

Well, I am here to say tonight it is a sham. And I would hope, overnight, that my colleagues on this side of the aisle would see the light and have the courage to vote against it, to not participate in the sham. But I don't know if they will or not.

But let me just give you the background and the backdrop of why all of this is happening. This war started March 19, 2003. Total number of U.S. troops in Iraq today, about 133,000. Number of soldiers dead, 2,499, as of June 14. Number of soldiers injured, 18,490, as of June 14. Total amount appropriated, including latest supplemental, \$320 billion. The cost of the war per month, \$6.1 billion, almost \$11 million an hour. There were 1,398 reported killings in May alone, more than any other month since the war began in 2003, and that figure doesn't include slain soldiers or civilians killed in bombings. Yet, the President of the United States would make you believe we are winning the war. We are advancing. We are going to be able to turn this mess over to the Iraqis and they are going to be able to contain what is now a civil war.

According to the Pentagon, there are about 600 insurgent attacks each week since the new government took over in February. The rate of insurgent attacks is higher now than it was in 2004. Our soldiers are being killed. It is difficult for them to protect themselves against these bombings, these suicide bombings, these bombings that are set off in cars along the road and dead dogs and on and on and on.

And why are they dying? We are in this war because the President of the United States said that there were weapons of mass destruction that we had to protect against. All that we have encountered is mismanagement, corruption, missteps, a lack of winning this crazy thing. Soldiers dying and some of our young people now being charged with killing innocent people because they put guns in their hands and they told them to go and kill them because they hated it.

These soldiers should not be charged. The President of the United States should be charged. The Republicans should be charged and the Democrats should get some courage and come to this Chamber and make sure that they oppose this war.

ILLEGAL ENTRY INTO TUCSON, ARIZONA

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness in the United States. And failure to protect our borders is a national security issue. And I come to you tonight with some disturbing news. The threat is even more serious than many Americans know.

Tucson, Arizona is 65 miles from Mexico. I have it here on the map. It is

shown by the red dot. It is the route to two interstates, one going north and south and one going east and west. Just southeast of Tucson, Arizona is the University of Arizona Technology Park. On that park, which is surrounded by an old-fashioned chain link fence, is a technology firm called Raytheon. Raytheon is a defense contractor that makes Tomahawk cruise missiles.

Well, neighbors in Tucson, Arizona have sent me some pictures of what appears to be illegal entry into the perimeter of this plant. Here we have the chain link fence. This photograph is taken inside the perimeter. On these premises, 400 acres, is the Raytheon plant. It is true there is another fence around Raytheon that is a fence that is a cable type fence that keeps trucks from coming through. But someone, of course, could crawl underneath or over that particular fence. And you see, Mr. Speaker, there is all types of litter inside the fence. And the question occurs, where does this come from? These are trails that are similar to what you see along the Texas border where I am from, but border towns down in Southeast Texas don't have a plant that makes Tomahawk cruise missiles. Tucson neighbors say these trails are filled with trash, backpacks, water bottles and clothes. And why is that? Well, it seems that the illegals that come from Mexico sneak under this fence and hide on these 400 acres until the human smugglers come back later and pick them up and transport them throughout the United States.

Raytheon public relations officials have said well, they hadn't heard anything about it from the security. And they have strict security procedures to enter that facility. But a supervisor at Raytheon security said yes, illegals have been known to come through the grounds, but they were just passing through. And some illegals have been found working at the Raytheon plant by subcontractors, but they were ordered off the premises.

I would like to show you some more disturbing photographs that the Tucson neighbors have sent me. This is a photograph taken inside the perimeter of the chain link fence. And you see numerous backpacks where illegals have come in to the perimeter, have hidden on the premises. When the human smugglers come to pick them up and take them into the heartland of America, they bring with them the backpacks that allow them to change clothes.

It is somewhat disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have this contractor that makes Tomahawk missiles that allows this to occur on their premises because, you see, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness in the United States. And you would think that a company that has submitted a border security plan for the Department of Homeland Security just 2 weeks ago would be concerned about their border too. After all, it is a national security issue.

I have one more photograph to show you, taken on the same premises, but on the other end of the perimeter. A similar photograph of backpacks, water bottles left by the people that illegally entered the United States. How ironic that it is that they hide on the premises of a place and an institution that is trying to protect the national security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Raytheon problems are our problems because the U.S.-Mexico border is not secure. We have to stop the illegal entry at the border between the United States and Mexico. Otherwise, we will continue to see these backpacks throughout the United States. And some may have clothes, but some may also bring in to the United States property and explosives that could damage the United States. It is a national security issue. It is a border security issue.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to the American people and have to have the moral will to protect the borders and the dignity of the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

THE WAR IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, you have heard many of my colleagues talk about the debate tomorrow on Iraq and the war that we are facing. We also have a war going on in this country that unfortunately is very quiet, and that is the shooting and killing of people throughout this country.

Most people don't realize how many people die on a yearly basis because each newspaper reports it but we don't hear all that information nationwide. There are answers on how we can get there to stop this kind of killing.

Last month the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security approved my bill, H.R. 1415, the NICS Improvement Act.

□ 1830

This is a bill that would increase the effectiveness of the existing national instant criminal background check system, the database used to check potential firearms buyers for any criminal record or any other disqualifying criteria. Hopefully, the whole committee will take up this important piece of legislation soon so it can pass both Houses before the 109th Congress adjourns.

Overall, NICS has been a very good success. Since 1994 more than 1.2 million individuals have been denied a gun because of a failed background check. NICS also provides the vast majority of honest gun sellers with peace of mind in knowing they are selling their products to citizens who will use them safely and legally.

However, the NICS system is only as good as the information it contains.

And, unfortunately, many States do not have the resources necessary to enter all of their disqualifying criteria into the NICS system. The end result is that felons and others who are not permitted by existing law to buy guns are passing background checks and buying guns through legitimate means.

In fact, 28 States have automated less than 75 percent of their criminal history records. In 15 States, domestic violence restraining orders, which are a disqualifying offense, are not accessible through the NICS system.

These and other loopholes, of course, have cost people their lives, including two of my constituents. On March 8, 2002, Peter Troy purchased a .22 caliber semiautomatic rifle from a legitimate gun dealer in New York. He had a history of mental health problems, and his own mother had a restraining order against him as the result of his violent background. Mental adjudication and a restraining order are both NICS disqualifying issues. Yet Peter Troy's NICS background check turned up no red flags. It was illegal for him to purchase a gun, but like so many others, he simply slipped through the cracks in the NICS system because of lack of information.

Four days later Peter Troy walked into Our Lady of Peace Church in Lynbrook, New York, my district, and killed two of my constituents.

Peter Troy had no business buying a gun, and the system created to prevent him from doing so simply failed. It is only a matter of time before the system's failings provoke larger tragedies. We must improve the NICS system and allow it to do what it was designed to do.

The responsibility for the accuracy and the effectiveness of the NICS system ultimately belongs to the States. However, many States' budgets are already overburdened. This legislation would provide grants to States and update the NICS system. States would be able to update their NICS database to include felons, domestic abusers, and others not legally qualified to buy a gun. The bill's goal is to have 50 States enter at least 90 percent of their disqualifying information into NICS. States that do not comply or fall short of these goals will be penalized with a 5 percent reduction of their Federal Department of Justice grant allocations.

Also, the bill would provide grants for State courts to promptly enter information into the NICS system. For example, when someone is served with a restraining order stemming from domestic violence, an inefficient NICS system allows him or her to leave the courthouse and head right to the gun store. My bill would make sure all relevant court records are entered into the NICS before a crime of passion can be committed.

It is important to keep in mind that this bill does not infringe on anyone's second amendment rights, which I support. It creates no new gun laws. It simply enforces the laws that are on

the books. If H.R. 1415 becomes law, law-abiding citizens who want to buy a gun legally will not experience any delay at the point of purchase.

And this bill proposes no new burdens on gun sellers. In fact, I introduced this bill in 2002 and it was passed here in the House.

I am hoping that we can pass this bill rapidly. We have the opportunity to stop this small war in this country, and we can save lives, which is the most important thing.

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

(Mr. BILIRAKIS 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 North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD extraneous materials this evening, particularly an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Prices Rise, and Interest Rates Sure to Follow."

This evening we have heard from many of our colleagues about the ensuing debate tomorrow on a very weak resolution concerning the ongoing war in Iraq. Tonight I would like to direct my comments to the terrible taxes that this war places on the American people. And not just taxes in the conventional meaning of the word because, indeed, this war is causing us to borrow money, which we must pay back, and we are borrowing it back from foreign countries. This war is costing us more every day. Over \$300 billion and rising. We have to pay those dollars back because we are borrowing them.

This war is placing a terrible burden on this economy as we now see prices rise and interest rates ticking up, which I will talk about in just a second. And, of course, the greatest tax is on the loss of life and the injury to body and limb of those that we have asked to fight the battles of this Nation, as well as innocent civilians who are being killed and injured across Iraq and the region.

This war in Iraq is also exacting a terrible tax on the people of the Middle East and adjoining regions because it is yielding more terrorism, not less. This war is yielding more repressive regimes in places like Pakistan; in places like Egypt; in the Palestinian Authority; indeed, adjoining nations like Lebanon.

The tax on democratizing regimes is getting heavier and heavier every day. There is more instability in the region as we watch the demonstrations in the West Bank and in Gaza, as we see Hamas and Fatah locked in internal struggles. There is more instability, not more stability. And most crushing for our country globally is the United States is losing respect across the world. We have fewer friends and more enemies and those who doubt the United States across the globe.

Here at home we see rising interest rates, and that is the article I will enter into the RECORD tonight. Higher prices for such things as airline tickets, housing, health care, and, of course, gasoline are now starting to eat into consumers' pocketbooks. Indeed, this war is a terrible tax on the American people, and they are feeling it in their pocketbooks.

Wednesday, the Labor Department reported the May consumer price index rose .4 percent after a .6 percent rise in April. This is well above the comfort level of the Federal Reserve, the Nation's chief inflation fighter. The Fed is going to have to raise interest rates more out of a desire to keep the market from thinking the new sheriff in town at the Federal Reserve is not serious about fighting inflation. Prices are rising against a backdrop of weakening housing and other parts of the economy. This war in Iraq is a heavy tax.

Economists are most concerned that rising prices seem to have moved beyond the energy sector and removing food and energy, typically the most volatile prices from the inflation rate, indicates core prices rose in May .3 percent; and over the past 3 months, the core rate of inflation is up to an annual rate of 3.8 percent, the fastest pace in more than a decade. We are seeing a near-term acceleration in the core rate. An increase of half a percentage point at the next Fed meeting is a strong possibility before the Fed decides to back away.

So we look at what this war is yielding on many levels. More terrorism, not less terrorism. Is it yielding more democratic regimes throughout the Middle East? No. The oil regimes continue to be as repressive as they ever were. There is not a single democratic nation anywhere in the region, and there will not be one for a long time to come. The United States ought to decouple itself from the repressive oil regimes it continues to support and become energy independent here at home.

Is there a solution to the Palestinian-Israeli standoff? Are there ongoing negotiations? No. There is just shooting across borders. There are more demonstrations in the street. There is no back channel that is being actively promulgated by this administration to get the warring parties to sit down and finally reach a peace process following on the agreement that was attempted to be negotiated during the Clinton years.

Have we seen freedom on the rise? No. We see repression on the rise, as