

my colleagues to cosponsor and to support the passage of H.R. 933, the Witness Security Protection Act of 2007, should it come to the House floor for a vote. Upon enactment, this legislation authorizes \$90 million per year over the next 3 years to enable State and local prosecutors to provide witness protection on their own or to pay the cost of enrolling their witnesses in the Short-Term State Witness Protection Program to be created within the United States Marshals Service.

In closing, I will highlight a recent case that exemplifies the need for this type of program.

On his way to lunch in March 2006, Carl Stanley Lackl, Jr., walked through a Baltimore City alley and witnessed Patrick Byers shoot Larry Haynes. Not only did Carl Lackl call the police, he stayed with the dying victim, comforting and reassuring him as paramedics arrived. Mr. Lackl was prepared to testify as a key witness in Byers' trial.

Unfortunately, Carl Lackl will not get the opportunity to carry out his civic duty. He was killed 8 days before the trial, gunned down in front of his home. Police have accused Byers of sending a text message to an associate giving Lackl's name and address and offering \$1,000 to have him killed. According to police, Lackl was at home at about 8:45 when he received a call about a Cadillac that he was selling. As he stood next to the Cadillac, a dark-colored car drove up, and a 15-year-old inside shot him three times, in the arm, chest and leg. Carl Lackl was pronounced dead soon after arriving at a nearby hospital.

Mr. Lackl deserved better. By all accounts, he was a hard worker and a devoted father. My prayers go out to his mother, his daughter, and his entire family. We can and should do better.

Mr. Speaker, witness intimidation is a growing national problem jeopardizing the criminal justice system's ability to protect the public. This issue must be addressed because without witnesses there can be no justice.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 933, the Witness Security and Protection Act of 2007.

□ 1845

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONSTITUTIONAL WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I introduced H.J. Res. 53, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution. Today, every Member of Congress received a Dear Colleague letter on this resolution. I hope that all Members and their staffs will take the time to review this legislation.

Too many times, this Congress has abdicated its constitutional duty by allowing Presidents to overstep their executive authority. Our Constitution states that, while the Commander in Chief has the power to conduct wars, only Congress has the power to authorize war.

As threats to international peace and security continue to evolve, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution re-dedicating Congress to its primary constitutional role of deciding when to use force abroad.

In 1793, James Madison said: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature. The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war." And that was James Madison, 1793.

The Framers of our Constitution sought to decentralize the war powers of the United States and construct a balance between the political branches. Because this balance has been too often ignored throughout American history, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution seeks to establish a clear national policy for today's post-9/11 world.

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 aimed to clarify the intent of the constitutional Framers and to ensure that Congress and the President share in the decisionmaking process in the event of armed conflict. Yet, since the enactment of the resolution, time and again Presidents have maintained that the resolution's consultation reporting and congressional authorization requirements are unconstitutional obstacles to executive authority.

By more fully clarifying the war powers of the President and the Congress, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution improves upon the War Powers Resolution of 1973 in a number of ways. It clearly spells out the powers that the Congress and the President must exercise collectively, as well as the defensive measures that the Commander in Chief may exercise without congressional authority.

It also provides a more robust reporting requirement that would enable Congress to be more informed and have greater oversight. This resolution is the result of the dedicated work of the Constitutional Project and its War Powers Initiative. And it protects and preserves the checks and balances the Framers intended in the decision to bring our Nation into war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope many of my colleagues will consider cosponsoring this

legislation. It is time for Congress to meet its constitutional duty, and it is long overdue.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back my time, I want to ask God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform and to bless their families, and for God to continue to bless America.

THE HEALTH OF IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the World Health Organization released a report that can only be called shocking and appalling. Cholera is on the rise in Iraq and spreading to urban areas like Baghdad and Basrah, and some of the northern provinces as well.

As most of you know, cholera is a diarrheal illness caused by infection of the intestine. People get cholera from drinking water or food contaminated with the cholera bacteria, and it spreads rapidly in areas with inadequate treatment of sewage and drinking water.

This sounds like a disease of the Third World, not one of a developed and wealthy country, certainly not a country where the United States is propping up the health care system, right? Then why have the confirmed number of cases of cholera risen to more than 2,000? In one week alone, 616 new cases were discovered. The WHO estimates that more than 30,000 people have fallen ill with similar symptoms which may later be confirmed as cholera.

This is a shocking epidemic. As a result, the Iraqi Government is considering travel restrictions to limit the spread of this often deadly disease, particularly for children.

In a country already crippled by refugees and internally displaced people, the situation grows more severe every single day. Why, as we are spending more than \$13 million an hour for the occupation of Iraq, \$13 million an hour, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, can we not join with the international community to provide for the most basic human needs? We are talking clean drinking water and proper sanitation. This is not reinventing the wheel or putting a man on the Moon.

Clean water and sanitary conditions, is that too much to ask? I guess it might be for our leader at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, because the administration spews a lot of rhetoric about liberating the Iraqi people. Does that mean crumbling infrastructure, sectarian fighting, a massive refugee crisis, and on top of that, a possible epidemic of cholera?

Iraqi families need to start their lives over again. They need their kids to be able to go to school. And they need to start their businesses and reopen them. They want real sovereignty

over their own nation. They want U.S. troops out.

Real leadership in Iraq means bringing our troops home and offering humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq. We must join with the international community to provide relief, reconstruction, and reconciliation. This is the only way forward for Iraq.

Force and occupation will not rebuild Iraq. It will not provide healthier communities. And most importantly, it will not provide a peaceful future for the people of Iraq.

Bring our troops home. Bring hope to our military families at home and the Iraq families yearning for peace.

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.)

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

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

RUSH LIMBAUGH'S "PHONY SOLDIER" COMMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Well, Rush Limbaugh is at it again. Unable to defend an indefensible war in Iraq, he has once again resorted to "sliming" the messenger. In this case, unbelievably, the messengers he's going after are the brave men and women who have served their country in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other wars.

Men and women who serve in Iraq differ from Rush Limbaugh in two critical ways. First, unlike Mr. Limbaugh, they actually served in the military. Second, unlike Mr. Limbaugh, they understand that the war in Iraq is making our country less safe and destroying the military.

How dare Rush Limbaugh label anyone who has served in the military as a "phony soldier." How dare he say that his views in Iraq, formed in the comfort of his radio studio, are legitimate, while the views of those whose opinions were forged on the battlefield are not. Could Rush Limbaugh actually face soldiers who have risked their lives and tell them that their beliefs don't matter?

These are soldiers like Brandon Friedman, a former rifle platoon leader in the Army's 101st Airborne Division who fought in Afghanistan in 2002 and commanded troops in Iraq. He says, "The escalation of the war is failing and now the mission must change. The

fact is," he says, "the Iraq war has kept us from devoting assets we need to fight terrorists worldwide, as evidenced by the fact that Osama bin Laden is still on the loose and al Qaeda has been able to rebuild. We need an effective strategy that takes the fight to our real enemies abroad, and the best way to do that is to get our troops out of the middle of the civil war in Iraq." Is Brandon Friedman a phony?

Or Josh Gaines, who earned the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal and the National Defense Service Medal during his 2 years in Iraq, he believes the war in Iraq was a mistake from the beginning. Is he a phony? Or retired General William Odom, the head of the National Security Agency during the Reagan administration. His advice: "The sensible policy is not to stay the course in Iraq. It is rapid withdrawal, re-establishing strong relations with our allies in Europe, showing confidence in the U.N. Security Council, and trying to knit together a large coalition, including the major states of Europe, Japan, South Korea, China and India to back a strategy for stabilizing the area from the eastern Mediterranean to Afghanistan to Pakistan." General Odom says: "Until the United States withdraws from Iraq and admits its strategic error, no such coalition can be formed. Thus those fear leaving a mess are actually helping make things worse while preventing a new strategic approach with some promise of success."

Does Rush Limbaugh really want to look General Odom in the eye and call him a phony? I believe that we should all pay attention to the views of Brandon Friedman and Josh Gaines and General Odom whose beliefs, like their military experience, are real. And while we're at it, let's pay attention to the 72 percent of American troops serving in Iraq who also think the U.S. should exit the country within the next year, and more than one in four who say the troops should leave immediately, according to the Zogby poll. I guess they're all a bunch of phonies, according to Rush Limbaugh.

Our military men and women deserve respect. Apparently, however, Mr. Limbaugh thinks they deserve to be smeared and belittled unless they happen to agree with him. I understand why Rush Limbaugh cannot debate this war on the merits, but bashing soldiers and veterans who disagree with him is unpatriotic and un-American.

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

(Mr. LAMBORN 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 gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. DREIER 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 gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE VOTING IRREGULARITIES OF AUGUST 2, 2007, 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the Select Committee to Investigate the Voting Irregularities of August 2, 2007 for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Select Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on September 27, 2007.

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE VOTING IRREGULARITIES OF AUGUST 2, 2007, 110TH CONGRESS, ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 27, 2007

Resolved, That the Rules of the Select Committee to Investigate the Voting Irregularities of August 2, 2007 shall be as follows: Except as provided in paragraphs (1)–(4), rule XI and clause 2(c) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be rules of the Select Committee.

(1) Regular Meeting Days. If the House is in session, the Committee shall meet on the first Thursday of each month at 9 a.m. for the consideration of any pending business. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The Chairman may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(2) Questioning Witnesses. The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified period that is equal for each side and not longer than 30 minutes for each side at a time. The chairman and ranking minority member shall each determine how to allocate this time for their members.

(3) Views. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed under rule XI and rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the time allowed for filing of such views shall be three calendar days, beginning on the day of notice, but excluding