

IN MEMORY OF KEVIN BROPHY

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to honor the memory of the late Kevin Brophy. Kevin was a remarkable young man who touched the lives of all those he met.

Kevin Brophy was a native of Melbourne, Australia, who graduated from Memorial Day School in Savannah, GA. In his time at Memorial, Kevin averaged 28.4 points, 7.2 rebounds, and 12.4 assists per game setting a single season school record of 424 points.

Kevin went on to attend the University of Georgia where, as a walk-on, to the 2005 Bulldogs men's basketball team he played in all 28 games of his freshman season and started in seven Southeastern Conference contests. Though he began his collegiate sports career as a walk-on, Kevin quickly earned an athletic scholarship before the start of his sophomore season.

As a member of the Georgia Bulldogs basketball program, Kevin scored a season high of 19 points against the Vanderbilt University Commodores, nine of those coming in the last nine minutes. Kevin's attitude, maturity, and work ethic were contagious, spreading to all those with whom he came in contact.

Tragically, Kevin's life ended July 20, 2006, near Greensboro, GA, just hours after he devoted his time to improving the basketball program at the Athens Boys and Girls Club. His death has left a community in mourning but his life has inspired us all.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TOM RICE TO OUR HOMELAND SECURITY

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished constituent and a valued member of our country's Homeland Security team, Tom Rice, the federal security director for Port Columbus International Airport. Tom was recently chosen from among 125 peers by the Transportation Security Administration as the Federal Security Director of the Year for the Eastern Region.

In bestowing this honor, TSA recognized Tom's contributions in providing operational direction for federal security, demonstrating integrity and innovation, and improving the morale of employees by promoting a culture of achievement among team members.

Tom's four decades of distinguished and impeccable service in law enforcement is no secret to central Ohio. After serving for 33 years in the Ohio State Highway Patrol, Tom spent a year at the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction as the acting chief inspector and then had a 5-year tour with the City of Columbus as safety director. Before briefly retiring, Tom also consulted for the Ohio Department of Youth Services. However, with the creation of TSA, Tom was swiftly called to return to duty and was sworn in as the first FSD for

Port Columbus and Rickenbacker airports in June 2002.

I am thrilled to see his leadership in security recognized nationally by our Nation's top security agency. Passengers at Port Columbus know and trust Tom. And even amid passenger uncertainty due to terrorist threats, his innovative and professional leadership has helped Port Columbus continue to grow and business at Rickenbacker to flourish. I can think of no better person to receive the recognition of our Homeland Security community.

HONORING THE HEART HOSPITAL OF NEW MEXICO

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable organization from the State of New Mexico. The Heart Hospital of New Mexico was established in 1999, through a joint effort between the state's leading cardiology and cardiovascular surgery groups, as an entire medical facility dedicated to fighting heart disease. Located near downtown Albuquerque, it is the state's first free-standing heart facility, dedicated to providing the most advanced, patient-centered, family-centered care for the region.

Recently, Quantum Research and the New Mexico Business Weekly sponsored a comprehensive employee survey to identify the "best places to work" in New Mexico. With 211 hardworking employees, the Heart Hospital was ranked first amongst New Mexico's largest employers. The award acknowledges a company's achievements in creating a positive work environment that not only attracts employees, but also retains them.

Heart Hospital employees cited flexible work schedules, employee-driven work standards and commitment to superior patient care as critical to their job satisfaction. The Heart Hospital also offers reimbursements for licensures, certifications and tuition; reimbursement for nursing education for household members of employees; full vestment for the company portion of 401(k) upon enrollment and employee appreciation lunches and other recognition.

Madam Speaker, no matter how you measure it, the Heart Hospital of New Mexico sets a standard of excellence. The hospital fills a crucial need in central New Mexico's community, and I am honored to recognize such an outstanding healthcare provider and its outstanding team of dedicated employees here today.

STATEMENT HONORING ROBERT L. HADLEY, SR.

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an honorable man, Robert L. Hadley Sr. His commitment towards his family and his hard work has made him a commendable role model for all of America's future generations.

Born on April 13, 1919, Mr. Hadley was raised to hold strong to his faith and valued the beliefs embedded in him from his childhood. His everyday life and career reflected those praiseworthy values.

In 1937, after the completion of his studies Mr. Hadley entered into the car sales industry with a zest for learning. In 1941, he was called upon by his country to serve in the Army during WWII. He courageously contributed his time to protect our Nation.

Mr. Hadley completed his service to the U.S. Army and returned to his loving wife and son. He then continued working hard in the automotive sales industry while ensuring his son grew up to become an admirable young man. The life lead by Mr. Hadley has undoubtedly become a legacy.

On behalf of the Dallas, TX community, I commend Mr. Robert Hadley's admirable achievements.

ENDING THE WAR IN IRAQ

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the President will announce he has yet another new strategy for victory in Iraq. This strategy will come just over a year after he released his last strategy for victory in Iraq, which was completed in November 2005.

According to the Brookings Institution's Iraq Index, since the President released his last plan, more than 900 U.S. troops have been killed in Iraq, more than 2,200 Iraqi police and military forces have also been killed. The number of Iraqi civilians killed has risen from 1,778 in January 2006 to nearly 3,300 in December 2006. The number of multiple fatality bombings has increased from 41 in November 2005 to 69 in December 2006.

In other words, by virtually every measure, the violence in Iraq is worse this year than last year, the political situation is more volatile and deteriorating by the day and the civil war is expanding.

After nearly four years, after more than 3,000 U.S. troops have been killed, after more than 22,500 U.S. troops have been injured—nearly half of whom have been injured severely enough that they cannot return to duty—and after more than \$300 billion of U.S. taxpayers' money has been spent with no benefit to U.S. national security and with little progress toward stabilizing Iraq, what is the President's response? All indications are that he will propose to compound the failure by escalating the war, putting tens of thousands of more American lives at risk, and borrowing tens or hundreds of billions of dollars more in order to prosecute a war that cannot be won militarily.

It is past time to end the open-ended commitment the President has made in Iraq. Reportedly the President will propose benchmarks the Iraqi government must achieve, but since there will be no consequences if the Iraqis fail, these benchmarks are meaningless. The Iraqi government has failed to follow through on previous commitments, yet the President's response has only been to express continuing support for the Iraqi Prime Minister. His proposal this week will likely be more of the same.

As long as the U.S. military remains stuck with the President's pledge of unlimited support, Iraqi politicians and security forces will use the U.S. presence as a crutch and will fail to take the necessary steps to solve their differences, establish an effective and inclusive government, end sectarian violence, and create a secure and prosperous society.

Democracy and stability cannot be imposed on unwilling parties. As New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman said recently on Meet the Press, a stable, pluralistic democracy in Iraq is everyone's second choice except ours. The Shias want power for themselves. The Sunnis want power. And the Kurds want power and independence. What they don't want to do is share that power, and we can't make them.

Being confronted with the reality of a U.S. withdrawal should force the Iraqi factions to reach the political compromises necessary to move their country forward. If not, there is no reason to prolong the U.S. involvement in Iraq if we want a stable country more than the Iraqi people and their elected leaders do.

The U.S. cannot impose freedom, security, and unity in Iraq by force. Those worthy goals can only be achieved by the Iraqi people themselves, which will only happen when the Iraqi people and their leaders decide to put aside their sectarian differences. The U.S. cannot force Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds to make peace or to act for the common good. They have been in conflict for 1,400 years. Nor should the U.S. military be forced to remain in Iraq essentially as an army for one side of a civil war. The U.S. military cannot solve the sectarian violence and the lack of political reconciliation in Iraq. Only the Iraqis can.

In a minute, I will address where I believe we need to go from here. But, before that, I want to briefly review how we got into Iraq and how the Bush administration's many mistakes have brought us to the disaster we face today.

The list of the Bush administration's failures with respect to Iraq is long and well-known. But it bears repeating, particularly since the administration may be making similar ones with respect to Iran.

The administration manipulated, misrepresented and in some cases outright lied about the intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs and non-existent ties to al-Qaeda in order to build support in Congress and among the public for the war.

The administration went in with too few troops to successfully carry out the mission.

The administration went in with few real allies.

The administration went in with no exit strategy.

The administration failed to stop the rampant looting in the wake of Saddam Hussein's ousting, which set back recovery and reconstruction.

The administration failed to understand the ethnic tensions that were unleashed in Iraq.

The administration failed to understand the ethnic power bases in Iraq.

The administration relied on Iraqi exiles with no support among the Iraqi people.

The administration did not turn over authority to Iraqis early on. Instead, they stood up the Coalition Provision Authority to run Iraq, which cemented in the minds of the Iraqis that U.S. forces were an occupying power.

The administration largely used inexperienced political hacks to run the CPA rather

than experienced foreign service-types or individuals with subject matter expertise.

The administration disbanded the Iraqi army, which added to the security problems by creating a large pool of unemployed, armed, and alienated Iraqis.

The administration purged the Iraqi government of all Baath party members, even low-level Baathists, which continues to hamper the delivery of even basic government services to Iraqis since the bureaucracy has basically been created from scratch.

The administration failed to conduct proper oversight of reconstruction resulting in waste, fraud, and abuse, poor contractor performance and Iraqi expectations for progress not being met.

This is not an exhaustive list, but it highlights some major failures that have contributed to the chaos in Iraq.

The administration claims that what has happened in Iraq was unforeseeable. In reality, many critics predicted the problems in Iraq. The administration just chose to ignore those who raised concerns. The problems in Iraq are actually worse than predicted because of the administration's blunders.

The administration ignored the doctrine created by its own Secretary of State Colin Powell when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The "Powell doctrine" says that the U.S. should go to war only as a last resort and then only with overwhelming force. In his article "U.S. Forces: Challenges Ahead" in Foreign Affairs in 1992-93 Powell posed a number of questions to be asked by U.S. policymakers before launching a war. Is a vital national security interest threatened? Do we have a clear, attainable objective? Have the risks and costs been fully and frankly analyzed? Have all other non-violent policy means been exhausted? Is there a plausible exit strategy? Have the consequences been fully considered? Is the action supported by the American people? Does the U.S. have broad international support?

The answer to these questions in the case of the Iraq war is no. But the administration went ahead anyway and Powell put aside any misgivings he may have had and publicly supported it.

The administration ignored General Eric Shinseki, then the head of the Army, who testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 25, 2003, that the administration's plans failed to include an adequate number of troops. He said, "I would say that what's been mobilized to this point—something on the order of several hundred thousand soldiers are probably, you know, a figure that would be required. We're talking about post-hostilities control over a piece of geography that's fairly significant, with the kinds of ethnic tensions that could lead to other problems."

Secretary Rumsfeld and his deputy, Paul Wolfowitz, called Shinseki's estimate "far off the mark" and "wildly off the mark". Wolfowitz said it would be "hard to believe" more troops would be required for post-war Iraq than to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

It may have been hard for an ideologue like Mr. Wolfowitz to believe, but it wasn't hard for a military professional like General Shinseki to envision.

Many Members of Congress also raised concerns. I personally wrote to the President on September 5, 2002. I challenged the sup-

posed threat posed by Iraq's assumed WMD programs. I raised questions about more pressing national security challenges like North Korea and Iran. I raised questions about the impact the war would have on U.S. relations with allies and our reputation in the world. I posed questions about what the impact of a long-term occupation of Iraq by U.S. forces. I asked about the impact of diverting military and intelligence resources to Iraq from the battle against al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. And I raised concerns about the economic impact and the impact on U.S. taxpayers from the war.

The administration dismissed the concerns and warnings of critics like me and launched this ill-advised war. I voted against it. We're forty-six months into the war, where do we go from here?

The President apparently believes that the U.S. needs to escalate the conflict in Iraq by sending 30,000 or more additional troops to Iraq. I think that is a mistake. It will not bring stability to Iraq, and I oppose it and will vote against it if given the opportunity.

Just as importantly, the President's chief military advisors oppose it. As General John Abizaid, then the head of all U.S. forces in the Middle East, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on November 15, 2006, "I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the core commander, General Dempsey, we all talked together. And I said, in your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American Troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq? And they all said no. And the reason is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon to us do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future."

The President didn't like what he heard, which may be why General Abizaid is expected to retire this March. As a Lebanese-American who is fluent in Arabic, his understanding of the region will be greatly missed. General Casey has also been removed as commander of U.S. forces in Iraq.

Shinseki, Abizaid, Casey. There is a pattern here of the Bush administration ignoring the advice of military leaders and firing them when they don't tell the President what he wants to hear.

Let me be clear, I do not believe there is any level of U.S. troops that could stabilize Iraq at this point.

But, I think it is particularly offensive that the President is reportedly planning to put 30,000 additional U.S. lives at risk when that escalation is virtually certain to have little or no impact on the violence in Iraq. There might be a small, temporary reduction in the chaos in Iraq, but the escalation will not solve the deep and underlying political conflicts that are preventing a long-term resolution to the violence in Iraq.

The President desperately wants to look like he's trying something new in Iraq in response to the concerns of the American people, but really he's just repeating the same mistakes and compounding previous failures. The administration is trying to prolong the U.S. involvement in Iraq in order to perpetuate the fallacy that the President's original vision for a democratic, pro-U.S., capitalistic, pluralistic Iraq is still achievable. It is not. The American

Enterprise Institute military escalation plan for Iraq, which is the basis for the President's proposals, has a timeline of 18–24 months, conveniently enough leaving the mess in Iraq for the next President, meaning President Bush would never have to admit his policies in Iraq have been a failure but at a very steep cost to our troops taxpayers.

The administration already increased the number of U.S. troops in Baghdad this summer and has occasionally increased the number of troops throughout Iraq, yet the violence against our troops and Iraqi security forces and civilians continues to increase. Following the influx of troops this summer in Operation Forward Together, the violence in Iraq actually increased. Weekly attacks increased by 15 percent while the number of Iraqi civilian casualties increased by 51 percent.

Based on historical analysis, counterinsurgency experts estimate it takes around 20 U.S. troops per 1,000 inhabitants to successfully fight a counterinsurgency. To achieve that ratio in Baghdad alone would require 120,000 troops. Even with the escalation proposed by the President, we'd only have around 40,000 troops in Baghdad. For all of Iraq, it would require 500,000 troops. We only have around 140,000 there today.

General Shinseki and others based their original recommendation for several hundred thousand troops on this historical analysis. But, the time in which a large number of forces could stabilize Iraq has long since passed.

The bottom line is that a proposal to increase U.S. troop levels in Baghdad or Iraq more generally by 30,000 troops in not a serious effort to restore stability to Iraq. Essentially, the President is proposing to put more lives at risk with little or no chance of success.

The President and his allies justify the continuing U.S. presence in Iraq by claiming that if we don't fight there, we'll have to fight here at home. However, the Iraqi Sunni rejectionists, Saddamists, and nationalist Shias, who combined make up the vast bulk of the insurgents and militias committing violence in Iraq, have no interest in attacking the U.S. homeland. They just want U.S. military forces out of their own country. They have no designs on our country. So it is misleading, at best, to argue that if we don't fight there, we will fight them in the streets of the United States.

It is also misleading to pretend that if the U.S. leaves that somehow Osama bin Laden will take control of Iraq. There is no chance that the Shias and Kurds, who represent around 80 percent of the population in Iraq, will allow foreign terrorist elements to take over the country. Even the majority of the Sunnis have grown tired of foreign terrorists operating in Iraq.

A better strategy is to announce a timeline for bringing our troops home over the next 6 months to a year. The administration has always set timelines for political developments in Iraq—for elections, for the drafting of the constitution etc. The administration argued such timelines were necessary to focus the energy of Iraq's leaders and to force compromises. We need to do the same on the military side.

In the interim, I have also proposed that U.S. troops be removed from front line combat positions in Iraqi cities and towns, turning over daily security patrols, interactions with citizens,

and any offensive security actions to the Iraqis themselves.

The training and equipping of Iraqi security forces should be accelerated and the sectarian balance must be improved.

The U.S. must renounce any U.S. interest in constructing permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq.

It is also important to accelerate reconstruction spending and grant the bulk of reconstruction contracts to local companies employing Iraqis rather than multinational corporations, whom have proven inefficient, inflexible, sometimes fraudulent and have even imported workers rather than employing Iraqis.

The U.S. embassy in Baghdad should also be reduced to normal size and authority rather than establishing one of the largest embassies in the world.

And, the U.S. must engage in robust diplomacy with all factions in Iraq, except the foreign terrorists and domestic al-Qaeda elements, and work with Iraq's neighbors in an effort to bring about political reconciliation among Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds.

Our troops have done all that has been asked of them in Iraq. Saddam Hussein is dead. His allies are on the run or in prison. The threat from WMDs in Iraq is nonexistent. Arguably, the war that Congress authorized has been won. Our troops should come home. Congress did not authorize U.S. troops to referee a civil war in Iraq.

TRIBUTE TO ALLISON STANGEBY

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Allison Stangeby—the recipient of the 2006 Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Award. Because of Allison's efforts, thousands of our nation's less fortunate have been provided with food aid.

Allison used her workplace as a tool to reach out to the hungry. She works for the New York Giants as the Director of Community Relations. Under Allison's leadership, the New York Giants became the first sports franchise to arrange to have its stadium-generated leftover concession food made available to feed the hungry through Sports Wrap. Sports Wrap is a new venture that evolved from Rock and Wrap It Up!, a volunteer hunger relief charity started in 1990.

Additionally, Allison has helped launch similar programs with the New York Yankees, New York Mets, New York Jets and New Jersey Nets. By setting an example, Allison has empowered others to reach out to those in need. This is the mark of a great volunteer.

This is the vision my late husband Bill Emerson had for domestic food aid programs when he worked to pass the Good Samaritan Food Act protecting these donations from liability. Bill's hopes for hunger relief in America were very high when he worked to make such programs possible in 1990. He would be very proud of Allison for her contributions to hunger relief.

Allison is a major reason why this hunger relief charity continues to gain notoriety and grow. As long as there are men, women and children who need the helping hand of other

Americans, people like Allison have proven they will be there with a helping hand to offer.

Thank you for your kind service to our Nation, Allison. Congratulations on earning the 2006 Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Award. Best of luck to you as you continue your noble work.

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Florida football team on winning the 2006 NCAA national championship.

Madam Speaker, as a University of Florida graduate, born in "Gator Country," I could not be happier with the outcome of last night's game. This team showed true grit and grace by overcoming public opinion, which said they did not belong in the national title game, to defeat a daunting opponent.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the University of Florida as a whole for becoming the first institution in Division I history to hold both the NCAA Men's Basketball and NCAA Football Championships at the same time. Last night's achievement was truly historic.

Madam Speaker, it took the University of Florida 90 years to win its first NCAA Football Championship and only 10 to win its second. Hopefully this trend will continue.

Madam Speaker, I hope everyone will join me in congratulating these fine young men on their historic victory.

HONORING BEN ANDERSON OF AMERICAN CANYON, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mr. Thompson of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ben Anderson of American Canyon, California, and thank him for his many years of service devoted to the city and people of American Canyon. As a member of the first city council elected in 1992, Ben Anderson has generously lent his wisdom and guidance to the process of constituting a city government.

Mr. Anderson moved to the area in the early 1980s as an officer in the US Navy at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. In the early 1990s he was instrumental in beginning the petition process and collecting signatures for the incorporation of American Canyon. Having received encouragement from other citizens involved in the campaign, he ran for a seat on the city council and won. He retired from service in the Navy around the same time he took his seat on the council, citing his desire to devote his efforts to full time service to the community.

During his 14 years as a council member Mr. Anderson has helped guide the development of American Canyon from its infancy into the rapidly growing and successful town we