elderly abuse and its consequences. Our communities will be strengthened as a result of such international efforts being promoted today, June 15, 2006, at the United Nations Headquarters.

HONORING THE JOHN OVERTON HIGH SCHOOL BAND

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 65th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Every December Americans gather in Hawaii to remember the day that so changed the world. This year, the John Overton High School band has been selected to represent Tennessee as we commemorate Pearl Harbor and honor those who died there on that fateful December day. Making their second appearance at this event, it's clear we're being well represented by members of the John Overton High School band.

The band will take part in a parade marking the day, perform at the USS *Missouri* Memorial and lay a wreath at the USS *Arizona* Memorial. This once in a lifetime opportunity will provide firsthand experience and insight into the bombing of Pearl Harbor and I know the students will never forget their time there.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating the John Overton High School band, and their leader Jo Ann Hood, on this wonderful honor. We applaud their hard work and their commitment to honoring America's fallen heroes.

ON DRILLING FOR OIL AND GAS ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

HON. DENNIS KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I gave the attached statement, in support of the OCS Drilling Ban Amendment to the FY2007 Interior Appropriations Bill, H.R. 5386 on May 18, 2006:

I rise in strong support of this amendment to preserve the popular and longstanding ban on drilling off our coasts. First, let's be clear that there is no such thing as drilling for gas only. Even the Administration and the energy industry have dismissed the idea as unworkable. So this is nothing more than a fig leaf.

But it's a fig leaf that will bring toxic contamination to our marine environment merely three miles off our coasts. And it could open the door to drilling in the Great Lakes, which is also opposed by Great Lakes residents.

We cannot forget that new drilling will have no effect on energy prices for years. In contrast, we have technologies to reduce our addiction to oil and natural gas that are ready to go today. The problem is that we're subsidizing unsustainable energy production like drilling for natural gas and oil while failing to fund real renewable solutions. I

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL J. SCOTT BURHOE

HON. JO ANN DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Coast Guard Officers are measured by the depth of their dedication to protecting our country and its citizens from all enemies, natural disasters and inclement weather. On June 16, 2006 Rear Admiral J. Scott Burhoe will conclude his tenure as Commanding Officer, Coast Guard Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia. Training Center Yorktown is the largest training center in the Coast Guard offering over 100 courses annually to over 8,000 U.S. Coast Guard active duty, reserve, civilian and auxiliary personnel, employees of numerous state and federal agencies, and members of allied nations.

Since assuming Command of the Training Center in June of 2003, Rear Admiral Burhoe has demonstrated exemplary professional competence, leadership, and initiative, ensuring the safe and effective training to 25,000 Coast Guard members, personnel from U.S. and foreign armed forces, and civilian agencies from more than 75 countries.

Envisioning improved global maritime security, Rear Admiral Burhoe empowered deployable teams on 400 missions to 87 countries, training over 4,000 foreign students which led to events such as the first seizure of a fishing vessel in the Republic of Georgia and reduced fees that Lloyd's of London charges world maritime shipping entering the Port of Aden, Yemen.

His leadership cultivated stellar performance and planning as he hosted two Joint Civilian Orientation Conferences and Mission Day events, providing an opportunity for a diverse group of influential U.S. leaders and Congressional staffers to understand the missions and capabilities of the Coast Guard.

Throughout his time as Training Center Commanding Officer, Rear Admiral Burhoe, fostered and encouraged strong community support through several command sponsored events such as blood drives, Boy Scouts, Toys for Tots, Salvation Army, Yorktown Day, Partnership in Education and others. In the last two years alone, Rear Admiral Burhoe has arranged for more than 600 computers to be donated to local public schools through the Federal Computers for Schools Program.

With his full support, a Memorandum of Understanding was developed with York River Academy, providing local students with a summer job opportunity and an introduction to both the Coast Guard and government employment as well as affording students the opportunity to use and improve their technical skills.

Rear Admiral Burhoe displayed visionary leadership as he revised and guided the mission of the Training Center's Learning Center. Today' s Learning Center not only provides a quiet place for junior personnel to study and take military advancement tests, but serves as a liaison for members to more than 36 colleges and universities offering on-line education, provides office space for two universities who have offered 11 college courses attended by 100 members, hosted two Education Fairs attended by 15 colleges and universities and has assisted 9 members complete bachelor degree requirements.

Rear Admiral Burhoe has also become active in both the Williamsburg and Peninsula Chambers of Commerce, educating members of the on and off duty efforts of Training Center personnel as well as providing recommendations on how the Chambers' could best support area military personnel.

On behalf of my constituents and the communities adjacent to the Training Center, I extend our congratulations to a friend and neighbor, Scott Burhoe, on his accomplishments and recent promotion to Rear Admiral, Lower Half and extend best wishes to him during his next assignment as Assistant Commandant for Governmental and Public Affairs.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, 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. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the misclassification of employees as independent contractors is a significant problem that annually leads to billions of dollars in lost Federal tax revenue. Employers who misclassify workers as independent contractors do not pay payroll and other taxes on those workers. The employers also gain an unfair advantage over their competitors by eliminating a piece of their labor costs. In the construction industry, for example, a contractor who chose to misclassify his workers as independent contractors would be able to easily underbid other construction companies who followed the law. Misclassification hurts workers and fair employers and has a significant monetary impact on government revenues.

The misclassification of employees as independent contractors is not a new problem. Over the past several decades, the IRS and Congress have periodically investigated the issue of misclassification. In 1984, in an estimate of the extent of misclassification for 5.2 million businesses, the IRS found employers had misclassified 3.4 million employees. Approximately 750,000 employers had misclassified employees as independent contractors. More recent estimates in the 1990s have estimated that the percentage of employer misclassifying employees has grown even beyond the 15 percent found in 1984. An independent study issued by Harvard Law School's Labor and Worklife Program, found abuses of the term ''independent contractor'' led up to 19 percent of workers across all industries being misclassified in the State of Massachusetts. Clearly, this problem is not going away on its own.

This misclassification is not merely a problem for workers who can unfairly be left without workers compensation or unemployment insurance. It also impacts local, State and Federal government revenue streams. In 1984, an IRS review found at least $1.6 billion in Federal tax revenue was lost due to misclassification in that year alone. A 2005 study on the issue in Maine also found a significant loss of State income tax revenue. While the statewide study of misclassification in Maine did not estimate the loss of Federal income tax revenue, it is evident the misclassification issue continues to negatively impact the revenues of the Federal Government as well.

We cannot, in good conscience, continue to ignore the problem of misclassification and its impact on Federal revenues. In a budget climate where many good and necessary programs are shortchanged, we cannot afford to continue losing billions of dollars each year to a problem for which there is no excuse and that we all can agree needs to be fixed.

IN RECOGNITION OF CARLOS E. PERNELL

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, SGT Carlos E. Pernell, 25, from Prattville, Alabama, died on June 6, 2006, in Iraq. Sergeant Pernell was assigned to the Army's B Company, 46th Engineer Battalion at Fort Rucker, Alabama, and according to initial reports was killed due to injuries when his camp came under indirect fire. His survivors include his wife Tiffanie; his daughter Kassidie; his mother Hattie of Prattville, Alabama; and his father, Eugene of Montgomery, Alabama.

Carlos Pernell loved sports, and was a proud father. Like all soldiers, he dutifully left behind his family and loved ones to serve our country overseas.

Words cannot express the sense of sadness we have for his family, and for the gratitude our country feels for his service. Sergeant Pernell died serving not just the United States, but the entire cause of liberty, on a noble mission to help spread the cause of freedom in Iraq and liberate an oppressed people from tyrannical rule. He was a true American.

We will forever hold him closely in our hearts, and remember his sacrifice and that of his family as a remembrance of his bravery and willingness to serve. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the House's remembrance on this mournful day.

WAIVING POINTS ON ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2006

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FY2006 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, which provides $2.325 billion for international assistance programs, $162 million above the House-passed level. The bill provides $1.485 billion for Iraq reconstruction and fully funds the administration's request for Afghanistan.

I am particularly pleased that the conference report provides $50 million above the President's requests for Sudan, Liberia and Jordan as well as $20 million for Haiti. I am also pleased that we were able to include an additional $25 million for refugee assistance and $25 million in disaster assistance above the request level.

In light of the escalating security costs in Iraq and Afghanistan, I regret that we were not able to fully fund the administration's request for operating expenses, but I am pleased that the conference report significantly increases funding above the House-passed level.

While the conference report fully funds the President's request for assistance to Afghanistan, $46 million in program funds for that country is not even a drop in the bucket. In light of the increasing violence and fragile political situation in Afghanistan, it is shameful that the administration failed to push for the $600 million that Ambassador Neumann indicated was necessary.

I applaud the funding in this bill for Sudan and for other humanitarian needs in Africa. However, I was disappointed that the administration did not seek robust funding for the fledgling democracy in Liberia and the critical transition in Haiti. The funding added by Congress—an additional $50 million for Liberia and $20 million for Haiti—will provide critical short-term support to meet refugee and humanitarian needs as well as help to stabilize these countries during the initial months of their transitions.

I regret that our conference allocation only allowed us to maintain half of the $100 million for Jordan that was passed by the Senate. Jordan has been a steadfast and important ally in the war on terror, as was clearly demonstrated by the assistance of Jordanian intelligence in the targeting of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. It is a shame that arbitrary limits placed on this supplemental have prevented us from fully funding this priority country.

Finally, let me speak to the bulk of the funding in the Foreign Operations section of the bill, which is for activities in Iraq. I support the additional funding because I think we owe our men and women in uniform in Iraq every chance to enhance their safety and return home speedily. To this end, I am glad that the conference report includes at least $50 million for democracy and governance activities and $50 million for the Community Action Program. These programs are having a tremendous impact and are more cost effective than many of the investments we have made thus far.

However, I am dismayed that neither the House nor the Senate included placed these additional funds under the oversight mandate of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. By failing to include this language, the House and Senate majority sent a clear message to American taxpayers that while Congress expects them to bear the burden of reconstructing Iraq, we are not interested in taking every precaution necessary to ensure that their money is accountably and effectively spent.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

HONORING DR. DONALD R. KENNON ON HIS 25TH ANNIVERSARY AT THE U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and pay tribute to a friend who, today, is marking his 25th anniversary with the United States Capitol Historical Society. Dr. Donald R. Kennon is the Society's Chief Historian and Vice President of Scholarship and Education.

A humble man, Dr. Kennon's career has been marked by accomplishment. He is the author of two books for the Society, including The Speakers of the House of Representatives: A Bibliography (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), and The Committee on Ways and Means: A Bicentennial History, 1789–1989 (Government Printing Office, 1989), and has edited more than a dozen volumes of the Society's symposia publications.

He has been Chief Historian since 1987 after joining the Society in 1981 as an Associate Historian. He holds a Ph.D. in American History from the University of Maryland and has taught as a visiting professor at the University of New Mexico. His doctoral dissertation focused on antebellum reform in a changing society, both legally and morally in the years surrounding the Civil War.

He is treasurer of the Abraham Lincoln Institute, a scholarly organization founded in 1998 to garner public attention on writings and research regarding our nation's 16th president.

Dr. Kennon has also very ably directed educational symposia, publications and outreach programs, while writing and lecturing about the history of this body, Congress, and the Capitol.

An avid collector, Dr. Kennon has one of the area's largest collections of antique stereo graphic images, including many of the Capitol building and Congress. He has a keen sense of humor and loves baseball. When he's not at games, he collects antique radios and vintage slot machines.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to honor Dr. Kennon and I ask my colleagues to rise and join me in congratulating him on 25 years at the United States Capitol Historical Society and in wishing him continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the following bills on June 12, 2006:

H. Res. 794, Recognizing the 17th anniversary of the massacre in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes (Rollcall No. 251): Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

H. Res. 804, Condemning the unauthorized, inappropriate, and coerced ordination of Catholic bishops by the People's Republic of China (Rollcall No. 252): Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

H. Res. 608, Condemning the escalating levels of religious persecution in the People's Republic of China (Rollcall No. 253). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

H. Con. Res. 338, Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the activities of Islamist terrorist organizations in the Western Hemisphere (Rollcall No. 254). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

And finally, Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" with regard to Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 857, waiving points of order against consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (Rollcall No. 255).

HONORING ZACH SHEEHAN

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a student from Southerland Hills Middle School in Boulder, Colorado.

Zach Sheehan has been selected to present his award winning history project at the Smithsonian National Museum of America. Zack's project was one of a handful selected by the National History Day program from hundreds of thousands nationwide.

Each project reflected on this year's National History Day theme, "Taking a Stand in History: People, Ideas, Events." Zack's project highlighted a scientist in Boulder who has had a major impact on increasing public awareness of global warming and helping spur the government to slow global warming.

It is my view that, as the world leader in science and technology, the United States must develop solutions that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These solutions are of vital importance to protecting our planet's resources and permitting the economic and social progress for our Nation and the world.

In the Old Hall of the House of Representatives, Clio, the Muse of History, stands in a winged chariot representing the passage of time. Clio is looking back; recording events as they occur. Mr. Speaker, this statue served as a poignant reminder to our forbearers of the importance of history as a guide to and a watchdog for the history that is made here every day.

History education is an integral part of the education of future generations of Americans. I would like commend the National History Day program for empowering teachers to improve history education and influencing students to follow Zack Sheehan's exemplary example.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO THE BASCOM MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay tribute to a special company in Ohio. This year, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company in Bascom, Ohio, celebrates 100 years of dedicated service.

Mr. Speaker, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company in Bascom, Ohio, is one of the oldest mutual telephone companies in the State of Ohio. Founded in 1906, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company has succeeded in providing quality telephone service to the residents of Bascom, Ohio.

Beginning operations on February 22, 1906, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company, known as Bascom Farmers Mutual Telephone Company from 1916 to 1953, began providing telephone service to the residents of Bascom, Ohio.

At the time of its inception in 1906, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company began operations with only eighteen members seeking the company's services. Today, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company, who is a vital component to the telecommunications infrastructure of Northwest Ohio, proudly serves over 940 members.

Throughout the decades, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company, as a product of Seneca County, has clearly distinguished itself as an innovator and industry leader. Through a dedicated workforce, top-notch facilities, and excellent customer service, The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company has set a benchmark for how to run a successful business.

The real success of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company comes not only from the technological advancements of its facilities, but from its employees. The management and staff of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company have indeed provided their customers with the service and dependability that are expected of a first-class company.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to the employees and the legacy of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company. As all who benefit from this fine establishment gather to celebrate its 100th anniversary of service, I am confident that the excellent employees will continue the successes of The Bascom Mutual Telephone Company into the future.

TRIBUTE TO MOUNT PISGAH BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the historic Mount Pisgah Baptist Church in Orangeburg, South Carolina as it celebrates its 153rd anniversary on June 25, 2006. Mount Pisgah has been a beacon in times of joy and sorrow for the Orangeburg community, and I congratulate Reverend D. Edward Chaney and his congregation on this significant milestone in the life of the church.

Mount Pisgah Baptist Church began as a gathering of a small group of Christian slaves in 1863. Two years later, this group broke off from the First Baptist Church in Orangeburg. They called their new church Sunny Side Baptist. By 1868, the congregation had grown to fifty members, and two years later they changed the name to Mount Pisgah Baptist Church. The renamed church began to grow in size and its ministry. By 1877, Mount Pisgah boasted a congregation of 283 members.

The 20th century was momentous in the life of Mount Pisgah. Remarkably from 1901 until 2000, the church had only three pastors. Reverend Nelson Nix presided over the congregation from 1900–1945. During his ministry, the first church building burned in 1902. However, Reverend Nix and the congregation rebuilt the structure that is still in use today.

Reverend John D. Rhodes served as Mount Pisgah's pastor from 1945–1968, and was followed by Reverend F.G.S. Everett who led the congregation from 1969–2001. During Reverend Everett's distinguished service, Mount Pisgah was listed on the Registry of Historical Places.

Today, Reverend Chaney presides over a dynamic church that is among the oldest in Orangeburg and South Carolina. The church has added a multipurpose education complex, and more property has been acquired for future expansion. Due to the enormous growth in the church, Reverend Chaney has initiated a Million Dollar Capital Campaign for church improvements and new construction.

Mount Pisgah currently has 17 ministries that include an outreach radio broadcast that reaches far beyond Orangeburg County into neighboring Calhoun, Colleton, and Dorchester counties. The church is also renowned for its music ministry that performs inspired Christmas and Easter concerts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mount Pisgah Baptist Church on its 153rd anniversary. This vibrant church has contributed to the rich history of Orangeburg and South Carolina, and I offer my congratulations and wish Mount Pisgah continued success and Godspeed!

INTRODUCTION OF THE STEEL FINANCING FAIRNESS ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Steel Financing Fairness Act. This bill helps our Nation's beleaguered steel industry by stopping the government from forcing American steel workers to subsidize their foreign competitors. Specifically, the bill prohibits the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and the Export-Import Bank (EXIMBANK) from providing any assistance to countries that subsidize their steel industries. The Steel Financing Fairness Act also instructs the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce America's contribution to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) by a prorated share of the IMF's assistance to countries that subsidize their steel industries.

One of the problems facing America's domestic steel industry is that it must compete with foreign industries that receive subsidies from their governments. Some of these subsidies are explicitly intended to provide these companies with a non-market advantage over American steel producers. The U.S. Government further compounds the damage caused by these subsidies by forcing the domestic steel producers to support their major competitors through taxpayer-funded programs.

For example, according to the most recent figures available, the five countries with the greatest EXIMBANK exposure are all among the top ten exporters of steel and/or steel products to the United States. In fact, EXIMBANK has provided almost $20 billion of U.S. taxpayer support to these countries.

Meanwhile, OPIC has provided almost $6 billion of the taxpayers' money to leading steel exporters. Thus, the American taxpayer has provided at least $26 billion worth of support to the countries that are the leading competitors of the domestic steel industry. This does not count the funds provided these countries by the IMF. Since money is fungible, the practical effect of providing aid to countries which practice industrial policy is to free up resources these governments can use to further subsidize their steel industries. Thus, taxpayer dollars sent to foreign governments and industries can benefit foreign steel manufacturers even if American taxpayer money is not sent to directly benefit those industries.

However, hard as it may be to believe, organizations funded by American taxpayers actually use American tax dollars to directly assist foreign steel producers! For example, among the projects funded by EXIMBANK in recent years is an $18 million loan guarantee to expand steel manufacturing in Red China.

Ironically, many of the supporters of these foreign giveaways claim to be promoters of free trade. This claim makes as much sense as a supporter of higher taxes and spending claiming to be a fiscally conservative supporter of limited government. Free trade is the peaceful exchange of goods and services across borders unhampered by government interference. Taxing American workers to support their overseas competitors is not free trade. Instead, it is corporatism designed to benefit certain politically powerful interests at the expense of American entrepreneurs and workers.

I have no doubt that America's steel industry can out-compete the steel industry of any country if allowed to compete on a level planning field. Unfortunately, due in part to government policy, today's playing field is in no way level. Congress must end this economically

destructive, immoral, and unconstitutional policy of forcing owners and workers in the domestic steel industry to subsidize their competitors. I therefore call upon my colleagues to cosponsor the Steel Financing Fairness Act.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE CITY OF WEST ALLIS' 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th anniversary celebration of the City of West Allis. I am proud to serve this community, a portion of which lies within the Fourth Congressional District. Happy 100th Birthday to this remarkable community!

The City of West Allis was incorporated in 1906, but this vibrant community's roots go back much further. In the 1820s and 1830s, prominent visitors to the Honey Creek area, now the heart of West Allis, were impressed with its dense woods and abundance of fresh water springs. Settlement proceeded and by 1860, Honey Creek boasted a school, blacksmith shop, post office and chapel that served Baptist and Episcopalian worshippers. In 1891, the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society purchased the land that is now home to the State Fairgrounds, and by 1894, the Milwaukee Street Car Company had extended transportation routes to this destination. The Allis Company moved from the heart of Milwaukee to West Allis in 1900, fueling the engines of economic growth and development. Throughout its history, West Allis has been known for its strong community, numerous recreational amenities, and the work ethic that underlies its industrial economy.

With the decline of the regional manufacturing economy, West Allis has undergone fundamental changes. It is a testament to the strength of this community and its visionary leadership that urban redevelopment initiatives have brought new economic benefits without compromising the community spirit that characterizes West Allis. The award-winning redevelopment of the Allis-Chalmers campus, for example, has preserved the structures of West Allis' industrial history while creating an exciting and unique office park that has rapidly attracted new tenants to the area. The bike path, currently under construction, serves as a reminder that early settlers were attracted by the beautiful natural landscape. The farmers' market, due to open this year, promises to further strengthen residents' ties to the community.

I am proud to represent the community of West Allis, congratulate it on 100 remarkable years, and look forward to continuing to work with its leaders and residents as its revitalization continues.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF KATHERINE DUNHAM

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the life and extraordinary achievements of Katherine Dunham, who passed away on May 21, 2006.

Katherine Dunham was born in Glen Ellyn, Illinois, on June 22, 1909. Her father, Albert Millard Dunham, was a descendant of slaves from Madagascar and West Africa. Her French Canadian mother, Fanny June Taylor, died when Miss Dunham was young. Her father then married Annette Poindexter, a schoolteacher from Iowa, and moved his family to Joliet, Ill., where he ran a dry-cleaning business.

Katherine Dunham became interested in dance at an early age. While a student at the University of Chicago, she formed a dance group that performed in concert at the Chicago World's Fair in 1934 and with the Chicago Civic Opera in 1935–36.

With a bachelor's degree in anthropology, she soon undertook field studies in the Caribbean and in Brazil. By the time she received her M.A. from the University of Chicago, she had acquired a vast knowledge of the dances and rituals of the black peoples of tropical America. (She later took a Ph.D. in anthropology.)

In 1938, she joined the Federal Theatre Project in Chicago and composed a ballet, L'Ag'Ya, based on Caribbean dance. In 1940, she formed an all-black company, which began touring extensively by 1943. Tropics (choreographed 1937) and Le Jazz Hot (1938) were among the earliest of many works based on her research.

Katherine Dunham is noted for her innovative interpretations of primitive, ritualistic, and ethnic dances and her tracing the roots of black culture. Many of her students, trained in her studios in Chicago and New York City, have become prominent in the field of modem dance. She also choreographed for Broadway stage productions and opera—including Aida (1963) for the New York Metropolitan Opera. She also choreographed and starred in dance sequences in such films as Carnival of Rhythm (1942), Stormy Weather (1943), and Casbah (1947).

Dunham also conducted special projects for Chicago black high school students. She served as the artistic and technical director (1966–67) to the president of Senegal; and artist-in-residence, and later professor, at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, and director of Southern Illinois's Performing Arts Training Centre and Dynamic Museum in East St. Louis, Ill.

Dunham's writings, sometimes published under the pseudonym Kaye Dunn, include Katherine Dunham's Journey to Accompong (1946), an account of her anthropological studies in Jamaica; A Touch of Innocence (1959), an autobiography; and Island Possessed (1969), as well as several articles for popular and scholarly journals.

Except for a brief appearance in 1965, Dunham has not performed regularly since 1962 and has concentrated on her choreography. One of her major works was the choreographing and directing of Scott Joplin's opera Treemonisha in 1972. She dissolved her company in 1965 to become advisor to the cultural ministry of Senegal and returned to the United States in 1967.

She left the conventional dance world of New York that year to live and work in East St. Louis at an inner-city branch of the Southern Illinois University, running a school attached to the University and working with neighborhood and youth groups.

The Dunham tradition has persisted. She was considered a woman far ahead of her time. She considered her technique "a way of life." The classes at her Manhattan school—attended by many artists, including Marlon Brando and Eartha Kitt, during the 1940s and the 1950s, were noted for their liberating influence.

Her mastery of body movement was considered "phenomenal." She was hailed for her smooth and fluent choreography and dominated a stage with what has been described as "an unmitigating radiant force providing beauty with a feminine touch full of variety and nuance," otherwise known as the Dunham Technique, which is still practiced today.

Katherine Dunham's intellectual, artistic, and humanitarian contributions have earned her many coveted awards over the years, including the Presidential Medal of Arts, the Kennedy Center Honors, French Legion of Honor, Southern Cross of Brazil, Grand Cross of Haiti, NAACP Lifetime Achievement Award, Lincoln Academy Laureate, and the Urban Leagues' Lifetime Achievement Award. She was also one of 75 women whose lives were celebrated in the book, I Have A Dream. Katherine is survived by a daughter, Marie-Christine Dunham-Pratt, who lives in Rome.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Katherine Dunham on her service, her lifetime of experiences and her contribution to the world of dance which serves as an invaluable resource to not only the people of East St. Louis but to the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 2006, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall 283. The vote I missed was an amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR to H.R. 5576.

Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 283.

TRIBUTE TO JEAN "GENE" NORMANDIN

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to my dear friend Jean "Gene" Normandin, who passed away on Thursday, May 4, 2006 at the age of 78. Gene was a devoted husband, loving father to his three sons an two daughters, man of compassion, and a

caring friend and mentor to many, including myself.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the eulogy delivered by his son, Robert Normandin on May 10, 2006.

A LIFE WELL LIVED—THE EULOGY FOR GENE NORMANDIN

Dedication, determination and devotion, are terms that sum up my father's life.

He was dedicated to his family, his 5 children, 13 grandchildren, and two great grandchildren. He was extremely fortunate to be blessed with 2 successful marriages. First, to our mother, to whom he was married to for almost 35 years. When our mother became ill, he dedicated himself to her, for every minute of every day for the rest of her life. His love for her never ended.

He was so fortunate to meet, fall in love and marry, Jeannine. Their marriage lasted almost 20 years and, as he did with my mother, she dedicated herself to him, taking care of him until the moment of his death. Jeannine, we are eternally grateful for the love, devotion and care that you gave him. We will never forget.

He was a successful businessman. He was a young man when he went to work for Manzi Dodge, at the time a struggling car dealership. Through this determination when he left, it was a thriving business. He founded other businesses, Custom Sentry Alarms and Normandin Liquors. He brought a determination to any endeavor in which he become involved. As he was fond of saying when someone said how lucky he was, ''yes, and the harder I work, the luckier I get.'' He was truly a lucky man.

He brought that determination and devotion to his church as well. When Frs. Hassett, Handley, O'Brien or Joyce had a problem at the Sacred Heart, one of the first people that they would seek out was Gene Normandin. Whether it was the men's club, 1000 club, or Bingo he was always there for them.

When he moved to Florida, he brought that dedication there. Whether it was serving food at a soup kitchen, clothing drives or washing dishes, he assisted the indigent migrant workers at Omoklee, Florida.

He was blessed during his life with many, many great friends, people like Kay and Pat and Armand and Connie, with whom he shared many laughs and a few tears.

It was in short, a life well lived. Dad, we will miss you.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the FY07 Transportation, Treasury, HUD Appropriations bill. I am very pleased that included in this bill is $4 million for the much needed Second Avenue Subway.

This worthy project will ease the incredibly overcrowded Lexington Avenue subway line, which is one of the busiest in the nation. It is unquestioned that the Second Avenue Subway will immediately benefit many tens of thousands of area residents. The 9/11 attack on New York City and the transportation restrictions imposed afterward only further magnify the importance of providing the region with an adequate mass transit system.

Just for some background on the project, construction of the full-length Second Avenue Subway has been divided into four phases, each of which will produce a minimum operating segment that will carry a significant number of passengers. The first phase of the Second Avenue Subway project will include stops at 96th, 86th and 72nd Streets, and tunnels from 99th to 62nd Streets. At 63rd Street, the subway will link onto the existing N and R tracks, providing a one-seat ride from the Upper East Side to Times Square, Wall Street and Brooklyn. When this phase is completed in 2012, 202,000 riders are expected to board the new line each day.

I am very grateful to the Committee for recognizing the importance of the Subway and thank Chairman KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member OLVER for this essential funding. I would also like to thank the bipartisan Members of the New York delegation for their continued support of this project.

IN HONOR OF THE JUST RUN PROGRAM OF MONTEREY COUNTY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Just Run program of Monterey County that has been a collaboration of the Big Sur International Marathon as well as other local organizations.

Designed to assist school and other youth organizations in providing vital fitness programs to youth in Monterey County, Just Run is a group running program that teaches children activity, fitness principles, goal setting, and physical development with the help of teachers and parent volunteers.

This program engages local fitness and running experts, such as future Olympic runners from the Big Sur Distance Project, to work with students at free on-site clinics and serve as role models and motivators. In conjunction with running and physical activity, the program also promotes good citizenship and good deeds by emphasizing a drug-free and healthy active lifestyle. In a time when it has become so easy for children to make unhealthy choices, this program is a much needed reminder to our kids of the importance of fitness.

I also want to highlight Just Run's involvement in supporting the new initiative in Monterey County called HELP (Healthy Eating Lifestyle Principles) that works towards including more healthy fruit and vegetables in school lunch programs as well as an increased role for physical activity in school. The Central Coast is an ideal area for the implementation of this policy because of the abundance of fresh produce cultivated within the 17th district. Students learn that eating fresh fruits and vegetables, in addition to participating in the Just Run program are both steps in the right direction to fostering a healthier lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Just Run program and its affiliates for their outstanding work whose benefits will be reaped throughout our community.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE DELIVERY OF THE 28TH AND FINAL M31 MARINE CORPS EXPEDITIONARY ARRESTING GEAR SYSTEM TO THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, June 15, a celebration is being held in Aston, Pennsylvania, marking the delivery of the 28th and final M31 Marine Corps Expeditionary Arresting Gear System, MCEAGS, to the United States Marine Corps.

Initial production of the Expeditionary Arresting Gear started in March of 2002 and the final delivery of the one on June 15 will provide the Marine Corps full operational capability for the Expeditionary Arresting Gear. The M31 Arresting Gear is now employed worldwide, including operations in Iraq. The great news is that the contractor, Engineered Arresting Systems Corporation, ESCO, delivered all these systems on schedule and under cost.

The M31 program is unique and a great success story. Designed and developed under an integrated product team arrangement, the Marines, NAVAIR Lakehurst and the contractor have produced equipment that demonstrated meeting Marine Corps requirements at government test facilities. Additionally, ESCO is providing all spare parts and logistics support for the system. Best of all—it works. It works very well. ESCO, in conjunction with its teammates of the M31 Integrated Product Team from NAVAIR Expeditionary Airfield Support Team at Lakehurst, NJ have been providing full logistics to the fielded M31 systems for the past 4 years. This team's support includes full system supply support, depot maintenance, continuing, engineering support and configuration management. A 5-year indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contract was put in place in December 2005 to provide the above support through December 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the other great story is the teamwork between ESCO and the Naval Air Systems Command Team. The support and dedication of personnel from both NAVAIR, Lakehurst, New Jersey and Patuxent River, Maryland cannot be overemphasized. Both the military and civilian government employees have played a very active and crucial role in the development, production, fielding and support of the M31 Expeditionary Arresting Gear System.

This program is a model program for the entire Department of Defense to emulate. Congratulations to ESCO and the Naval Air Systems Command for a job ''well done.''

CALLING FOR AN END TO IMPUNITY FOR PREDATORS OF PRESS FREEDOM

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 18-month anniversary of a tragic event that is symptomatic of the deterioration of press freedom in the Gambia and elsewhere.

On December 16, 2004, one of the most respected journalists in West Africa, Deyda Hydara, was shot in the head and chest by unidentified gunmen. He died instantly, but the repercussions of his murder sent a shock wave through media and human rights advocates throughout the region. Mr. Hydara cofounded the Gambia's first independent newspaper and served as a foreign correspondent for a French newspaper and the media rights organization, Reporters Without Borders.

Hydara's murder is just one incident in an alarming crackdown by Gambian authorities on the independent press. In July 2002 the government passed legislation requiring journalists and media organizations to register with a media commission for one-year renewable licenses. In September 2003, Hydara and three other independent journalists filed a lawsuit challenging the law in a case that is still pending before the Gambian Supreme Court.

Two days before Hydara's murder, the Gambian National Assembly passed a new round of repressive media legislation that imposed mandatory prison terms of six months to three years for any published work judged to be ''seditious'' and increased the scope of what might be deemed libelous. Hydara and other independent journalists had publicly opposed the law and Hydara had published an editorial denouncing it the day before he was killed.

In the 18 months that have elapsed since Deyda Hydara was killed, Gambian authorities have ignored calls for a thorough investigation into his murder. It is widely believed to have been politically-motivated and related to a string of similar attacks. Meanwhile, at least 3 journalists are currently detained in Gambia in violation of regional and international human rights law. I will be sending a letter to Gambian President, Mr. Yahya Jammeh, urging him to appoint an independent board of inquiry to investigate the murder of Deyda Hydara and improve protections for journalists and the principle of press freedom in his country. I would like to submit this letter for the RECORD.

Resistance to impunity is essential to maintain civil peace and demonstrate a commitment to democratic values. In a time when repeated anonymous attacks against media professionals have created tense relations between the state and the media in many countries, Deyda Hydara's unrequited murder is deeply worrisome to those who are committed to democracy and justice in Africa. I hope that the Gambian Government will take this occasion to reverse its record on press freedom and set an example for the rest of the region.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5903–S5986

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3516–3530, S. Res. 513, and S. Con. Res. 102. **Pages S5949–50**

Measures Reported:

S. 3524, to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve health care provided to Indians under the Medicare, Medicaid, and State Children's Health Insurance Programs.

S. 3525, to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve outcomes for children in families affected by methamphetamine abuse and addiction, to reauthorize the promoting safe and stable families program. **Page S5949**

Measures Passed:

Commemorating King Adulyadej of Thailand: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 409, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Frist (for Biden) Amendment No. 4291, to amend the preamble. **Page S5985**

National Time-Out Day: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 482, supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S5985**

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 S5909–39**

Adopted:

Durbin Amendment No. 4253, to require a pilot program on troops to nurse teachers. **Pages S5909–13**

Feingold Amendment No. 4256, to strengthen the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. **Pages S5914–17**

By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 173), Biden Amendment No. 4257, to state the policy of the United States on the nuclear programs of Iran. **Pages S5917, S5921–22**

Warner Amendment No. 4278, to provide for the incorporation of a classified annex. **Page S5933**

Warner Amendment No. 4279, to modify the limitations applicable to payments under incentives clauses in chemical demilitarization contracts. **Page S5933**

Warner/Levin Amendment No. 4280, to repeal requirements for certain reports applicable to other nations. **Page S5933**

Warner Amendment No. 4200, to modify the requirements for contingency program management to require only a Department of Defense plan for such management. **Page S5933**

Warner Amendment No. 4201, to make a technical correction to section 871, relating to a clarification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects. **Page S5933**

Warner/Levin Amendment No. 4198, to improve the authorities relating to policies and practices on test and evaluation to address emerging acquisition approaches. **Page S5933**

Warner/Levin Amendment No. 4281, to improve the authorities relating to major automated information system programs. **Pages S5933–34**

Warner Amendment No. 4282, to require a report assessing the desirability and feasability of incentives to encourage certain members and former members of the Armed Forces to serve in the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection. **Page S5934**

Levin (for Clinton/Bingaman) Amendment No. 4283, relating to energy efficiency in the weapons platforms of the Armed Forces. **Page S5934**

Warner (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4284, to modify limitations on assistance under the American Servicemembers' Protection Act of 2002. **Page S5934**

Warner (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 4252, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members. **Pages S5934–36**

Warner (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4225, to require that, not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army transport to an authorized disposal facility for appropriate disposal all of the Federal Government-furnished uranium in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma. **Page S5936**

Warner (for Salazar) Modified Amendment No. 4218, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention. **Page S5936**

Warner (for Lugar) Amendment No. 4285, to improve authorities to address urgent nonproliferation crises and United States nonproliferation operations. **Page S5936**

Warner Amendment No. 4286, to provide for the applicability of certain requirements to the acquisition of certain speciality metals. **Page S5936**

Warner (for Warner/Snowe) Modified Amendment No. 4199, to authorize a pilot program on the expanded use of mentor-protege authority. **Page S5937**

Warner (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 4287, expressing the sense of the Senate on the nomination of an individual to serve as Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense on a permanent basis. **Page S5937**

Rejected:

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 172), Santorum Amendment No. 4234, to authorize, with an offset, assistance for pro-democracy programs and activities inside and outside Iran, to make clear that the United States supports the ability of the people of Iran to exercise self-determination over their own form of government, and to make enhancements to the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act of 1996. **Pages S5917–21**

McConnell Amendment No. 4269 (to Amendment No. 4265), to require the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq and urge the convening of an Iraq summit. (By 93 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 174), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S5927–29**

Withdrawn:

Feingold Amendment No. 4192, to provide for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by December 31, 2006. **Pages S5913–14**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia. **Page S5909**

Nelson (FL)/Menendez Amendment No. 4265, to express the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States. **Pages S5922–27**

McConnell Amendment No. 4272, to commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces. **Pages S5932–33**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 10:45 a.m. on Friday, June 16, 2008. **Page S5986**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations—Conference Report: By 98 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 171), Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S5905–09**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Robert M. Couch, of Alabama, to be President, Government National Mortgage Association.

James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development for a term of five years.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring July 15, 2013.

Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2007.

Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2011. **Page S5986**

Nominations Discharged: The following nomination was discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was sent to the Senate on February 14, 2006, from the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Page S5986**

Messages From the House: **Page S5949**

Measures Referred: **Page S5949**

Executive Communications: Page S5949
Executive Reports of Committees: Page S5949
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S5950–52
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S5952–67
Additional Statements: Pages S5947–49
Amendments Submitted: Pages S5967–84
Notics of Hearings/Meetings: Page S5984
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S5984
Privileges of the Floor: Pages S5984–85

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—174) Pages S5909, S5921, S5922, S5929

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, June 16, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5986.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FANNIE MAE

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Report of the Special Examination of Fannie Mae, after receiving testimony from James B. Lockhart III, Acting Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Christopher Cox, Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission; and Daniel H. Mudd, and Stephen B. Ashley, both of Fannie Mae, Washington, D.C.

BUDGET: COAST GUARD

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Fisheries and the Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine the Coast Guard budget, after receiving testimony from Admiral Thad W. Allen, Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; and Stephen L. Caldwell, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

SUPERFUND PROGRAM

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Superfund and Waste Management concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Superfund Program, which was created by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), focusing on efforts to stabilize and clean up National Priority list (NPL) sites through the United States, after receiving testimony from Senators Durbin and Cantwell; Susan Parker Bodine, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; Leonardo Trasande, Mount Sinai School of Medicine Department of Community and Preventive Medicine Center for Children's Health and the Environment, New York, New York; Michael W. Steinberg, Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, LLP, on behalf of the Superfund Settlements Project, and Katherine N. Probst, both of Washington, D.C.; Robert Spiegel, Edison Wetlands Association, Edison, New Jersey; and J. Winston Porter, Waste Policy Center, Leesburg, Virginia.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 2145, to enhance security and protect against terrorist attacks at chemical facilities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1554, to establish an intergovernmental grant program to identify and develop homeland security information, equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services to further the homeland security of the United States and to address the homeland security needs of Federal, State, and local governments, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1741, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to carry out a program for the protection of the health and safety of residents, workers, volunteers, and others in a disaster area;

S. 2068, to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia;

S. 2146, to extend relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees; and

H.R. 3508, to authorize improvements in the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S.J. Res. 12, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, with amendments; and

The nominations of Frank D. Whitney, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, and Thomas D. Anderson, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont, all of the Department of Justice.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jerome A. Holmes, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Inhofe, Daniel Porter Jordan III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, who was introduced by Senators Cochran and Lott, and Gustavo Antonio Gelpi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, who was introduced by Representative Fortuño, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 5622–5630; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 871 were introduced. **Pages H4133–34**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4134–35**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5136, to establish a National Integrated Drought Information System within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to improve drought monitoring and forecasting capabilities, with an amendment (H. Rept. 109–503). **Page H4133**

Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary: The House began consideration of H. Res. 861, to declare that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary. Further consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, Friday, June 16. **Pages H4024–H4123**

H. Res. 868, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 287, after ordering the previous question without objection. **Pages H4014–24**

Senate Message: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H4024.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4023–24. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at midnight.

Committee Meetings

CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing to review Efforts to Eliminate Waste, Fraud and Abuse in the Crop Insurance Program. Testimony was heard from Eldon Gould, Administrator, Risk Management Agency, USDA; Daniel Bertoni, Acting Director, Natural Resources and Environment Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION PUBLIC LANDS EFFECTS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Effects of Illegal Immigration on Public and Tribal Lands. Testimony was heard from Representatives Tancredo and Grijalva; the following officials of the Department of the Interior: William T. Civish, District Manager, Dila District, Bureau of Land Management; and Selanhongva McDonald, Southwestern Regional Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and public witnesses.

COMBAT EQUIPMENT—IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing to receive an update on the use of combat helmets, vehicle armor, and body armor by ground forces in Operation Iraq

Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: MG Stephen M. Speakes, USA, Director, Force Development, Army G8; MG William D. Catto, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Systems Command; Roger M. Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Littoral and Mine Warfare; and MG (sel) Gary McCoy, USAF, Director, Logistics Readiness, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics, Installations and Mission Support.

HEALTH MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Ordered reported the following measures: S. 655, amended, A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; H.R. 5573, Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006; H.R. 5574, amended, Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006; H. Con. Res. 426, Recognizing the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drugs Act for the important service it provides to the Nation; and H.R. 4157, amended, Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2005.

SILICOSIS INVESTIGATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations approved a motion authorizing the issuance of subpoenas in connection with the Committee's investigation on silicosis.

NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA'S HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled ''Regional Insecurity: DHS Grants to the National Capital Area.'' Testimony was heard from George W. Foresman, Under Secretary, Preparedness, Department of Homeland Security; Edward D. Reiskin, Deputy Mayor, Public Safety and Justice, District of Columbia; Robert Crouch, Assistant to the Governor for Preparedness, State of Virginia; Dennis Schrader, Director, Office of Homeland Security, State of Maryland; and David Robertson, Executive Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT—SHIRLINGTON LIMO CASE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight held a hearing entitled ''An Examination of the Department of Homeland Security's Procurement Process Regarding Shirlington Limousine and Transportation, Inc.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Elaine C. Duke, Chief Procurement Officer; and Kevin Boshears, Director, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization; and Calvin Jenkins, Deputy to the Associate Deputy Administrator, SBA

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPERTY—PREVENT DISCRIMINATORY TAXATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law approved for full Committee action H.R. 1369, To prevent discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property.

OVERSIGHT—PATENT TROLLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property held an oversight hearing on Patent Trolls: Fact or Fiction? Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FISHERIES/HATCHERY MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4957, Tylersville Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; H.R. 5061, Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance Act; and H.R. 5381, National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Boucher; Mamie Parker, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Douglas Austen, Executive Director, Fish and Boat Commission, State of Pennsylvania; Gary Martel, Director, Fisheries, Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT

Committee on Rules: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 4890, Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006.

OVERSIGHT—INTERMODALISM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines held an oversight hearing on Intermodalism. Testimony was heard from Jeffrey Shane, Under Secretary, Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation; Katherine Siggerud, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO; J. Robert Bray, Executive Director, Port Authority, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—RECENT PATIENT SAFETY ISSUES

Committee on Veterans Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held an oversight hearing on recent patient safety issues. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: James P. Bagian, M.D., VHA Chief

Patient Safety Officer and Director, VA National Center for Patient Safety; and John D. Daigh, Jr., M.D., Assistant Inspector General, Healthcare Inspections; Daniel Schultz, M.D., Director, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services; and Laurie Ekstrand, Director, Health Care, GAO.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROMOTION ACT OF 2006

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 4157, Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2006.

SSA's IMPROVED DISABILITY DETERMINATION PROCESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on the Social Security Administration's Improved Disability Determination Process. Testimony was heard from Jo Anne B. Barnhart, Commissioner, SSA; Robert E. Robertson, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

SOUTH CENTRAL EUROPE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission): Commission concluded a hearing to examine human rights challenges that countries in South Central Europe face as they seek integration into the European Union and/or North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), focusing on legal restrictions on religions activities and other attacks on religious freedom, lagging efforts to combat trafficking in persons, discrimination and violence against Roma, and the prevalence of official corruption and organized crime, after receiving testimony from Rosemary A. DiCarlo, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasia Affairs; Daniel Serwer, United States Institute of Peace, Janusz Bugajski, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Joseph K. Grieboski, Institute on Religion and Public Policy, all of Washington, D.C.; and Nicolae Gheorghe, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw, Poland.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D 572)*

H.R. 1953, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Old Mint at San Francisco, otherwise known as the "Granite Lady". Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–230)

H.R. 3829, to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Muskogee, Oklahoma, as the Jack C. Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–231)

H.R. 5401, to amend section 308 of the Lewis and Clark Expedition Bicentennial Commemorative Coin Act to make certain clarifying and technical amendments. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–232)

S. 1235, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and extend housing, insurance, outreach, and benefits programs provided under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to improve and extend employment programs for veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Labor. Signed on June 15, 2006. (Public Law 109–233)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Government Reform, hearing entitled "Disabled Services in the District of Columbia: Who is Protecting the Rights of D.C.'s Most Vulnerable Residents?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing entitled "Evaluating the Synthetic Drug Control Strategy," 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection and Cybersecurity, hearing on H.R. 5604, Screening Applied Fairly and Equitably to Truckers Act of 2006, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Friday, June 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:45 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of S. 2766, National Defense Authorization.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Friday, June 16

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Continue consideration on H. Res. 861—Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E1163
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E1159, E1159
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1162
Costello, Jerry F., Ill., E1163
Davis, Jo Ann, Va., E1160
Dicks, Norman D., Wash., E1161
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1164
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1161
Gillmor, Paul E., Ohio, E1162
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1159, E1160
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1159
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E1161
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1164
Meehan, Martin T., Mass., E1163
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1163
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1162
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1160
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1165
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1161
Weldon, Curt, Pa., E1164

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.