

## NOT VOTING—45

Barrow	Johnson, Sam	Sanchez, Loretta
Costa	Kucinich	Schiff
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Schwartz
Galleghy	Linder	Shimkus
Graves	Lipinski	Simpson
Grijalva	Lucas	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Marshall	Smith (WA)
Hastert	Mollohan	Souder
Hooley	Payne	Tancredo
Hulshof	Peterson (PA)	Taylor
Hunter	Pickering	Terry
Israel	Poe	Watson
Jindal	Pryce (OH)	Weller
Johnson (IL)	Royce	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, E. B.	Rush	Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in the vote.

□ 1949

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. HIRONO and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Georgia). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, ANDREWS, SCOTT of Virginia, HINOJOSA, TIERNEY, WU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. HIRONO, Messrs. ALTMIRE, YARMUTH, COURTNEY, MCKEON, KELLER of Florida, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. KUHL of New York, WALBERG, SOUDER, EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

There was no objection.

## NOW IS THE TIME TO DECLARE A MILITARY VICTORY IN IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the United States Government Accountability report, “Securing, Stabilizing and Rebuilding Iraq.” The Iraqi Government has not met most legislative security and economic benchmarks.

The President and Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense made a surprise visit to Anbar Province in Iraq. Out of their visit, I might imagine they would hope to have a counteroffensive against a number of hearings that the majority will be holding on the question of are we safer today than we were before the Iraq war. This report is both striking and provoking, provoking Americans to realize that the policy in Iraq has failed.

It is time now to declare a military success, a military victory. Our soldiers have done their job. They have created an opportunity for a democratic government in Iraq. But, unfortunately, the job that needs to be done by the Iraqi Government has not been

done. There are no battalions that are ready to go on the ground.

So I will say to the administration, a surge will not work. Staying the course will not work. I ask that the troops be redeployed and a new direction be taken in Iraq.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## HONORING DR. JOHN FREIHAUT

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor a great friend and a colleague in the medical profession, Dr. John Freihaut, who passed away just before Congress broke for the August recess.

In addition to caring for the oral health of thousands of 11th District residents through his 27 years of private practice in Marietta, Georgia, the heart of my district, Dr. Freihaut held numerous positions in organized dentistry. Dr. Freihaut was a dedicated member of the 2007 Board of Directors of the American Dental Association’s Political Action Committee where he insisted on attending meetings throughout his fight with cancer.

John also served as the president of the Georgia Dental Association from 2001 to 2002 and of the Georgia Society of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons between 1996 and 1998. Dr. Freihaut was named the Northwestern District Dental Society’s Dentist of the Year in 2005. It was on these committees where Dr. Freihaut created his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, fighting for patients’ rights in both State and Federal Government, John’s dedication to his profession was unparalleled. During his life, John was one of the single-most significant advocates for the dental profession in the State of Georgia. In a State which has had one dentist and three physician Members of Congress, as well, of course, as our friend, the late Representative Dr. Charlie Norwood, and a recent American Dental Association president, John was still known as the State’s dental expert and relied upon as an adviser to us all. I know that I sought John’s expertise on several occasions throughout the years as I tried to make the best decisions for patients in the State of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, John was passionate about his family, his profession, and his responsibilities in life.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers go out to Dr. John Freihaut’s family, and my thanks go to my friend, John, for his 25 years of dedication to improving the quality of health care in this country.

□ 2000

## IN MEMORY OF LEON SHULL, FORMER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the recess recently, one of the men from whom I learned a great deal, I hope with some impact about how to be a successful advocate for a better and fairer world, died.

Leon Shull had been, for many years, the executive director of Americans for Democratic Action. He had a passion for social justice which he combined with a clear-headedness about how to get there that was extraordinary.

Too often in our politics, we see a divide between the people with passion, the people with reason, people who feel very, very deeply about the need to correct injustice, and people who are able to calculate in a cool manner what types of political activity will be effective. Leon Shull was one of those rare people who combined both of them in a way that made each of those qualities more important. There wasn’t any trade-off with Leon between his pragmatic and clear-headed political analysis and his strong idealism. His idealism and his pragmatism worked together. They strengthened each other.

He was determined to be effective because he felt that he had a moral obligation not simply to will a fairer world, a world with fewer poor children, a world with less discrimination based on race or gender or sexual orientation or religion, a world with less widespread killing for unjustified reasons; he felt the moral obligation to diminish those things to the extent that any one human being could. And because he felt morally obligated to do it, he knew he was morally obligated to be effective.

He worked with many people who would give in from time to time to that wonderful feeling of just lashing out, of just letting your emotions run. But he knew the work to which he was committed was too important for that, that he owed the children and the victims of racism and poor, elderly people and working people thrown out of jobs, people in other parts of this world living in dire poverty, he knew that he owed them not just goodwill, but a commitment to making their lives better.

He was for many years the leader of Americans for Democratic Action.

Americans for Democratic Action immediately after World War II under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt and John Kenneth Galbraith and Walter Reuther and others was a very important organization in which liberals fought a two-front ideologic war against conservatives who wanted to retreat from the New Deal on the one side and from Communists who were anti-democratic on the other.

As time went on, the Americans for Democratic Action, ADA as it is known, became less important, probably because the Democratic Party, I believe, moved more in that direction. But it was still important to have that organization then as it is now as an independent force, and Leon Shull kept that organization vibrant.

There is an expression used about boxers who are fighting in a weight class heavier than their own, that they are able to punch above their weight, that they have a strength and a physical ability that allows them to be competitive with people bigger and theoretically beyond their reach.

Leon Shull punched above his weight, and ADA under him punched above its weight. He was in this city for many years a beacon for those of us who believed that the liberal tenets of Franklin Roosevelt were still very relevant, that a wealthy society in the United States had both the obligation and the resources to diminish inequality, not to dispose of it altogether in a capitalistic system, but to diminish it.

Leon Shull was an ally of people fighting racism, of people fighting poverty, of people fighting unjust wars, of people fighting for rational environmental policy, of people fighting for free speech and fairness. And with all that, he was a gentle man. He was a fierce advocate of these policies, but in personal demeanor a man of gentleness, a man who inspired the love and affection of those who worked with him. In later years he retired and he moved away from Washington, and I saw much less of him.

Mr. Speaker, when I read of his death, I realized as I thought about it all that he is one of the people from whom I learned a great deal. To his wife, Anne, to his daughters and others who have lost this great man, I send my deepest sympathy; and to his memory I express my gratitude for being the model of an effective liberal.

#### ILLUSORY PROGRESS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. WYNN. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday, I had the unfortunate occasion to attend the funeral of Sergeant Princess Samuels, age 22, a graduate of Flowers High School in my district and one of the most recent casualties of our misadventure in Iraq.

I rise today to comment on what I consider to be a failed policy in Iraq,

because she is only one of over 3,700 American soldiers who have been killed in Iraq. Meanwhile, 27,000 U.S. troops have been wounded in action, 12,000 of whom will not be able to return to action, and although we don't comment on it often, at least 50,000 Iraqis have been killed; 18,000 Iraqi civilians were killed in August alone.

It was very sad to be with the family of Sergeant Princess Samuels. Her mother, in an understandable note of bitterness, said that here she found herself prepared for a funeral while the Commander in Chief was preparing for a wedding for his daughter. Her anger was certainly understandable, and our sympathies and those of all us in the Fourth Congressional District go out to Ms. Samuels.

So I find it very unfortunate that we begin to hear comments such as "the surge is working" and that we need to "stay the course." This is the wrong course. This is the wrong course. We need to stay engaged, but we need to move away from this military course.

Our troops have fought valiantly and they have done everything we have asked of them. They have done more. But, right now, the GAO report tells us that the strategy is flawed. You see, the strategy was to have a surge that would allow this government some breathing room, and in that breathing room they would have a reconciliation and begin to bring the various sectarian groups in Iraq together.

What we found from the GAO report is that that hasn't happened. The surge has only provided the illusion of progress. That is, if you put more troops in, you will reduce the casualties among those troops. But the fact is, the overall level of violence continues to be very high. The number of Iraqis killed remains about the same.

Now, last January the President laid out some benchmarks. He said that these ought to be completed, and this is why we are having the surge. The GAO report says only three of the 18 benchmarks have been met. Do the math: that means 15 have not been met.

These are not benchmarks that U.S. troops, no matter how valiant, can achieve. These are political benchmarks that this Iraqi Government has failed to achieve. The number of daily attacks over the last 6 months is about the same. In fact, the number of Iraqi army units capable of independent operation has actually decreased. And what we find is insurgents frequently work with the Iraqi police and military forces based on common sectarian ties.

There is an interesting article in The Washington Post today. Our U.S. troops are pinned down in a section of west Baghdad and they are calling for relief from Iraqi troops. The relief did not come. Why? Because the Iraqi troops were in league with the Shiite militia in that area and they did not respond. Fortunately, our American troops were able to reach cover and survive, but the story illustrates an-

other failure that is occurring in Iraq as the so-called security forces that we are trying to prop up were in fact working with our enemies. The policy is not working.

We can't continue this policy. We need a new direction. We need to look to diplomacy as a way to resolve this problem. People say, well, if we withdraw U.S. troops, there is going to be a bloodbath. There is a bloodbath now.

The fact of the matter is if U.S. troops withdraw, one of the major catalysts for violence will be removed from the situation. We will then be in a position to support diplomatic efforts, peace initiatives by Muslim countries, by the U.N., by internationally recognized military leaders. Sometimes this country has an arrogance and believes that we are the only ones that can promote peace. I disagree. I believe that other countries, Muslim countries, other people can also promote peace. And I also believe that they want peace, and given supportive conditions, they can in fact create peace.

I think we have to accept the fact that the surge gives an illusion of success, but the overall policy has not worked, because the GAO reported the benchmarks haven't been met, and it is time to move in a new direction. I also noted today the British, our allies in this adventure, have already begun to leave Basra, leaving the cities in the hands of the Iraqi security.

The point is, everyone but this administration realizes we need a new direction. I hope the administration will look at the GAO report and conclude, as it has, that this policy is a failure and that we need a new policy in Iraq.

#### ENDING THE MADNESS IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there will be a great debate in Congress in the coming days about the administration's escalation strategy in Iraq. The administration has been trying during this time to influence that debate by launching a saturation public relations campaign designed to convince us that the escalation is working. Before the debate in Congress begins, however, it is really important for every Member of this House to know the facts; and the truth is the escalation is not working. It is failing. Here are the facts:

First, this summer has been the bloodiest summer of the occupation for American troops since the occupation began. Between June and August, 261 of our brave troops died. Over the same three months last year, 169 died. That is too many, absolutely; but it is a 54 percent increase this year over last year.

Second, the escalation has been deadly for U.S. troops ever since it began: 654 U.S. troops were killed between February, when the escalation began,