

Prior to the 31st Infantry's surrender, Mr. Small was suffering from malaria and malnutrition caused by the malaria. He was released just 3 days before he began what would become known to history as the Bataan Death March. Although weak, Mr. Small survived the death march and the 17-day journey in the infamous "Hell Ships" to Japan.

While being held by the Japanese, Mr. Small's weight declined to approximately 98 pounds. He was held as a Japanese Prisoner of War for 3 years and 5 months until his liberation on September 10, 1945.

Mr. Small was awarded the American Defense Service Medal with one Bronze Star, an American Campaign Medal, the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with two Bronze Stars, the Distinguished Unit Badge with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one Bronze Star, the World War II Victory Medal, and the POW Medal for his meritorious service.

Mr. Small was discharged from the Army on November 26, 1946 and decided to stay in the Army Reserves until his retirement as a Major on March 1, 1968. Mr. Small will celebrate his 98th birthday on February 24, 2006. Mr. Small's will to survive and dedication to the United States Army is a testament to his character, and it is an honor to recognize him today.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and heartfelt gratitude that I salute a great American hero, George Small, for his service and dedication to our great Nation.

SHORTCHANGING OUR TROOPS: RUMSFELD SPENDS BILLIONS TO FIGHT FICTIVE SUPERPOWERS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce into the RECORD the editorial entitled "Still Shortchanging the Troops" which appeared on February 10, 2006, in the New York Times. The military industrial complex is in your face America, front and center, rewarding corporate America, contractors and Halliburton, but shortchanging the troops.

The New York Times in its lead editorial on February 10, 2006, made a scathing criticism of Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's recently revealed Defense Department budget. As the Times put it: "It's amazing how Donald Rumsfeld's Defense Spending plan can produce a \$439 billion and still skimp on the one thing the American Military desperately needs: expanded ground forces so the weakened and cannibalized Army" can meet the needs of Iraq without hurting its ability to respond to other threats.

I do not believe more ground troops are needed in Iraq. I think this editorial is referencing the fact that the troops fighting in Iraq are returning two, three and four times and have borne more than their fair share of President Bush's Iraq war. I support Congressman MURTHA's position that our ground troops in Iraq have become the targets in Iraq; the one unifying idea for all the splintered factions fighting a civil war there is that Americans must get out of their country. However, there is much I do agree with in the editorial.

I agree that it is a disgrace to spend only a small part of its 7 percent budget increase for increase of pay and recruitment bonuses while a "large chunk of this nearly \$30 billion goes to more new weapons and postponing overdue cuts in wasteful Air Force and Navy projects unrelated to fighting terrorism. This highlights as nothing else can the disconnect with what Secretary Rumsfeld says he cares about and what he really cares about.

When the Secretary of Defense is at a press conference or a briefing, he consistently talks about this war and the brave men and women sacrificing in Iraq to keep us safe. He and President Bush have repeatedly expressed the view that we are fighting the terrorists "over there, so we don't have to fight them over here." Support the troops has become the rallying call for those who blindly accept platitudes in place of plans and rhetoric instead of substantive answers to the many legitimate questions being asked by millions of U.S. citizens. Secretary Rumsfeld misses no opportunity to label Americans who do not give unquestioning support to the President's war as unpatriotic and worse giving support to terrorists and harming our troops in Iraq.

It is quite obvious to me that neither President Bush nor Secretary Rumsfeld support our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq. The President precipitously sent our troops into battle on false information and with no plan for the peace. Iraq has become a haven for terrorists and is currently in a civil war in which our troops are caught with nowhere to go. Secretary Rumsfeld sent them into combat without the necessary armored trucks and tanks and without the necessary body armor. Even from the beginning of the war, there were stories about parents having to buy their sons and daughters armor and of parents collecting used bullet proof vests from policemen. Even after Rumsfeld was asked when he would get his armor, Rumsfeld had nothing but the most unsettling reply. You go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you wish you had. No, Secretary Rumsfeld, you go to war with a properly equipped army and an exit plan to get the troops out of harm's way when the mission is accomplished.

Even after this incident, when Secretary Rumsfeld was questioned by Members of Congress about the lack of proper armor, the troops did not receive what they needed. A recently released report from the Navy and Military pathologist showed that 80 percent of deaths from torso injuries could have been prevented if the troops had had the proper body armor. The Navy had ordered the armor. As of January 7, the Army had not. This indicates a neglect of the troops, not support for the troops.

I am also glad that the Times repeats a truth well worth repeating and one I hope the country will finally understand and will not only demand Secretary Rumsfeld's resignation but hold him responsible for the many unnecessary deaths in Iraq caused by his refusal to listen to his own senior generals.

According to the Times and according to my belief and that of many of my Democratic colleagues: "The prospects of Iraq might have been very different today if Mr. Rumsfeld had listened to some of his own senior generals and occupation officials and authorized significantly larger ground forces from the beginning. The early looting might have been contained before it shattered political confidence and

vital infrastructure. The insurgency might never have gotten such a head start. . . . But the obstinate ideologues in Mr. Rumsfeld's Pentagon have never accepted the fact that the reality of Iraq did not fit their assumptions. The budget and the four-year plan released with it read almost as if the current conflict had never happened and could never happen again."

The budget priorities reveal Mr. Rumsfeld's utter disdain for our troops and an almost unbelievable disconnect from what is actually happening in Iraq. In his speech before the National Press Club on February 3, 2006, Secretary Rumsfeld reiterated his view of the war Americans now face, a war he calls a "generational war." This is the war both he and the President have variously described as the war on fascist Islamic fundamentalists; or against al Qaeda terrorists, or ideologues determined to replace our American values with the values of those who hate freedom and hate our way of life.

A very important point made by the Times editorial and the one I want to particularly emphasize is the complete disconnect between the Pentagon budget and spending plan set out and explained to the National Press Club on February 3, 2006, and what Mr. Rumsfeld is spending on in 2007. The President and Mr. Rumsfeld have told the Nation it will be fighting for the next 30 years or perhaps forever a long war against an army we can't see because it does not represent a nation state; it may not wear a uniform; it could be in any country at any time. But, as the Times points out: "Instead of reallocating resources toward the real threat America faces, the military services continue to pour their money into fighting fictive superpowers in the wild blue yonder and on and below the seven seas. Pentagon budgeters showed themselves so pathetically unable to restrain spending on expensive ships and planes that they actually cut back, rather than increased the overall size of the Army over the next few years to pay for it.

It would cost about \$4 billion to \$5 billion a year to give the Army 30,000 more troops, the minimum it needs to check its alarming slide. Instead the Pentagon chose to begin the construction of two unneeded new stealth destroyers, which will end up costing \$2 billion to \$3 billion each.

It also decided to splurge on a new nuclear attack submarine for \$2.6 billion and to shell out \$5.5 billion for separate Navy and Air Force versions of new stealth fighter jets, plus another \$5.5 billion for yet a third version that either can use. In all the Pentagon is asking for \$84 billion to buy weapons systems—twice what it got in 1996—and \$73 billion more for research and development.

This budget would be wasteful even under a worst-case assumption that had a second superpower arising within the life span of these weapons, turning hostile to America and arming itself to the teeth with the most advanced weapons. There's still unnecessary spending that could be used to repair the Army, which has been ground down at least as much by Pentagon miserliness as by Iraqi insurgents.

The citizens of this country, all of them care about the troops. Disagreeing with the President's policies or lack of them does not mean an American does not care about the troops. I would argue those questioning the President

care more about the troops than the President. In the same way, Secretary Rumsfeld, preparing for wars with fictive superpowers while still ignoring the very real need of the troops in Iraq, reveals a chilling lack of concern for the troops.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 2006]

ARMY PLEDGES NO CUTBACKS IN NATIONAL GUARD

(By Ann Scott Tyson)

Facing pressure from both parties in Congress and state National Guard leaders, the Army yesterday committed to keeping the National Guard's authorized manpower at 350,000 and promised to fund it up to that level.

"If they recruit 350,000, the funding's there. Their authorization remains 350,000," Gen. Peter Schoomaker, the Army's chief of staff, said at a Pentagon news conference yesterday.

Because of recruiting shortfalls, the Guard has about 333,000 soldiers on the rolls, but Guard leaders say they are confident of reaching the goal of 350,000 this year. "We are on a glide path to get to 350,000," said Lt. Gen. Clyde Vaughn, director of the Army National Guard, who appeared at the briefing with Schoomaker.

The Army had proposed cutting the budgeted Guard strength by about 17,000 positions, in part by replacing six combat brigades that each have 3,500 to 4,000 slots with brigade headquarters that have only a few hundred, said Maj. Gen. Roger P. Lempke, president of the Adjutants General Association of the United States.

The National Guard, which represents about 38 percent of the U.S. military's force structure, has served heavily in Iraq, deploying seven combat brigades as well as headquarters and other units with tens of thousands of troops since the war began. Last fall, it surged 50,000 troops to respond to hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

"There's a very strong sense out there among our political leadership that the Guard should not be reduced in any way right now," Lempke said yesterday. "We don't know where the war is going. We're very heavily deployed" and the suggested cuts "didn't set well," said Lempke, whose association represents the senior leaders of the Army and Air National Guard in the 54 states, territories and the District of Columbia.

A bipartisan group of 75 U.S. senators yesterday sent Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld a letter stating they "strongly oppose" reported proposals by the Pentagon to cut National Guard force levels.

"We respectfully oppose proposals to cut the end-strength of the National Guard," said the letter from Sen. Christopher S. Bond (R-Mo.) and Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), co-chairs of the Senate's National Guard Caucus. The letter signed by 73 other senators.

Lempke said he welcomed the Army's commitment to keep end strength at 350,000, which he said will help ensure budget money is allocated for the necessary training and recruitment.

Schoomaker said the Army would progress with a plan to cut the number of National Guard combat brigades from 34 to 28, but reiterated a plan to replace them with six support brigades. One reason for the reduction in combat brigades, he said, was that many of the units were not fully manned or equipped, a situation worsened when soldiers and gear were shifted to units deploying for Iraq—a process the Army calls "cross-leveling."

"We've used 34 brigades all over the world, and we've had to cross-level big time since 9/11 to make that happen," Vaughn said.

The Army plan calls for ensuring the 28 remaining combat brigades will be fully manned, trained and equipped to be ready to deploy, Schoomaker said. Toward this goal, the Army has budgeted about \$21 billion from 2005 to 2011 to modernize equipment for the National Guard, which he said was a fourfold increase over funding levels in 1999.

"This is a tremendous investment," Schoomaker said. "This is not taking things down; this is building wholeness up."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 2006]

STILL SHORTCHANGING THE TROOPS

It's amazing how Donald Rumsfeld's Defense Department can produce a \$439 billion spending plan and still skimp on the one thing the American military desperately needs: expanded ground forces so the weakened and cannibalized Army can meet the requirements of Iraq without hurting its ability to respond to other threats.

While the Pentagon intends to increase pay and recruitment bonuses, no part of its nearly 7 percent budget increase is aimed at raising overall troop strength. Instead, a large chunk of this nearly \$30 billion bonanza goes to buying more new weapons and postponing overdue cuts in wasteful Air Force and Navy projects unrelated to fighting terrorism.

The prospects for Iraq might be very different today if Mr. Rumsfeld had listened to some of his own senior generals and occupation officials and authorized significantly larger ground forces from the beginning. The early looting might have been contained before it shattered political confidence and vital infrastructure. The insurgency might never have gotten such a head start. The incineration tactics of Falluja and the Abu Ghraib nightmare might have been avoided. And the Army's downward spiral of readiness, recruitment and morale might never have begun. But the obstinate ideologues in Mr. Rumsfeld's Pentagon have never accepted the fact that the reality of Iraq did not fit their assumptions. The budget and the four-year plan released with it read almost as if the current conflict had never happened and could never happen again.

Instead of reallocating resources toward the real threats America faces, the military services continue to pour their money into fighting fictive superpowers in the wild blue yonder and on and below the seven seas. Pentagon budgeters showed themselves so pathetically unable to restrain spending on expensive ships and planes that they actually cut back, rather than increased, the overall size of the Army over the next few years to pay for it.

It would cost about \$4 billion to \$5 billion a year to give the Army 30,000 more troops, the minimum it needs to check its alarming slide. Instead the Pentagon chose to begin the construction of two unneeded new stealth destroyers, which will end up costing \$2 billion to \$3 billion each.

It also decided to splurge on a new nuclear attack submarine for \$2.6 billion and to shell out \$5.5 billion for separate Navy and Air Force versions of new stealth fighter jets, plus another \$5.5 billion for yet a third version that either can use. In all, the Pentagon is asking for \$84 billion to buy weapons systems (twice what it got in 1996) and \$73 billion more for research and development.

This budget would be wasteful even under a worst-case assumption that had a second superpower arising within the lifespan of these weapons, turning hostile to America and arming itself to the teeth with the most advanced weapons. There's still unnecessary spending that could be used to repair the Army, which has been ground down at least

as much by Pentagon miserliness as by Iraqi insurgents.

The military contractors are doing just fine. It's the troops in Iraq who need help from Washington.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. RICHARD P. MCCORMICK

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 2006

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Richard P. McCormick, professor, dean, and historian of Rutgers—the State University of New Jersey, as well as president of the New Jersey Historical Society, who passed away on January 16, 2006. Having faithfully served the University and the State of New Jersey for over six decades, Dr. McCormick died after an extended illness at the age of 89.

Born December 14, 1916, in Queens, New York, Richard Patrick McCormick moved to Tenafly, New Jersey, and attended Rutgers College, graduating with a bachelor's degree in 1938. In 1940, he earned a master's degree in history from Rutgers Graduate School–New Brunswick and then received his doctorate in 1948 from the University of Pennsylvania.

After teaching in the history department for three years, Dr. McCormick was appointed the Rutgers University Historian in 1948, at which time he developed a full-year course on New Jersey's history. A prolific writer, Dr. McCormick was awarded the biennial book prize from the American Association for State and Local History in 1968 for his work "Rutgers, a Bicentennial History." He remained at Rutgers where he chaired the history department from 1966 to 1969, chaired the Rutgers College Coeducational Committee in 1971, and served as dean of Rutgers College from 1974 to 1977.

Following his retirement in 1982, Dr. McCormick remained active on campus and was awarded an honorary doctor of letters degree by the University, a rare distinction for faculty members. In 1990, he was inducted into the Rutgers Hall of Distinguished Alumni, and in 2002, the American Historical Association granted Dr. McCormick the Award for Scholarly Distinction for lifetime achievement. Additionally, this past fall, the Rutgers College Educational Opportunity Fund created the Richard P. McCormick Social Justice Award in recognition of his 1969 efforts to address African-American issues at the school, despite protests on three of the University's campuses. These honors, among others, depict a man of great worth who will surely be missed.

Dr. McCormick is survived by his wife of 60 years, Katheryne Levis McCormick, as well as their daughter, Dorothy Boulia; son, the current president of Rutgers, Richard L. McCormick; and three grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commemorate Dr. McCormick and to thank his family for the countless contributions that he made to the community and the State of New Jersey. His dedication to education, history, and activism will not be forgotten.