

to significantly diminish, if not remove, the very threat that's regaining strength.

Mr. Speaker, we must not lose our nerve. It is the responsibility of this body, carrying a mandate from the American people, to correct the grievous mistakes and reverse the disastrous course of this administration.

We must devote ourselves to democracy-building, reconstruction and humanitarian assistance in Iraq and Afghanistan. We must bring our troops home from Iraq. And once they're home, we must treat them with the dignity and respect they've earned.

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

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

HONORING CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT JACKSON A. WINSETT

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding United States Air Force Reserve senior non-commissioned officer, Chief Master Sergeant Jackson A. Winsett, upon his retirement from Air Force Reserve after more than 28 years of honorable service.

Throughout his career, Chief Master Sergeant Winsett served with distinction, and it is my privilege to recognize his many accomplishments and to commend him for the superb service he has provided the Air Force Reserve and our Nation.

Chief Master Sergeant Winsett is a native of Murfreesboro, Tennessee, and currently lives in Lenexa, Kansas. He entered the United States Army in October 1966.

His assignments took him to the Republic of Vietnam and the Federal Republic of Germany where he served his Nation as an administrative and personnel assistant. In September 1969, Chief Master Sergeant Winsett was honorably discharged from the United States Army as a Sergeant E-5.

Chief Master Sergeant Winsett joined the United States Air Force Reserve in October 1981 as an administrative specialist in the 442nd Fighter Wing, Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri. During his tenure with this organization, he served in numerous positions, including a 2-year assignment as the consolidated base personnel office career adviser, 2 years as the unit career adviser for the 442nd Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Squadron, 4 years as the first sergeant for the 442nd Combat Support Group, 7 years as the first sergeant for the 442nd Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Squadron, 2 years as the senior enlisted adviser for the 442nd Fighter Wing, and 2 years as the command chief master sergeant for the 442nd Fighter Wing.

Chief Master Sergeant Winsett applied for and was selected in July 2000 to be the command chief master sergeant for headquarters, 10th Air Force, at Naval Air Station, Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth, Texas.

During this assignment, which increased in scope and responsibility, Chief Winsett was responsible for providing advice on personnel matters concerning the welfare, effective use, and progress of the 10,000-member enlisted force to the 10th Air Force Command.

Chief Master Sergeant Winsett most recently served as the command chief master sergeant at headquarters, Air Force Reserve Command Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, where he continued his personal tradition of excellence, service and integrity. Through frequent communications, Chief Winsett maintained liaison between the commander of the United States Air Force Reserve Command and the 60,000-plus member enlisted force and key staff members.

He communicated to the commander problems and solutions, concerns, morale and attitude of the enlisted force, and ensured the commander's policies were known and understood by them.

Additionally, Chief Master Sergeant Winsett evaluated the quality of non-commissioned officer leadership, management and supervision. He monitored compliance with various Air Force instructions, including conduct and performance standards. Within his functional area, he issued directives and other guidance ensuring policy compliance.

During his incredible career, Chief Master Sergeant Winsett has served the United States Air Force Reserve and our great Nation with excellence and distinction. He provided exemplary leadership to the best trained and best prepared enlisted citizen-airmen force in the history of the United States.

Chief Master Sergeant Winsett is a model of leadership and a living example of our military's dedication to our safety and security entrusted to them by each of us.

Chief Master Sergeant Winsett will retire from the United States Air Force Reserve on March 7, 2007, after 28 years and 3 months of dedicated service. On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I wish Chief Master Sergeant Winsett the very best. Congratulations on completion of an outstanding and successful career.

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

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

WHITE HOUSE NEEDS TO CHANGE RHETORIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned and the world is very uneasy. Congress must begin to restore what the President and Vice President have shattered: our credibility in the world.

Headlines in the U.S. and international news media remove all doubt how the U.S. is viewed today in the world. One said: "Russian official warns U.S. not to attack Iran."

"Use of force on Iran unacceptable," says France.

"Trigger-happy U.S. worries Putin."

The BBC reports that the U.S. Central Command officials have already chosen an extensive list for missile and bomb attacks inside Iran.

Another in the Asia Times: "Three reasons why we should attack Iran," and all this comes from yesterday's headlines.

The French Foreign Ministry told an Asia news agency that France believes that the use of force to solve the Iranian nuclear issue is both unimaginable and unacceptable; but not in this White House.

When the Vice President announced recently that all options are still on the table, our international credibility took another direct hit. We cannot afford that kind of warmongering rhetoric any more, not in dollars, not in soldiers, not in insecurity, and not in international standing. It sounds like 2002 all over again. Like Yogi Berra said, "deja vu all over again."

That is a cause for grave concern on this floor and needs congressional action. We must include language in every military appropriation bill that specifically prohibits the administration from unilaterally waging war in Iran except by a vote of the Congress.

As it stands, the President and the Vice President are using the same speeches from 2002. They are just replacing the name of the country, Iraq, with Iran; but this time, the world has noticed.

The French foreign minister tells his boss before a television audience: "Predictions that U.S. strikes will be conducted against Iran have become more common, and this causes concern."

In the Baltimore Chronicle, Robert Perry writes: "A number of U.S. military leaders, including the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have waged an extraordinary behind-the-scenes resistance to what they fear is a secret plan by George Bush to wage war against Iran."

The BBC reports that two "triggers," or pretexts, for a U.S. attack have already been chosen.

Seymour Hersch writes in The New Yorker that the Pentagon has been ordered by the White House to plan a bombing campaign against Iran ready to go on a day's notice.

Michael Klare writing in the Asia Times says that recent remarks by the President seek to instill the same fear as the run-up to the Iraq war.

Listen to the President's rhetoric: "stabilizing the region in the face of extremist challenges."

Then there was the line by the President the other day: "We are also taking other steps to bolster the security of Iraq and protect American interests in the Middle East."

And then the President said: "It is also clear that we face an escalating danger from Shiite extremists who are just as hostile to America, and are also determined to dominate the Middle East." He is making a bogey-man out of Iran.

People and nations listen to that inflammatory rhetoric from our President and Vice President and worry about a world careening towards another war. There is no doubt that America needs a thoughtful and coherent foreign policy concerning Iran. We ought to talk to them, for starters.

We don't need to merely change the rhetoric of the White House. We need to change the administration's perilous world view that America can and will just shoot its way to peace anywhere there is a problem in the world.

The first step in restoring America's credibility and global leadership is to let the world know that Congress is a coequal branch of government that will exercise its constitutional duty to ensure that the administration does not run off on its own to go to war.

We have to declare that the days of runaway rhetoric by the administration are over. But let us go beyond that. Let Congress take the administration's threat of war off the table and replace it with America's true belief that we view war as unimaginable and unacceptable.

THREE U.S. REASONS TO ATTACK IRAN (By Michael T. Klare)

Some time this spring or summer, barring an unexpected turnaround by Tehran, US President George W Bush is likely to go on national television and announce that he has ordered US ships and aircraft to strike at military targets inside Iran.

We must still sit through several months of soap opera at the United Nations in New York and assorted foreign capitals before this comes to pass, and it is always possible that a diplomatic breakthrough will occur—let it be so!—but I am convinced that Bush has already decided an attack is his only option and the rest is a charade he must go through to satisfy his European allies.

The proof of this, I believe, lies half-hidden in recent public statements of his, which, if pieced together, provide a *casus belli*, or formal list of justifications, for going to war.

Three of his statements, in particular, contained the essence of this justification: his January 10 televised speech on his plan for a troop "surge" in Iraq, his State of the Union address of January 23, and his first televised press conference of the year on February 14. None of these was primarily focused on Iran, but Bush used each of them to warn of the extraordinary dangers that country poses to the United States and to hint at severe US reprisals if the Iranians did not desist from "harming US troops".

In each, moreover, he laid out various parts of the overall argument he will certainly use to justify an attack on Iran. String these together in one place and you

can almost anticipate what Bush's speechwriters will concoct before he addresses the American people from the Oval Office some time this year. Think of them as talking points for the next war.

The first of these revealing statements was Bush's January 10 televised address on Iraq. This speech was supposedly intended to rally public and congressional support behind his plan to send 21,500 additional US troops into the Iraqi capital and al-Anbar province, the heartland of the Sunni Insurgency.

But his presentation that night was so uninspired, so lacking in conviction, that—according to media commentary and polling data—few, if any, Americans were persuaded by his arguments. Only once that evening did Bush visibly come alive: when he spoke about the threat to Iraq supposedly posed by Iran.

"Succeeding in Iraq also requires defending its territorial integrity and stabilizing the region in the face of extremist challenges," he declared, which meant, he assured his audience, addressing the problem of Iran. That country, he asserted, "is providing material support for attacks on American troops". (This support was later identified as advanced improvised explosive devices—IEDs or roadside bombs—given to anti-American Shi'ite militias.)

Then followed an unambiguous warning: "We will disrupt the attacks on our forces . . . And we will seek out and destroy the networks providing advanced weaponry and training to our enemies in Iraq."

Consider this Item 1 in his *casus belli*: because Iran is aiding and abetting the United States' enemies in Iraq, the US is justified in attacking Iran as a matter of self-defense.

Bush put it this way in an interview with Juan Williams of National Public Radio on January 29: "If Iran escalates its military action in Iraq to the detriment of our troops and/or innocent Iraqi people, we will respond firmly . . . It makes common sense for the commander-in-chief to say to our troops and the Iraqi people—and the Iraqi government that we will help you defend yourself from people that want to sow discord and harm."

In his January 10 address, Bush went on to fill in a second item in any future *casus belli*: Iran is seeking nuclear weapons to dominate the Middle East to the detriment of the United States' friends in the region—a goal that it simply cannot be allowed to achieve.

In response to such a possibility, Bush declared, "We're also taking other steps to bolster the security of Iraq and protect American interests in the Middle East." These include deploying a second US aircraft-carrier battle group to the Persian Gulf region, consisting of the USS *John C Stennis* and a flotilla of cruisers, destroyers and submarines (presumably to provide additional air and missile assets for strikes on Iran), along with additional Patriot anti-missile batteries (presumably to shoot down any Iranian missiles that might be fired in retaliation for an air attack on the country and its nuclear facilities). "And," Bush added, "we will work with others to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons and dominating the region."

Bush added a third item to the *casus belli* in his State of the Union address on January 23. After years of describing Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda as the greatest threats to U.S. interests in the Middle East, he now introduced a new menace: the resurgent Shi'ite branch of Islam led by Iran.

Aside from al-Qaeda and other Sunni extremists, he explained, "It has also become clear that we face an escalating danger from Shi'ite extremists who are just as hostile to America, and are also determined to dominate the Middle East." Many of these extremists, he noted, "are known to take di-

rection from the regime in Iran", including the Hezbollah movement in Lebanon.

As if to nail down this point, he offered some hair-raising imagery right out of the Left Behind best-selling book series so beloved of Christian evangelicals and their neoconservative allies: "If American forces step back [from Iraq] before Baghdad is secure, the Iraqi government would be overrun by extremists on all sides. We could expect an epic battle between Shi'ite extremists backed by Iran, and Sunni extremists backed by al-Qaeda and supporters of the old regime. A contagion of violence could spill across the country, and in time the entire region could be drawn into the conflict. For America, this is a nightmare scenario. For the enemy, this is the objective."

As refined by Bush speechwriters, this, then, is the third item in his *casus belli* for attacking Iran: to prevent a "nightmare scenario" in which the Shi'ite leaders of Iran might emerge as the grandmasters of regional instability, using such proxies as Hezbollah to imperil Israel and pro-American regimes in Jordan, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia—with potentially catastrophic consequences for the safety of Middle Eastern oil supplies. You can be sure of what Bush will say to this in his future address: no U.S. president would ever allow such a scenario to come to pass.

Many of these themes were reiterated in Bush's White House Valentine's Day (February 14) press conference. Once again, Iraq was meant to be the main story, but Iran captured all the headlines.

Bush's most widely cited comments on Iran focused on claims of Iranian involvement in the delivery of sophisticated versions of the roadside IEDs that have been responsible for many of the U.S. casualties in recent months. Just a few days earlier, unidentified U.S. military officials in Baghdad had declared that elements of the Iranian military—specifically, the Quds Force of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards—were supplying the deadly devices to Shi'ite militias in Iraq, and that high-ranking Iranian government officials were aware of the deliveries.

These claims were contested by other U.S. officials and members of Congress who expressed doubt about the reliability of the evidence and the intelligence work behind it, but Bush evinced no such uncertainty: "What we do know is that the Quds Force was instrumental in providing these deadly IEDs to networks inside of Iraq. We know that. And we also know that the Quds Force is a part of the Iranian government. That's a known."

What is not known, he continued, is just how high up in the Iranian government went the decision-making that led such IEDs to be delivered to the Shi'ite militias in Iraq. But that doesn't matter, he explained. "What matters is, is that they're there . . . We know they're there, and we're going to protect our troops." As commander-in-chief, he insisted, he would "do what is necessary to protect our soldiers in harm's way".

He then went on to indicate that "the biggest problem I see is the Iranians' desire to have a nuclear weapon". He expressed his wish that this problem can be "dealt with" in a peaceful way—by the Iranians voluntarily agreeing to cease their program to enrich uranium to weapons-grade levels. But he also made it clear that the onus was purely on Tehran to take the necessary action to avoid unspecified harm: "I would like to be at the . . . have been given a chance for us to explain that we have no desire to harm the Iranian people."

No reporters at the press conference asked him to explain this odd twist of phrase, delivered in the past tense, about his regret

that he was unable to explain to the Iranian people why he had meant them no harm—presumably after the fact. However, if you view this as the Bush version of a Freudian slip, one obvious conclusion can be drawn: that Bush has already made the decision to begin the countdown for an attack on Iran, and only total capitulation by the Iranians could possibly bring the process to a halt.

Further evidence for this conclusion is provided by Bush's repeated reference to Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter. On three separate occasions during the press conference he praised Russia, China and the "EU3"—the United Kingdom, France and Germany—for framing the December 23 UN Security Council resolution condemning Iran's nuclear activities and imposing economic sanctions on Iran in the context of Chapter 7—that is, of "Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression".

This sets the stage for the international community, under UN leadership, to take such steps as may be deemed necessary "to maintain or restore international peace and stability", ranging from mild economic sanctions to fullscale war (steps that are described in Articles 39-51). But the December 23 resolution was specifically framed under Article 41, which entails "measures not involving the use of armed force", a stipulation demanded by China and Russia, which have categorically ruled out the use of military force to resolve the nuclear dispute with Iran.

One suspects that Bush has Chapter 7 on the brain, because he now intends to ask for a new resolution under Article 42, which allows the use of military force to restore international peace and stability. But it is nearly inconceivable that Russia and China will approve such a resolution. Such approval would also be tantamount to acknowledging U.S. hegemony worldwide, and this is something they are simply unwilling to do.

So we can expect several months of fruitless diplomacy at the United Nations in which the United States may achieve slightly more severe economic sanctions under Chapter 41 but not approval for military action under Chapter 42. Bush knows that this is the inevitable outcome, and so I am convinced that, in his various speeches and meetings with reporters, he is already preparing the way for a future address to the nation.

In it, he will speak somberly of a tireless U.S. effort to secure a meaningful resolution from the United Nations on Iran with real teeth in it and his deep disappointment that no such resolution has been forthcoming. He will also point out that, despite the heroic efforts of American diplomats as well as military commanders in Iraq, Iran continues to pose a vital and unchecked threat to U.S. security in Iraq, in the region, and even—via its nuclear program—in the wider world.

Further diplomacy, he will insist, appears futile and yet Iran must be stopped. Hence, he will say, "I have made the unavoidable decision to eliminate this vital threat through direct military action," and will announce—in language eerily reminiscent of his address to the nation on March 19, 2003, that a massive air offensive against Iran has already been under way for several hours.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY 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 gentlewoman 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.)

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.)

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here today with other Members of the class of 2006, the caucus of the new Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, the majority makers, to talk today about the Employee Free Choice Act which we passed in this Chamber just a short time ago.

I want to congratulate my colleagues on supporting H.R. 800, the Employee Free Choice Act, because it is an act that helps set a new direction for our country. If we can see final passage of H.R. 800, it will have a profound impact on working people in our country.

I would like to start with an example of why the protection H.R. 800 offers is so desperately needed. Last week I was home for a work week in my district in New Hampshire and I had the opportunity to meet one of my constituents, Emily, a nurse from Concord, New Hampshire. She was interested in improving working conditions at the nursing home where she worked and where she had worked for a long time.

So on January 12 of this year, she reached out to a local union to talk about organizing the employees, the other nurses, who were working in her nursing home. Seventeen days later, despite an impeccable history of service and excellent reviews, never had a

bad review, no problems with her personnel file, she was fired for what the home called "insubordination."

Now, Emily works long hours in an industry that desperately needs qualified people like her. There is a nursing shortage. She loves her job and she cares about her patients and cares about the people she attends to, and the folks that she is working with are also my constituents. They are people who care about the rights of the people who are taking care of them and working with them.

□ 1630

Emily deserves to have an advocate for safe and healthy working conditions, and she deserves to have a voice in her workplace. It is people like Emily who need the Employee Free Choice Act. It would make what happened to her illegal, as it should be. It would also penalize employers who intimidate and harass workers who want to join together to negotiate their contracts.

It is important to note that there are thousands of responsible employers in our country who are already complying with the Act on a voluntary basis, and that is a good thing. When a majority of their employees sign up to join a union, they recognize it. They do not discriminate against those who are interested in joining together to exercise what ought to be the rights of every worker in this country to collectively bargain.

This law that we have passed, that we are hoping to see final passage of, simply brings the rest of America's employers into line with the many who already acknowledge that their employees deserve a voice in their workplace. This is a bill that honors the integrity of work and promotes effective dialogue, dialogue between employers and the employees who are working with them.

Now, opponents of this bill, many of the people on the other side of this aisle, point to record corporate profits and soaring executive payouts as proof that we do not need the Employee Free Choice Act. Well, they are right about one thing. The rich in this country sure are getting richer, and in fact, while executive pay has rocketed to 350 times what the average worker makes in a company, real wages for working people have remained stagnant.

I have got a chart here today, and it is a wonderful thing because, as you know, this is one of the first sessions that we have had as the new Members in the Democratic majority, the new majority makers, doing what the 30-something Working Group has done so often on the floor over the past few years, educating the American people and our colleagues and each other about what is going on. They have pioneered the use of these kinds of charts, and I just want to point out what this chart shows.

This chart shows the value of CEO pay and average worker production pay