

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). The resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 5, 108th Congress, and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) of the House to the Select Committee on Homeland Security to fill the existing vacancy thereon, and to rank immediately after the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

There was no objection.

UNITED FOR AMERICAN SOLDIERS

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today to call for a higher level of political dialogue and to request that we set aside the recent onslaught of partisanship concerning the war in Iraq.

Being in Kansas over the last several weeks has reminded me of the need to come together, to unify behind our forces fighting overseas. While not everyone will agree on the reasons they got there or whether these reasons justify war, the reality is that American soldiers are engaged in battle. Our troops are fighting for the rights that we have in this Chamber that we must uphold: The cause of liberty, of justice, and freedom from oppression.

This Congress adopted a resolution authorizing the use of force on October 16, 2002 with a vote of 296 to 133.

In recent weeks we have seen the reports of some of the deadliest fighting of the war. We have received reports daily that another soldier has been killed and that another young person has died. Timing is important and priorities must be established. I believe there are legitimate questions to be asked and answered about intelligence that we received before the war, but now we have thousands of troops that are depending upon Americans to unite behind their efforts. Partisan fingerpointing surrounding the 9/11 Commission is not productive, either to the Commission or to the troops. It undercuts the jobs our troops have loyally agreed to do.

These are not Republicans or Democrats in Iraq, these are American soldiers, our men and women, our sons and daughters, our neighbors and friends, fighting so that the people of Iraq might have a chance for a better tomorrow and to reduce the threat of a terrorist attack on our own country.

These are critical times. Historically during times of crisis, some of our greatest leaders have risen above the partisanship of the moment to unite

behind our troops and our President. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, from my State of Kansas, is just one example. Following the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, Eisenhower emerged from his farm and from retirement to meet with President Kennedy and to defend the President's actions.

Eisenhower understood. He knew what it was like to be President, but he also knew what it was like to be on the front lines as a soldier. He knew that criticizing the President during difficult times would provide encouragement to our foes and weaken our Nation's resolve. Eisenhower knew that using war for partisan gain would only serve to undermine the mission of the troops and dishonor the sacrifices of their families.

But today candidates and elected officials alike rush to the evening cable news shows to berate President Bush, to the detriment I believe of the troops he commands, diminishing the validity of their efforts. I am troubled as I imagine a soldier or a soldier's family listening to insensitive remarks, wondering if the soldier will be forsaken by a country whose call to duty he or she answered. Our soldiers and their families deserve better. Partisanship for the sake of scoring political points has no place on the front lines of the war.

Last week, a friend told me, "This is just another Vietnam." Well, I thought a lot about that and concluded it is only another Vietnam if we create that environment. I came of age during the Vietnam era. I remember the protests, the body counts, the escalation and the retreat. This is not today's Vietnam, not unless we choose to make it through inconsistent policies, contradictory strategies and weakened resolve. We can win both the war and the peace in Iraq, and emerge having given the people of Iraq and the region new reason for hope.

An e-mail from a Fort Riley soldier arrived in my office this month and ended with this quote: "You have never lived . . . until you have almost died . . . for those that have fought to protect it . . . freedom has a special flavor . . . the protected will never know."

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues and all Americans to think of our men and women overseas before they rush to criticize the conduct of this war. Our soldiers' efforts must be upheld and honored. I do not consider it unpatriotic to question governmental decisions, but what we need today are politicians who put country above partisanship and their Nation ahead of the next election. We need statesmanship.

By unifying behind our troops and their efforts, by requiring our political and military leaders to develop not an exit strategy but a winning strategy, and by making certain that the Iraqi people fully fight for the future of their own country, we can sustain our troops and the mission can be accomplished. With consistent policies, clear strategies, and a firm resolve, we can avoid

the war in Iraq becoming just another Vietnam.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

There was no objection.

MISSING WITHOUT ACTION

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the previous speaker. The growing division in America over war in Iraq pales by comparison with the gut wrenching images that divided America during the Vietnam War. Thousands of men were called to serve their countries in Vietnam. Senator JOHN KERRY did just that. Other Americans chose to be conscientious objectors and serve their country in non-combatant roles.

Still other Americans had one or another kind of deferment or joined the National Guard. A week ago, the administration chose to enlist Republicans in a new kind of draft for a new kind of war.

In this Chamber, Republicans launched a sneak attack against the heroism and patriotism of Senator JOHN KERRY. The American people deserve to know the service records of Senator JOHN KERRY and President George W. Bush. He can provide one of them. In 1968, JOHN KERRY commanded a U.S. Navy swift boat in Vietnam. This was a 50-foot aluminum boat that was heavily armed but had no armor protection.

In 1968, George W. Bush joined the Texas Air National Guard jumping ahead of 150 people on the waiting list.

On the night of December 2, 1968, JOHN KERRY commanded a Navy swift boat. It came under intense fire while on patrol. JOHN KERRY was wounded and awarded the Purple Heart.

George W. Bush meanwhile was accepted into pilot training after scoring the lowest score possible to qualify.

In early 1969, the swift boat JOHN KERRY commanded in Vietnam was in a fire fight with the enemy. JOHN KERRY was wounded by shrapnel and awarded a second Purple Heart.

When George W. Bush joined the Texas Air National Guard, he could have volunteered for overseas duty as did JOHN KERRY, but he checked the other box on the form, the one that said "do not volunteer."

In March 1969, JOHN KERRY's swift boat was one of five on patrol in the Bay Hap River. They came under attack. The boat was hit. An intense fire fight ensued. Suddenly a mine detonated near his boat. JOHN KERRY was hit and bleeding. Viet Cong fired automatic weapons from the shore. A man in KERRY's boat fell overboard. JOHN KERRY would not leave that man behind. Under intense fire, JOHN KERRY turned the boat around. With both sides exchanging fire, JOHN KERRY moved to the bow of the swift boat, exposed to enemy fire. Still bleeding, JOHN KERRY did not hesitate. He reached down into the water, bullets whizzing by. JOHN KERRY grabbed hold of the sailor and pulled him into the boat. For his courage and valor under fire, JOHN KERRY was awarded the distinguished Combat "V."

JOHN KERRY was wounded three times in battle serving his country. Yet, Republicans on this floor rose to dishonor every combat veteran by attacking JOHN KERRY and others.

In 2000, Senator Max Cleland of Georgia lost both legs and one arm in Vietnam. Republicans disgraced themselves by impugning the man's courage and service to the Nation. America needs to know. Where was President Bush during the Vietnam War?

Missing without action, that is where the President was.

In February 1972, the military stripped George W. Bush of his flight status. He was suspended from flying for failure to take a required physical exam. Why? Why did George W. Bush not take the physical? Would a physical have revealed a top gun or a smoking gun? We do not know.

There is an 11-month gap in George W. Bush's record, from May 1, 1972 to April 1, 1973. George W. Bush was not only grounded during this period, he was on the ground in Alabama working in a political campaign. That is not a mission in the National Guard manual. We would like to know more, but the National Guard Bureau Chief told a Spokane, Washington newspaper he was under orders not to talk.

Why is that?

We know that Senator JOHN KERRY was wounded in battle three times. We know that Senator JOHN KERRY never left a man behind. We know that Senator JOHN KERRY fought with courage and valor on behalf of his country.

We know that George W. Bush flew under the radar, because that is the only explanation of how a pilot suspended from flying parachuted into a Republican political campaign in Alabama.

JOHN KERRY, Max Cleland. America has many heroes from the Vietnam War. It is time Republicans and the administration honor the courage and

valor of American veterans, no matter what party they belong to.

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

(Mr. OSBORNE 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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

□ 1945

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 89TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARME- NIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the one and a half million Armenians who perished in the Armenian genocide that began 89 years ago on April 24, 1915. I consider this a sacred obligation, to ensure that future generations of Americans remember the first genocide of the 20th century and to ensure that the men, women and children who perished at the hands of the Ottoman Empire are not lost to history.

We have always recognized the transience of memory. It is why we set aside holidays and build monuments to honor our heroes and the events that have shaped our societies. The stone and concrete of a memorial serve to freeze history and to preserve it for those who will follow. The written word cannot be burned when it is etched into rock.

Time is the ally of those who would deny or change history. Such has it been with the government of Turkey and the Armenian genocide. Although the genocide was perpetrated by modern Turkey's predecessor, generations of Turkish leaders have steadfastly denied that the genocide ever took place, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

Time is on their side. The generation of Armenians with direct memory of the genocide is gone. Their children are

aging. Much of the rest of the world has moved on, reluctant to dredge up unpleasant memories and risk the ire of modern Turkey. For those of us who care deeply about the issue, we must redouble our efforts to ensure that our Nation, which has championed liberty and human rights throughout its history, is not complicit in Ankara's effort to obfuscate what happened between 1915 and 1923. Worse still, by tacitly siding with those who would deny the Armenian genocide, we have rendered hollow our commitment to never again let genocide occur.

Among historians there is no dispute that what happened to the Armenian people was genocide. Thousands of pages of documents sit in our National Archives. Newspapers of the day were replete with stories about the murder of Armenians. Appeal to Turkey to stop massacres headlined the New York Times on April 28, 1915, just as the killing began. On October 7 of that year, the Times reported that 800,000 Armenians had been slain in cold blood in Asia Minor. In mid-December of 1915, the Times spoke of a million Armenians killed or in exile.

Prominent citizens of the day, including America's ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, and Britain's Lord Bryce reported on the massacres in great detail. Morgenthau was appalled at what he would later call the sadistic orgies of rape, torture, and murder. Lord Bryce, a former British ambassador to the United States, worked to raise awareness of and money for the victims of what he called the most colossal crime in the history of the world. In October 1915, the Rockefeller Foundation contributed \$30,000, a sum worth more than half a million dollars today, to a relief fund for Armenia.

Others, too, reacted in horror to what Ambassador Morgenthau called, for lack of a specific term, race murder. In the early 1930s, 10 years after the genocide, a young Polish attorney named Raphael Lemkin, who had read of the genocide as a child, tried to get European statesmen to criminalize the destruction of ethnic and religious groups. He was dismissed as an alarmist. A few years later, when Hitler invaded Poland, Lemkin lost 49 members of his family in the Holocaust.

Lemkin escaped, first to Sweden, where he documented the horrors going on in Nazi-occupied Europe and then to the United States, where he worked for the Allied war effort. He resolved to create a word to convey the mass atrocities being committed by the Germans. In 1944, while working for the U.S. War Department, he coined the term "genocide," citing the slaughter of Armenians three decades earlier.

In 1948, in the shadow of the Holocaust, the international community responded to Nazi Germany's methodically orchestrated acts of genocide by approving the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. It confirms that genocide