I reaffirm my commitment to our Native people, honor their sovereignty and urge the United States Congress to honor all commitments conferred with our Native American Tribal Nations.

COMPARISON AND HISTORY TEACH US A LOT

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful comparison of U.S. military strategy in Vietnam and present-day military operations in Iraq written by Jerry Hogan, a retired Army Lieutenant Colonel who lives in Heath, TX, in the Fourth Congressional District. I urge my colleagues to review and reflect upon this as Congress faces critical decisions in the upcoming months on funding the war on terror.

COMPARISON AND HISTORY TEACH US A LOT

(By Jerry Hogan)

Sometimes it is important that we look at what we have done in the past to make sure we don't make the same mistakes again.

In 1950, believe it or not, the United States established a military assistance and advisory group in Vietnam to advise the French puppet government on strategy and train Vietnamese soldiers. This started America's longest war that did not end until April of 1975 with the infamous ''Fall of Saigon'' that we saw in our living rooms thanks to the modern miracle of television. For the almost three million of us who served in that war, those pictures on our TV sets burned holes through our heads as we saw first hand what we had done to a country and its people as we abandoned them without finishing the job we helped start.

Unfortunately there are many similarities between the U.S. involvement in Vietnam and our current involvement in Iraq. While we had advisors in Vietnam starting in 1950, our real combat role that saw the buildup of our forces go from 16,000 to 553,000, did not start until after the Gulf of Tonkin incident where, on August 2, 1964, one of our Naval ships was attacked by torpedo boats along North Vietnam's coast. Two days later, another ''attack'' occurred in about the same place against two more of our ships. These ''attacks'' led to retaliatory air strikes on our part and caused Congress to approve the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution which gave the president power to conduct military operations in Southeast Asia without declaring war. Later it was determined that the second ''attack'' was questionable which caused many people to say we entered this conflict under false pretenses. Sound anything like how we got into Iraq according to the opponents of that war?

The Vietnam War is viewed by many historians as a Cold War conflict between the United States, its allies, and the Republic of Vietnam on one side, and the Soviet Union, its allies, the People's Republic of China, and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on the other. Many others, particularly the vocal opponents to the U.S. involvement in this war, viewed the conflict as a civil war between communist and non communist Vietnamese factions.

Today, the War in Iraq is viewed as a battleground between the US, its allies, and the Republic of Iraq versus the Islamist Jihadis and their allies, Syria and Iran, in the International War on Terrorism. Exchange the words ''communist and non communist'' with ''Sunni and Shiite'' and you hear the same arguments today about this war being just a civil war between two opposing religious factions in Iraq. Isn't it amazing how history seems to repeat itself with us Americans?

While actual U.S. combat operations did not start in Vietnam until 1964, U.S. forces assumed full responsibility for training the South Vietnamese Army in 1956 and President Kennedy increased our troop strength from 500 to over 16,000 when he took office. In his inaugural address, he made that famous pledge we know so well: ''the U.S. will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.'' Remember what President Bush continues to say about our support for Afghanistan and Iraq as they held their elections and voted for a democratic form of government and how we would stand with them in their desire for a free and elected democracy? Sounds like two of our presidents so heavily involved with two separate unpopular wars had the same views!

During the Vietnam War, the U.S. had a Draft for supplying personnel needed in the military. President Johnson refused to mobilize the Reserve units during the war as he feared a political backlash. This led to larger draft call ups and the extension of some tours of duty. It also put a heavy strain on U.S. forces committed to other parts of the world. While the military today is an all-volunteer force, the same problems face the services today; tour extensions in Iraq for the Soldiers and Marines, equipment shortages, limited capabilities in other areas of the world, repeated tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, and continued pressure on families of the service men and women. Again, you might think we learned from previous mistakes.

In January of 1968, the forces of North Vietnam launched the surprise ''Tet Offensive'' in hopes of sparking a national uprising. While the military objectives were not achieved, the U.S. public was shocked and confused over the war as General Westmoreland, the commander in Vietnam, had just predicted ''the end comes into view.'' The American media, which had been largely supportive of the administration, turned on President Johnson for what had become an increasing credibility gap. His approval ratings dropped from 48% to 36%; he declined to run for re-election; and the public's support for the war started a rapid decline. Any of this sound like something you may have heard recently?

In December, 1974, the Congress passed the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, which cut off all military funding to the South Vietnamese government. The act went on to restrict the number of U.S. military personnel allowed in Vietnam to ''no more than 4000 within six months of enactment and 3000 within one year.'' By April of 1975 only four months after the cutoff of funds and the removal of essentially all U.S. forces, the Republic of Vietnam fell to the victors from the North.

During the Vietnam War, over 250,000 South Vietnamese military were killed and about 1.2 million were wounded. It is estimated that somewhere between two and five million Vietnamese civilians were killed. 58,000 Americans lost their life while 153,000 were wounded. In Iraq today, about 3,500 Americans have been killed and about 18,000 have been wounded. Close to 350 U.S. personnel have been killed in Afghanistan. Statistics on Iraqi and Afghanistan's military and civilian casualties are not available but estimates show they are high as well.

So what does this all mean today? Clearly there are two opposing views as to what should happen in Iraq. The President has been consistent in his view that we are fighting an International War on Terrorism and that freedom and democracy need help in the Middle East. Iraq is a fledgling democracy trying to establish itself after decades of dictatorship and after being made a main battleground by the worldwide Jihadist forces. Strong religious and political forces, both within and outside Iraq, are making the process of democracy very difficult. A military solution will not solve the problems in Iraq; it must be a political solution with a military component. Political will, as much as military might, is a decisive factor in this outcome.

The second view being expressed daily by some of our elected officials in Washington calls for a timetable for withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq. In my considered military view, this outlandish stupid course of action takes us right back to the days of Vietnam and is nothing more than a political proposal that leads us once again to watching the ''Fall of Saigon'' in our living rooms, but this time it will be the ''Fall of Baghdad.'' I really don't want to go through that again . . . and I hope you don't either. Let your elected officials know how you feel.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO CAMPBELL SOUP ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAPOLEON OHIO MANUFACTURING FACILITY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. GILLMOR. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to a special company in northwest Ohio. On July 17, 2007, the Campbell Soup Company will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the largest soup manufacturing facility in the world, located in the town of Napoleon, in the heart of northwest Ohio.

When Campbell's first came to Napoleon, the town of 5,500 was located just 16 miles from what was then the ''new'' Ohio turnpike alongside some of the most fertile farms in the United States. The combination of abundant resources, a strong transportation network and a terrific work force all helped bring Campbell's to value northwest Ohio.

Few would dispute that the growth of Napoleon to a city of more than 9,000 citizens is tied to the progress of the Campbell's facility. Only 50 years ago, the first cans of Chicken and Rice Soup came off the Napoleon assembly line. With the popularity of products such as canned spaghetti and V8 juice, today the Napoleon facility manufactures nearly 100 million individual products from almost 500 different varieties, ranging from Prego sauces to Swanson broth, and Campbell's full offering of beverage and soup items.

With 65 acres under roof, including more than 2 million square feet to manufacture Campbell's trademark soups, the Napoleon facility remains among Campbell's and the food processing industry's most modern and sophisticated facilities. In almost every year since 1957, Campbell's has invested in new technology at Napoleon that has helped to reach the heights of efficient, quality production that it is legendary for today, from vegetable sorting machines in 1960 to a new plastic bottle expansion in 2004.

Campbell's hasn't just been Napoleon's biggest employer, but also a terrific neighbor and friend to the community and all of northwest Ohio. It started in 1957 with a $100,000 contribution by Campbell's to expand the local hospital, the first of many such donations by Campbell's to improve the community over these past five decades.

Madam Speaker, the real success of Napoleon's Campbell Soup Facility comes not only from its products, but from its people. I have walked this plant, sat in the break room, greeted employees working the lines, and even had a V8 or two. I can tell you firsthand that what makes the Campbell's Soup plant in Napoleon special are its dedicated employees.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to the employees and the legacy of Campbell's Napoleon facility. Campbell's Napoleon facility has a rich and storied history of contributions made by thousands of Ohioans who have made their careers there. We're proud to have such a terrific company like Campbell's in northwest Ohio and look forward to many more years of success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 609, on a motion to suspend the rules and adopt H. Res. 526—Supporting Home Ownership and Responsible Lending, I am recorded as a ''no'' vote. Having intended to vote ''yes,'' I would like the RECORD to reflect my support for adoption of this resolution.

CELEBRATING THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES-ROMANIAN STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Romanian Caucus, I rise today to celebrate the 10 year anniversary of the launch of the United States-Romanian strategic partnership.

In 1997 the United States and Romania established a strategic partnership resulting in close cooperation and consultations on all issues of common interest, particularly: NATO policies; promoting stability and security in Southeastern Europe, combating non-traditional threats; military and economic reforms in Romania and its region.

After ten years, we look back at the remarkable vision that inspired this unprecedented course in the development of the relations between the United States and Romania.

With utmost determination and U.S. support, Romania has since grown to what is today a trustworthy ally of the United States and one the most respectable and reliable contributors to global security. Romania is a member of NATO and of the European Union, an active player in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and a significant voice at the UN and in other international and regional organizations at the Black Sea and in Eastern and Southeastern Europe.

Romania has committed to a wide scale set of reforms internally, in its economic, social, justice and administrative sectors. Romania's achievements over the past ten years in its comprehensive internal reforms not only have prompted the country to NATO and EU membership, but serves as a great example of successful transformation to modernity and progress.

This transformation has yielded significant benefits mostly to the Romanian people but also to the Western community and to the transatlantic alliance. Next year in April, Romania will be the host of the NATO Summit, an event of critical importance to the alliance's shape and future. Romania has proved its capability to sustain long term commitments, along with its Western allies, in the fight against terrorism and organized crime.

At the same time, Romania has been an active promoter of tolerance and understanding among ethnic and religious communities. The recent OSCE high level conference on combating discrimination and other forms of intolerance, in Bucharest last June, has had a significant impact on maintaining the public commitment to respecting the most profound human values at the OSCE level. Romania also has taken meaningful steps towards assuming its own painful past through public education about, and remembrance of, the Holocaust.

We must all be proud of these accomplishments that were in large part inspired by the vision of a partnership laid out ten years ago. We also must affirm our duty to continue to build on this growing relation. It is this kind of partnership that continues to give us the power to overcome global challenges.

At this anniversary moment, we must acknowledge the indispensable contribution of the citizens of Romania, and of the Romanian American community to the successful development of our partnership. I congratulate the Romanian people and all its political leaders for their unwavering commitment to building such a strong mutual relation with the United States of America.

HONORING SKYLAND CAMP FOR GIRLS

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. SHULER. Madam Speaker, 90 years ago, the Skyland Camp for Girls was born with the auctioneer's call, ''Sold to the lady in the apron.'' With $3,000, Susan Courtney Harris saved the hotel she loved in Clyde, North Carolina, and created a sanctuary for five generations of young women.

Four generations of the Harris family have kept the camp true to its purpose of building lifelong relationships founded in camaraderie and learning from one another. Mrs. Harris ran the camp until her daughters, Francis Brown and Helen Harris, took over and ran the camp until 1973 . Bunny Brown, bride of Mrs. Harris' grandson Timothy, owns the camp today, and it is run by her daughter Sherry.

I invite my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 90th anniversary of the Skyland Camp for Girls and the generations of vibrant young female leaders it has helped raise in North Carolina.

RECOGNIZING MATTHEW SCOTT

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share an article written about a young man who serves as a member of the city council—guiding and planning for a city that the Dallas News pointed out last February to be in the county seat of the fastest growing county in the United States. I wish to place this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to highlight the service of one unusually well-qualified young family man who finds time to also guide the destiny of my hometown of Rockwall, Texas, as it sheds its rural status and grows into the city of tomorrow. The article speaks for itself as set out in a recent issue of ''Texas Super Lawyers 2007 Rising Stars Edition.''

GREAT SCOTT

By Paul Sweeney

Why is Matthew Scott, a 39-year-old Dallas attorney, so often described as ''a go-to guy''?

Just ask Greg Supan, a former law partner and colleague at the Dallas firm of Bell Nunnally & Martin. Not long ago, Supan got a last-minute, out-of-the-blue telephone call: An old fraternity brother from the University of Texas was relocating his oral surgery practice from Houston to Dallas. He urgently needed help in structuring an employment agreement between him and his new dentistry group.

Unfortunately, the attorney who assured Supan he could handle the assignment called back three days later and announced he was going on vacation. ''He told me that I didn't tell him it was time-sensitive,'' Supan recalls, exasperation creeping into his voice.

So he turned to Scott, all 6 feet 6 inches of him. The former basketball player at the University of Iowa has, over the last decade, become an avid Texan—so much so that he won election to the city council in the bedroom community of Rockwall.

''At that point we had 24 hours to get the assignment done,'' Supan says, ''and Matt, an expert in employment law, dropped everything to help out. He ended up doing a great job on what was actually a very complicated partnership. The client was thrilled.'' Supan adds: ''When you're down by two, you pass the ball to him. He's a real buzzer-beater.''

Amid the book-lined suite of offices at Bell Nunnally one hears similar stories, not just about Scott's dependability but also about his work ethic. Sherri Alexander, who heads the litigation section at the firm, says, ''At our business-development meetings, where the partners get together to talk about work, and about which new clients have been contacted recently, Matt's always willing to participate.'' Praising his sense of timing, she adds, ''Not too much—but not too little either.''

''And when I have to go out of town on business,'' she says, ''I can always trust him to deal directly with a client and handle things well in my absence.''

The bottom line? ''He has his own docket,'' she says, ''plus the city council. But if somebody needs help, he always goes the extra mile.''