months after the massacres of September 2001, we are engaged in a war on terror that will, undoubtedly, last at least as long as WWI and WWII, if not much of the 21st century.

Unfortunately, we didn't keep faith—as much as we should have—with the veterans of Korea and Vietnam, especially the Vietnam veterans. We didn't adequately respect their service, and sufficiently encourage their potential. But perhaps, starting with this dedication, we're beginning to learn the practical, sensible, and, yes, pragmatic lesson of the WWII bill. We owe the young men and women who are—and will be—our protectors in this long, shadowy conflict no less than a moral—and a financial—equivalent of the WWII GI Bill.

We don't just owe it to them; we owe it to ourselves.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 2002

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3389) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant Program Act, which authorizes Sea Grant through fiscal year 2008. This legislation, which I am pleased to cosponsor, reaffirms federal support for essential marine research programs. I wish to thank the members of the Science and Resources Committees, who have collaborated to craft legislation that will encourage significant developments in marine research in the coming decade.

Sea Grant is particularly important to the state of Rhode Island, whose history and economy have been tied to the ocean since our earliest days. The University of Rhode Island, one of the premier Sea Grant institutions in the United States, has strengthened this bond by delving deeper into the ocean's complexities and enriching us with their findings. I am proud of their impressive accomplishments and will continue my efforts to vigoroulsy advocate full federal support for Sea Grant.

I am particularly pleased that the committees of jurisdiction did not move Sea Grant from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to the National Science Foundation (NSF), as recommended by the Bush Administration. While I have nothing but the greatest respect for the NSF's work, Sea Grant's research is noteworthy because of its immediate practical application through NOAA and other Department of Commerce agencies. URI's work in the fields of fisheries management, biotechnology, aquaculture, and marine security has helped business leaders, educators, and policy advocates when considering complicated maritime issues. Furthermore, URI's educational outreach efforts, especially in grades K–12, demonstrate Sea Grant's effectiveness not only at undertaking state-of-the-art research, but also in cultivating future generations' interest in ocean and environmental science.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure today so that our universities and scientific institutions will be able to build upon their successes with the Sea Grant program.

HONORING THE FIGHTING 105TH INFANTRY REGIMENT

HON. JOHN E. SWEENEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 2002

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the forgotten heroes of the fighting 105th Infantry Regiment—part of the New York National Guard's 27th Division—activated for duty in October of 1940. These brave soldiers embraced their Nation's call to arms wholeheartedly and without hesitation. On the field of battle, they fought with the fire of freedom in their souls and the fury of the American spirit in their hearts.

On July 7, 1944 an overwhelming force estimated between 3,000 and 5,000 Japanese soldiers strong attacked the First and Second Battalions of the 105th Infantry Regiment, 27th Infantry Division. It was one of the largest attacks attempted in the Pacific Theater during World War II. As the firestorm rained down upon them, the gallant ''Appleknockers'' of the 105th met the challenge of their foes with unparalleled vigor and tenacity. With gallant fervor, might and determination, the 105th fought on against the enemy. As terror reigned, the red-gray storm over the land swarmed onward breaking through the combined perimeter of the Battalion, inflicting massive casualties on the young troops. Yet, in brotherhood and blood, the fighting 105th pressed on. Inspired with the strength of democracy and infused with the iron will of America, the Appleknockers did not surrender. As the fighting 105th fought on and their foes fell before them, our freedoms were preserved and our way of life secured.

The Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously to three of the men in the 105th—Lt./Col. William O'Brien, Sgt. Thomas Baker and Captain (Dr.) Ben L. Salomon DDS. There are many other courageous men that also fought gallantly for our country in the July 7, 1944 attack. At least seven unsung survivors of this most difficult day presently live in and around the Troy, New York area and are active members of the distinguished Tibbits Cadets. Among these dignified veterans are Mr. Joseph Meighan, Mr. Sam DiNova, Mr. Joseph Mariano, Mr. Frank Pusatere, Mr. Adam Weasack, Mr. Nick Grinaolda and Mr. Ralph Colangione.

The brave soldiers of the gallant Appleknockers of the 105th have served their country and their fellow man with integrity and valor. In their pursuit of freedom and prosperity for the world, the men of the First and Second Battalions met the fact of fear and fought with honor. As the ''Appleknockers'' remember the 58th Anniversary of the July 7, 1944 action, may we pause a moment to honor all those that fought in that harrowing battle. To the fighting men of the 105th, I respectfully extend my most heartfelt gratitude and respect—they fought as soldiers, lived as patriots and are forever heroes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 2002

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 247, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.'' On rollcall No. 248, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF EAST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 2002

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the League of Women Voters of East San Gabriel Valley for its dedication to increase participation in the democratic processes of government.

Founded in 1956 as the Provisional League of Women Voters of West Covina, the organization was officially recognized by the National League of Women Voters in 1958. When the group's name changed to the League of Women Voters of East San Gabriel Valley in 1969, the chapter was the second largest in the state of California. Today the group serves communities in more than 20 cities in Southern California.

The League provides a host of services to fulfill its fundamental mission of providing nonpartisan information to citizens that will encourage them to participate in all levels of government and to influence public policy through education and advocacy. Citizens in my district have benefited from activities such as a year-round voter information service, candidate forums during election season, summaries about Los Angeles County ballot measures, explanations of new voting devices and voter registration drives.

I am proud to have this commendable public service organization in my district. Their efforts to educate our community about the importance of voting and political participation are helping to produce a well-informed electorate that fights for the issues that are important to working men and women.

LOS ANGELES TIMES ARTICLE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 2002

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to a recent article by Scott Ritter, former chief UN weapons inspector in Iraq, published in the Los Angeles Times. In this article, Mr. Ritter makes a salient point that deserves careful and serious consideration in this body: how will it be possible to achieve the stated Administration goal of getting weapons inspectors back into Iraq when the Administration has made it known that it intends to assassinate the Iraqi leader?

If nothing else, Saddam Hussein has proven himself a survivor. Does anyone believe that

he will allow inspectors back into his country knowing that any one of them might kill him? Is it the intention of the Administration to get inspectors back into Iraq and thus answers to lingering and critical questions regarding Iraq's military capabilities, or is the intent to invade that country regardless of the near total absence of information? Or actually make it impossible for Suddam Hussein to accept the inspectors.

Mr. Ritter, who as former chief UN inspector in Iraq probably knows that country better than any of us here, made some excellent points in a recent meeting with Republican members of Congress. According to Mr. Ritter, no American-installed regime could survive in Iraq. Interestingly, Mr. Ritter noted that though his rule is no doubt despotic, Saddam Hussein has been harsher toward Islamic fundamentalism than any other Arab regime. He added that any U.S. invasion to remove Saddam from power would likely open the door to an anti-American fundamentalist Islamic regime in Iraq. That can hardly be viewed in a positive light here in the United States. Is a policy that replaces a bad regime with a worse regime the wisest course to follow?

Much is made of Iraqi National Congress leader Ahmed Chalabi, as a potential post-invasion leader of Iraq. Mr. Ritter told me that in his many dealings with Chalabi, he found him to be completely unreliable and untrustworthy. He added that neither he nor the approximately 100 Iraqi generals that the US is courting have any credibility inside Iraq, and any attempt to place them in power would be rejected in the strongest manner by the Iraqi people. Hundreds, if not thousands, of American military personnel would be required to occupy Iraq indefinitely if any American-installed regime is to remain in power. Again, it appears we are creating a larger problem than we are attempting to solve.

Similarly, proponents of a US invasion of Iraq often cite the Kurds in the northern part of that country as a Northern Alliance-like ally, who will do much of our fighting on the ground and unseat Saddam. But just last week the Washington Times reported that neither of the two rival Kurdish groups in northern Iraq want anything to do with an invasion of Iraq.

In the meeting last month, Scott Ritter reminded members of Congress that a nation cannot go to war based on assumptions and guesses, that a lack of knowledge is no basis on which to initiate military action. Mr. Ritter warned those present that remaining acquiescent in the face of the Administration's seeming determination to exceed the authority granted to go after those who attacked us, will actually hurt the president and will hurt Congress. He concluded by stating that going in to Iraq without Congressionally-granted authority would be a ''failure of American democracy.'' Those pounding the war drums loudest for an invasion of Iraq should pause for a moment and ponder what Scott Ritter is saying. Thousands of lives are at stake.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 19, 2002]

BEHIND ''PLOT'' ON HUSSEIN, A SECRET AGENDA

(By Scott Ritter)

President Bush has reportedly authorized the CIA to use all of the means at its disposal—including U.S. military special operations forces and CIA paramilitary teams—to eliminate Iraq's Saddam Hussein. According to reports, the CIA is to view any such plan as ''preparatory'' for a larger military strike.

Congressional leaders from both parties have greeted these reports with enthusiasm. In their rush to be seen as embracing the president's hard-line stance on Iraq, however, almost no one in Congress has questioned why a supposedly covert operation would be made public, thus undermining the very mission it was intended to accomplish.

It is high time that Congress start questioning the hype and rhetoric emanating from the White House regarding Baghdad, because the leaked CIA plan is well timed to undermine the efforts underway in the United Nations to get weapons inspectors back to work in Iraq. In early July, the U.N. secretary-general will meet with Iraq's foreign minister for a third round of talks on the return of the weapons monitors. A major sticking point is Iraqi concern over the use—or abuse—of such inspections by the U.S. for intelligence collection.

I recall during my time as a chief inspector in Iraq the dozens of extremely fit ''missile experts'' and ''logistics specialists'' who frequented my inspection teams and others. Drawn from U.S. units such as Delta Force or from CIA paramilitary teams such as the Special Activities Staff (both of which have an ongoing role in the conflict in Afghanistan), these specialists had a legitimate part to play in the difficult cat-and-mouse effort to disarm Iraq. So did the teams of British radio intercept operators I ran in Iraq from 1996 to 1998—which listened in on the conversations of Hussein's inner circle—and the various other intelligence specialists who were part of the inspection effort.

The presence of such personnel on inspection teams was, and is, viewed by the Iraqi government as an unacceptable risk to its nation's security.

As early as 1992, the Iraqis viewed the teams I led inside Iraq as a threat to the safety of their president. They were concerned that my inspections were nothing more than a front for a larger effort to eliminate their leader.

Those concerns were largely baseless while I was in Iraq. Now that Bush has specifically authorized American covert-operations forces to remove Hussein, however, the Iraqis will never trust an inspection regime that has already shown itself susceptible to infiltration and manipulation by intelligence services hostile to Iraq, regardless of any assurances the U.N. secretary-general might give.

The leaked CIA covert operations plan effectively kills any chance of inspectors returning to Iraq, and it closes the door on the last opportunity for shedding light on the true state of affairs regarding any threat in the form of Iraq weapons of mass destruction.

Absent any return of weapons inspectors, no one seems willing to challenge the Bush administration's assertions of an Iraqi threat. If Bush has a factual case against Iraq concerning weapons of mass destruction, he hasn't made it yet.

Can the Bush administration substantiate any of its claims that Iraq continues to pursue efforts to reacquire its capability to produce chemical and biological weapons, which was dismantled and destroyed by U.N. weapons inspectors from 1991 to 1998? The same question applies to nuclear weapons. What facts show that Iraq continues to pursue nuclear weapons aspirations?

Bush spoke ominously of an Iraqi ballistic missile threat to Europe. What missile threat is the president talking about? These questions are valid, and if the case for war is to be made, they must be answered with more than speculative rhetoric.

Congress has seemed unwilling to challenge the Bush administration's pursuit of war against Iraq. The one roadblock to an all-out U.S. assault would be weapons inspectors reporting on the facts inside Iraq. Yet without any meaningful discussion and debate by Congress concerning the nature of the threat posed by Baghdad, war seems all but inevitable.

The true target of the supposed CIA plan may not be Hussein but rather the weapons inspection program itself. The real casualty is the last chance to avoid bloody conflict.

TRIBUTE TO GEOFF MALEMAN

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 2002

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the achievements of my friend and constituent Geoff Maleman, of Westchester, California.

As the President of the Westchester/LAX/Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce, Geoff is a tireless leader in the business and greater community.

Following the tragic events of September 11th, Geoff spearheaded an effort with other local Chambers of Commerce to develop a task force to address challenges facing the business community. The travel industry surrounding Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is beginning to recover, in no small part, due to Geoff's leadership.

Geoff is a great communicator. We have cohosted numerous forums together in my Congressional District. Last October, Geoff and I spoke to hundreds of residents and business owners about security at Los Angeles International Airport, an issue of great concern to the neighboring communities. Geoff was both informative and reassuring in addressing the challenging and frightening issue.

Most importantly, Geoff and his wife Nicole are proud new parents of a beautiful baby girl, Kaitlyn Michelle Maleman—born during his term as President, on December 6, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, as Geoff's tenure as President of the Westchester/LAX/Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce comes to an end, I appreciate this opportunity to share how proud and fortunate I am to have Geoff Maleman in my Congressional District.

ON HILLSBORO, OREGON'S RECEIPT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION'S CORE VALUES PROJECT OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 2002

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to honor Hillsboro, Oregon for its receipt of the International Association for Public Participation's Core Values Project of the Year Award for its Hillsboro 2020 Vision Project.

During the past 20 years, Hillsboro has experienced significant residential and economic growth. The community has become economically self-sufficient with a strong and diverse industrial base, and vital retail areas. It has grown geographically to more than double its