

I have no doubt that his actions qualify him for this award. After all, if saving someone's life does not earn one the Medal of Honor, then what does? Sergeant McKiddy made the ultimate sacrifice to fight for his country and protect his fellow man. His distinguished service deserves the highest honor. I know Sergeant McKiddy's family, and I know how much this honor would mean to them. After more than 30 years, they are as committed as ever to receiving the appropriate recognition of Gary's service. I too am committed to doing all that I can to ensure that Sergeant McKiddy receives the Medal of Honor. As a Vietnam-era veteran and the son of a World War II veteran, I know in my heart the honor in answering a nation's call to serve and the value of this service.

I have heard from Gary's relatives, his close friends, and the man he saved, Specialist Skaggs. They too know in their hearts the ultimate gift that Gary and our other lost soldiers gave to us. I believe the Army should reverse its decision and award Sergeant Gary McKiddy the Medal of Honor that he deserves, and I pledge to Gary's family and friends that I will continue to fight alongside them to see that Gary receives this honor. The Congressman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL), has been very active in this effort for many, many years, and we pledge together to work to make this happen.

May we all keep in our prayers those men and women who are serving our Nation overseas today. Like Gary, they show us through their courage and strength what it means to be an American.

HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to Huntington's Disease which affects approximately 30,000 people in the United States. Each child of a parent with Huntington's Disease has a 50 percent risk of inheriting the illness, meaning that there are 200,000 individuals who are at risk today. Huntington's Disease results from a genetically programmed degeneration of nerve cells in certain parts of the brain.

□ 1445

While medication is available to help control the symptoms of Huntington's Disease, sadly, there is no treatment to stop or reverse the course of the disease.

According to the Huntington's Disease Society of America, this disease is named for Dr. George Huntington who first described this hereditary disorder in 1872. Huntington's Disease is now recognized as one of the more common genetic disorders in America. Hunting-

ton's Disease affects as many people as hemophilia, cystic fibrosis and muscular dystrophy.

Early symptoms of Huntington's Disease may affect cognitive ability or mobility and include depression, mood swings, forgetfulness, clumsiness, involuntary twitching, and lack of coordination. As the disease progresses, concentration and short-term memory diminish and involuntary movements of the head, trunk and limbs increase. Walking, speaking, and swallowing abilities deteriorate. Eventually the person is unable to care for himself or herself. Death follows from complications such as choking, infection, or heart failure.

Huntington's Disease typically begins in mid-life between the ages of 30 and 45, though onset may occur as early as the age of 2. Children who develop the juvenile form of the disease rarely live to adulthood. Huntington's Disease affects men and women equally and crosses all ethnic and racial boundaries. Everyone who carries the gene will develop the disease. In 1993, the Huntington's Disease gene was isolated and a direct genetic test developed which can accurately determine whether a person carries the Huntington's Disease gene.

I would like to commend Dr. Ruth Abramson of Columbia, South Carolina for her leadership and dedication for conducting ongoing research to find a cure for Huntington's Disease at both the University of South Carolina School of Medicine and the South Carolina Department of Mental Health. I also want to commend my chief of staff, Eric Dell, and his courageous mother, Ouida Dell, for their efforts in fighting Huntington's Disease within their family.

I encourage the American people to be aware of their own family histories, to be aware of the issues in genetic testing, and to advocate for families with Huntington's Disease in their communities. I also call on my colleagues in the House to join in this effort to find a cure for those suffering from this disease.

To that extent, I would like to read this concurrent resolution about Huntington's Disease which I have introduced in the House of Representatives.

"Concurrent resolution. Whereas about 30,000 people in the United States suffer from Huntington's Disease; whereas each child of a parent with Huntington's Disease has a 50 percent risk of inheriting the illness; around 200,000 individuals are at risk; whereas Huntington's Disease results from a genetically programmed degeneration of nerve cells in certain parts of the brain; whereas this degeneration causes uncontrolled movements, loss of intellectual faculties, and emotional disturbances; whereas presymptomatic testing is available for those with a family history of Huntington's Disease, and medication is available to help

control the symptoms, yet there is no treatment to stop or reverse the course of the disease; whereas Congress as an institution and Members of Congress as individuals are in unique positions to help raise public awareness about the need for increased funding for research, detection, and treatment of Huntington's Disease and to support the fight against this disease:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that subsection 1, all Americans should take an active role in the fight against Huntington's Disease by any means available to them, including being aware of their own family history, being aware of the issues in genetic testing, and advocating for families with Huntington's Disease in their communities and their States;

"Section 2, the role played by national community organizations and health care providers in promoting awareness should be recognized and applauded;

"And section 3, the Federal Government has a responsibility to, A, endeavor to raise awareness about the detection and treatment of Huntington's Disease; and B, increase funding for research so that a cure might be found."

Mr. Speaker, as May marked Huntington's Disease Awareness Month, we must do everything possible to ensure we search out hope for thousands of Americans by finding a cure for this disease.

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

(Mr. FILNER 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GEPHARDT SPEECH TO WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS AND THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS DESERVES CAREFUL STUDY BY HOUSE MEMBERS

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech made last week by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the House of Representatives Democratic leader. He offered ideas for constructing a strong, bipartisan, long-term approach to the war on terrorism in a speech to the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and to the Council on Foreign Relations. As we have come to know and expect, our distinguished leader offered outstanding insights and thoughtful proposals for dealing with the urgent issues of our Nation's foreign policy.

Leader GEPHARDT outlined proposals to build consensus for military transformation so we can win the war on terrorism. He offered a 21st Century foreign policy to promote prosperity, democracy and universal education for stability and opportunity in the developing world. He proposed greater citizen involvement in all aspects of our public diplomacy. Leader GEPHARDT urged the administration to do more to strengthen international alliances that will help fight terrorism, and he called for the much faster development of a tough new homeland defense strategy.

Mr. Speaker, Leader GEPHARDT wisely stated in his speech that the goal of America's foreign policy in the 21st century should be "to promote the universal values of freedom, fairness and opportunity, which has never been more in America's self-interest. We should seek to lead a community of nations that are law-abiding, prosperous and democratic. Such a world would leave fewer places for terrorists to hide and more places for citizens across the globe to pursue life, liberty, and happiness."

The three qualities of this foreign policy, as Leader GEPHARDT points out, should be economic development, democracy, and universal education. These qualities are not only intimately interconnected and self-reinforcing, but they are critical to the achievement of long-term American security and prosperity and, more importantly, they are pragmatic, achievable, and cost-effective.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out an additional observation that Leader GEPHARDT made in his speech. He could not have been more correct when he said that "America must lead" and that "leadership is not a synonym for unilateralism." The recent U.S. foreign policy moves towards international agreements, multilateral institutions, and transnational issues such as the environment pose a threat to our ability to prosecute the war on terrorism

effectively by putting at risk the assistance and cooperation of other nations, including some of our closest allies. America must remain engaged and America must lead.

Leader GEPHARDT's ideas deserve the thoughtful consideration of all of us as we grapple with America's course in foreign policy. I am proud to enter a copy of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT)'s speech into the RECORD, and I urge all of my colleagues to give it the thorough reading and study it deserves.

BUILDING A NEW LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AND SECURITY

Today, we are gathering almost nine months after enemies of America killed more than 3,000 of our fellow citizens.

It has been eight months since America sent troops into battle in Afghanistan and five months since dialogue in the Middle East broke down and that region sank into destructive waves of suicide bombings.

Today, events continue to move swiftly, with momentous consequences for our nation and for the people of the world.

I believe now is the appropriate time to reflect on how we have gotten here, but much more importantly, where we must go.

Too often, issues of national security are considered separately—they are seen as fragmented, distinct disputes, such as: Must we prepare for two major simultaneous wars? What should be our diplomatic approach to the Middle East? Or will Americans back peacekeeping in some foreign land?

But it is also evident, when we take a step back, that these issues are profoundly intertwined, and that we must approach them from the single perspective of ensuring America's security.

The world in which we live is very different from the Cold War era, when a bipartisan group of "wise men" shaped our thinking. I do not need to talk very much about the trends that have remade our times—we live with them every day.

Globalization has made events in faraway places more relevant to use that ever before.

Information technology and the latest scientific revolution have changed the way we live and produced astonishing gains in productivity and knowledge.

And, of course, the crumbling of the Soviet empire has fundamentally changed the strategic face of the globe.

With the advent of each of these trends, the world has become closer, moved faster, and grown more interconnected.

Great wars have been followed by uneasy peace as America has struggled to create international arrangements to preserve harmony. After each war, America has debated how engaged it should be in world affairs; and when the peace has been broken, America has chosen to engage the world ever more closely.

I urge this Administration to build on this tradition of engagement, not turn away from it. Now is the time to take the long view of this challenge. We are often too focused on issues at the margins of the status quo. This is not going to be a short struggle or an easy one. In addition to all we are doing now, we will need to do more. We will need to make our military stronger, our homeland safer, and build alliances abroad to serve American interests.

We are engaged in a global conflict. We face a competition between governance and terror, between the great majority who benefit from order, and the small few who thrive on chaos.

The question today is whether a collection of nation states—committed to human val-

ues of democracy and freedom, the rule of law and tolerance—can succeed in a struggle against the ideology of fanaticism and extremism, an ideology that holds us to be the political, economic, and cultural enemy and states its desire to destroy America.

While we now have terrorist organizations on the run, we must acknowledge that in some ways they are succeeding in creating division. Enemies of America still flourish, sowing seeds of hatred for this country and reaping violence. Some terrorist groups are small in number, limited in visibility and short on supplies. Others find harbor in failed states or enjoy support from sympathetic regimes, utilizing sophisticated technology to hatch their murderous plots. This is a tough, complicated foe, one that should not be oversimplified or underestimated.

Over the past half-century, America's bipartisan policy of containment served to hem in and deter a singular, comparable adversary. Today, with smaller, less discernible enemies, we need a strategy that seeks not to wall off threatening parts of the world, but to engage potentially hostile regions.

We need to be prepared to deliver the most forceful military responses to provocation, but also to expand opportunities for peace and prosperity. With deference to George Kennan, the seminal work he did at the Council on Foreign Relations, and the institute here that bears his name, I believe such a policy could be called one of commitment. With determination as our guide, we must move forward with a unified approach:

A commitment to constantly updating the most effective military ever;

A commitment to being engaged diplomatically all over the world;

A commitment to making our homeland secure and involving our citizens and our leaders in the issues of the world.

President Bush was right Saturday to say we are fighting a new war and will have to be ready to strike when necessary, not just deter. But on the home front, we are moving too slowly to develop a homeland defense plan that is tough enough for this new war.

Let us be clear about the stakes in this struggle. As in all wars, the question is not just who shall govern, but also one of life itself. More than 3,000 people died on Sept. 11th. And American lives remain at risk so long as we are in this conflict.

MODERNIZATION OF THE MILITARY

Of course, no one makes a greater sacrifice, or a more important contribution to our security, than our nation's military. The first challenge of a new policy is to strengthen our Armed Forces for the future.

We know our military must go through a transformation—and we need our legislative branch to be working on this transformation along with the executive and uniformed services.

Each of the branches is already reaching for the goal of modernization. In the future, our Army will be lighter and faster; our Navy will deploy smaller, stealthier ships; the Marines will move faster and with more firepower; and the Air Force will revolutionize its planes and weapons systems.

The results will be positive. As Bill Owens, the former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, has suggested, electronics and computers should dramatically improve our forces without huge cost increases.

But to set goals and achieve them are two different things. While some experts foresee transformations that could take up to 30 years, much of what we must accomplish has to happen in 15 or less. So we need to focus our energies and our resources.

My suggestions for military reform come with two qualifiers.

First, I am deeply committed to not politicizing our military and strategic decision-