

□ 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). 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.)

EVEN THE SOLDIERS WILL TELL YOU THAT NOTHING IS GOING TO HELP

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as the previous speaker just mentioned, tomorrow we will begin debating the Iraq war surge resolution. George Will, the conservative columnist wrote in opposition to this surge and said it would take a miracle for the surge to succeed.

Dick Arme, our former majority leader, in an interview with a major newspaper chain said just a few days ago that he deeply regretted voting to go to war in Iraq, and said, "Had I been more true to myself and the principles I believed in at the time, I would have openly opposed the whole adventure vocally and aggressively."

William F. Buckley, Jr., often called the godfather of conservatism, wrote in 2004 that if he had known in 2002 what he knew in 2004 he would have opposed the war. Chris Matthews on Election Night said, "The decision to go to war in Iraq was not a conservative decision historically," and he said it asked Republicans, "to behave like a different people than they intrinsically are."

And that confirmed what I have said many times on this floor, that the war in Iraq went against every traditional conservative position I have ever known. I would like to read into the RECORD at this time a column that I wrote for the Nashville Tennessean, Tennessee's largest circulation daily.

I wrote this, "I voted against going to war in Iraq when Congress voted on this in October of 2002. And I am opposed to sending more U.S. troops there now. President Bush has said repeatedly that he is going to listen mainly to his commanders. I wish he would listen to Specialist Don Roberts, 22, of Paonia, Colorado, now in his second tour in Iraq, who told the Associated Press: 'What could more guys do? We cannot pick sides. It is like we have to watch them kill each other then ask questions.'"

Sergeant Josh Keim, of Canton, Ohio, also on his second term said, "nothing is going to help. It is a religious war and we are caught in the middle of it."

Saddam Hussein was an evil man, but he had a total military budget only a little over two-tenths of 1 percent of ours, most of which he spent protecting himself and his family and building castles.

He was no threat to us at all. As the conservative columnist Charley Reese has written several times, Iraq did not threaten us with war. They did not attack us, and were not even capable of attacking us.

But even before the war started, Fortune Magazine had an article saying that an American occupation of Iraq would be "prolonged and expensive" and would make U.S. soldiers "sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists."

Now we have had more than 3,000 Americans killed, many thousands more wounded horribly, and have spent \$400 billion, and the Pentagon wants \$170 billion more.

Most of what we have spent has been purely foreign aid in nature: rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure, giving free medical care, training police, giving jobs to several hundred thousand Iraqis and on and on. Our Constitution does not give us the authority to run another country as we have in reality been doing in Iraq.

With a national debt of almost \$9 trillion, we cannot afford it. To me our misadventure in Iraq is both unconstitutional and unaffordable. Some have said it was a mistake to start this war but that now that we are there we have to finish the job, and we cannot cut and run. Well, if you find out you are going the wrong way down the interstate, you do not keep going, you get off at the next exit.

Very few pushed as hard for us to go to war in Iraq as did syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer. Last week he wrote that the Maliki government we have installed there cares only about making sure the Shiites dominate the Sunnis. We should not be surging troops in defense of such a government, Krauthammer wrote. Maliki should be made to know that if he insists on having this sectarian war, he can well have it without us.

There is no way we can keep all of our promises to our own people on Social Security, veterans benefits, and many other things in the years ahead if we keep trying to run the whole world. As another columnist, Georgie Anne Geyer, wrote more than 3 years ago, Americans "will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe."

We should help other countries during humanitarian crises and have trade and tourism and cultural and educational exchanges. But conservatives have traditionally been the strongest opponents to interventionist foreign policies that create so much resentment for us around the world.

We need to return to the more humble foreign policy President Bush advocated when he campaigned in 2000.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we need to tell all of these defense contractors that the time for this Iraq gravy train with its obscene profits is over. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to bring our troops home.

NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF PRESIDENT BUSH'S BUDGET ON NEW YORK

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the negative impact of President Bush's proposed budget on New York State. New York is consistently faced with a funding imbalance. We receive far less funding than we pay out in taxes. This imbalance has held back projects in key areas. Key programs have been constantly underfunded, and this year's proposed budget again makes the wrong choices for New York's families. Gang violence is a growing problem on Long Island. Our police departments and community groups are doing all they can with this small budget.

Unfortunately, these budgets will be further reduced if the President has his way. His budget request attempts to eliminate two of New York's local crime fighting tools: the Community Oriented Policing Service, or the COPS Program, and the Justice Assistance Grants Program. These two programs allow law enforcement agencies to hire police officers and support crime prevention.

It is a lot cheaper to prevent crime than it is to send someone to prison. Police departments rely on this money to purchase new technology and equipment, to educate their members on how to best combat issues such as gun violence.

In the year 2006, New York received more than \$27 million in COPS and JAG funding. If this money is not available, our law enforcement will not have the tools they need to keep our families and communities safe. But it is not just our communities that are put at risk by the President's budget.

College assistance programs to help New York students will be slashed if the President has his way. The education of our Nation's students is one of the most important issues facing us today. I have traveled to China and India and have seen the attention those countries are giving to education for their students.

We need to do a better job at funding our educational programs to give our students the tools they need to compete in a global economy. However, under the President's budget, key programs such as work study and supplemental educational opportunity grants will be frozen.

Tuition in New York State schools have increased over 20 percent over the last few years. These new cuts in student aid will put college further out of reach of so many of the New York students. This is the wrong message to be sending to our students who work hard in high school and dream of going to college. We can do a better job, but we need adequate funding to truly help our students achieve their dreams.

As you know, our health care system needs attention also. Over 40 million

Americans are without health insurance. In New York 2.5 million are uninsured. In his State of the Union address, President Bush vaguely outlined a proposal to deal with this very issue. I applaud the President for bringing this issue to the forefront of the debate.

However, I do not agree with the President's plan. I am afraid his proposal will raise health care costs for New York's working class, while doing very little to help the 2.5 million uninsured. The money President Bush requested for his plan can be better used to lower premiums and truly make health care affordable for all Americans.

Since the start of the 110th Congress the House has done the people's work. We have raised the minimum wage, cut student loan interest rates, and helped Medicare beneficiaries. We have changed the focus of our Nation to help all Americans.

The President's budget request misses the mark and will harm already underfunded programs. We in Congress must devote more attention and funding to our Nation's education and health care. These issues have been long underfunded for too long.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to refocus our priorities and fully fund our educational and health care programs. I know in the next 3 days we are going to be debating Iraq, which I think is probably one of the most important issues facing this Nation.

But even with that, we as Democrats will continue doing the work of the American people and finally getting some work done that is going to help all Americans. That is what we as Democrats will do. That is what we pledged and we will follow through with that.

SUPPORT THE DRIVE ACT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about House Resolution or House bill 670, which is a bill called the DRIVE Act; that is, the Dependency Reduction through Innovative Vehicle and Energy Policy.

It is a bill that ELIOT ENGEL and I have cosponsored. It has almost an equal number of Democrats and Republican cosponsors, up to about 60. And its goal is to reduce your oil consumption by 20 percent in 20 years. What we did is sat down and said, how could we achieve that goal and do something for national security, something for the environment, and something for mom and dad back home and their pocket-book?

So we set out to try to stay true to those goals. We put fourth four things in it. To change consumer habits, we have doubled the tax credit for purchase of hybrids, flex fuel vehicles, and

biodiesel, anything that would drive on something besides gasoline.

Secondly, we have sent a message to Detroit that we would like to see 80 percent of the cars made in 10 years be at least flex fuel so that Wall Street will also follow suit and invest in flex fuel vehicles and hybrids and ethanol, things like that. If Wall Street knows that the government is behind it and the market is going to be there, then the investment dollars will follow.

Too often what happens when the price of gasoline goes up, everyone rushes out and looks at alternatives; then when the price of gasoline goes down, everybody forgets all about it. We want to have a permanent investment stream from Wall Street. That is why it is a good method when you follow what we did with air bags, the air bag model.

Thirdly, we require the government to start scoring based on energy consumption. When the government goes out and buys fleets of vehicles, we want to know, are you buying innovative vehicles, flex fuels, hybrids and so forth. We believe it is important for the Federal Government to have a goal.

One thing I point out, which is not in the bill; but we deliver on Saturday, mail which is 30 percent of the volume that you have Monday through Friday, but we use 100 percent of the fuel. So it would make sense if you are in the business place to quit delivering mail on Saturday.

I understand that has some political ramifications, and thinking with our political minds instead of our business minds. I just say that is an example. Finally, we believe that a lot more research has to be done. But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Toyota is already on their fourth-generation hybrid.

Unfortunately, many of the Detroit American motor companies are not that far along. But there is a lot coming down the pike. The University of Georgia, for example is making ethanol out of sweet potatoes, left-over Coca Cola and watermelon. There are all kinds of ways to make ethanol in addition to using corn.

These are the things that our bill does. You know, in Washington it is actually easy to agree to disagree. My friend, Mr. MILLER and I, we have no problem disagreeing agreeably. But what we need to do is agree to agree, which is much harder. Because when Republicans and Democrats agree to agree, we make progress, and sometimes the interest groups that surround us from both parties really do not want that, because they are not as empowered as they are when we are fighting.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 742. An act to amend the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, to extend the term of the Antitrust Modernization Commission and to make a technical correction.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) as Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress:

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD);

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD);

The Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY); and

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as already has been noted this evening, tomorrow the House will begin a 3-day debate on the question of whether or not we support the escalation of the war in Iraq by supporting the President's policy to send over 21,000 additional troops to Baghdad, what is called the surge, but is in fact an escalation of the war and of the exposure of our American troops in Iraq.

It is an important debate, and it will be an important vote. It will be a very simple proposition: Either you support the escalation or you do not. This is the vote that the American people have been asking for now for many, many months. They certainly expressed it in the election. They have expressed it since the election where we see time and again they are telling the country, they are telling those of us who are in the Congress of the United States that they do not support this policy; they want an exit plan; they want our young men and women brought home from Iraq; and they want the Iraqis to take responsibility for the political decisions that must be made if Iraq is in fact going to be a unified country, if Iraq in fact can proceed along a road to building democratic institutions and hopefully finally building a democracy.

□ 1945

But none of that, none of that will be done by the troops from America. None of that can be done by the troops from America. The fact of the matter is that that must be done by the Iraqi people.