

begin at that point an immediate redeployment of their involvement in the Iraq War which must be completed by December of 2007. Other dates, October 1, also are being discussed and other dates, including March 1, 2008. It was a startling contrast, to say the least.

On Thursday of this week, our generals in Baghdad and our "generals" here in Congress were describing their plans for the war in Iraq.

But I must say that history teaches that we have but one commander in chief, Madam Speaker. In fact, if you study the minutes of the Constitutional Convention in that balmy summer of 1787, you will find more agreement on no other point than that our Founders believed in the unified chain of command, that there would be one commander in chief and that that power, under article II of the Constitution, would be vested in the President of the United States.

We have a role in this Chamber. Under article I, Congress has the exclusive authority to declare war and to make decisions which will be a part of the aforementioned legislation to determine whether and to what degree we will fund war.

But the conduct of the war on the ground, including the setting of benchmarks, the execution of timetables on the ground and the like, fall within the purview of the commanders and specifically the commander in chief. And I would argue, as something of a student of American history, during the Revolutionary period, that our Founders rejected this because of painful experiences during the Revolutionary War. Our first commander in chief, George Washington, actually would spend every night writing letters in his tent to Congress to ask permission for military maneuvers and almost failed as a result of that micromanagement.

Congress must not intrude on the constitutional province of the President of the United States to lead us as Commander in Chief. Napoleon said it best. He said, "I would rather face 20 brilliant generals than one mediocre one."

We must, as we move into this debate, carry before the American people a very simple principle: We must support our troops in the field, provide them with the resources they need to get the job done and come home safe. But in the midst of this debate, with civility, let us also take the case to the American people of whether or not they want one commander in chief or whether they want 435 commanders in chief elected to this article I body of the Congress. I say we have one leader of our military who leads our commanders on the ground. The Constitution says it; I will stand by it.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 985, WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007; AND H.R. 1362, ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONTRACTING ACT

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet the week of March 12 to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 985, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 1 p.m. on Monday, March 12.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. A copy of that bill is posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

In addition, the Rules Committee intends to meet next week to grant a rule that may structure the amendment process on H.R. 1362, the Accountability in Contracting Act.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 1 p.m. on Tuesday, March 13.

Amendments must be drafted to the bill as ordered reported on March 8 by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. A copy of that bill will be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

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.)

□ 1445

TRIBUTE TO DR. TED STILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise to mark the passing this week of one of the most effective environmentalists in the State of New Jersey, indeed in the country, Dr. Ted Stiles. Perhaps not the most celebrated, he should be celebrated. He preserved thousands of acres, advanced the understanding of ecology, and improved the environment for millions of people for generations to come. To some of my colleagues from the western States, thousands of acres may not sound like much, but the significance of that preservation and the difficulty of doing it in the densely populated Northeast are great.

Dr. Stiles chaired and led boards of the Stony Brook Millstone Watershed Association, the Mercer County Open Space Preservation Board, the Friends of Hopewell Valley Open Space, the Municipal Land Use Center, the New Jersey Academy of Science, and the Hutchinson Memorial Forest. He served for many years on boards, including the Crossroads of the American Revolution Association; The Nature Conservancy, New Jersey chapter; and others. He continued all of this work through his illness and up to his death.

He showed creative approaches to locally based environmental decision-making, such as his creation of the Municipal Land Use Center; and he received awards from academia and regional and community organizations and the highest environmental award from the Governor of New Jersey.

What distinguished Dr. Stiles especially was his unparalleled, unmatched ability to make people want to do those things that contribute to the general good. He made landowners want to offer their land to preservation organizations, and he made people want to spend their money to purchase and preserve that land. He made volunteer board members want to give of their time and effort to build communities and to improve the environment.

He made grad students want to go to remote places around the world to do such things as measuring the size of fruits relative to the sizes of birds' beaks so we could better understand the relationship between communities of plants and communities of animals.

He made hundreds of local citizens want to spend a day twice a year cleaning up their town. And he made a politically interested scientist want to leave a research career to run for Congress. Yes, I am that scientist. Dr. Stiles' research students continue to make contributions to research, teaching, and public policy around the country.

Throughout his life, it is not an empty cliché to say, Dr. Stiles, through goodwill and good ideas and

leadership, made this country a better place.

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.)

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. HOLLMANN

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great American. Mr. Daniel J. Hollmann of Odessa, Texas, has been a community leader in Odessa and the Permian Basin for more than three decades. A small businessman, family man and steadfast volunteer, Dan is one of the shining stars in the Eleventh Congressional District of Texas.

April 1 of this year marks the 30th anniversary of Dan receiving his license to practice law and the founding of his own firm, now Hollmann, Lyon, Patterson and Durell. Reaching this milestone is a great achievement, and I congratulate him for showing the hard work and perseverance I know it takes to run a small business.

I would also like to recognize and congratulate Dan as the 2006 recipient of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce's Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award. The award, given to the chamber member who best represents the collective goals of the business community of Odessa, was given to Dan because of his extensive volunteer history to the community and involvement in volunteerism that led to this award.

He has donated legal services to various nonprofit organizations, including the Formation of Court Appointed Special Advocates of Ector County and Catholic Charities Community Services, and is a proud supporter of many public school booster clubs, ranging from the Permian High School Choir Booster Club to the Odessa High School Basketball Booster Club.

Again, I congratulate my friend Daniel J. Hollmann on all of these achievements and thank him for his continued service to our community. Other citizens should look to him as a role model, and I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and to call him my friend.

PROPOSED TIME LINE FOR WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, on a different topic altogether, we have heard talk that the Democrats will bring forth the idea that we can set some sort of an artificial time line on when to get out of Iraq. I would argue there are really only two choices in this issue, and this third choice is false and misleading.

Here is the example: let's assume for the sake of this argument that Democrats decide in March of 2008 we need to stop this fight. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how do you look those family members in the eye whose loved ones are killed or maimed in March of 2008 and say, gee, if we had known in March of 2007 what we now know in March of 2008, that your loved one would have gotten killed, I might have thought a February 28 date was a better date.

Madam Speaker, we have no three choices. We have two choices, and they are honorable, in a sense. One is to fight this fight and win, which is the choice I believe is the correct one; or we simply raise the white flag, admit defeat, say that we have lost and get our troops out today. Anything short of that is untenable. The impact it has on the war fighter is obvious, ignoring, of course, the impact it has on the folks we oppose and the advantages it gives them. We simply cannot hamstring our fighters in this fight.

I cannot face families in July of this year or March of next year and say, gee, but for the calendar clicking off, your loved one would not have been at risk.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pick sides in this fight. Either we fight it or we get out. Pick a side. There is no third alternative.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Effective immediately, I hereby resign from my position on the House Committee for Education and Labor. I have gained much from my time served on this committee, and now look forward to serving the 110th Congress in other capacities.

Best regards,

BOB INGLIS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

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.)

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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON 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. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MANNER OF CONDUCTING PROCEEDINGS IN THE 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, we have had I think a very eventful week here this week and accomplished a significant amount and had some intense debates here on the floor of this Congress. In my time here and in anybody's memory here, I don't think anyone remembers a time that there have been three motions to recommit that have actually succeeded and attached that new policy on to the bill that was prepared for final passage here on the floor. That makes it an eventful week.

Madam Speaker, I reflect here that at the beginning of the 110th Congress there were a lot of objections to a scoreboard vote board that was kept open when Republicans were in charge for the sake of being able to allow people to change their votes until everyone was satisfied. There were strong and loud and vociferous complaints to keeping that board open when it was the Republicans in charge.

I am not here to make a loud, vociferous objection to the Democrats keeping the board open, but I am here to point out that the shoe is on the other foot today, and today this motion to recommit went up on the board, and it had 147 Democrats that voted "no" on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit, what it did was said that no individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted of or found not guilty by reason of insanity in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies. In other words, nobody is going to be boarding a maritime vessel if they are guilty of these crimes: espionage or conspiracy, sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition, treason,