

United Nations said 34,452 Iraqi civilians had been killed in sectarian violence in 2006.

This is not insurgents or al Qaeda coming across the border. These are Iraqi civilians caught up in sectarian violence. We have not been able to stop it. This is a terrible day today. We have over 100 today that have died. Over 100.

So when we begin to try and resolve this question of Iraq, can we not put in place serious diplomatic negotiations? Can we not work in a bipartisan manner? Can we not suggest that we have done enough to warrant the Prime Minister at the table along with Sunni leaders? Can we ask the Prime Minister not to be so singular in his viewpoints? Do you expect, with his relationship with the cleric, that he would in any way provide the kind of necessary commitment that we have been told by this administration will be required for the Baghdad policy to work, dividing Baghdad into nine districts, forcing our soldiers, 20,000-plus, into neighborhoods, dragging people out of their neighborhoods when the bombing that occurred today occurred at the end of al Sadr, the city? The largest and one of the most egregious horrific bombings and we are to expect that our soldiers will be able to be in the midst?

Oh, yes, I have the greatest faith in our young men and women. And I do believe they are well trained. I take nothing away from them, and I thank them for being willing warriors. They are called and they go, and we should never diminish them. They are our defenders. And when the Commander in Chief calls them, they respond.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, in the times I have gone every year since we invaded Iraq, I have gone along to Afghanistan, I have been in Mazul and Tikrit, and I have spoken to soldiers, and I probably left some behind who lost their lives. And every one of them would give you a stiff upper lip. They are there. As I got to go more recently, unfortunately I would see those who are there on their second and third redeployment, and those who will go back will be on the second and third redeployment.

So Dr. King's dream is being extinguished in the bloodiness, in the misdirectedness of an ongoing war, longer than World War II, with no solution. We leave Dr. King's dream of non-violence, of ways of using nonviolence, extinguished and stomped under our feet.

So I say to the American people, Dr. King's birthday is past, it was yesterday, and we had a weekend of activities, I'm sure, in many, many cities. You won't remember it again until next year this time, but I believe we are commanded by icons like Dr. King and our own Founding Fathers who indicated first that we organize this Nation to form a more perfect Union. It is right here in the Constitution, the very document that provides for us the right kind of way to declare war, which we never did.

Then, of course, Alexander Hamilton wanted to make sure we didn't leave our democracy, our freedom, our ability to speak just on some parchment paper they had written on. He said it has to be living, and we are not living the dream or living freedom here in America today. And, America, is what I am saying to my colleagues, you voted in November, I know, but it is time to break the silence. That is what Martin King said on April 4, 1967, a year before his death. Beyond Vietnam, a time to break the silence.

That was a stepping away from Dr. King's whole legacy at that time. And, believe me, he received enormous criticism. But he said a time comes when silence is betrayal, and that time has come for us in relation to Vietnam. He even went on to say, when pressed by the demands of inner truth, men do not easily assume the task of opposing their government's policy, especially in times of war. Nor does the human spirit move without great difficulty against all the apathy of conforming thought within one's own bosom and in the surrounding world.

He said, again, it is time to break the silence. Tonight, as he spoke to the congregation in this speech, he said: However, I wish not to speak with Hanoi and the National Liberation Front, then of course our proposed enemies during Vietnam, but rather to my fellow Americans, who with me bear the greatest responsibility in ending a conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

So this is what I leave with my friends. It is the responsibility of America. It is our responsibility to end the conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

□ 2240

And so I ask Americans to push forward. Let us hear from you on the cutting off of funds because, as we have heard over the weekend, the administration refuses to listen to the voices of the American people. And I was told the Vice President indicated that we have enough money, and so the Congress is not needed.

But I remain committed and inspired by Martin King's dream. And he had a wonderful dream for a better America. He wanted to see all of us of all hues and religion, little black boys and girls and white boys and girls and brown boys and girls, and all races and creeds of his era, now translated to today sitting down at the table of peace and harmony.

It may sound dated, but it is relevant today, and the New Direction Congress has grabbed hold, if you will, of the idea of making America great.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot make America great unless, of course, we bring, in dignity, the end to the Iraq conflict. 34,000 dead. And America must speak against the funding and the continued funding of this horrific, misdirected conflict.

Might I say, it has nothing to do with cutting off the resources of our valued

soldiers on the battlefield, for, as we have heard, there are monies there. But unless our voice is heard, non-violently, and comprehensively, we have a failed policy and a failed direction continued by the executive.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by citing in the Constitution the recognition that there are three branches of government, the executive, the judiciary, and the legislature. The Founding Fathers made sure, not knowing of Dr. King's dream, that they were equal and balanced.

And I respect the President as a Commander-in-Chief, but it is time now for America to breathe life into this Constitution, and to ensure, as we breathe life into this constitution, we, the people who are here to form a more perfect union, demand in debate and demand in action that we redeploy and bring our soldiers home.

And we can be successful because America has always lifted her voice of reason and brought people to the table in negotiation. And all the violence in Iraq, all of the violence in Iraq has not brought the parties together. All of the warring, all of the militia and our soldiers on the ground has not brought the parties together. That is where the administration fails in its duty to heal America and to make a solution that recognizes sectarian violence is going to require those sects to sit down and find a valid peace.

Martin King left us with good words, answer the Macedonian call to render aid, and we, as Americans, would get to the promised land some day. He might not be with us, but we have the opportunity, still, to continue our greatness and be part of the promised land.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again for your patience this evening and having given us an opportunity to remind Americans that our history is not one that is passed, but it is living. Dr. King's dream must live within us.

THREE AMERICAN HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of Ohio). The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning, at 7:24 a.m., the first rays of the morning sun will illuminate the markers, the crosses and Stars of David at Arlington Cemetery. And about a half hour later they will move across the oak ridges of the Blue Ridge Mountains and down to the slow waters of the Shenandoah River and across the Midwest of this country.

And, Mr. Speaker, they will arrive, about an hour later, that great American sunrise, at the small towns in Texas, the hometowns of Audie Murphy, who fought with such great heroism in World War II, Sergeant Roy Benevides, who was a hero of the Vietnam War, and the hometown of Corporal Jason Dunham, who was given, a few days ago, the Medal of Honor by the President of the United States for his extreme valor in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, these three American heroes are tied by a common thread to each other and to the American people and to our national purpose, in that they all fought for the expansion of freedom.

Now, Audie Murphy fought in a war, World War II, which was a war that, once we had gotten into it and got past that first vote for a draft, which I think passed by one vote in this body, and realized that it was make or break time for the United States, that it was a war that would involve the full commitment of our entire country and all of our energies, a war in which there was unanimous support, that it was a war in which Audie Murphy fought with such great heroism.

The war in which Roy Benevides fought was a war that didn't support, or didn't involve that unanimous support by the American people, but, nonetheless, involved a noble cause, the cause of spreading freedom in Vietnam.

And the war that Corporal Jason Dunham gave his life in to protect his buddies in the 1st Marine Division, was a war, similarly, in which the United States has entered a long established blueprint for establishing freedom around the world, that is standing up a free government, standing up a military to protect that free government. And he was involved in the dangerous conflict in Anbar Province and gave his life for his colleagues in that struggle. So all three of these heroes were involved in the greatest American purpose, which is to spread freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we have an interest in spreading freedom, not just a humanitarian interest, but a national interest. After World War II, we stood up the free government in Japan, and we stood up a military apparatus that could protect it. And who would quarrel with the idea that we have an enormous interest in having Japan, a free nation, with considerable economic and military capability, on that end of the Pacific Ocean?

We also maintained free Germany, that is, West Germany, with the Berlin airlift, which was carried out with lots of American expenses and involvement and sacrifice. But we did that and, ultimately, that resulted in the reuniting of East and West Germany, and after the wall came down, the freeing of hundreds of millions of people as a result of America's triumph in the Cold War. And nobody would quarrel with the idea that having a free Germany in that strategic location was important to the United States.

In our own hemisphere, we maintained a shield around that fragile democracy in El Salvador as we stood up that free government and allowed them to have their first elections. And nobody would quarrel with the idea that El Salvador, which now is an ally of the United States in the operation in Iraq, is an important asset for the United States in our own hemisphere, an important ally, an important part-

ner; and that that is much preferable to the Marxist state which was where it was headed when the United States intervened.

□ 2250

Having free nations around the world in strategic locations especially is important to America. I think we all agree with that now, we have got a chance, if we succeed in Iraq, and having a country that is a friend, not an enemy of the United States, a country that will not be a state sponsor of terrorism in the future for the next 5, 10, 15, 20 years, and a country which has a modicum of freedom for its people.

Now, you know in spreading freedom around the world, incidentally, there are lots of naysayers. There are a lot of people who criticize and have criticized the American efforts.

After all, we only saved half of the Korean peninsula and none of Vietnam for freedom. People can point to the cliffs of Normandy in France and point out that the country that hosts those American gravesides for the soldiers who gave their lives for the liberation of France, that country is less than enthusiastic in supporting the United States in our efforts to expand freedom around the world.

You could probably say the same thing about the Government of Germany, seeming to have forgotten the ordeal of the Berlin airlift that the Americans endured to maintain freedom in West Germany and ultimately bring freedom to all the German people. There can be lots of criticism about the American plan. But, you know, the American plan, the idea of freedom has worked.

I want to talk just a little bit about the Baghdad plan, the plan that the President and the joint chiefs and our war fighting leadership in Iraq have put together. Now, somebody along this great tradition of critics who like to imply that somehow the road that we didn't take was a smooth road, there is lots of criticism of this plan.

This plan is not guaranteed to work because a lot of it relies on a factor that the United States doesn't control, and that is willingness, the willingness of the Iraqi military to show up with all of its units, to stand and fight, to be willing to engage in battle, and to be willing to take the burden of security that presently is carried mainly by the Americans.

But let us talk about this Baghdad plan, because the Baghdad plan could be a pattern for the handoff of the security responsibilities from the United States to the Iraqi Government.

In each of the nine sectors in Baghdad that the plan envisions, there will be an Iraqi brigade. Now, usually an Iraqi brigade will consist of two or three maneuvered battalions. A battalion can be anything from 500 to 800 people, so it consists of two or three maneuvered battalions who will be out in front. They will have some embedded American advisors and people who

can do things like call in medivacs and direct precision fire and do other things that we call combat enablers, so they will have American embedded teams helping them.

Beyond that, standing as a backup to these two or three Iraqi battalions will be an American battalion, helping to shore them up, helping to give them advice, standing behind them while the Iraqis move through the neighborhoods and through the communities in the areas that are violent in Baghdad.

Now, my recommendation has been that we take some of the 27 Iraqi battalions that have been trained and equipped that are in the quiet areas of Iraq, and nine of the 18 provinces are quiet areas. They are areas that involve less than one attack a day. That means that the 27 battalions that we have trained and equipped that are in those areas aren't undertaking substantial military operations right now.

We make sure that the Iraqi Ministry of Defense saddles up those battalions and moves them into the fight, rotates them into the battle, principally in the Baghdad area, but they could do the same thing in other areas in the Sunni triangle and even out in the al Anbar province. That does a couple of things. First, it helps get the job done. It moves trained and equipped fighting personnel into a theater of battle, and it provides people and equipment to make the necessary military operations to settle down Baghdad.

But the second thing it does is train up the Iraqi Army, because the best way to train any army is to put them in military operations. Let us put them in military operations.

Now my understanding that it is, in fact, from those nine quiet provinces we are going to have some three brigades that will involve six to nine battalions moving from the north and south, from quiet areas in Iraq, into Baghdad. We will be moving Iraqi battalions into Baghdad. Those have been committed by the Iraqi Government.

Now, there is no guarantees that all Iraqi forces are going to show up. They are going to have to prove that. In the past, they haven't always shown up. Although they have battalions that have performed very, very well in combat, they have got others that haven't performed well.

Now, we could take this pattern of having two or three Iraqi battalions with an American backup battalion, and we could use that to get combat experience and operational experience for every single Iraqi unit. Presently, there are 114 Iraqi battalions extant. That means that we have trained and equipped 114 battalions.

I am sure that they are at varying levels of end strength, that is, personnel, and probably varying levels of equipment. But you only need some basic equipment for this urban fighting. You need to have weapons, you need to have ammunition, you need to have communications gear, and you need to have transportation, and you need to have

soldiers who are willing, willing to obey the chain of command. You need to have leaders who are willing and able to lead, and you need to have a plan.

This Baghdad plan, this idea of dividing it into nine sectors, saddle up Iraqi units that heretofore have not been operating in Baghdad, moving them in, putting them out front, in front of the Americans, the Americans are backup, using that basic pattern to run through all of the 114 Iraqi battalions and give them combat experience is a good way for us to start this handoff in which we hand off the full security burden to the Iraqi forces.

Now, there is no guarantee that this can be done. There is no guarantee because one element of this plan is the commitment of Iraqi political leadership and the military leadership to carry out what they say they are going to do.

This plan can be a blueprint for the handoff of the security burden. I would hope that Members understand that the troops that we are sending to Iraq right now are, indeed, reinforcements. Some of them are already arriving. They are the reinforcements that are necessary to execute this plan. Some 4,000 of them are going to al Anbar province where the Marines have requested them, and the balance are going to the Baghdad operation and other operations, presumably in the Sunni Triangle.

This is a deployment of reinforcements, and the idea that this body or any other body would attempt to cut off American reinforcements to a military which is already engaged in combat is unacceptable. I think it is unprecedented. We have already made a vote to get into this operation. Right now we have got troops engaged in combat.

When reinforcements are required, and you have troops engaged in combat, it is incumbent upon us to make sure that our policy, and our policy is directed by the Commander in Chief, it is not directed by 435 Secretaries of State, that is all the Members of Congress becoming Secretaries of State in the House and another 100 in the other body, it is not directed by 535 self-appointed Secretaries of Defense. It is directed by the Commander in Chief who was elected by all the people to lead the militaries of this country. In consultation with our military leadership, he has done that. The troops are now moving. We need to get behind them.

That leads me to another issue, and that is I talked a little bit about that American sunrise and how it shines first on these stars of David and crosses at Arlington Cemetery, and then it moves across this country, takes about 3 hours to get to my hometown in San Diego and Fort Rosecrans Cemetery there on the edge of the Pacific Ocean.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, in the Midwest it flows over lots and lots of old factories and

plants that used to represent what we called the "arsenal of democracy."

When we got into World War II, our allies and our adversaries realized very quickly that America had an arsenal of democracy. We had a great industrial base. We had an industrial base in which our major auto makers were able to turn immediately to making tanks and personnel carriers and all the other equipment of war.

I know that in my own hometown in San Diego, we had an old facility you can still see if you drive down by the harbor that used to turn out a bomber aircraft every 60 minutes. That means they could have built the entire B-2 force in one day and had three hours left over.

Everywhere across this land, because we had a strong industrial base, which were able to transform that industrial base into a wartime footing, and it was with the support of that industrial base that the armies of the United States moved across Europe, that the Marine Corps and the armies moved across the Pacific, and that we brought this war to a conclusion that favored the United States of America. An arsenal of democracy is pretty important to democracies.

Today, if you want to look at a big part of the arsenal of democracy, you may have to go to some other countries. One country you may have to go to is China, because China is cheating on trade and China is acquiring hundreds of billions of American dollars, more than we are acquiring from them, and as the money piles up in China, they are using those billions of American trade dollars to buy military equipment.

That is why they are able to have some 17 submarines under production today while we have a fraction of that. That is why they are able to buy and build medium-range ballistic missiles. I predict at some point, Mr. Speaker, those ballistic missiles will have an anti-ship capability that will present a major threat to the American fleet. That is why they are able to start developing a new industrial base for the development of a modern tactical aircraft program.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see this one-way street on trade beginning to move the arsenal of democracy offshore. I can tell you in the past year on the Armed Services Committee I have looked at certain critical components of the arsenal of democracy, and I note that we only have one carbon fiber manufacturer left in the United States, and we only have, according to our research, one rocket fuel manufacturer left in the United States.

As we look at more and more of the industries that are critical to national security, we realize that in many of them we only have one or two or three businesses or companies that are left that are capable of making particular components that are critical to America's military strength.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to change and reverse this one-way street trade pol-

icy that we have acquiesced to and restore the arsenal of democracy.

It is kind of funny. When China enters a trade deal with the United States or competes against an American company, since we are all talking football at this time of the year, they start with 74 points on the scoreboard before the opening kickoff.

They give a 17 percent refund of their VAT tax, basically a 17 percent subsidy to this exporter who is sending out products to the United States. When our products arrive at China's shores, they give us a 17 percent penalty. That is now a 34 point spread. And then, just to make sure that we don't throw a Hail Mary and come from behind and win that particular competition on that particular product, they devalue their currency by 40 percent, and they increase the spread in points to 74 points.

That means that before the opening kickoff in this competition that we call world trade between the Chinese corporation and the American business and American workers, China has 74 points on the scoreboard. Then if we lose the competition, they say, what's the matter? Can't you play football?

China is cheating on trade, Mr. Speaker, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board made that clear in his preliminary speech which called this manipulation of currency an illegal subsidy. That word "subsidy" was subsequently removed from the speech before it was given to the Chinese leadership, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that illegal subsidy and that 17 percent penalty that is given to American trade goods and the 17 percent subsidy that they give to their trade goods as they are moved for export to the United States, that 74 points on the scoreboard hurts American businesses, it hurts American workers and it erodes the arsenal of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to need the arsenal of democracy at some point in the future, and we need to have a trade policy and new trade laws that say this: We are not going to live with the 74-point disparity anymore, and you can do it the easy way or the hard way. We can all start with zero points on the scoreboard, or we will put the same taxes on your goods that you put on ours, and we will both start with 74 points on the scoreboard. But we are not going to start anymore with the score being America zero, China 74.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope this is a year in which we pass a bill that calls the currency manipulation and devaluation by the central government of China what it is, which is an illegal subsidy.

Let me move on to another issue, Mr. Speaker, because as that American sunrise that lit up the Arlington Cemetery at 7:24 a.m. this morning moves across the United States, about 2 hours after that, it reaches the Southwest border of America. It shines on what I call the thin green line. That is the few thousand American Border Patrol men and women who defend the borders of

the United States. They have got a 2,000-mile border to defend. Mr. Speaker, all the way from San Diego, California, to Brownsville, Texas, and we owe it to them to use the best of our technology and the best of our resources to make sure that that border is defensible.

Now, we asked one of our great think tanks, the Sandia Laboratory, in fact, that is one of the laboratories that is full of scientists who design our nuclear weapons, design the warheads, we asked them once to solve a problem for us. We said, what is a good way for us to stop drugs from coming across the border from the south?

They thought about it for a while and came back and gave us a report, and the report said we are going to show you something that is not too complicated. How about a fence? In fact, how about a triple fence, which will slow down the smugglers enough so that your Border Patrolmen can catch them, which gives you a fighting chance to halt people that would come across illegally?

Now, this fence, in fact we call it the Sandia Fence because the Sandia National Laboratory designed it, is pretty simple. It consists of a steel fence. It is right on the border. Then you have a Border Patrol road that is about 50-foot wide, and then you have about a 15-foot high fence with an overhang, and then another Border Patrol fence, and then another fence that is a shorter fence. Three fences.

We built that when Republicans took control of this body in 1994 in San Diego. I can remember, because I drafted that language that went into the immigration bill that provided for that fence.

Mr. Speaker, when we built that fence, and we said it had to be built, the Clinton administration did not want to build it, and President Clinton's own INS representatives fought the fence. But they had to build it, because it was the law.

They said, do we have to build all three layers of fence? We sat down with them and said, well, we will tell you what; we will keep the three layers in the law, but let's build the first two, and if we don't need the third layer, we won't make you build it.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't needed the third layer, because that fence, the 14-mile fence in the San Diego sector, once we built the first big piece of that, we knocked down the smuggling of people and narcotics by more than 90 percent. We eliminated the drive-through drug trucks, we eliminated the 10 murders a year that were occurring on the border by the border gangs, and we eliminated the border gangs, because the border gangs needed to be able to move back and forth, north and south. If they were pursued from the north, they would go south, if they were pursued from the south, they would go north. We took away their mobility by building that fence.

Mr. Speaker, that fence works. And the new law that President Bush signed

a couple of months ago mandates the extension of that fence, the San Diego fence, 854 miles across the deserts of Arizona, New Mexico and Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I drafted that bill, that fence provision that was in the bill that was offered by Homeland Security, and the first big section that I put in was the section between Calexico, California, and Douglas, Arizona. That is about 392 miles. That is the number one smugglers' corridor, now that we have closed the San Diego-Tijuana corridor by fencing it.

That 392-mile section is a section through which massive amounts of people and narcotics are being smuggled. The Department of Homeland Security has a mandate. In fact, when we wrote that law, I put in the word "shall." "Shall" means that this is not an option, it is not a goal, it is not something that would be nice to have if you could do it. It is a mandate to the Federal Government to build that fence.

There is available now appropriated and ready to go in the bank, so-to-speak, \$1.2 billion. That may not build the entire 854 miles of fence, but it gives you an awfully good big piece of it.

Something we found out about the San Diego fence was after we had built even a third of the San Diego fence, because we channelized the smugglers, especially the drug trucks and they had fewer places to go, we were able to concentrate our border agents in those channelized openings that were still unfenced and we caught lots of them, and our interdiction rate went way up, even before we completed the fence.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing so compelling in this country as an idea that the people support which has been passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President and represents a law that came right from the heartland of this great country and which needs to be executed.

The Department of Homeland Security has the obligation of executing this law, and I look forward to working with my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, over the next several months and making sure that this fence gets started. We can start it concurrently in separate sections. You can have one contractor build it from mile 1 to mile 5, the next guy go from mile 5 to mile 10 and so on. We can immediately see a reduction in the amount of people and narcotics that are smuggled across this border.

Let me tell you why we have to build this border fence, Mr. Speaker: Since 9/11, it has become clear that border security is no longer primarily an immigration issue. It is a national security issue. We have to know, very simply, who is coming into our country and what they are bringing with them.

You know something else? We have got 250,000 criminal aliens right now in our Federal penitentiaries and our State and local prisons and jails, a quarter of a million criminal aliens. They cost us as much as \$50,000 apiece

to incarcerate for a year. That means that each year we spend around \$3 billion in cash money out of our Treasury to incarcerate the people that come across this unfenced section of the southern border of the United States. We would save enough money in one year on incarceration a loan to build the entire fence. Let's build it, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and January 17 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. CALVERT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral in her district.

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALOMAVEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today, January 17, 18, and 19.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, January 18.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, January 17, and 18.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.