

In fact, a key turning point took place in March of 2001 when President Bush took a courageous step that President Clinton should have taken but did not take during the last year of his Presidency. In 1999, the big State of California, with a tremendous consumption of fuel for automobiles and energy—generally, the State of California, at that time, was deciding to ban the competitor to ethanol as an octane enhancer that is known by the acronym MTBE. It stands for methyl tertiary-butyl ether. It was found to contaminate ground water.

Obviously, California had to quit using it, but they did not want to substitute ethanol. According to the 1990 Clean Air Act, they had to substitute ethanol without a waiver by the President or Congress. They were asking for that waiver. It did not happen, so we did not know where the ethanol industry sat versus the MTBE, so ethanol did not benefit the way it could have if President Clinton had made a decision.

California Governor Gray Davis did not want his citizens to have to use ethanol—which the 1990 law required—and he petitioned Clinton for that waiver. While many of my colleagues and I lobbied President Clinton to deny the waiver, he took no action. When President Clinton had the opportunity to demonstrate his confidence in our Nation's farmers and ranchers to produce this clean renewable alternative energy, President Clinton was nowhere to be found.

That changed when Governor George Bush was elected President. Less than 90 days into his term as President, George Bush denied the waiver which put the ethanol industry firmly on a path to growth because California uses so much energy.

Along the way, Congress considered and enacted a number of incentives and supportive policies to foster the development of this important industry. In August 2005, President Bush signed into law the Energy Policy Act which included the renewable fuels standard, or RFS, for short. This provision was a culmination of the work of dozens of Senators during a period that spanned three Congresses. It has also been key to the growth of the domestic ethanol industry.

The effort to enact a strong renewable fuels standard was bipartisan, but it was approved by the majority Republican Congress with the help of President Bush.

During the consideration of the Energy Policy Act, President Bush asked Congress for a bill that would help diversify the U.S. away from crude oil. He put his public support behind the renewable fuels standard to require the use of ethanol and/or biodiesel. The President supported our efforts toward a renewable fuels standard because he recognized that increasing our use of ethanol and biodiesel would create new markets for farm products and increase our energy security.

During the consideration by the Senate during this period of time—and I

referred to this a little bit before—no fewer than 11 amendments were offered by Members of the other side of the aisle to delay, reduce, or render useless the renewable fuels standard which had broad bipartisan support, particularly from those from the Midwest. It was not the Republicans offering these amendments to kill the growth of the domestic renewable fuels market. It was members of the other side, some of whom are the same ones who may be criticizing the President today for not doing enough to decrease dependence upon foreign oil.

Perhaps more ironic is that a strong renewable fuels standard could have been enacted earlier than 2005. In November 2003, an Energy bill conference report came to the Senate with a renewable fuels standard but ran into a filibuster in the Senate. Had there not been a Democratic-led filibuster, what the President signed in August of 2005 would have been signed in November 2003. We would have been 2 years ahead of the game.

In addition to the renewable fuels standard, other provisions enacted in the past 6 years have perhaps done even more to spur the growth of the renewable fuels, particularly ethanol and particularly biodiesel. In 2004, Congress enacted the American Jobs Creation Act. This legislation included modification and extension of the ethanol tax incentive. While improving the incentive, it also extended it through 2010.

In the Energy Policy Act, which the President signed in August of 2005, Congress expanded the incentive for small ethanol producers and created a new credit for small producers of biodiesel. Most recently, Congress extended the tariff on imported ethanol through the year 2008. The tariff ensures that U.S. taxpayers are not subsidizing foreign ethanol and that we continue to grow our domestic production of ethanol.

As a result of the tax incentives, the ethanol import tariff and the renewable fuels standard, the domestic renewable fuels industry, is growing faster than anyone could have ever imagined. The policies put in place by the Congress when Republicans controlled it, with the support and assistance of President Bush, have put this industry on a path of extraordinary growth. We have recognized that renewable fuels, such as ethanol and biodiesel, improve air quality, strengthen national security, reduce the trade deficit, decrease dependence upon the volatile Middle East for oil, expand markets for agricultural products, increase income for farmers, and create good-paying jobs in rural America.

In other words, it is as the Campbell's soup advertisement of 25 years ago: everything about ethanol is good, good, good.

The fact is, President Bush has been the most prorenewable fuels President our country has ever had. I stated earlier when he was a candidate for Presi-

dent coming from big oil Texas and being Governor of that State, would I expect him to be a renewable fuels person in the future? No, because I have been dealing with big oil and fighting them versus ethanol for a long period of time. It is only within the last 3 or 4 years that we had the freedom of not having to fight big oil. Who knows, maybe today we will have to fight big oil again when it comes to some ethanol products for the future, but there has been a lull. I thank President Bush for keeping his word to the people when he promised to be prorenewable fuels.

Getting back to those who claim the renewable fuels industry has lacked attention from President Bush and previous Republican Congresses, I leave with one final point. In the year 2000, the final year of the Clinton administration, we produced 1.6 billion gallons of ethanol. That is nothing negative about President Clinton. He seemed to be, for the most part, very ethanol friendly. But you cannot criticize this President when we have this figure: By the time he leaves office in 2008, we will be producing 10 billion gallons. The policy supported by the Republican Congress led to this growth.

I have proven that I don't want to sit by quietly while the other side tries to say otherwise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Does the Democratic side seek unanimous consent to address the Senate?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to speak as if in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have been periodically tuning in today during committee hearings and other work we do around here on some of the debate surrounding whether we are going to have a debate on Iraq. It is hard for the average American out there who may be watching C-SPAN to understand whether there is any sanity in this place, whether we are really rational individuals running the Senate.

This is supposed to be the most deliberative body, as we keep calling ourselves, in the world. The function of the Senate is to debate and to discuss, sometimes ad nauseam, different measures. Sometimes we can debate for a long time around here. People in this country wonder what is happening here that the Republicans won't even allow debate on the most important single issue confronting America today: the war in Iraq and the escalation.

I make it clear from the outset to those who may be watching, to try to clear it up as much as possible, the Republicans, through parliamentary maneuvers and through their vote yesterday, will not even allow the Senate to

debate Iraq. I can talk on it if I want to. Of course, I can. But they will not allow us to go to a debate on the Warner resolution, which has very strong bipartisan support, and has a majority of the votes in the Senate.

We are faced with an unusual situation which I don't know has ever occurred here before. A matter which is life and death for so many of our young men and women—disrupting families, causing untold drain on our Federal Treasury, not just now but for years in the future, causing us to lose friends and allies around the world—and we can't even debate it. But that is the situation in which we find ourselves.

I can tell you, over the last few weeks I have had thousands contact my office through e-mails and phone calls. I must say, the vast majority, the overwhelming majority, oppose the President's escalation and the war in Iraq.

Over the last 24 hours, since yesterday, much of their anger and focus has been not so much on the President and his misguided policies but on the Republicans in the Senate who won't allow Members to debate the issue. As one said, we debate this in our workplace, we debate it in the parking lot, we debate it after church on Sunday, we debate it with our neighbors, in our clubs, at the bowling alleys, but you guys can't debate it in the Senate? They just cannot believe that Republican Senators are blocking debate on the No. 1 issue before our Nation.

In a nutshell, what callers are saying to my office is that Senators have a right if they want to support the President's position on the war in Iraq. They have a right to embrace his escalation of the war, but they do not have a right to block legitimate debate in the Senate on whether the escalation is wise or appropriate. They do not have the right to silence the voices of tens of millions of Americans who have had enough of our quagmire in Iraq.

People in Iowa, and I suspect across the country, are saying the election last November was a referendum on the war. Voters spoke loudly and clearly; they want our troops out of the civil war in Iraq. I imagine the American people probably thought their elected leaders in Washington got the message. Well, maybe they see now that the Republican minority in the Senate does not even care about what happened in the election. They want to escalate the war. But that is fine. If that is their choice, that is their choice. But what should not be their choice is to silence debate by a majority of Senators who oppose the escalation in Iraq.

I think this is what got people so upset and are calling and e-mailing my office. People in this country, in times of crisis such as this, are always way ahead of the politicians. They know that by voting against debating the war, the Republican Senators have voted to endorse President Bush's escalation of that war.

It is one thing for Republican Senators to ignore the Iraq Study Group's

recommendations. It is one thing for Republican Senators to ignore the results of the November election. It is one thing for them to ignore all the warnings of the generals last year. But what is unacceptable is that Republicans in the Senate refuse to listen to the families of soldiers who are being asked to put their lives on the line for this last and reckless roll of the dice in Iraq.

Among those being committed to the escalation are more than 600 soldiers from the Iowa Army National Guard. Many of them are from the 1st Battalion of the 133rd Infantry headquartered in Waterloo, IA. Other units are from Dubuque, Iowa Falls, Charles City, and Oelwein. These soldiers have been deployed since early last year in Anbar Province, the most violent region in Iraq.

These soldiers were supposed to come home in the spring. But just 1 day after the President announced his escalation, they learned they would not be coming home. Instead, their combat tour in Iraq would be extended to 16 months. Think about that—nearly a year and a half in the middle of some of the most deadly combat in Iraq. To make matters worse, as we now know, many of the soldiers and their families learned about it through the media before they were officially notified.

I want to make it clear, I know some of these members of the Iowa Army National Guard. They are disciplined professionals. Even those who I know profoundly disagree with this escalation, I know they will do their duty. And they are doing their duty in Iraq. They deserve our profound respect and admiration. But they deserve to be listened to. And their families deserve to be listened to.

From the letters, e-mails, and phone calls I have gotten, people are outraged that Republicans are not allowing the Senate to even debate the escalation.

We got some e-mails in, and I started reading some of them. I asked my staff to contact them to see if I could read them on the Senate floor. I would not want to read an e-mail on the floor unless I had permission from the sender.

So I have three letters I am going to read because they are so profound. One is from Barbara—I will not use the last name—in Iowa whose husband is with the 133rd Infantry. This is what she writes:

Senator Harkin: I sit here to write this letter, not knowing why since I'm feeling like no one cares anymore or will be able to do anything about it. I am a 41 year old woman, (as of today), a military wife of 23 years and a mother of 3. My husband is a proud member of the 1-133rd Infantry. This unit was called up to serve in the Sinai for 9 months from April 2003 until January of 2004. Just a short 18 months later they were ripped away from their families once again to be a part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. They are currently serving in Iraq and have been gone for 16 months so far on this mission. The soldiers and the families have finally been feeling like we were seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. As the new year began we all started our countdown for our reunions ex-

pected for the first part of April. Three days ago, our worlds came crashing down once again as we learned that our loved ones would not be coming home in April, but were being extended until August, thus being deployed for almost 2 years by the time they return. I am angry, I am devastated! How could this happen? How could you let this happen? How could this be right? I have lost all hope and faith in our government. I don't understand much about politics so my biggest question is if so many people are against this war and the increase of troops being sent over then why is the president not listening? Doesn't he care? I voted for him and believed in him and he has let me down. I attended a meeting that was to discuss this extension and we were told some good things were happening for the future for the guards. Limited times of 12 months being deployed and 5 years in between call ups. Even though I am so happy for these changes for the future, you have to understand that 700 families are devastated right now, feeling left out, and not cared for because this doesn't help our soldiers or us right now. Please, please think about the effects this is having on our soldiers and their families. We all have given so much and though we are proud to have been part of serving our country, it's time for our soldiers to come home. Please bring them home.

Sincerely,
Barbara

The next letter is from Jodi in Iowa. She said:

I have a 20 year old son who has put his life on hold for the past 18 months. He left after only two weeks of his freshman year of college. He deployed to Iraq last April and was due to come home in three months. Now we are told he is to stay another 4 months. I have seen no progress in the Iraqi war and can not justify my son losing another 4 months of his life. I feel it is the lower and middle class people who are providing the men and women who are fighting this war. How many of your fellow congressmen have sons, daughters, husbands, wives, nieces or nephews serving in this war? I have a son, a nephew and a niece in Iraq. They joined the Guard for money so they could attend college, not because they were eager to go to war. They were assured when they signed up that they would not need to worry about being deployed. They do not want nor do we want them to stay longer than what they were told when they left last April. Please help bring my son home. He has served his time and his country and served it well.

Sincerely,
Jodi

Last, I will read a letter from Nikole:

Dear Senator Harkin:
I write to you as the wife of a soldier in the 1-133. My husband, SSG Nicholas . . . , has been stationed in Iraq since the end of March 2006. He also trained at Camp Shelby, Mississippi for five months prior. He was to come home at the beginning of April; however, he has now been extended for an additional four months.

My husband and I have been married for almost six years. He was in the US Army when we married and then joined the Iowa National Guard after exiting the service to continue to serve his country. My husband is 27 years old. He has served eight years in the military. Before his deployment he was a junior at Iowa State University majoring in Community Regional Planning and had plans to attend graduate school.

Our lives have been put on hold during this deployment. We both went into the deployment knowing that it would be difficult, but

we knew that our love would allow us to make it through. Our motivation was the ability to secure our future with financial freedom.

Think about that: "Our motivation was the ability to secure our future with financial freedom."

We planned to purchase our first house with the money that we saved.

During his two-week leave in September, we began building a new home. The house was to be finished in February. This would allow me time to move in and decorate just in time for his return. It was PERFECT timing. We would be able to pick up our lives and move on.

As you can imagine, we were both extremely disappointed to hear the news that he would be extended for an additional four months, already a longer time than any other unit deployed to Iraq.

I have not only lost my husband. I have lost my very best friend, my lover, my confident, my motivation and inspiration for life, that one person that knows and understands me the most. I am sure you can relate to someone in your own life.

Sure, my wife.

Now imagine that person being torn away from you for two years and place them in harm's way in a war zone. I act tough to my husband so that he will have one less thing to worry about. However, it IS an act. I miss him. I need him. I am falling apart.

My intention is not to be rude, complain, and say nasty comments. I am sure that you receive enough of those types of letters. I just pray that our story can give you a glimpse into our lives and the effect of the situation. I also pray that by hearing a personal story you will reconsider and allow the 1-133 to return home to their families, their children, their jobs, and continue their lives as American citizens.

Sincerely,
Nikole

Mr. President, I took the time to read those three letters. If we do not speak for these families, who will? If we are not allowed to debate here, are their voices to be silenced? They do not have the right to come here on the Senate floor and speak. I have the right to read their letters, with their permission, but why can't we debate this and speak on behalf of them and so many other families in this country who want their stories told and who want an end to this quagmire in Iraq?

They now know—people are so far ahead of us; they are so far ahead of the politicians around here—they know what is happening. They know that Iraq was a lie; it was a mistake. They know there was never any weapons of mass destruction. They know now that Saddam Hussein, however bad he was, was not involved in acts of terrorism against the United States—against his own people but not against the United States.

They now know that what is happening in Iraq is a civil war. As I was told some years ago by a person from the Emirates—close to there—he said to me: Senator, you have to understand that Iraq was really three countries. It is just a figment of the British imagination that they put it together in the Treaty of Versailles after the First World War. He said: Really it is three countries, the Shias, the Sunnis, and

the Kurds. He said: Furthermore, Senator, it is a civil war waiting to happen, and there is nothing you can do about it.

Yes, maybe someone as ruthless as Saddam could put the lid on it for a while. And we would hope they would come to their senses and not have a civil war. They have had an election. They have a parliament. And now it is time for the Iraqis to take matters into their own hands. The longer we are there, the more involved we become, the more it becomes America's war against the Iraqis.

I read the article in the Washington Post this morning about how our troops are now going door-to-door in Iraq, and they just bust in. They busted into the home of a woman who had a master's degree in English translation, whose husband was a major in the Iraqi Army. And she said: Why didn't you just have the courtesy to knock? I would have let you in.

These soldiers are going into homes. They are going into bedrooms and looking under beds, tearing sheets off the beds, looking through dressers of people who have nothing to do with the war. These are just civilians and they happen to be caught in a zone.

You wonder how they feel about us after something like that happens. One soldier was quoted in the paper this morning talking about his first tour of Iraq right after the invasion. He said: Things were fine. We went out with the Iraqi people. Now I go over there and they spit at us, every one of them.

So the people of this country understand that this war was a terrible mistake from the beginning. It has been not only a mistake and a lie to get into it, it has been mismanaged from the very beginning. It has cost over 3,000 of our young men and women's lives. How many Iraqi lives? I am told the count is now way over 50,000, maybe as high as 100,000, with millions more displaced from their homes, going into Jordan. That is going to cause a lot of unrest in Jordan with all the displaced people and refugees there.

The answer is not to continue this miserable escalation the President wants to do. Everyone realizes this won't do it. It is just going to cause more misery, more suffering, cost more money, cost more lives.

That is the kind of debate we want to have. But Republican Senators will not allow us to have the debate or even to have a vote on the resolution of disapproval. We have a duty to debate this escalation, to speak up when we believe the President's policy is wrong. We have a duty to speak up for families, such as the ones whose letters I read, and for the overwhelming majority of Americans who oppose this new escalation. It is unconscionable that Republicans leaders, at the behest of President Bush, are refusing to allow the Senate to debate the escalation in Iraq. It is time for them to listen to the American people and the families of our troops in the field. It is time to

stop the obstruction, allow the Senate to debate the Warner resolution, and to have a vote. That is all we are asking for. Vote your conscience. If people want to vote to support the escalation, if they want to speak on behalf of it, that is their right as U.S. Senators. But I hope they don't realize they have a right to silence the voices of millions of Americans who are looking to us to do something, to bring some reasoning, some rational discourse, and some clear thinking to what is happening in Iraq and to confront the truth.

As I said earlier, our young men and women are doing their duty. I know. I have an e-mail I received the other day from a young man in Iraq who has been there for quite a while. I won't use his name because I didn't ask his permission to use the e-mail. He said in his e-mail that he—I am not sure of the word—disagreed with the war. He said: This war is not winnable. The military cannot do this over here. But he is doing his job. He is putting himself in harm's way day after day. They realize this is a bad mistake. You think we would start realizing it around here, too.

War is not the answer in Iraq. Diplomacy is, bringing in other countries. Does it mean we have to talk with Iran? I have no problem with that. The President once said he didn't want to talk to Iran because they were our enemies. I guess all we want to talk to is our friends. If I disagree with someone here, I want to talk to that person. I want to find out why. Is there any way we can reach resolution? So we ought to be talking with Syria and Jordan and Iran, Iraq, of course, Turkey, Syria—all the countries around there. We ought to be talking to them. And there ought to be a more concerted effort on the diplomatic side than there is on the military side. We are putting too much on the military and not enough on diplomacy. I would hope the Iraqis would come to their senses and not engage in a civil war, but that is their decision to make. We can't make it for them.

The longer we are there, the worse it becomes. The longer we are there, the more and more Iraqis turn against us. More and more people in the Mideast turn against us. And more and more we lose our standing in the world community. I daresay we have precious few friends around the world today who are willing to stand with us. Prior to this war, after 9/11, the entire world was on our side. After those planes hit the Twin Towers and the one hit the Pentagon and the one went down in Pennsylvania which was probably coming here, the world was on our side. Countries all over the world—Muslim nations were on our side. Even Iran sent out some feelers to go after the Taliban. They didn't like the Taliban, either. And here we squandered it all, with the whole world on our side 5 years ago. Now we would be hard-pressed to find a few. They may be with us here and there on this or that, but

we know what they are saying about our involvement in Iraq. We know what they are saying about our standing in the world community. We know that. It is going to take a long time to rebuild it. The longer we persist in this unconscionable, unwinnable quagmire war in Iraq, the longer it is going to take us to get our standing back in the world community. Try we must. We need to bring this war to its conclusion.

It is not losing the war. People say: We can't lose it. I wasn't in the Senate, but I was in the House of Representatives when the Vietnam war finally came to a close. We heard the same arguments then, that we can't afford to lose, that the whole of Southeast Asia would be in flames, communism would take over the Philippines, communism would take over Indonesia. We heard it time after time. Guess what. None of it happened. And you look back now and you go down here to the Vietnam Memorial wall and you read those names and you think about their sacrifice, families that were left behind, children, loved ones. You wonder what for. What for? They served their country proudly. They did their duty. But you wonder in the end, what was it for?

I think, as we look back on this war in Iraq years from now, the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives, we will ask that same question: What for? Why? War is not the answer. Escalation is not the answer. We need to bring our troops home.

Those on the other side are saying we ought to talk about cutting off funding. That is going to come. We are going to have a supplemental appropriations bill. It will be here probably in the next couple months. I, for one, am going to do everything I can to make sure we have some kind of amendment on that bill which will limit the President's ability to spend the taxpayers' money on the war in Iraq. After all, the Constitution gives us the power of the purse strings, not the President. If we want to say: Mr. President, you can spend the money to redeploy troops out of Iraq and to protect them while they are being deployed, you can do that, but you can't spend any of that money to send any more troops there and put them in harm's way and have them going door to door in Baghdad and have them be shot at by snipers, we will have that opportunity when the supplemental appropriations bill comes before us.

Right now is time for us as a Senate to stand up and say whether we approve of the escalation or disapprove. Republican Senators on the other side of the aisle won't even give us that opportunity. I hope they hear from more families like the letters I just read. Maybe we will get that opportunity. It is time for us to quit shirking our responsibility, time for us to stand up and say whether we are for the escalation. I, for one, am not. Maybe others are for it. I think that is what we ought to debate, and that is what we ought to vote on.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

FIRST LIEUTENANT JACOB FRITZ

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise to express my sympathy over the loss of U.S. Army 1LT Jacob Fritz of Nebraska. Lieutenant Fritz was killed near Karbala, Iraq on January 20. He was 25 years old.

Lieutenant Fritz was raised on his family's farm near Verdon, NE. From a young age, Lieutenant Fritz knew he wanted to be a leader. After graduating from Dawson-Verdon High School in 2000, he followed through on this goal. I had the honor of nominating Lieutenant Fritz to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He graduated from the Academy in 2005. His brother, Daniel Fritz, 22, followed in his footsteps and is currently in his third year at West Point. Like his brother Jake, I had the privilege of nominating Dan to West Point.

Lieutenant Fritz was leading a unit of more than 30 soldiers in Iraq since October. Lieutenant Fritz described his mission as a liaison between Iraqi police and the U.S. Army. He said the work was challenging, but rewarding.

Lieutenant Fritz was buried on January 31 with full military honors in a church cemetery 4 miles from his family home near Verdon, NE. Family and friends paid their final respects in a moving service that reminded all of the courage, commitment, and sacrifice of soldiers like Lieutenant Fritz. As his childhood friend Air Force 1LT Brett Cooper remembered, a life of service to his country followed by a retirement to the small town life that he loved was all that Lieutenant Fritz wanted. We're proud of Lieutenant Fritz's service to our country as well as the service of thousands of brave Americans who are currently serving in Iraq.

In addition to his brother Dan, Lieutenant Fritz is survived by his parents Lyle and Noala and his younger brother Ethan.

I ask my colleagues to join me and all Americans in honoring 1LT Jacob Fritz.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF G. MARTIN WAGNER

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I honor G. Martin Wagner—a dedicated public servant who, on January 31, 2007, retired from Federal service after 31 years.

Marty Wagner has had an exemplary career working for the Federal Government. Far removed from the apocryphal "faceless bureaucrat" that so many of those who wrongly belittle our Federal workforce often refer to, Marty should serve as an example to us all in how to best serve the people of this great country. Marty was a leader and a doer who accomplished much over the past three decades, and leaves the Federal Government a far better place than how he found it.

Over his 31 years in the Federal civil service, Marty earned many honors and awards for his efforts to make the Federal Government a better place to work for all Federal employees. His service has also resulted in a Federal Government that is more caring and responsive to the needs of the American public.

Marty grew up in Tucson, AZ. In his youth, he played guitar and sang folk songs in old time "hootenannies." He has a deep, recognizable voice, which would have served him well as a professional musician or radio persona. Fortunately for us, his career took a different path and Marty became a dedicated, hard-working Federal employee—serving in a number of agencies and departments over the past 31 years.

Most of us who know and have worked with Mr. Wagner over the years, associate him with his almost two decades of service with the General Services Administration, GSA, where he has been an innovative leader and promoter of initiatives for improved and more accessible information technology for Federal workers and the public alike. Most recently, Marty has served as Deputy Commissioner of the new Federal Acquisition Service, FAS. Prior to accepting this position, Marty also served as Acting Commissioner and Acting Deputy Commissioner of FAS. However, Marty was also a leader before his days at GSA, and I call to my colleagues attention just one of his major accomplishments over his Federal career.

Early on, Marty was an economic analyst at the Environmental Protection Agency. His outstanding work in the environmental arena proved to be invaluable to the quality of the air we breathe. In addressing the economic impact of pending EPA regulations, Marty was instrumental in producing the findings that resulted in the first requirement to remove lead from gasoline. I believe Marty could have retired at this point and have served his country well but, fortunately, this was just the first step in a long and distinguished career with the Federal Government.

G. Martin Wagner was a masterful manager and leader of innovative change within the Federal Government. The results of his untiring efforts over the past 30 years are evident in numerous Federal programs, resulting in a much more effective and efficient Federal Government.